

7/19/19

District Name:	South San Antonio	Name:	Laurie Elliott	Installation Type:	Monitor
County District No.:	015-908	Reporting Month:	June	Board President:	Connie Prado
Date of Installation:	11/2/2018	Date of Submission:	7/6/2019	Superintendent:	Alex Flores
Entry Condition(s):	Board was accepted as a mentor district to the LSG Exemplar Cohort				

Governance					
District Status	Progress Toward Academic Accountability	Activities Complete	Exit Criteria	Notes/Comments	<p>Conservator is highly recommended. The board is not following the tenants of LSG or any type of good governance. The board members voting in the majority ignore the other board members, the superintendent and the Texas Education Agency.</p>
	Off Track	0%	See Exit Criteria Tab		

Monitor/Conservator Activities & Status	Activity (Actions/Processes)	Status	Implementation Timeline		Person(s) Responsible	Expected Outcomes (Goal/Target)	Results (Evidence/Outcomes/Data)	Next Steps
			Recommended Start Date	Completed or Due By				
Continuation	Supporting Board chair/Board members and superintendent Collaboration	Off Track	1/1/2019	4/15/2019	Board chair/Board members, superintendent	Communicate often and collaborate on the implementation of LSG. Supt and board chair and board members to collaborate on business of the board and district.	Communication with the superintendent is in the form of directives. Board members voting as the majority do not collaborate with the superintendent, but rely mostly on the lawyer.	The monitor expects the board to begin complete implementation of Lone Star Governance. The monitor will continue to document any lack of collaboration with the superintendent.
Continuation	Support LSG Implementation	Off Track	1/1/2019	4/15/2019	Monitor, LSG Coach, Board Chair, Board Members, Superintendent	Begin the implementation process of Vision 1,2,3, and 4. Begin the implementation of Accountability 1 and 2; Structure, Advocacy and Unity	Although, goals and constraints are in place, all other components of LSG are ignored.	Monitor and LSG coach review all parts of framework with the board as well as the law. The monitor asked for a time to review, but the board has not responded. This has not happened
Continuation	Support Policy Adherence by the board.	Off Track	2/1/2019	4/15/2019	Board Chair, Board Members, Superintendent	Adhere to local policy and state statute	The board has broken its own local policy. It has violated its constraints set forth in the AE local previously adopted (AE Local 1). Communication by the president to all board members is lacking equity. The board members voting as the majority continue to break local policy and continues to lack collaboration and communication with the superintendent.	The monitor will recommend better communication and will continue to document the board chairman's lack of communication with the superintendent as well as board members voting as the minority. The monitor will continue to document directives given to the superintendent by those trustees voting as the majority, the school lawyer and consulting team of Moak-Casey.

