



三藩市家长在行动 (SF Parents Action)

www.sfparentaction.org

Questions for November 2026 SFUSD School Board Candidates

2026年11月三藩市联合校区教委会委员候选人问卷调查

Michael J. Turon

迈克尔·J·图龙

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree

1 = 强烈不同意, 2 = 有些不同意, 3 = 有些同意, 4 = 强烈同意

<p><i>Excellent and Equitable Public Schools</i></p> <p>卓越和公平的公立学校</p>	<p><i>Level of Agreement</i></p> <p>同意程度</p>
<p>1. I SUPPORT the SF Parents Parent Priorities: A focus on equity and excellence going hand-in-hand, improving student outcomes in our district, building trust and rebuilding community morale, improving the fiscal health of SFUSD, and overall good governance should be the top priorities of the School Board going into 2026-27.</p> <p>1. 我支持三藩市家长联盟的家长优先事项。将公平和卓越并重, 改善我们校区的学生学业成果, 重建信任和社区士气, 改善三藩市联合校区的财务状况, 以及整体良好的治理应是2026-2027学年教委会的首要任务。</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>2. DISTRICT TRANSPARENCY: I support increased transparency of school performance that enables San Francisco to evaluate and improve the quality of our public schools. This should include a public dashboard that shares math and reading assessment data at the school level, updated at least twice a year.</p> <p>2. 社区透明度: 我支持增加学校工作的透明度, 以便三藩市评估和改进我们公立学校的质量。这应包括一个公开的平台, 在学校一级分享数学和英文阅读评估数据, 且每年至少更新两次。</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>3. LITERACY AND MATH: I believe in the urgency of improving student outcomes in literacy and math at SFUSD. I commit to ensuring that SFUSD continues to implement and fully support a comprehensive plan, and makes the necessary adjustments to curricula, tools, and instructional methods that follow an evidence- and standards-based approach.</p>	<p>4</p>

<p>3.读写能力与数学:我认为提高三藩市联合校区的学生在读写能力和数学方面的学习成果具有紧迫性。我承诺确保校区继续实施并全面支持一项综合性计划,并根据以证据和标准为基础的方法,对课程设置、教具和教学方式作出必要调整。</p>	
<p>4. EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE: An effective School Board centers on 1) supporting the superintendent and cabinet to ensure student-focused leadership, 2) setting a clear, shared vision, and 3) defining goals rather than managing day-to-day operations or unnecessary interference in implementation or policy execution.</p> <p>4.有效治理:一个有效的校区教委会应当以如下几点为核心:1)支持学监及其领导团队,确保以学生为中心的领导力;2)制定清晰且共同认同的发展愿景;3)专注于设定目标,而不是介入日常运营管理,或对具体实施及政策执行进行不必要的干预。</p>	4
<p>5. BUDGET HEALTH: I commit to governing in accordance with nationally-established best financial practice. I will hold District leadership accountable for presenting the budget clearly. When fixing our budget deficit, I support SF Parents' call for minimizing negative impacts to our most vulnerable students while ensuring a baseline of excellence across all schools.</p> <p>5.财务健康:我承诺按照国家建立的最佳财务实践进行管理。我将要求校区领导层提供清晰的财务预算。在解决我们的预算赤字时,我支持三藩市家长联盟的呼吁,尽量减少对我们最脆弱的学生群体的负面影响,同时确保所有学校都保持基准的卓越。</p>	4

1. Optional: Expand on any of your responses to the statements above, in 250 words or fewer.

1. 选择性问答:对上述您的任何一个回答进行扩展说明,字数不超过**250**字。

I want to expand briefly on Statements 4 and 5. The SOFG governance frame and the GFOA budget framework are tightly connected in practice.

我想就第4点和第5点再稍作展开,学生成果导向治理框架(SOFG)与政府财务官协会预算框架(GFOA),在实际运作中是紧密相连的。

The SOFG manual is right that the Board should not run day-to-day operations. The Board represents community values through goals, guardrails, and accessible tracking. The Superintendent runs the work. But oversight of the work is still governance. When the Board commissions an audit, requires public milestones, and acts on findings through budget and policy, it is not crossing into staff work. It is doing the part of SOFG that prevents goals from becoming paper.

《学生成果导向治理框架手册》所说的是对的:教委会不应负责日常运营管理。教委会通过制定目标、设立护栏(guardrails)以及建立便于公众了解的追踪机制,来体现社区价值;而

具体工作的执行则由学监负责。但对这些工作的监督本身，仍然属于治理的一部分。当教委会发起审计、要求公开阶段性进展，并依据审计结果通过预算和政策采取行动时，这并不是越界进入员工的日常工作，而是在履行学生成果导向治理的核心职责——确保目标不只是停留在纸面上。

The same logic applies to GFOA. Smarter School Spending says budget choices should follow instructional priorities — literacy, math, special education, retention. That requires the Board to know, in public, what each major budget category is producing for students and measure those outcomes. A peer-district audit of central administration is not the Board running the audit from the dais. It is the Board commissioning a governance instrument: defining the question, requesting the supporting facts, and deciding what to do with them.

