



UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

David L. Crandall, Chair David L. Thomas, Vice Chair

Dixie L. Allen
Kim R. Burningham
Keith M. Buswell
Leslie B. Castle
Barbara W. Corry

Dan Griffiths
Heather Groom
Michael G. Jensen
Jennifer A. Johnson

Jefferson Moss
C. Mark Openshaw
Debra G. Roberts
Terry Warner

Joel Coleman, Interim Chief Executive Officer
Lorraine Austin, Board Secretary

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, Utah State Board of Education

FROM: Joel Coleman
Interim Chief Executive Officer

DATE: September 5, 2014

INFORMATION: School Children's Trust Report

Background:

Utah law requires that the School Children's Trust Director report annually to the State Board regarding the Trust (UCA § 53A-16-101.6(9)). In to the Annual Report, a summary of a presentation entitled "The Future of School Community Councils" will be presented.

Key Points:

The annual report and summary of the Future of School Community Councils presentation are provided for informational purposes.

Anticipated Action:

The Board will receive the reports.

Contact: Bruce Williams, Associate Superintendent, 801-538-7514
Tim Donaldson, School Children's Trust Director, 801-538-7709

Annual Report on Utah's School Trust

Tim Donaldson, School Children's Trust Director, Utah State Board of Education
September 5, 2014

Utah law requires that the School Children's Trust Director "...shall provide independent oversight on the prudent and profitable management of the trust and report annually to the State Board of Education and the Legislature." (Utah Code 53A-16-101.6(9))

The public school beneficiaries are extremely grateful for the funding provided by the trust lands and funds. The volunteer members of boards and committees, current and past, are especially to be commended for their public service. The well-intentioned best efforts of policy makers, trustees and education administrators are recognized and appreciated. Criticism contained herein is intended to be constructive, and to add value as the trust forever tries to improve and grow.

I. SCHOOL TRUST LANDS

A. Federal Land Policy

Overview: Federal land policy often has a chilling effect on the ability of the School and Institutional Trust Land Administration (SITLA) to access scattered school trust sections and put them into economic production. Decades of frustration with federal land ownership and policies led the Utah Legislature to pass, and the Governor to sign, the Utah Transfer of Public Lands Act in 2012. Political and legal momentum for that controversial approach is tentative, and the Grand Bargain process sponsored by Rep. Bishop has moved to the forefront in state policy efforts. Both approaches have some potential costs, but significant potential gains, for Utah's school trust and public education generally. Land exchanges pose a unique opportunity for the trust to exchange out of lands captured by various federal conservation designations and into new lands with revenue potential. Land exchanges have been perhaps the biggest focus of the current SITLA administration over the last decade. It could perhaps be said that no entity in the country is as committed to land exchanges as SITLA. SITLA has successfully completed the Recreation Land Exchange and the Hill Creek Exchange Authorization this year.

Beneficiary Concerns and Recommendations: The beneficiaries have concerns that land exchange efforts are exceedingly time consuming, expensive, and risky. A review of the largest land exchange efforts of the past quarter century indicates that they fail more often than they succeed. Land exchange efforts can take on a life of their own, and threaten the SITLA Board's proper legal control of trust land holdings as trustees, seen during the 2013 controversy over the Book Cliffs lease to Anadarko. Land exchange efforts can be impeded

by lengthy timeframes, and their attendant turnover in SITLA board members, accumulation of costs, and most concerning, “sunk cost” thinking. As an example, the agency expressed willingness to cover the federal government’s half of mineral appraisals on the Recreation Exchange until the beneficiaries’ public concerns brought about appropriate cost sharing. Additionally, the appraisal of the trust’s Castle Valley Block seemed low relative to comps that might have been used, though it appears lands which the schools were trading away may have also been valued low. Off the record promises seem to have been made to various individuals and entities over the years which have been shown to have some claim on the agency’s ability to operate subsequently. Misaligned incentives are another risk on land exchange efforts. Sometimes individuals inside various state or federal entities become attached to completing certain exchanges at any cost, because so much time and effort have already gone into the effort. The end result threatens to be a set of incentives where the trust may be in the poor negotiating position of being willing to keep on giving to complete deals at any cost. The SITLA Board has created a Land Exchange Committee, including the beneficiaries, which has been meeting often and should continue to, in order to keep stakeholders apprised of the exchange efforts as they move forward, before major decisions are made. Both the Transfer of Public Lands Act and the Grand Bargain, in addition to other land exchange efforts, represent large potential opportunities to the trust and to public education in Utah generally, and should remain a key strategic tool, with ongoing assessment at the board level of specific tactics, acquisition targets, and lands for disposal.

