

**BSEP Minutes for January 6, 2014  
Berkeley High School  
Location: Conference Room B**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Community</b>	<b>Attended</b>
Hector Cardenas	Parent	Yes
Aaron Glimme	Teacher	Yes
John Lavine	Parent	Yes
Catherine Lazio	Parent	Yes
Nia Hampton	Student	Yes
Sara Cerami	Student	Yes
Sarah Cline	Teacher	Yes
Austin Lloyd	Student	Yes
Maya Smith	Student	Yes
Joseph Battles	Student	Yes
Matt Albinson	Teacher	Yes
Michael Peltz	Parent	Yes
Pasquale Scuderi	Principal	Yes
Richard Boyden		Yes
Jessica Lopez-Tello	Staff	Yes
Rhonda Jefferson	Staff	No
Orlando Williams	Parent	No
Debbie Symes	Parent	No

**Quorum Established:** Yes at 4:34 pm

**Approval of Minutes:** Yes

Changes made by Hector on Google docs from 12/2 minutes. Minor change, such as typos.  
No other changes.

10 approved

1 Abstention

**Approval of Agenda – Additions/Changes:** Changes were made to the agenda

Changes: Motion to adjourn meeting at 6:30pm

All approved

No objections

Proposal to add a 5:20pm item to assign evaluations to committee members. Those who missed meeting on 12/2 can direct questions to Aaron Glimme by email. If there are still questions, we can discuss next meeting.

**Public Comment:** No

**PS:** I was contacted today by CIF who are honoring a man by the name of Charles Bidenboch who was the principal at BHS from 1912 to 1932. He also served as the secretary for the CIF from 1914 to 1937 and he was also largely credited as the guy who invented middle schools. I've been asked to come and accept an award because they can't a living relative. CIF oversees the athletic programs statewide. He also served on the Alameda County Board of Education during that time.

**Chair Report:**

**HC:** Will there be a new version of the WASC action plan?

**AG:** Yes, there will be a new version coming out soon.

**HC:** You can send that to me or Jessica.

**HC:** We talked about an email with the evaluation rubric to get feedback. So, basically we need to get that WASC doc from you. What is the email about the evaluation rubric.

**AG:** The concern had been: Do we want to adapt/change/modify the application process to encourage people to apply. Would this be a good time to encourage people to haven't or have stopped submitting applications for things we used to fund, like equipment and supplies. We might want to modify the application in order to encourage that. Does that mean we have to look at the rubric for evaluating a proposal and how the way we look at programs in light of those changes.

**JL:** That is also my recollection. We specifically talked about a short form evaluation, so that it encourages small first time funding programs.

**HC:** Was there a proposal as to the shape and form of that evaluation.

**CL:** I looked at the application in google docs. There is essentially basic information at the top and there are 12 questions. Some are short and the narrative can be quite long. So, my recommendation was at least in the short form and maybe even in the long form to have a short version of the narrative that can suffice as the narrative. Basically there are five questions that can be translated into a chart. I took an evaluation from last year, and what that reader did, they took a narrative and put it into a chart. It takes that step for the evaluators out of the process and is a crutch tool for someone who may be unfamiliar with filling out applications. We can get the first five questions into a chart form. The first one would just be a simple one-sentence description of the project. The second would be one or two sentences of the mission or objective. The chart could answer the questions of the specific goals, how they would measure progress and the activities of those goals.

**HC:** Did Valerie share with you the online application form the developed?

**AG:** She said they were developing it.

**HC:** I've seen it and I gave her comments on it, but I don't know if she responded. There are two things they are developing. 1) The application form. 2) The evaluation form. The evaluation form I responded to her in detail. I think that a lot of these things are covered in the one that we have already, and in some ways the one that we had seemed to be better than this new one. So we talked about it, and she said to keep using yours for that. And for the application form, did you guys see it at the last meeting?

**AG:** No. I think that is one of the things we talked about. Before we approve this, we really would like to see the online version. That is why we pushed some of this stuff off.

**JL:** I think there are two things going on here. 1) A streamline form and 2) Are we going to encourage new applicants. And that has to be contingent in us having that discussion and saying "we're open to shifting some of our funding.

HC: That seems to be contingent on the first part of the meeting last time where Natasha discussed the funding. With the new funding formula, certain types of things we've been funding will very likely be funded in a different way. If the money is restricted in certain ways, the district might want to help us by picking up some of these things, but a lot of it depends on how the state regulations play out.

PS: There is some long-term incongruence with the fact that the district has until June to submit the LCAP to the county, which makes it difficult for us.