同样的逻辑也适用于校区财务官。“更聪明的学校支出 (Smarter School Spending)”理念强调，预算决策应服务于教学优先事项，例如英文读写能力、数学、特殊教育以及教师留任。因此，教委会必须能够公开了解每一项主要预算支出究竟为学生带来了什么成果，并对这些成果进行衡量。对中心行政部门开展同类校区 (peer district) 审计，并不意味着教委会坐在主席台上亲自执行审计工作，而是教委会在运用一种治理工具，界定需要回答的问题、要求提供支持性事实，并决定如何根据结果采取行动。

What I will not do: Pretend SOFG forbids this kind of oversight. The current Board has built useful progress-monitoring habits around literacy and math. The next step is the same discipline applied to operations: implementation plans, deadlines, public dashboards, and variance reports when things slip. Families deserve to know whether Board decisions actually became real.

我不会做的事情：假装学生成果导向治理制度禁止这种监督。现任教委会已经围绕英文读写和数学建立了一些有益的进度监督机制。下一步，应当把同样的制度应用到运营管理上：制定实施计划、设定截止日期、建立公开数据看板，以及在进度落后时发布差异报告。家庭和社区理应知道，教委会的决定是否真正落实成为现实。

2. Why are you running for the Board of Education, and why now? Within your response, please describe:

- **Your connection to SFUSD students and families**
- **The leadership experience that prepares you to govern a public education system**
- **Your views on both academic excellence and equity in education**

2. 您为什么竞选校区教委会委员？为什么现在参加竞选？请在回答中说明：

- 您与三藩市联合校区学生及家庭的联系
- 哪些领导经验使您具备治理公立教育体系的能力
- 您对于教育中的学业卓越与教育公平的看法

I am running because my two children enter SFUSD this fall. I want them — and every child — in the strongest schools we can build.

我之所以参选，是因为我的两个孩子将在今年秋天进入三藩市联合校区就读。我希望他们——以及每一个孩子——都能进入我们所能建设的最优秀学校。

A) Connection. My family has lived in the Mission since 2007; SF since 2000. I was born in Hayward to two immigrant parents from Poland. Our kids start SFUSD this fall. I will be a public-school parent through 2040. I am not a longtime SFUSD organizer. I am a parent whose stake here is just starting. I adopted the UESF picket line at César Chávez Elementary; I visited the educators there on two of the four strike days. My family supported the educators there.

A) 我与社区的联系

我的家庭自2007年以来一直居住在米慎区 (Mission District)；而我本人自2000年起便生活在三藩市。我出生于海沃德 (Hayward)，父母都是来自波兰的移民。我们的孩子将在今年秋天进入三藩市联合校区。我将一直是一名公立学校家长，直到2040年。我并不是长期参与三藩市联合校区组织工作的活动人士。我是一位刚刚开始真正与这个校区利益紧密相连的家长。在三藩市教师罢工期间，我曾前往塞萨尔·查韦斯小学 (César Chávez Elementary School) 的罢工集会现场表达支持，并在四天罢工中的两天探访了那里的教育工作者。我的家庭始终支持这些教师。

B) Leadership. I hold a Cambridge Physics PhD. Twenty years leading analytics, operations, and finance teams. As acting CFO at HelloFresh, I led the turnaround. Profit went from negative \$33M to positive \$9M in one year. At Royal Caribbean, I led a vendor cleanup that saved roughly \$72M across two programs. That is the work I do. I find where systems leak money and time. I build the plan. I track the fix.

B) 我的领导力：我拥有英国剑桥大学物理学博士学位，并拥有二十年领导数据分析、运营与财务团队的经验。在担任 HelloFresh 代理首席财务官期间，我主导了一次业务扭转，公司利润在一年内从亏损3300万美元转为盈利900万美元。在 Royal Caribbean 工作期间，我曾

领导供应商清理项目, 在两个项目中总计节省约7200万美元。这就是我一直从事的工作: 找出系统中浪费资金和时间的漏洞, 制定解决方案, 并持续跟踪落实。

C) Excellence and equity. These are not opposites. They are the same promise. Students farthest from grade level need clear paths and strong supports. Students ready for advanced work need access without barriers. A district that delivers both has a baseline of excellence everywhere.