B. Real Estate Development

Overview: Utah is one of only a few states which actively engage in aggressive real estate development on school trust lands. The school trust real estate holdings are primary concentrated in the Washington County area, with significant additional holdings in the Saratoga Springs and Eagle Mountain areas west of Utah Lake. Revenue from development has been extraordinarily volatile over the past decade, ranging from almost \$40 million to as low as \$3 million, depending on the year. SITLA has also spent approximately \$80 million in capital investments to increase land values over the past decade or so, and it is difficult to measure and evaluate the effectiveness in the long term of those investments.

Beneficiary Concerns and Recommendations: The Real Estate Development Group’s financial operations have in the past suffered from a lack of precision and rigor in reporting. The financial analysis, pro forma, and reports are largely generated independent of the agency’s chief financial officer. It appears that the financial operations lack appropriate levels of accuracy, transparency and accountability as a result. The Major Project Summary document distributed annually to the Legislative Fiscal Analyst and State Board has been an ongoing source of frustration for three years, and illustrates many of

these beneficiary concerns. Despite having many projects that have included investment of millions or even tens of millions of beneficiary capital dollars, initial estimated returns are simply revised every year without explanation, and without any kind of progress report measuring returns to date. Final reports on completed projects are not produced. The State Board of Education expressed these concerns to SITLA's real estate staff this spring. The SITLA Board and staff do appear to be taking an increased level of oversight and monitoring responsibility with tracking real estate financial metrics, which is encouraging. The board and Real Estate Committee should continue to look at how capital is spent, how results are measured, and evaluate general principles of operation in those areas as the Development group seeks to maximize the value of our extensive real estate portfolio.

C. Legal

Overview: The legal group drafts contracts, represents the agency in courts and administrative hearings, and provides legal counsel to the board and administration. Some of the legal work that the agency needs to do is a result of legacy transactions that occurred before the agency was created in 1994, and continue to cost the trust. The legal group has recently settled multiple cases which involved significant risks, costs, and/or gains to the trust. RS-2477 litigation over access to remote areas of the state with energy potential is a significant ongoing issue our legal group is extensively involved in.

Beneficiary Concerns: The legal group represents a significant cost of doing business, and despite having four in-house attorneys, frequently uses outside counsel at significant expense to the trust. Typically, several different law firms are engaged at any given time. There has been some ongoing concern from revenue group directors that the legal group at times oversteps its proper role as legal counsel and functions in a business deal-making capacity. The staff and board should consider whether less-frequent recourse to outside counsel is prudent, and revenue group directors should insist on their own authority over business deals if/when necessary.

D. Surface

Overview: The Surface group employs the largest staff within SITLA, with approximately 20 employees, and therefore has the largest operating budget. There are field offices in Moab, Richfield, and Price. Many of the activities of the Surface group are revenue neutral but are required to maintain the land resource as a landowner with good stewardship practices, and in support of the larger revenue purposes of the agency. Notwithstanding its more modest financial contribution in terms of the ratio of expenses to revenue, the Surface group is often involved in innovative land use projects which balance development,

ranching, preservation, and the interests of local elected officials and other stakeholders. The Surface group plays an important part in generating positive impressions of trust lands throughout the state amongst stakeholders, and in maintaining political support for SITLA's money-making mandate. The Surface Group manages grazing, forestry, agriculture, industrial, and many other surface uses of trust lands, and does so as efficiently as possible with a strong land stewardship ethic. SITLA successfully completed a 3 way trade with the federal government and state division of wildlife resources this year which was a significant accomplishment and resulted in a payment of over \$10 million to the trust.

Beneficiary Concerns and Recommendations: The hunter access payment from the Division of Wildlife Resources, though escalating annually, appears to be lower than fair market value, and has twice not been fully paid. An informal Attorney General Opinion issued in December 2012 re-emphasized that the beneficiaries are legally entitled to full fair market value for sportsmen accessing trust lands. The SITLA staff and board should prepare for the 2017 expiration of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) regarding hunter access. The trust should diligently prepare for those negotiations by exploring in depth alternatives to a negotiated agreement and what a full fair market value payment should be. SITLA leases for grazing most trust lands not subject to other uses, and charges more in grazing fees than does the federal government, though noticeably less than private landowners charge, which is complicated by the fact that many of SITLA's grazing lands are interspersed within larger federal grazing leases.