JB: There is some rule that the district itself can't shift funds around, but it might be ok for us because we are not part of the district. In addition, would the district like to fund us?

MP: This may have been in the minutes; separate from the issues you just talked about. Is it clear how much would come to BHS vs. the rest of the district? Aside from the \$600, 000.00

PS: Some of the supplemental funding comes from free and reduced lunch. So we are right now in the middle of a campaign that Daniel Roose, Ann Busacca-Ryan and Vernon Walton are doing to try to make sure to get more kids signed up for free and reduced lunch because the number that they take can be used in our funding for 3 years. There are two things. There is the increase in the base funding which is supposed to restore the whole district to 07 funding levels. Then there is supplemental budget that is additional funds that we might have for programs specifically for ELLs, low income, foster and homeless youth.

AG: It's important to understand that the way the law is written is a fundamental change. Now, the district gets to decide how that money gets allocated. It was school by school basis before.

HC: As far as our work, in the coming sessions, we have to proceed in a rather strategic way, so we don't go too fast in some of the decisions we have to make to give a little time for this thing to play out. My preference would be that we not approve and send out the request for proposals yet until we have been able to look at the online application that the BSEP office is working on. That way we're more certain of the rules. I'm not too concerned because we have enough time. I would like to start doing is making sure who is going to evaluate what program. And if there were no firm proposals, then we should go with its current version.

JL: If there is the possibility that some of the programs we are currently funding might get shifted to other alternative funding the work we do evaluating them for the purposes of refunding them.

HC: Is still valuable because is information that the BSEP office might be able to use. We have to do it anyway to evaluate the things that we fund. If you get money, you should have an evaluation.

PS: Another possibility is that the LCAP for the district has 8 priority areas. The plan that the district puts together is supposed to follow 8 specific things. Rolling out the new common core standards, measuring student outcomes which includes physical education, and the arts. It could be that we will have additional budget from base funding that will bring new programs to the school site. So maybe this new solicitation that we make for proposals could be sort of jointly in light of a potential base funding increase from LCAP plus the possibility of BSEP funds becoming available. The superintendent has already posed that question to school principals. I'm for the idea to trying to re-energize people submitting new proposals.

**P& O report:** None

## **SSC Report**

**SC:** They went into depth about school funding rules and how to increase funding.

**HC:** Have you seen any impact of what they are doing on our work? Is there anything we have to be cognizant of?

**PS:** The question is what is the SSC going to be now in light of the LCAP. There is going to be a parent advisory group that initially is appointed to represent the HS at the district level and they are crafting that. The question of us submitting a single plan in SPSA is now on the table and in play.

## **Action Item: Discuss and Approve Release of 2012-13 Application form**

**HC:** We were discussing that a moment ago. My preference is that we hold off on that, but we should have a discussion about that. Before we approve and release the application. We take a close look at what BSEP is doing and what Catherine is working on. Then bring to our next meeting a proposal that can be voted on by the committee member. That is how I'm thinking. But I want everyone chime in on this...

**CL:** What do you think of the short form?

**HC:** In the minutes I read that the discussion was maybe a short form for smaller amounts. What they are doing at the BSEP office they have a google doc that feeds into a spreadsheet and we get the chart. I think the most important question: What questions do we ask? And do we have less questions for the \$1000 grant. I see a lot of value in that. It makes things simpler. We have to roll up our sleeves and get this done in a short time frame.

**MP:** I like the idea of holding off based on the conversation we just had. One of things, that I thought would be useful to stress to encourage people to self-evaluate during this period. In some case people have done that pretty well in terms of surveying people using the programs. During this period of time that we have, it would be useful to remind them.

**HC:** I remember that was brought up at the meeting before the last. Why don't we have them self-evaluate then the committee members go to evaluate. Then their job is not so much to start from scratch. It would make the process more efficient. It also it gives a lot more control to the people that are being evaluated, so there is more ownership in that. I'm glad you brought that idea to the table again.

**CL:** I didn't have a lot of time this afternoon to review our evaluation form and the application. It seems to me that about 80% is exactly the same.

**MS:** Last year we had to wait, so we should tell them start gathering it the information.

**TS:** Who will draft the letter? We need help.

**HC:** Let's get a motion to do this on the table, so that we can make it formal.

**MP:** I make a motion to have a letter drafted to grant recipients to begin the process of thinking about self-evaluation. We can also put it on google docs so we can decide within a week to have it reviewed.

SC: Fill me in really briefly.