C) 卓越与公平: 卓越与公平并不是对立的, 它们本质上是同一个承诺。对于学习水平尚未达到年级标准的学生, 我们需要提供清晰的发展路径和有力支持; 而对于已经准备好接受更高阶学习的学生, 我们则应确保他们能够无障碍地获得进阶课程机会。一个真正能够同时做到这两点的校区, 才能在每一所学校建立起卓越教育的基本底线。

3. Why do you want the SF Parents endorsement? How will you uplift the voices of parents across SFUSD as a Board of Education decisionmaker?

3. 您为什么希望获得三藩市家长联盟(SF Parents)的背书? 作为校区教委会决策者, 您将如何提升三藩市联合校区全体家长的声音?

I want SFPA's backing because SFPA built the most parent-led process in this race. Blind scoring. Parent-written questions. Open talks to reach the same view. That is how endorsements should work. It is also how the Board should treat parent input. Not as decor. As real signal.

我希望获得三藩市家长联盟(SF Parents)组织的支持, 因为三藩市家长联盟在这场选举中建立了最以家长为主导的评估流程: 匿名评分、由家长撰写问题, 以及通过公开讨论达成共识。这才是背书应有的方式。教委会对待家长意见, 也应如此, 即不是把家长参与当作装饰, 而是真正视为重要的信息与信号。

On lifting parent voices: the Statement 2 dashboard is part of it. The bigger part is the build. I would push for a public outreach plan tied to Board votes. In many languages for accessibility. Notice times families can plan around. I would push for a "you said, district did" loop so parents see what their input changed.

关于提升家长声音: 我在第2项声明中提到的公开数据平台(dashboard)只是其中的一部分, 更重要的是建立完整的参与机制。我会推动建立与教委会投票事项相配套的公众沟通参与计划, 并提供多语言版本, 确保所有家庭都能够平等获取信息。通知发布时间也应让家庭

能够提前安排与参与。同时，我还会推动建立一种“你们提出意见，校区采取行动(you said, district did)”的反馈机制，让家长能够清楚看到，他们的意见究竟带来了哪些改变。

One more thing. SFPA does not have to pick one strength on the November ballot - but the collection of strengths for a stronger Board. Phil Kim has given the Board a steady hand. SFPA backed him for June 2026. Alida Fisher has kept special education and family voice on the Board's agenda. She pushed back in public on cuts to teacher-pipeline programs. She sits on the Ad Hoc Committee on Public Engagement.

还有一点非常重要，三藩市家长联盟并不一定需要在11月的选票中只选择一种“优势”，而是可以选择一组互补的优势，共同打造更强大的教委会。菲尔金(Phil Kim)一直为教委会带来稳健与稳定的领导力，因此三藩市家长联盟已支持他竞选2026年6月的席位。斐义莎(Alida Fisher)则持续将特殊教育和家庭声音置于教委会议程的重要位置。她曾公开反对削减“教师培养项目(teacher-pipeline programs)”的预算，并参与了“公众参与特别委员会(Ad Hoc Committee on Public Engagement)”的工作。

What I add is operator skill. The skill to turn a budget problem into a clear plan and tracked outcome. Phil's steady hand, Alida's focus, and my operator skills are three tools. I am running to add to the existing Board, not work against it.

而我能够带来的是“运营者(operator)”的能力，即把预算问题转化为清晰的执行方案，并通过可追踪的成果确保落实。菲尔金(Phil)的稳健领导、斐义莎(Alida)对特殊教育与家庭参与的关注，以及我的运营执行能力，是三种不同但互补的工具。我参选，不是为了对抗现有教委会，而是为了在现有基础上进一步增强它的能力。

4. What's your perspective on the teacher strike that happened in February, including what could have been handled differently by 1) SFUSD leadership, 2) Board of Education, and 3) the Teacher's Union? What can the School Board do to promote a more collaborative relationship between the teacher's union and the district going forward?

4.您如何看待今年二月发生的教师罢工？有哪些方面本可以由以下几方处理得更好：1) 校区领导层；2) 校区教委会；3) 教师工会？未来校区教委会可以采取哪些措施，促进教师工会与校区之间建立更加协作的关系？

Four school days mattered. They hit working families with no childcare options the hardest. They hit kids whose meals and care come from school.

四天的停课影响重大。受冲击最严重的是那些没有托儿选择的工薪家庭，以及那些依赖学校提供餐食和照护服务的孩子。

The strike was the event seen by the public. The deeper fault: families were left to wing it.

罢工是公众看到的事件，但更深层的问题在于：家庭被迫“自行应对(wing it)”，缺乏系统性的支持与信息。

SFUSD lead. I will not make this personal. Wayne stepped down in October 2024. Maria Su stepped in days later. She became permanent in November 2025. A district in repair needs systems, not heroics. Families got bargaining and budget news too late.