E. Oil and Gas

Overview: Natural gas represents the largest revenue source, year in and year out, for school trust lands. The nationwide energy boom owing to "fracking", particularly natural gas production, is the main reason why CO2 emissions are down to 1994 levels. For point of reference, the Kyoto Treaty which failed in the United States Senate called for 1990 levels. 95% of the natural gas produced nationwide is due to fracking. It seems to be good policy for America to be exporting natural gas more and importing oil less. The Oil and Gas group brought in revenues of nearly \$90 million in FY2014, comprising approximately 2/3rds of SITLA's revenue. The group has many large projects on the horizon, including the Book Cliffs lease and the potential for development in the Kane Springs and Paradox Basin areas. SITLA's revenue figures are highly dependent upon natural gas prices, which have dropped precipitously from its highs in the 2000s.

Beneficiary Concerns and Recommendations Oil and gas consistently represents the majority of revenue available to the trust. The risk/return calculations might suggest the board and agency consider steps to be a little more active and less passive in operations, as

several board members have suggested, while maintaining a long term, disciplined, and prudent business aversion to excessive risk taking.

F. Mining

Overview: The Mining Group earns money through coal and other hard rock minerals. Federal policy has led to a severe curtailment of coal revenue available to the trust. The Mining group produced revenues of approximately \$9 million in FY2014, off from highs in excess of \$20 million in FY2009 and FY2010. This decline is largely due to a drop in the price of coal and other external causes out of the trust's control. The Mining group is aggressively pursuing a large number of new developments in the West Desert and Uintah Basin which could add significantly to SITLA's annual production once these projects get off the ground.

Beneficiary Concerns: As with Oil and Gas, the risk/return calculations might suggest the agency considering steps to be a little more active and less passive in operations, as several board members have suggested. The staff and board should evaluate whether there are opportunities for the trust to take a prudent but more active role.

G. Finance

Overview: The accounting group provides internal accounting services for the board and agency, and the audit group provides internal auditing, as well as audits of outside lessees. The Legislature annually appropriates an operating, capital, and stewardship budget for the agency, which is paid from trust revenues. The board sets the budget annually and must approve capital expenditures on a project basis for any project in excess of \$100,000. The agency earned \$136 million in fiscal 2014, an encouraging increase as the economy has recovered.

Beneficiary Concerns and Recommendations: It is a truism that "what gets measured gets done", as well as "you can't manage what you can't measure." The beneficiaries have emphasized in recent years that the purpose of the trust is to maximize long term financial impact to the public school beneficiaries, which means there may be times when a project would increase long term revenue for SITLA but not be in the public school beneficiaries' best interest. This is because a dollar spent at SITLA is a dollar that is not placed in the permanent school fund, where history has shown it would compound at 7-8% annually on average. The State Treasurer also has accurately pointed out that risks are often better born at the permanent fund level, where they can be more easily diversified and managed. As such, the opportunity cost and time value of money invested at SITLA are significant,

and the board and agency need to continue to reflect upon business decisions, particularly capital expenditures, within that light.

II. PERMANENT STATE SCHOOL FUND

The Legislature in 2014 passed significant legislation relating to the permanent school fund. There is now created a Nominating Committee, comprised of 2 members appointed by the State Board of Education, the School Children's Trust Director, the CIOs of the University of Utah and Utah State University Endowments, and 2 members appointed by the School Children's Trust Director based on membership in nationally recognized organizations with relevant expertise. That Nominating Committee, in turn, submits 2 names to the Treasurer for each opening on the School Trust Fund Board of Trustees, and the Treasurer appoints members from that list.

The School Trust Fund Board of Trustees is now formed and will hold its first meeting on September 15, 2014. The board will be appointing a Chief Investment Officer by January 25, 2015 under state code. The board will also be establishing an Investment Policy Statement including an asset allocation. It is expected that the board will meet frequently this fall and winter as there is a great amount of work to be done.

A. Alternative Investments

Overview: The permanent State School Fund does not hold any private equity, absolute return, hedge fund, commodity, venture capital, or distressed debt investments, due in part to legal confusion over a "subscription to stock" prohibition in the Utah Constitution.

