

**BHS BSEP Meeting
February 9, 2015
Conference Room B**

NAME	COMMUNITY	ATTENDANCE
Sandi Hunt	Parent	Yes
Nia Hampton	Student	Yes
Susi Lopez-Platt	Staff	Yes
Jed Waldman	Parent	Yes
John Lavine	Parent	Yes
Timothy Carter	Parent	Yes
Matt Albinson	Staff	Yes
Toni Stein	Parent	Yes
Kristin Glechur	Principal	Yes
Catherine Lazio	Parent	Yes
Sarah Cline	Staff	Yes
Nerine Ortiz-Pon	Student	No
Jackson Grisby	Student	No
Zack Marienthal	Student	No
Max Cramer	Student	No
Harry Overstreet	Parent	No
Aaron Glimme	Staff	No
Rhonda Jefferson	Staff	No
Walter Mitchell	Staff	No

Quorum: Quorum was not established

Approval of Minutes from Last Meeting: Committee was unable to vote on minutes from last meeting because quorum was not established.

Approval of Agenda-Additions/Changes: Committee was unable to vote on minutes from last meeting because quorum was not established.

Public Comment: No public Comment

Chair Report: I want to report on the application. They wanted to make it as a fillable PDF. A technical feedback is that people only have line limits in the application. Jessica will send out an extra page to add extra information. Personal I think they should stay within their line limits. Hopefully people will be able to keep the space allowed because they should be able to state their case within the space allowed.

P&O Report:

The P&O meeting was sparsely attended; therefore they were unable to vote on anything. Most of the conversation revolved around class-size reduction and how to allocate those monies. There was further discussion regarding monies for positions that are funded, but not filled. It was suggested that a report is made available to see how often that happens. An example of the Youth Court position that was previously funded by BHS BSEP was never filled and that money was still available as carryover. Pasquale Scuderi asked the committee if that money could instead be spent on the College and Career Counselor clerical position, but the committee voted that down. There are some school sites (not BHS) that have huge balances left over because of unfilled positions. In the case of BHS, there is a plan for what to do with monies that do not get spent. Historically, it goes to instructional materials.

SSC/Principal Report:

KG: We added a few caveats to the school site plan and the school site counsel:

- Can the site implement an effective student evaluation of teachers to provide anonymous feedback to admin and staff? A group of students and teachers would be interested in a voluntary, not evaluatory feedback form that students give to teachers. We will be looking into that with BFT and we will bring it to teacher leadership tomorrow and continue to have those conversations. Our hope is that we can implement a voluntary student survey in the Spring of this year.
- How can students and parents be assured of regular online every two weeks at minimum communications about grades and assignments? Many teachers, for a good reason don't like PowerSchool because it inhibits their ability to give good feedback to kids.
- What other discipline alternatives such as restorative justice can we implement as alternatives to suspension?
- What are the specific ways that the site and the district are recruiting and retaining teachers of color? That is an LCAP and a site/district level concern.
- How does the lottery and learning communities selection process contribute to segregation?
- Alternative for students who are struggling in academic classes. For example: Alternative for AP placements, increased opportunities for students to take other than a four-year path out of high school. Career Tech ed, comes to mind, and alternative options.
- Are improvement targets realistic and rigorous enough?
- Does the school site plan adequately address _____
- How can A-G requirements be more explicit in the school site plan?
- How can we improved teacher/administrator communication?

Status Update on Evaluations of Programs Funded Last Year:

We do have in our timeline that all evaluations are to be completed by March 6th. Any input? Any question on next steps for evaluations?

Susi: What is the role of the student?

JL: There is no differentiation. It is up to you how to divvy up the work.

CL: The fun part of the process is the conclusion. Especially if you've come to different conclusions.

Confirm Schedule for Remainder of the Year:

SH: Our next meeting is March 9th, which after all the evaluations are to be completed. On that day we will begin evaluating the proposals.

JW: I am wondering how the March 9th meeting will look like since we will have the evaluations and proposals potentially here.

JLT: I think the March 9th meeting is about reporting back, and everyone who evaluated takes a few minutes to report on how the meeting went, evaluations and recommendations for funding. There is no actual voting. The voting happens in the following meetings.

JW: Do you look at the new proposals in light of that?

JL: Not in light of that, but separate but equal to that are new proposals coming in, and that is our first look at them.

SH: Is that typically, just an hour and half meeting? Or is it longer than an hour and a half?

JLT: I think is just an hour and a half meeting, and then when we look at the actual proposals is when we have the long meetings.

JL: My recollection is that even in the hour and a half meeting we end up voting to extend the time. So, it's essentially a two hour long meeting.

SH: We had fourteen items that were funded last year, one of which was instructional materials, so that is not being reviewed. So we will split the time evenly for the evaluation of the existing programs and the new proposals. Just from a logistical perspective, communications outreach and volunteers, clearly we're going to get a proposal for that again. Do we typically listen to the evaluation and proposal for that at the same time? Or do we go through all the evaluations and then back to the proposals?