关于三藩市联合校区领导层：我不想把问题个人化。韦恩(Wayne)于2024年10月离职，玛利亚·苏(Maria Su)几天后接任，并于2025年11月正式成为常任学监。一个处于修复阶段的校区，需要依靠制度，而不是依靠个人英雄主义。家庭获得有关谈判和预算的信息严重滞后。

The Board. The Board should have treated the strike as the latest sign of a system that had failed families. EmpowerSF grew from \$9.5M to over \$40M and still failed to pay teachers. The October 2024 thirteen-school closure list was another warning — shelved when the public pushed back. The Student Success Fund lag was a third — \$26M set aside for 2024-25, only \$1M spent by September 2024. Real oversight would have called for plans long before a strike.

关于教委会(**Board**)：教委会本应把这次罢工视为一个长期系统失灵、未能服务家庭的最新警讯。EmpowerSF的预算从950万美元增长到超过4000万美元，但依然未能解决教师薪资问题；2024年10月提出的“关闭13所学校名单”，在公众强烈反对后被搁置，这是第二个警讯。学生成功基金(Student Success Fund)的执行滞后则是第三个警讯——2024-2025学年预留了2600万美元，但截至2024年9月仅支出了100万美元。真正有效的监督，本应在罢工发生之前，就要求明确的执行计划与问责机制。

The Union. I focus on missing build, not blame. There was no joint district-union-family info loop. Families had no clear timelines.

关于工会(**Union**)：我的重点不是追究责任，而是指出系统建设的缺失。校区、工会与家庭之间，并没有建立联合的信息沟通机制。家庭始终无法获得清晰的时间表与预期。

Going forward. Adopt a Board rule: a joint district-union-family comms protocol. It kicks in 30 days before any strike vote. Staff runs it. The Board sets and tracks.

未来应如何改进:我会推动教委会通过一项规则:建立“校区—工会—家庭联合沟通机制(joint district-union-family communications protocol)”。

该机制应在任何罢工投票前30天自动启动。由校区工作人员负责执行,而教委会则负责制定规则并监督落实。

5. What does effective Board governance look like in practice? In your response, describe how you would:

- **Work with the Superintendent while maintaining appropriate oversight**
- **Ensure Board decisions are followed through on, without overstepping into staff work**

5. 在实践中,什么样的校区教委会治理才算有效?请在回答中说明您将如何:

- 在保持适当监督的同时,与学监合作
- 确保校区教委会的决定得到落实,同时不过度介入教职员工的具体工作

Good Board work is not passive. The Board sets goals and guardrails (and kill-switches). It tracks progress and holds staff to account before a guardrail is hit. It adopts the budget. It rates the Superintendent. It asks for public proof that votes become real. Staff runs the work. Both halves of that line need to hold for SOFG to work.

优秀的教委会治理绝不是被动的。教委会需要设定目标与护栏(guardrails),以及必要时的“紧急停止机制(kill-switches)”;需要持续追踪进展,并在触及护栏之前就要求行政团队承担责任;需要通过预算;评估学监的表现;并要求公开证明教委会的决议真正落地实施。行政团队负责具体执行工作,而教委会负责治理监督。只有这两部分职责都得到落实, SOFG (学生成果导向治理)模式才能真正发挥作用。

Working with the Superintendent while keeping oversight. Start with what works. The Board's monthly Goal 1 and Goal 2 reviews on math and reading are the right SOFG habit. Goals set. Data reviewed. Adult moves tied to student outcomes. I would lean into that pace. I would add the same for ops: regular public review of major rollout marks, with reports when timelines slip.

如何在与学监合作的同时保持监督

首先,应当延续已经有效的做法。目前教委会围绕数学和阅读所进行的 Goal 1 与 Goal 2 月度审查,就是一种正确的 SOFG 工作习惯:先设定目标;再审查数据;将成年人采取的行动与学生成果直接关联。我会进一步强化这种节奏。与此同时,我也会把同样的机制应用到运营管理上:定期公开审查重大项目的实施进度,并在时间表延误时发布公开报告。

What I would avoid: public ambush of the Superintendent, surprise votes that skip the public, and Board-by-press-release moves. Splits belong in committee, not soundbites.

我会避免的做法:在公开场合“伏击式”攻击总监;通过突然提出、绕过公众参与的投票推进决策;用新闻稿代替治理程序。意见分歧应该在委员会讨论中解决,而不是通过媒体口号或片面发声制造对立。

Follow-through without overreach. The central-office audit fits here. The Board calls for the audit and acts on what it finds. Staff does the work. That is just what SOFG calls Board oversight.

在不越权的情况下确保落实:中心办公室审计(central-office audit)正是一个典型例子。教委会负责要求进行审计,并依据审计结果采取行动;具体执行则由行政团队负责。这正是 SOFG 所定义的教委会监督职责。

Two recent cases. The Strong Schools vote from November 2025 set clearer rules on closure than the October 2024 try. The zone-based plan, now pushed to 2028-29, shows what happens when the Board lets staff slip.