Beneficiary Concerns and Recommendations: The average endowment has a 65% allocation to alternative investments according to the latest NACUBO report, and a 78% allocation to "illiquidity premium" assets. The newly created School Trust Fund Board of Trustees should seek legal guidance on whether the prohibition applies, and how the permanent State School Fund can be exempted from the prohibition, if necessary. The asset allocation set by the new board of trustees should be thoroughly analyze all asset classes, to ensure full diversification is achieved and to better manage risks to the trust fund.

B. Distribution Policy

Overview: The Utah Enabling Act says that "the interest of (the permanent fund) only shall be expended" every year. The Utah Constitution, after a 1994 amendment, now says "interest and dividends" are expended every year. Most endowments changed to a rolling percentage of a total return distribution policy about a half century ago, finding that

approach reduced distribution volatility by approximately 70% and struck a better intergenerational equity balance than an income approach. Interest rates are historically low, as are dividend yields, as markets have evolved. This has resulted in a distribution of only about 2% of fund value annually, which arguably short-changes current beneficiaries and tilts the intergenerational balance towards long term beneficiaries. The financial literature also indicates that a mix of a rolling average with a band of inflation and student enrollment growth calculation may achieve an even better balance between the competing interests at play. For example, a distribution might be 80% based on the prior year's distribution adjusted by the sum of student enrollment growth and inflation, and 20% based on 4% of a rolling 12 quarter average.

Beneficiary Concerns and Recommendations: The State Board's School Trust Investment Task Force recommended that the newly created School Trust Fund Board of Trustees study the distribution policy issue and recommend a new distribution policy, if appropriate. That will need at least a 2016 Constitutional Amendment, and may need a change to the federal Enabling Act, as at least 4 other states have done on precisely this issue. It could conceivably be argued that the current state Constitution violates the Enabling Act by including dividends with "interest only", though it appears these practices are all within the overall intent of the archaic language of balancing intergenerational equity. It is a good idea to fix the formula into the state Constitution, to prevent a political raid of the fund, which history in Utah and other states has shown to be most likely during an economic downturn and state budget crunch.

C. Real Estate

Overview: The permanent fund currently is 10% invested in real estate partnerships, half to core income-generating real estate, and half to active and aggressive opportunistic funds. The latter category is spread over three different outside managers.

Beneficiary Concerns and Recommendations: In the past, concerns have been expressed by Investment Advisory Committee members that the school trust already has more than enough risk exposure to real estate as an asset class, due to SITLA's real estate holdings. On the other hand, geographical and category exposures may be enhanced by investments the permanent fund can make which SITLA cannot. The newly created School Trust Fund Board of Trustees should study risk exposures, in concert with SITLA's risk exposures, to best diversify the trust's holdings holistically.

D. Stocks

Overview: Two-thirds of the permanent school fund (67%) is allocated to enhanced index stock funds through Vanguard. 47% is in domestic stocks and 20% in international stocks. This equity tilt is appropriate for a permanent school fund, and the Treasurer has, in the past, wisely avoided attempting to time the market. As a result, the fund has performed well as the stock markets recovered the past 5 years from the 2007-09 crash.

Beneficiary Concerns and Recommendations: The weighting of these equity investments is such that domestic equities are tilted towards large cap stocks, and international equities are tilted towards large developed markets, such as Europe and Japan. These may or may not be wise strategies for equities in a long term fund, and is an issue the board and CIO should analyze. Also, consultants and Investment Advisory Committee members have repeatedly recommended adding active management in a core-plus approach, specifically in the targeted areas of small cap stocks and international stocks. The board and CIO should study whether or not those are prudent ways to maximize long term risk adjusted returns.

E. Bonds

Overview: 23% of the permanent fund is allocated to fixed income, which is also held in Vanguard indexed products. Within the past year, the State Treasurer's Office has more actively managed these products out of duration risk concerns, as interest rate volatility spiked when the Federal Reserve began to talk about the need to "taper" quantitative easing.

Beneficiary Concerns and Recommendations: The more active bond management was a significant change in approach, one not contemplated in the Investment Policy Statement, and one not well communicated to the committee and beneficiaries at the time. Interestingly, some prominent endowment managers allocate only a small amount to fixed income, and place all of that allocation in US Treasuries, reasoning that bonds are only valuable if they act like bonds when financial market turbulence occurs, and only US treasuries do that. This is another issue the new board and CIO should study.