Narrative:	<p>From what the monitor has observed, nothing has changed. The board members voting as a majority, continue to ignore the superintendent's recommendations and give directives to the superintendent and his staff. There is no collaboration. The board members voting as a majority want the three schools previously closed reopened and this is an ongoing topic for discussion. The superintendent and his team are working tirelessly to do so in a way that will benefit the district and the students. Apparently, this is costing money. The project is straining the district financially. Board members voting as a majority have created their own budget for the project which, supposedly, will save money. They want partitions instead of walls in some areas of the schools which educators know will not be conducive to a good learning environment. They have, also, wanted to avoid repairing a roof that was badly needed to reopen one of the schools. So cutting cost is a priority. Although cutting cost is important to the board, during the last board meeting the monitor attended, board members voting in the majority, voted to install new artificial turf on the football field which will cost approximately \$800,000. This was to be a priority for administration in the future; therefore, the superintendent recommended not to do this now, but the board voting as the majority ignored his recommendation and passed a motion to go forward. The board stated it was a safety issue. Recently, board members voting as the majority have mentioned capping the present budget at 89% in hopes to recapture money from this year's budget. This puts administration in a rough situation. Contracts must be paid; electric bills must be paid; salaries must be paid. At the last meeting, the board had one member not in attendance. The superintendent recommended not to cap the present budget. The motion to accept the superintendent's recommendation was not accepted or rejected since there were 3 against and 3 for. It seems as if the board is creating chaos for the district financially. First, they want the schools open, and they want to do it as inexpensively as possible even to the point of not repairing a roof badly in need of repair and using partitions for walls. Then, board members, voting as the majority, hire Moak Casey to manage the project. They, also, hire architects and marketing agents as well. How much money do these groups cost? Now, the board members voting as the majority want to cap the budget to recapture money within the present budget putting administration in a very difficult financial situation in which to finish the year. . The board members voting as the majority, on one hand, want these schools open but using a low budget. On the other hand, these same board members voting as the majority, hire costly agents to do the project instead of relying on administration to open the schools as cost effectively as possible with the needs of the students in mind. In regard to Lone Star Governance: The monitor does not see evidence of those board members voting in the majority wanting to implement Lone Star Governance. There is a lack of trust between these board members and the superintendent. The superintendent's recommendations are not accepted, but, at least, they do allow him to make recommendations which was not the case in previous months. In regard to Lone Star Governance, the board has adopted student outcome goals, goal progress measures, constraints and constraint progress measures. I see no evidence where the community had input into the process. The monitor was told that community had input, but no evidence has been provided. The board is working on a goal and a constraint centered around social emotional learning. This need was actually presented by students and community at a board meeting not at a board created community involvement meeting. The board was greatly surprised at the need. If the board was truly implementing LSG, the board would have already been aware of the need. The superintendent needs to be giving the monitoring reports, and the superintendent, board and coaches have been advised that this is the case. Also, at last reading, the constraint progress measures were not SMART. This has, also, been brought to the attention of the superintendent, board and coaches. The monitor will check to make sure these key elements are in place. A huge part of Lone Star Governance is the board understanding what is board work and what is superintendent work. The board does represent the vision and values of the community, but the board should not be managing the everyday workings of the school, but this is what is happening at South San. The board really wants to know line by line how money is being spent. The board gives directives not only to the superintendent, but, also, to staff. Because the board voting as the majority call for meetings continually and ask for detailed information continually, the superintendent and administrative staff spend enormous amounts of time trying to please the board instead of focusing on student outcome and their student outcome goals. In spite of these meetings and constant request, administration has succeeded in focusing on student outcomes and improvement academically has happened in spite of the board. The board members voting in the majority really want control over the workings of the schools especially the schools that will be reopened in the fall. This is concerning since they do not understand the accountability system in its completeness nor do they understand high school graduation plans which include endorsements. This micro-managing control will pose issues for high school students especially. At this time, the monitor has been informed that the May and June reports will not be given orally to the board. Board members will be given the written reports and are aware that the reports are public information. For the sake of the students, a conservator is highly recommended.</p>
-------------------	---

Statutory Compliance (SAI)					
District Status	Progress Toward Academic Accountability	Activities Complete	Exit Criteria	Notes/ Comments	Conservator is highly recommended. The board continues to ignore its own AE local as well as other state statutes.
	Off Track	0%	See Exit Criteria Tab		