HC: Because the BHS BSEP committee works on a grant making basis. What we is that every year we go back to the grant recipients, we talk to them and gather some data so we know how money was used and whether they are achieving their goals and how they can improve their application next year. . A few years ago, we re-did the evaluation framework and designed a document that has guidance on how to do the evaluations for the committee members, and at this time a year, we evaluate to do the evaluations. We usually have two people evaluating one program.

SC: When will you be sending that out because is a significant amount of work that you are asking we do, and timing is important.

HC: We have a fair amount of time. So we send them out, this week, then we can set a timeline, so those evaluations don't have to be complete.

SC: Can I suggest that you wait until grades are done?

AG: Many of the grant recipients are teachers though. In fact, a few of them are.

AL: If we have a clear timeline there will be less pressure of deadlines.

JL: can you remind me? When have we stated the deadline for applications to be received?

HC: In the past it was the first week in February.

AG: We will push that by a month.

JB: The proposal has to be approved by this committee then sent out today or tomorrow.

HC: The proposal is to draft a letter with a deadline so that is clear what the timeline is for that, and to send that out as soon as possible; we can have that letter sent to me and I'll circulate it. We can make comments by email. Ideally we can have the letter going out on Thursday.

TS: Is there any value in trying to bring to light and memorialize the good work of anything that is outstanding that happens with the programs?

HC: In terms of the evaluations?

TS: Is there any value of saving something?

HC: You would think that, but most of the programs have been going and going. Almost everything has been pretty permanent.

AG: In terms of the letter, the deadline you are talking about. Is this the deadline for when applications are due? When we are going to start potentially having people come around and doing reviews?

HC: I was thinking more the second. We will be telling them: Here is the evaluation framework, please start doing self evaluation, and our committee members will contact you by Jan. 22<sup>nd</sup>. Then we have an internal deadline so we know when we should be done with evaluations, which is usually a week or so before our first budget meeting. That doesn't have to be done until April.

HC: Let's look at a calendar. Start February 3<sup>rd</sup> someone should contact you. So, that is the motion.

AG: I second the motion

HC: All those in favor of having Antoinette draft a letter with a timeline informing grant recipients that they should proceed to do a self-evaluation using our evaluation framework and they will be contacted within the first week of February.

13 approved

### **Next Order of Business**

HC: We decided not to issue the application form until we finish reviewing it.

### **Evaluation Assignments:**

<b>Program Evaluated</b>	<b>Evaluators</b>
Instructional Materials	No Report Needed
BSEP Committee Support	No Report Needed
Volunteer Coordinator Program Assistant	Sarah Cline and Matt Albinson
Dance and Drum Instructional Specialist	Sara Cerami and Michael Peltz
Athletic Equipment	Nia Hampton and Aaron Glimme
College and Career Advisors	Matt Albinson and Hector Cardenas
RISE Program	Joseph Battles and Toni Stein

Parent Liaison .53	Austin Lloyd and Orlando
Musical Excellence	Aaron Glimme and John Lavine
Bilingual Home School Liaison/Bilingual Tutors	Rhonda Jefferson and Pasquale Scuderi
Outsiders Club	Austin Lloyd and Pasquale Scuderi
Instrucional Media Tech	Michael Peltz and Rhonda Jefferson
Academic Resource Coordinator	Maya Smith and John Lavine
OCI Intervention Counselor .6 and Student Welfare and Attendance Specialist 1.0	Orlando and Catherine Lazio and Deebie Symes
Teacher on Special Assignment and Tutoring Coordinator .8	Catherine Lazio and Joseph Battles
Student Court	Toni Stein and Nia Hampton

HC: Everyone on the committee is assigned to at least 1 program. Ideally 2. As soon as we get the letter from Toni, I will circulate that and you will know what day you are supposed to call your contact person.

HC: Those are all the items on the agenda. Does anyone else have anything to add?

PS: I wanted to ask a brief question. We have for a number of reasons not hired someone for the Student Court position. So, approaching next semester we will have half a year worth of saving, and I wanted to know since the money would go into carryover; if there is a mid-year expense that could be funded. We are looking for a way to provide some clerical support to the college and career center if a proposal could come mid-year. What would be the appropriate time to do that? Or is the impression that is not an appropriate expense. Maybe that is a question that we can differ for another meeting.

HC: These are the funds that were not used for the student court coordinator?

PS: Yes. We believe that we may be able to make a second semester hire, but as you know, classified hiring in this district can take time.

HC: This is an interesting issue because it hasn't come up. We've always the budgets on a yearly basis. It would like to hear the opinion of the committee about bringing something to the table outside the regular budget process.

TS: We have the college and career, could there be an amendment to add some additional money that you then work under that program?