III. THE SCHOOL LAND TRUST PROGRAM

A. School Community Councils

Overview: School community councils are established at every public school in the state of Utah. Parents elect parents, and teachers elect teachers. The principal is automatically a member of the council. The councils have 2 person parent majorities and are charged with

developing the School Improvement Plan, which includes the school's allotment of School LAND Trust Program dollars. Those plans must spend the money on the school's greatest academic need(s), as determined by the council's review of test score data and input from teachers and the principal on where there are school needs. State board rule clarifies the boundaries of what is considered an "academic" expenditure. The majority of the expenditures tend to be on aides for math and reading, technology, and textbooks. The School LAND Trust plan is adopted by a majority vote of the council, and may be approved or rejected for any reason by the local school board. If rejecting a plan the local school board must, under state code, explain the reasons for the rejection in writing. Charter schools participate fully in the School LAND Trust Program, and this year the board rule was amended to allow a first year charter school to participate, with funding adjusted in the subsequent year to reflect actual audited enrollment. Charter schools do not develop School Improvement Plans, as their school charter fills that analogous function. Charter schools have trust land committees instead of school community councils, which involves fewer requirements than district schools.

Beneficiary Concerns and Recommendations: School community councils are a unique way that Utah encourages meaningful parental involvement in school governance. Interest and participation within school communities varies significantly from school to school, and district to district. The USOE has worked with Rep. Angela Romero (D- SLC) and stakeholders from various education groups to find ways to make school community councils more inclusive of diverse groups, a study process that is ongoing. The School LAND Trust Program is currently capped by statute at 2% of the overall state public education minimum school program, a threshold that the program may reach within the next 3-5 years. Above that amount, the money is deposited into the Uniform School Fund, which is also used to fund higher education, and that may result in an unconstitutional funneling of school trust money to higher education. The State Board should take the lead in exploring policy options as to how to address that statutory concern, with all of the appropriate stakeholders, in a way that fully utilizes the potential benefit of councils and also does not undermine the governance authority of local school boards. I have prepared a detailed presentation on "the future of school community councils" to help begin that discussion.

B. Compliance Reviews

Overview: Under State Board rule, the School Children's Trust Section conducts compliance reviews on 10% of the school districts and 10% of the charter schools in the state each year. These reviews function under the purview of the State Board of Education's Internal Auditor and final decisions on findings, recommendations, and appeals are made by the

State Board Audit Committee. Compliance reviews focus primarily on whether funds were approved as expended in the plan adopted by the school community council and approved by the local school board, and whether the funds were spent in accordance with law and board rule. The process also allows for a review of internal controls within a LEA's accounting processes, and for a brief discussion with principals. Costs are occasionally questioned, but the primary benefit of compliance reviews is in providing training information to districts and schools.

Beneficiary Concerns and Recommendations: Compliance reviews conducted at a rate of 10% per year allow the average district or charter school to only be reviewed approximately once per decade. The growth in the number of charter schools also makes that 10% portion more labor intensive. At some point it may be worth increasing the compliance review total to 20% of districts and charter schools per year.

C. Training School Community Councils

Overview: Under legislation recently enacted, the School Children's Trust Section is charged with providing training annually on the School LAND Trust Program and school community councils to local school boards and charter school governing boards; school districts and charter schools; and school community councils. Teachers are often unaware of trust lands and the ability they have to weigh in on how their schools spend discretionary funds, which is why the State Board of Education passed a UEA supported rule requiring that the short introductory video be shown annually at a faculty meeting.

Beneficiary Concerns and Recommendations: The section will, in conjunction with local school districts, be providing 5 trainings this fall for local board members and school community council members, at locations spread around the state. It is recommended that all stakeholders and interested parties attend and help spread the word to attend those trainings.



Creating Inclusive School Community Councils

Parent participation on school community councils is important. Councils prepare, adopt, and implement education plans at their school. A majority of Utah parents are still unaware and unengaged, and many school community councils are not reflective of the diverse communities they represent. Building equitable representation from within the councils will give our state a greater community asset.

Why Participate

Improved student success and wellbeing for ALL students

Engaged parent representation in decision making will allow for greater equity

A diverse pool of parent viewpoints helps bridge cultural gaps

How

Successful parent involvement on school community councils happens when:

Parents understand how they can influence school and student improvement. They understand why their involvement is important. *Many parents may have heard of and even participated in council elections, but parents need to know why the school community council should be a priority for how they spend their volunteer time.*

Parents feel empowered.