CL: I thought last year we did them on separate days?

SC: It might be a good idea that on the evaluations this year, we note if the program will be requesting money from us again.

SH: There is a part of the evaluation form. The last step, which is your recommendation for funding: same, less or more.

JW: If we are evaluating a program that is not continuing, do we need to discuss?

SH: No.

KG: I think the only reason people would come and say they would not be reapplying is because they've secured funding elsewhere.

SH: Just to be clear. The March 9th meeting is when we will be bringing back all evaluations and we will have a quick run through of the proposals. But the big run of the proposals is March 23rd. And that is when we start the budget process.

JL: Something to consider is that, is just going to be a time crunch. Another way to think about it is that the evaluations will come in, and will all be posted on google docs, and we can all review those. The only thing that wouldn't be able to review, is the new proposals coming in.

SH: The March 9th meeting will probably go two hours.

CL: People should probably know that their evaluations will take 3 or 4 minutes

JLT: I want to tell applicants to contact me if they want to come speak to the committee. But should I say that they should limit the number of students they want to speak to us?

SC: Are they coming on the 9th:

JLT: No, on the 23rd.

SC: I have a question about students that come in to talk. I find that to be a mental waste of time, because they all say the same thing. They all love their programs. It just becomes this thing, where it all mushes together in your mind. I didn't find it useful, in terms of thinking about what to fund.

SH: There is nothing to say that we can't put a limit per proposal.

JLT: We'll need someone to be tough with the timing, because they tend to go over their allotted time.

SLP: I can do it. I have don't have a problem stopping them.

MA: I would just encourage the grantees that the process is a written one, but if there is something that you need to add, then by all means.

JLT: Once I get all the proposals in, then I can send an email to all the proposal writers asking them to sign up to speak to the committee. I should also divide up the speakers on two days, so that we're not sitting here doing it all in one night.

SC: It might also be good to just write and say, "past members of the committee have found that the student support comments to be not useful"

TC: Can I just chime in on the public comment portion. The public wants to be heard. I think our job is to make sure that all the stakeholders feel like they are being heard. We don't want them to feel like they are not being heard and they really have something to say. I just want to make sure that people speak if they want to speak. I would hate to discourage a student or the public.

TS: I agree too.

CL: Maybe we can say that their presentation is limited to five minutes and they would have to select amongst themselves how they want to use that time. We can encourage it that way.

SH: What has happened in the past as far as time? Was there a time limit before?

JLT: No. We put in a time limit last year to 5 minutes, and I scheduled people in five minutes intervals. We did that last year, so we can move the meeting along because we do stay here very late.

SLP: My experience too, is that if you put a time limit, they you really force presenter to be succinct and tell us what we really need to know to make a decision. Tell me what I need to know so I can say yes or no.

JL: Related to this, I want to raise the issue that there is an inherent advantage to having a program that is already funded; and it has been difficult for me sitting on the committee for the past couple of years, seeing a good way that encourages new programs to come in, and to be heard on an equal footing. How do we get to hear them and evaluate them equally to all the other proposals? In my mind, it argues a little bit against loading a meeting full of testimony from already existing programs. We already know what those programs are. I much rather spend our time hearing presentations from new proposals.

JW: What is the number of applications?

JLT: It fluctuates between 15 and 20 proposals.

SC: I think if we are going to have more people coming in, we should move it to a larger space.

KG: We could move it to the community theater lobby, or the library.

SH: There would be two dates for those meeting. March 23rd and April 13th = long meetings. March 9th will be two hours.

JLT: I'll look into the food situation with Rhonda Jefferson, for those two days.

SH: Maybe by the time March 9th rolls around we will have a better idea of how many proposals we have to work with.

SH: Can the rubric work be done ahead of time?

JLT: I think you set the time for that, where you say "here are all the proposals we have..." everyone gets a copy of the rubric ahead of time, and you set a deadline for when the rubric has to be completed.

SC: It was also helpful last year that we all scored a proposal together ahead of time. Just to norm the rubric.

JLT: Yes, that way we can all be on the same page about scoring.

SH: I do agree with a five minute limit on each presentation. People should really be telling their story in writing, and should be really answering questions on that day.

JLT: Should we invite people to present on the March 9th meeting?

SC: I think we have enough to do on March 9th. I think is hard to hear presentations on different days. Frankly, I rather hear them all on one day.

SH: I actually rather hear them all on the 23rd, and then do our evaluation on the 13th. Is there a reason why we shouldn't do it that way?

JLT: Mental capacity.

JW: If we do it all on the same day, no one would be at a disadvantage.

Committee discusses their preference on whether they want the committee to hear all presenters on one night, or split in to two nights. The majority of the committee prefers to hear from them on one night.

BSEP Meetings:

March 9th from 4:30 to 6pm

March 23rd from 4:30 to 9pm

April 13th from 4:30 to 9pm

Location for long meetings to be determined.

Meeting Adjourned: 6pm