PS: I think that is a long-term solution. There were some complications this year, and we've been down a counselor for sometime that kind of created a backlog in the college and career center; so I said I would ask.

HC: The BSEP office said, it is legal, and is a matter for the committee. It is within our discretion if we wanted to do it.

SC: It seems problematic to me to have a committee member that has inside knowledge about this money that is supposed to be open to anyone, and now is being proposed that we not do that. Instead we you are proposing that in this little room we not tell anyone that this money is available, and I see that as problematic.

CL: You could just have mid year grants available. You can put out a call for proposals for x amount of money that is available. From a tax payers point of view I would actually like to see the money allocated to the schools. From the P&O oversight, sometime you see the schools with great surpluses and they sit on them. So, I'm in support.

JL: While I am sympathetic to the idea, my experience from last year was that by the time we're sitting around with a pot of money trying to figure out how to divide it up. It was always a swap of "we never had enough" "we'll take a chunk from here and put it there"...It's never enough. So, there are always proposals in excess of what we had to spend, and it seems a disservice to the process.

MS: Where would the money go if we don't use it?

PS: It would become carryover. So, when we craft the budget this year, we usually have carryover priorities that will get funded based on what we need. The whole budget item is about \$30,000 which is not an insignificant amount, so that would rollover into carryover.

HC: So, when it rolls over into carryover we have an amount of money that the BSEP office tells us "this is coming your way", so we allocate those first. And they tell us, we also estimate that there is about \$30,000 in carryover or whatever the amount. That is money that was assigned the previous year, but wasn't spent for whatever reason. If we spend the money, or we reallocate the money mid-year, one of the effects would be it would not be counted into carryover for the budget process.

AG: Situations like these have arisen in the past, and things have happened mid-school year in the past. So, is not wholly unheard of. That said we have historically relied on the carryover to smooth the budget in process. But that hasn't been a lot of money. I also think that Pasquale who sits in a special position, at the school level who judges and analyzes the needs of the school as a whole, to bring something like that to us. I think that is somewhat appropriate. But there should be a proposal. I would be open to at least hearing what that is.

MP: At this point, I don't know that I'm stating a position on this. But there is something about protecting the integrity of the process, and at the same time it is a discretionary process. So, if there is a proposal made...I'm concerned if this sets a precedent to opening up mid-year budget decisions. I guess I'm open to a compelling proposal.



PS: Normally the carryover that we generate that we always need, that is usually generated by personal cost variances. This was just we did not fill the position for several reasons.

CL: What is the greater need of the CCC? They need more support?

PS. We have one counselor that had some medical issues, and was in and out; so consequently the workload that has been shared has not disproportionately landed to another person.

JB: I have two questions: 1) If we bring this to the next meeting and vote on the proposal, what difference would it make? That person would start now? Would a make a difference to make the decision now, versus a month later?

PS: The reason we're able to do this is when we have people that we bring on "provisionally" or short term employees, there was a combination of funds from BPEF and Berkeley Development Group and we put together what we could to pay this person, and that money is going to run out at the end of the semester.

SC: I want to ask if this happens every year? That this happens every year? Or is something that it might happen. It seems to me that there should be a clear procedure when this stuff happens.

HC: From what Aaron tells us, and I can tell you from my experience, that this is the first time that this is come up since I've been on BSEP. This is my fourth year. It makes me think that is not something that happens a lot. That said is good to have procedures.

SC: It can be something very simple.

MA: I think I would be reluctant to put in language that would make people think that there is always money that is not allocated.

PS: I would also keep in mind that is going to be highly atypical that there will be a position that for bureaucratic reasons doesn't get filled. The manner in which the pot of money has emerged has some safeguards in itself. But I understand the concern.

JL: I feel badly because I don't want everything I say to be taken as me being in opposition for this. If you look at the allocation to the CCC is the biggest ticket. I do remember last year we were originally to fund a 2.0 then we knocked it down to a 1.83 - I feel really uncomfortable to allocate that money to the one place that has gotten more money than anything else in our site budget.

AG: I agree is really important. This is a rare situation where a position has not been filled. If we have some special circumstances that have arisen, it would be useful to examine the possibility of funding.

HC: Would someone make a proposal so we can at least make some kind of decision about this. Obviously we are not going to decide tonight.

AG: I would like to move that we authorize or encourage Pasquale to bring a proposal for how we use that money.

Toni: Second

Vote:

10 in favor

SC: 1 against

JL, PS abstain

Sarah Cline: This group figure out a process for this issue of extra money that might become available mid-year.

MP: Second

Vote:

In Favor: Unanimous

Proposal is approved

HC we will take both items at next meeting.

Adjourn: 6:12pm