Their opinions and skills are valued and will have an impact on student success. The perspective of each member is recognized as unique and all perspectives are encouraged and respected. *Mentoring will help familiarize parents with the Utah educational system.*

Expectations are clear and happen logistically so all parents have the opportunity to participate.

Training is provided for all. *Councils may need to pay attention to the time of the meetings, cultural nuances, language barriers, childcare, etc.*

Investing in parents allows them to see results from their involvement.

They choose to continue being involved, and encourage others to participate.

Parents now become advocates, mentors and community assets for increased parental involvement.

MINORITY PARENT INVOLVEMENT ON SCHOOL COMMUNITY COUNCILS TASK FORCE

MEMBERS 2013-2014

ANGELA ROMERO Utah House of Representatives Chair	Continue
ANNA MARTINEZ WILLIAMS Representing UEA Park City School District	Resigned
SUZI JENSEN Representing Secondary Principals Clearfield High School, Davis School District	Continue
KIM HAYWOOD Representing Utah PTA	Resigned
KRISTI SWETT Representing Utah School Boards Association President, Salt Lake Board of Education	Continue
JENNIFER MAYER-GLENN Serving at the request of the Chair Assistant Principal, Glendale Middle School	Continue
RAE LOUIE Representing Elementary Principals Beacon Heights Elementary, Salt Lake School District	Continue
JOANNE R MILNER Education Partnership Coordinator, Salt Lake City Mayor's Office	Continue
ERIN PRESTON Representing Charter Schools Executive Director, Providence Hall Charter	Continue
BRAD C SMITH Representing Superintendents Superintendent, Ogden City School District	
PAULA PLANT School Children's Trust	Continue

School Community Council Survey

2013 Survey 2014 Survey

	2013 Survey	2014 Survey
Total Number of Surveys Submitted	1899	1546
During the school year, I have been serving on the school community council as a:		
Parent	57.66%	52.01%
Teacher or Staff Member	25.49%	25.55%
Principal	16.85%	22.45%
I am/have been serving on a SCC in the following school district:		
Do you believe the School LAND Trust plan your school implemented this year helped students improve academically?		
Definitely	79.80%	76.86%
Somewhat	18.66%	21.31%
Not at all	0.90%	1.44%
Not applicable	0.64%	0.39%
Was your SCC effective?		
Definitely	75.82%	72.54%
Somewhat	23.07%	25.50%
Not at all	1.11%	1.95%
Do you think your SCC needed more training?		
Definitely	10.92%	11.52%
Somewhat	41.65%	46.42%
Not at all	47.43%	42.06%
If you contacted staff at the district about the work of the SCC, did you find them friendly, helpful, and well-informed?		
Definitely	31.71%	31.29%
Somewhat	6.62%	7.89%
Not at all	1.60%	1.96%
Not applicable	60.66%	58.87%
If you contacted the School Children's Trust staff at USOE, did you find them friendly, helpful, and well-informed?		
Definitely	13.16%	15.16%
Somewhat	2.30%	3.40%
Not at all	0.32%	0.39%
Not applicable	84.22%	81.05%

RESULTS OF SCHOOL COMMUNITY COUNCIL SURVEY – 2013-14 School Year

There were really three main topics of discussion. Above anything else training was mentioned most often. The following are areas where councils would like more training. They are not in any particular order but were mentioned numerous times:

Training

- Examples of effective councils and networking with other schools and districts
- Sharing Ideas on how others are using funds and on what funds can be spent
- Empowering SCC – still too many principals controlling meetings
- 101 – What is a SCC - purpose and roles
- How to get more people willing to serve on SCC
- More locations and more dates for trainings
- More understanding of the website and why the numbers don't always make sense
- Provide training in other languages
- How a plan can be changed during the year
- Do SCC do more than just the School LAND Trust Program?
- Providing a safe environment for people to disagree with administration
- How to write a good plan
- Not discussing the preparation of the plan and then it is brought to them for approval
- Brief summary of all of the rules and restrictions
- More site visits to schools

Legislature

- Please work with legislature to ask them to STOP changing the rules – this was said over and over and over

Public Relations

- Get information out on School Community Councils and the School LAND Trust Program to the public at large.

School Children's Trust

- Simplify as much as possible
- Relax the rules to allow more flexibility in spending funds
- Communication – appreciate the emails
 - Would like more specifics – one page outlining when things are due for the entire year.
- Would like to see YouTube videos created