

Re: Agenda Item 12.2, Staff Housing Study Contract, 9-27 CCUSD Board Meeting

From: kyokosam via BoardMembers <BoardMembers@ccusd.org> Tue, Sep 27, 2022 at 12:22 PM PDT (GMT-07:00)
To: <kellyakent@gmail.com>
Cc: <boardmembers@ccusd.org>

Dear Ms. Kent,

Thank you for your prompt response.

I have concerns with some of the points you brought up, especially as it differs from the information posted on tonight's agenda and the contract attached to the agenda item. I am led to believe that if the information on the website is incorrect, everything posted on the website is unreliable information. This is troublesome as the documents state the amount to Brookwood Advisors is \$180,000 and the maximum amount is \$485,000 not the \$300,000 that you are stating.

I also take issue that the survey needs to be done with the outside agency, as this could have been a short and simple survey conducted by the district. You stated that more than half of the staff in 2019 were interested in this moving forward, but I have not seen the actual results of the survey. Was this more than half of the staff who responded or more than half of the total number of staff?

Also, if the monies are not originating from a grant, then the board should have the ability to make a motion to reallocate the funds for essential repairs. I do understand that the current facilities budget is depleted, but this should prompt the board to take action to reevaluate the budget and move the monies to accomplish this. Taking on an entirely new project that the board has no expertise in during a time of staffing shortages and urgent facilities repairs seems unfocused.

My request is to prioritize board actions with issues that are affecting our schools now. It hasn't been ideal, but housing for staff is a new project that the board should not be taking on.

Respectfully,
Joyce Yamashita

-----Original Message-----

From: Kelly Kent <kellyakent@gmail.com>
To: kyokosam@aol.com
Sent: Tue, Sep 27, 2022 9:37 am
Subject: Re: Agenda Item 12.2, Staff Housing Study Contract, 9-27 CCUSD Board Meeting

Thank you Joyce,

Please come tonight if you are able. I'm so sorry that this campaign to oppose the contract on tonight's agenda has been filled with misunderstandings. Tonight will clarify so much, but in the meantime I will address as many of your concerns as I can here:

1. **The contract is for \$180K** with a not-to-exceed amount of \$300K possible.
2. Brookwood, if engaged, will conduct another survey, but in 2019 **over half of our staff indicated interest in living on campus housing**.
3. We will of course be doing as much as we can with salaries this year *and* it will never be enough for staff to leave near Culver City.
4. Facilities monies and program/people monies do not overlap. They therefore do not conflict with each other. We could not use this money for facilities if we wanted to.
5. We are completely out of capital improvement monies (measure cc is exhausted) and will need to and should pass another bond in 2024 to upgrade our facilities.

6. The floods at LH and LB were not related to dilapidated facilities but rather to new, malfunctioning parts that are being replaced on all campuses.

I've attached some graphics including some produced by the state school board association in efforts to facilitate these exact conversations with communities.

I sincerely hope this helps.

Warmly,

Kelly



[b495b0041478420fb47ab49a7a798fa9.mov](#)



The school should focus on its mission and repair our old facilities, not invest in new unnecessary ones.

Education Workforce Housing can be an opportunity to invest in old facilities while constructing new ones. For example, co-locating housing on an active school campus can include renovating existing school buildings, replacing temporary classrooms, or adding new facilities like early childhood education on the ground floor of the project. Additionally, if a bond is issued, housing costs can be part of a larger bond package tied to school renovations.



I don't want to live in a dorm. Affordable housing for me is a sign of disrespect.

This is an understandable sentiment among employees, but workforce housing does not mean dormitory living that stigmatizes its residents. School districts in California have already demonstrated that they can build housing that is beautiful and well designed to communicate the respect that teachers and staff deserve.



Why not give us a direct salary increase?

Wage increase versus housing support is not an "either-or" issue. LEAs do not have control over the funding they receive, but they do have land and there are capital financing sources available specifically to help fund housing development. Workforce housing offers financial assistance and builds community, having positive impacts on employee commitment and retention, classroom instructional practices, and student achievement.

On Tue, Sep 27, 2022 at 8:20 AM kyokosam via BoardMembers <BoardMembers@ccusd.org> wrote:

Dear School Board Members,

I am requesting that the proposal to spend almost half a million dollars on a study for district staff housing be put on hold, and instead direct these funds towards urgent repairs and maintenance to the schools in our district. >From a previous survey of the district workforce, there seemed to be little interest in staff housing, so this has not been seen as an urgent matter in our workforce. Affordable housing is a civic issue outside of the realm of what our school board should be spending time, energy, and resources on. Please instead direct these funds towards the repair of our schools, including plumbing repairs to address flooding, repairing broken doors and windows, and making our campuses fully functional and safe for our students and staff. Prioritizing spending on urgent matters to promote a healthy learning environment is crucial to our students learning and general well-being, and I urge the board to treat these funds responsibly and respectfully to our CCUSD families and staff.

Sincerely,
Joyce Yamashita
CCUSD Parent

CULVER CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT E-MAIL DISCLAIMER. *This communication and any documents, files, or previous e-mail messages attached to it constitute an electronic communication within the scope of the Electronic Communication Privacy Act, 18 USCA 2510. This communication may contain non-public, confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole use of the designated recipient(s). The unlawful interception, use or disclosure of such information is strictly prohibited under 18 USCA 2511 and any applicable laws.*

--

Kelly Kent, Ph.D.
adaptED Consultants
www.adaptedconsultants.com
kellykent@adaptedconsultants.com
[@adaptedbrain](https://twitter.com/adaptedbrain)
(310) 869-5646