两个近期案例:2025年11月通过的强校计划(Strong Schools)投票,相比2024年10月的关闭学校方案,为学校关闭程序建立了更清晰的规则。而目前已推迟到2028-29学年的分区制(zone-based plan)改革,则说明了当教委会未能有效督促行政团队按时推进工作时,会产生什么后果。

6. Board decisions often face strong public criticism. How would you respond if a decision you supported was met with significant pushback from: 1) families? 2) teachers? What would you say, and what would you do next?

6. 校区教委会的决定常常会面临强烈的公众批评。如果您支持的一项决定遭遇以下群体的强烈反对，您会如何回应：1) 家庭/家长？2) 教师？您会说什么？接下来又会采取什么行动？

Public criticism is not a fail of Board work. Ignoring it is. The job is to hear the pushback. Test if it shows missing facts or unequal hit. Then revise the vote or explain it more clearly.

公众批评并不代表教委会工作失败。真正的失败，是对这些批评置之不理。教委会的职责，是倾听反对声音，判断其中是否揭示了遗漏的事实或不公平的影响，然后据此修改决策，或者更清楚地解释决策原因。

Pushback from families. I would thank them and address what they see at their school. I would put the data behind the vote into plain words. Make it ready in many tongues. Many SFUSD families do not have English as a first tongue. To explain a Board vote only in dense English is itself a snub. We have the tools.

面对家庭的质疑：我会首先感谢家长发声，并认真回应他们在自己学校实际看到的问题。我会把支持该项投票的数据，用通俗易懂的语言向公众说明，并提供多语言版本。许多三藩市联合家庭的第一语言并不是英语。如果教委会只用晦涩复杂的英文来解释一项政策投票，本身就是一种忽视与怠慢。而我们其实已经拥有解决这一问题的工具。

Next: meet fast. Share the data. Name the trade-offs. Show what can still shift. If pushback shows facts the Board did not weigh, I would call for a revisit. If the proof still backs the vote, I would track how it lands in public.

接下来，应当迅速召开沟通会议，公开数据，明确说明各种取舍(trade-offs)，并告诉公众哪些部分仍有调整空间。如果公众反馈揭示出教委会此前未充分考虑的重要事实，我会支持重新审议该项决策；如果现有证据依然支持原决定，我也会持续跟踪该政策在现实中的实施效果与公众反应。

Pushback from teachers. Teachers know first when a rule fails in class. I would want to hear if the vote is doable with the staff, time, and support we promised. If conditions do not match the rule, fix the conditions or fix the rule.

Work through the Superintendent and the union — not around them.

面对教师的质疑:教师往往是最早发现政策在课堂中无法落实的人。我会认真倾听:这项政策是否真的能够在我们承诺的人手、时间与支持条件下执行?如果现实条件无法支撑政策要求,那么就应当改善执行条件,或者修改政策本身。与此同时,所有沟通与协作都应通过学监和工会体系进行,而不是绕过他们。

What I will not do: brush off families as emotional or teachers as resistant. Or drop a needed vote because it is hard. The rule is the same: hear, test, decide, track, adjust, land.

我不会做的事:我不会把家长简单视为“情绪化”,也不会把教师贴上“抗拒改革”的标签;同样,我也不会因为一项必要的决策困难重重,就选择放弃。我的原则始终一致:倾听(hear)、检验(test)、决策(decide)、追踪(track)、调整(adjust)、落实(land)。

7. Does the district need to close schools, and if so, why? To what extent should community input, equity, and enrollment demand shape these processes and final decisions?

7.校区是否需要关闭部分学校?如果需要,原因是什么?在这一过程中,社区意见、教育公平以及招生需求应在多大程度上影响相关程序与最终决定?

Maybe. Enrollment is dropping. Some mergers may be needed. Schools are core to a block. A closure cannot be top-down. The Board sets the rules — then holds staff to them.

也许需要。学生人数正在下降,一些学校合并可能无法避免。但学校是社区街区(block)的核心,学校关闭绝不能由上而下强行决定。教委会的职责,是先制定明确规则,再监督行政团队严格遵守这些规则。

I pledge a three-rule closure test.

我承诺建立一个“三项学校关闭审查标准(three-rule closure test)”。

First: public data, 90 days. No closure vote until data has been public for 90 days. Data must include enrollment, space, dollar impact, equity impact, and student outcomes. The reason for each named site must be in plain words.

第一、公开数据, 至少**90**天。在相关数据公开满90天之前, 不得进行任何关闭学校投票。公开数据必须包括: 学生人数变化(enrollment)、校舍空间使用情况、财务影响、公平性影响(equity impact)、学生成果(student outcomes)。并且, 针对每一所被列入名单的学校, 都必须用清晰易懂的语言解释关闭理由。

Second: a real shift plan, 180 days. Schools taking in students must show staff, special-ed space, transport, language-program flow, and after-school care. In writing. With named owners.