Monitor/ Conservator Activities & Status	Activity (Actions/Processes)	Status	Implementation Timeline		Person(s) Responsible	Expected Outcomes (Goal/Target)	Results (Evidence/Outcomes/Data)	Next Steps
			Recommended Start Date	Completed or Due By				
Continuation	The monitor will follow the activities of the board to ensure compliance with State law.	Off Track	1/1/2019	1/5/2019	Board President and Board of Trustees	Board will comply with the State law governing the activities and responsibilities of board members.	The Board is not complying with State law. The board chair and trustees voting as the majority do not collaborate with the superintendent. Communication is lacking.	Monitor will continue to remind the board of local policy as well as document the board's lack of compliance. Continue to monitor.
Continuation	The monitor will follow the activities of the board to ensure compliance with local policy	Off Track	1/1/2019	1/5/19	Board President and Board of Trustees	Board will comply with Local Policy and operating procedures	Board members voting as the majority continue to ignore AE Local and state statute. The board president and another board member are micro-managing the district. They allow certain board members to place items on the agenda while denying others. They communicate with some board members and not with others. They fail to communicate completely with the superintendent. Equity among board members is an issue.	Monitor will continue to document the Board's lack of compliance with local policy and operating procedures. Continue to monitor
Narrative:	The monitor continues to remind the board as a whole that the board is not in compliance with Lone Star Governance, AE Local or state statute. Although the superintendent is asked for his recommendation, the board members voting in the majority continually vote against his recommendation even when it is best for the district. He and his team are virtually ignored. Also, trustees voting as a majority, legal counsel, and Moak-Casey, continue to give directives to the superintendent, his administrative team and the staff. The monitor has no proof but is concerned that procurement processes are not being followed by the board members voting in the majority. They are directing the superintendent to hire certain professional groups to work on the project of reopening the schools. It would be worth investigation. Conservator is highly recommended.							

Board Meetings: Monitors/Conservators are to attend no less than 80% of all regular meetings of the board throughout the installment. A Board Time Use Tracker should be completed at each meeting and submitted, with the agenda, as an attachment to the Progress Report. Monitors/Conservators shall request placement on the board meeting agenda no less than quarterly to provide the board with a status update on district progress with regards to the installment. *Those installed for reasons related to academic accountability or governance issues are to attend no less than 80% of any non-closed meeting authorized by the Board or Board president including, but not limited to, Board workshops, Board hearings, Board committees.

Date of Board Meeting	Type of Meeting (Regular, Special, Emergency, etc.)	Attended by Monitor/ Conservator	Attendance (% of members present)	Student Outcome Goals			Summary of Germane Action(s)/ Additional Comments
				Total # of meeting min. (Goal: < 2hr)	# Min. focused on Student Outcomes	% of min. focused on Student Outcomes	
		100%	100%	5.9			
6/3/19	Special Board Meeting	Yes	100%	288	0	0%	Discussion on Goals, Progress Measures and Constraints was postponed because of the lateness of the hour.
6/10/19	Special Board Meeting	Yes	100%	420	60	14%	Discussed the structure of Constraint progress measures as well as the constraint on Social Emotional Learning. (Phone attendance and streaming)
						0%	
						0%	
						0%	

Onsite Visits: Visits are scheduled as needed (approximately 3-5 times p/m) to monitor progress of district plans. Please provide the date, amount of time spent, the general purpose of the visit and comments or reflections.

Date of Visit	Duration of Visit	Contact(s) During Visit	Purpose of Visit	Summary / Next Steps / Additional Comments
6/3/2019	30 minutes	CFO/ Board Member Elda Flores	budget/ budget cap/Impact on District	Will continue to monitor board's micromanaging of budget. Will continue to monitor board in regard to LSG and board members.
6/10/2019	45 minutes	LSG Coach/ Superintendent/ Board member Elda Flores	Where the board is in regard to LSG	Will continue to monitor LSG work of the board and the superintendent.
		(phone conference)	What would be discussed at meeting	

Interventions and Sanctions--Grounds for Commissioner Action TEC 39A.001, 39A.002, 39A.003, 39A.004, 39A.004, 39A.005, 39A.006, 39A.007. Exit criteria is at the discretion of the Commissioner or designee. Exiting from monitoring includes, but is not limited to the following listed criteria. In conjunction with the following criteria, districts may be subject to continuance based on monthly monitoring reports, active investigations, financial compliance, and inquiries from additional TEA divisions.

Academic Accountability	
Exit Criteria	"C" or Higher
Exit Criteria	Commissioner discretion
Financial Accountability	
Exit Criteria	"C" or Higher
Exit Criteria	Commissioner discretion
Governance	
Exit Criteria	Training in student outcome reporting, 45 or more points in board tracker
Exit Criteria	Commissioner discretion
Statutory Compliance (SAI)	
Exit Criteria	Compliance with CAP Agreement and/or SAI finding
Exit Criteria	Commissioner discretion