第二、完整的过渡安置方案, 至少提前**180**天。

接收学生的学校, 必须提前明确说明: 教职员工作安排、特殊教育空间、交通方案、双语/语言项目衔接、课后照护服务。这些内容都必须形成书面计划, 并明确具体负责人。

Third: School Site Council consent. The community closest to the vote needs a real say. If the SSC says no, the Board goes back to the data.

Public voice is the process check. Equity is the impact check. The October 2024 thirteen-school closure list hit Asian American, Chinese American, Black, Pacific Islander, Latino, and immigrant families hardest. Shift planning was thin. Enrollment trend is the base — closures should track long patterns, not one bad year.

第三、学校校务委员会同意

距离决策最近的社区, 必须拥有真正的话语权。如果学校校务委员会(SSC)明确反对, 教委会就应重新审视数据与决策依据。公众参与, 是对程序是否公正的检验; 而教育公平, 则是对政策影响的检验。2024年10月提出的“关闭13所学校名单”, 对亚裔美国人、华裔美国人、非裔、太平洋岛裔、拉丁裔以及移民家庭造成了最严重影响。而当时针对学生转移与安置的规划明显不足。学生人数下降趋势固然是真实存在的, 但关闭学校应基于长期趋势, 而不是因为某一个学年的短期波动。

What I will not do: Surprise lists. Data-light votes. Balancing the budget on families least able to absorb the hit. Closures are not the first lever. The audit, enrollment work, and state LCFF push come first.

我不会做的事: 突然公布关闭名单; 在缺乏充分数据的情况下仓促投票; 通过牺牲最难承受冲击的家庭来平衡预算。学校关闭不应是第一个工具。在此之前, 应先完成中央办公室审计、招生与入学策略改革, 以及争取加州地方控制拨款资金等工作。

Closure rigor is not a closure veto. It is what makes the call last.

严格的关闭标准,并不意味着永远否决学校关闭;它的意义在于,确保任何最终决定都能够经得起时间与公众检验。

8. What are the biggest challenges and opportunities you see with the district's current student assignment ("lottery") system?

8.您认为校区当前的学生派位(“抽签”)制度面临的最大挑战与机遇是什么?

The current system fails on both sides. Not stable for families. Not fair for students. Travel times, late notices, waitlist churn make planning hard.

当前体系在两个方面都存在失败:对家庭而言不够稳定,对学生而言也不够公平。通勤时间不合理、通知发布时间过晚、候补名单频繁变动(waitlist churn),都让家庭几乎无法进行长期规划。

Challenges.

挑战如下:

First, delay. Policy 5101.2, the zone-based plan, was adopted in December 2020 on a 6-1 vote. Rollout has been pushed back over and over. The latest push, in May 2026, sets April 2027 as the goal for 2028-29. Almost a decade between vote and reality. Each pushed-back year is one more class of kids in a plan the Board voted to swap out.

首先是延迟问题。政策 5101.2(分区制方案)于2020年12月以6比1的投票通过。但此后其实实施时间被多次推迟。最近一次在2026年5月的延期,将目标实施时间再次推后至2027年4月,适用于2028-29学年。这意味着,从投票通过到真正落地之间,几乎跨越了将近十年。每延迟一年,都意味着又一届学生仍然处在一个教委会已经决定要替换、但尚未真正执行的新入学体系之中。

Second, the CTIP1 tiebreaker. It was a fair equity proxy in its day. Tied to street address, it is easy to game.

第二点是社区人口普查区整合优先(CTIP1)作为择校“平局优先规则”(tiebreaker)的问题。在其设立之初,它作为一种公平性的替代指标,具有合理性,用来反映社区与教育资源之间

的历史不平等。但随着时间推移,当这一规则与“具体街道地址绑定”后,它也变得更容易被人为利用或规避,从而削弱其原本的公平目标。

Opportunities.

机会在于:

First: launch the plan the Board already passed. Public timeline. Marks to hit. Stop the slips. Fund the modeling if it is not done.

第一、落实教委会已经通过的方案。公布公开时间表,明确各阶段必须完成的目标(marks to hit),停止一再拖延。如果相关数据建模(modeling)尚未完成,就应当立即提供资金支持完成它。

Second: swap CTIP1 for a household-level LCFF tiebreaker. Low income. English learner. Foster youth. Unhoused. IEP. Same factors LCFF uses, tied to the household. Equity stays. Gaming gets harder.

第二、以“基于家庭情况的地方控制与问责计划(LCFF)”的优先规则取代社区人口普查区整合优先(CTIP1)。衡量因素应包括:低收入家庭、英语学习者、寄养青少年、无家可归学生、个别化教育计划(IEP)学生。使用与加州地方控制拨款公式相同的公平指标,并直接基于家庭实际情况进行优先排序。这样既能保留公平性目标,也能减少制度被“钻空子”(gaming)的可能。

Third: keep language-immersion across the city. Mandarin. Spanish. Cantonese. Korean. Filipino at Bessie Carmichael and Longfellow.

第三、继续在全市范围保留并发展双语沉浸式项目(language immersion programs),包括:中文普通话、西班牙语、粤语、韩语、菲律宾语。并继续支持位于贝西·卡迈克尔学校(Bessie Carmichael School)和朗费罗小学(Longfellow Elementary School)的菲律宾语项目。

Fourth: one round of choice. Plain guides in Chinese, Spanish, Filipino. Public charts on top-choice rates and equity by group.

第四、实行“一轮择校”(one round of choice)制度,并提供简明易懂的中文、西班牙文和菲律宾文指南。同时公开各群体获得第一志愿学校(top-choice rates)及公平性数据的统计图表。

On charters: default no, burden of proof on each ask. SFUSD has to fix choice and access first.

关于特许学校(charter schools):我的默认立场是“不扩张”,除非申请方能够充分证明其必要性。三藩市联合校区必须先解决自身在择校与教育机会公平方面的问题。

What I will not do: Accept one more delay.

我不会做的事:我不会接受再一次拖延。

9. SFUSD is facing structural budget challenges, including declining enrollment, rising costs, and pressure on reserves. What do you see as the root causes of this situation, and how should the Board respond within its governance role?

9. 三藩市联合校区当前正面临结构性预算挑战,包括入学人数下降、成本上升以及储备资金压力等问题。您认为造成这一局面的根本原因是什么?校区教委会应如何在其治理职责范围内作出回应?

The root causes are layered. One-time COVID dollars — over \$330M for SFUSD — have run out. LCFF tracks enrollment (and absentee rates), enrollment has dropped. Costs have risen with Bay Area life costs. Ops faults let cash leak before classrooms. EmpowerSF grew from \$9.5M to over \$40M (with no kill switch) and still failed to pay teachers. The Board adopted \$113M in cuts for 2025-26. Another \$59M is planned for 2026-27 — including 85 teaching jobs. Total gap: about \$172M.

这些财政问题的根源是多层叠加的。首先,疫情期间的一次性联邦新冠疫情(COVID)资金已经耗尽。三藩市联合校区曾获得超过3.3亿美元的疫情援助资金,但这些资金如今已经用完。其次,加州地方控制拨款(LCFF)的资金与学生人数和出勤率挂钩,而目前学生入学人数持续下降。与此同时,湾区生活成本不断上涨,也进一步推高了校区运营成本。此外,运营管理上的问题,资金在真正进入课堂之前就已经流失。三藩市赋能组织(EmpowerSF)的预算从950万美元增长到超过4000万美元,而且缺乏有效的“紧急停止机制(kill switch)”,但最终依然未能解决教师薪资问题。教委会已经通过了2025-2026学年1.13亿美元的预算削减方案;而2026-2027学年还计划进一步削减5900万美元,其中包括85个教师岗位。总体财政缺口约为1.72亿美元。

The Board's role has three levers.

教委会的职责,主要集中在三项关键杠杆(three levers)上。

The audit. A 90-day peer-district audit is the core. The BLA found in January 2023 that SFUSD spends 83% more on central-office work than twelve California peers. UESF's Restructure It Right named the same gap. Done well, the audit could free \$40-60M each year.

开展审计(**The Audit**):核心措施是一项为期90天,与同类校区进行比较的运营审计(peer-district audit)。三藩市参事会预算与立法分析办公室(BLA)在2023年1月的报告中指出,三藩市联合校区在中心办公室行政管理方面的支出,比加州12个类似校区高出83%。三藩市教育工作者联合会提出的“正确推进重组(Restructure It Right)”报告,也指出了同样的问题。如果审计执行得当,每年有可能释放出4000万至6000万美元的资金空间。

More students back. Each student kept is about \$13K in LCFF. Better choice. Faster Prop G rollout. Real SpEd care. These drive the win.

吸引并留住更多学生:每留住一名学生,校区大约能获得1.3万美元的资金。改善择校制度、加快 Prop G 项目实施,以及真正改善特殊教育(SpEd)服务,都会帮助校区重新赢得家庭信任、稳定学生人数。

State LCFF push. The formula does not match Bay Area costs. Push with CFT for a regional add-on is years of work.

推动州级地方控制拨款公式(LCFF)改革:现行的地方控制拨款公式并未真正反映湾区的高生活成本。因此,需要与加州教师联合会等组织共同推动建立“区域成本附加补助(regional add-on)”。这将是一项需要多年持续推动的长期工作。

Reserves, three rules in order. Hold the state floor — drop below and the state takes over. Hold the payroll safety net. Reserves for one-time costs only.

关于储备金,我有三项原则,按顺序排列为:保持高于州政府规定的最低储备要求——否则州政府将接管校区;保持工资发放安全缓冲;储备金只能用于一次性支出,而不能填补长期结构性缺口。

What I will not do: Fund top-tier pay from the audit alone. The audit anchors a four-year pay plan. The audit is the funding source. Not the kids.

我不会做的事:我不会假装仅靠审计节省下来的资金,就能立即实现“顶级教师薪酬(top-tier pay)”。审计的作用是为一个为期四年的教师薪酬提升计划提供稳定资金来源。真正的资金来源应该是提高系统效率,而不是削减学生服务。

10. The Board's 2014 decision to change 8th grade algebra policy did not produce the intended results, and the current Board's recent revisions have drawn mixed reactions from teachers and families. What does this case reveal about how the San Francisco Board of Education should handle decisions around academic policy? If elected, what specific, measurable actions would you take to: 1) expand access to advanced coursework, and 2) improve outcomes for historically underserved students?

10. 校区教委会于2014年作出的八年级代数课程政策调整,并未达到预期效果,而现任校区教委会近期所做的修订,也在教师与家庭之间引发了不同反应。您认为这一案例揭示了三藩市联合校区教委会在制定学术政策时应如何开展决策?如果当选,您将采取哪些具体且可衡量的行动来:1)扩大学生修高阶课程的学习机会;2)改善“历史上未得到充分服务学生群体”(historically underserved students)的学习成果?

The lesson. The 2014 call had a fair equity reason. Fear that early tracking widened gaps. Kids with private tutors pulled ahead. Kids without were left behind. The outcome did not match the goal. The right move: stick to the proof base. Watch group results. Adjust when the data does not back the theory.

这场改革带来的教训:2014年的改革初衷,确实有其公平性的考虑——人们担心过早分流(tracking)会扩大教育差距。有私人补习资源的学生越来越领先,而缺乏资源的学生则被落在后面。但最终结果并没有达到最初目标。真正正确的做法,应当是坚持以证据为基础(proof base):持续观察不同学生群体的实际结果,并在数据不支持理论时及时调整政策。

Recent moves are the right path. The February 2024 vote to bring it back. The pilot in roughly ten schools across 2024-25 and 2025-26. The March 2026 rollout. The Board now must hold to the same proof bar.

最近的改革方向是正确的:2024年2月恢复了八年级代数(一)的投票;2024-2025和2025-2026学年在约十所学校开展了试点;于2026年3月全面推广。现在,教委会必须以同样严格的证据标准来监督这项工作。

(1) Expanding advanced coursework access.

(1) 扩大高级课程机会

Share enrollment and pass rates for Algebra 1, Geometry, and Algebra II. By school. By group: race, ethnicity, EL, IEP, FRL. Twice a year.

公开代数1 (Algebra 1)、几何 (Geometry) 和 代数2 (Algebra II) 的选课率与通过率。数据应按学校以及不同学生群体分类, 包括: 种族与族裔 (race/ethnicity)、英语学习者 (EL)、个别化教育计划学生 (IEP)、免费及减价午餐资格学生 (FRL)。并且每年公布两次。

Set placement three ways: test, teacher input, family choice. Cuts the chance gatekeeping replaces tracking.

Track sixth-to-eighth grade math readiness. Help reaches kids before Algebra 1.

课程分班应同时参考三项因素: 测试成绩、教师建议、家庭自主选择。

这样能够降低“以新的形式人为设限 (gatekeeping)”取代旧式分流 (tracking) 的风险。同时, 还应持续追踪六至八年级学生的数学准备情况, 确保支持与帮助能够在学生进入 代数1 之前就提前介入。

(2) Improving outcomes for historically underserved students.

(2) 改善长期服务不足学生群体的成果

Tutoring and summer bridge at schools where pilot data shows the biggest gaps.

Counselor input on course choice. Eighth-grade Algebra leads to AP-level math.

A by-group support report each year. The Board reviews whether results close or widen.

对于试点数据显示差距最大的学校, 应提供辅导 (tutoring) 和暑期衔接课程 (summer bridge)。辅导员 (counselors) 也应参与课程选择指导, 因为八年级代数往往会直接影响学生未来进入高级 (AP) 数学课程的机会。此外, 应每年发布一份“按学生群体分类的支持与成果报告”, 由教委会审查教育差距究竟是在缩小还是扩大。

What I will not do: Claim a win the day a vote passes. Lower the bar for underserved kids. Ignore data that shows a rule is not working.

我不会做的事: 不会在一项政策刚通过时就宣布“胜利”; 不会降低对长期服务不足学生群体的学术

标准;不会无视那些表明政策失效的数据。