

BSEP Minutes for December 2, 2013
Meeting Place: BHS Conference Room B

Attendance:

Printed Name	Community	Attended
Toni Stein	Parent	Yes
John Lavine	Parent	Yes
Sara Cerami	Student	Yes
Rhonda Jefferson	Staff	Yes
Maya Smith	Student	Yes
Aaron Glimme	Teacher	Yes
Nia Hampton	Student	Yes
Catherine Lazio	Parent	Yes
Joseph Battles	Student	Yes
Matt Albinson	Staff	Yes
Deebbie Symmes	Parent	Yes
Valerie Tay	BSEP	Yes
Natasha Beery	BSEP	Yes
Pasquale Scuderi	Principal	Yes
Jessica Lopez-Tello	Staff	Yes
Hector Cardenas	Parent	No
Michael Peltz	Parent	No

Quorum was established.
 Minutes from last meeting approved.
 Agenda approved.

No Public comment.

CHAIR REPORT: No report. HC called in sick

PNO: Nothing to report from this committee

SSC Report:

Sara: Community member talked about how she didn't feel comfortable with the math > not used to its potential, it wasn't benefiting anyone

Principal's report: Happy with the way the assessment report

Election of officers: Co-Chairs students

Local control funding formula: Money allocated to the school. Get students to sign-up for lunch forms. What is the best use for the money, how would it benefit students.

Principal Report:

Pasquale Scuderi (PS): We had a construction meeting last night, looks like we are on schedule to open the bldg this Spring. Another thing discussed with the Safety Staff about how to supervise that bldg. It certainly provides some new challenges. If you haven't seen it we also have two outdoor basketball courts. We're happy to have it, but we think there will be issues with students spending mid-period time in there, and it may present some challenges. BUT. It's a great space. As you know, AHA has been in a miserable space in their classrooms with climate control, so they will be on the top floor there, and then the World Language people will also just slide in. Portable will go away. The softball field is going to return to campus. We look like we are on schedule for a move-in over Spring Break.

RJ: Can I ask one question. Are we hiring more Safety Officers? Because we have a big building.

PS: Hesitates to answer. It certainly will complicate things. What I have asked the Safety Officers to do is to take a crack at drafting something. Next Monday I will go back to the Safety Officer meeting and they will present me with a plan on how we will deal with. I don't know if we will get another full time safety officer position at this time. There is a guy called Kenneth Trump who does School Safety stuff all across the country and I actually wrote and responded to him and he said "you have a student to safety officer ratio that's pretty [damn] high relative to schools your size" of course acknowledging the fact that we have some complications. We're downtown, in a densely populated area, close to a BART station. We have some very challenging situations that very much warrant the safety staff we have. Ideally we might go back to locker room monitors because we have a couple safety officers fixed in the PE locker room, so we can free them up. Thanks, that is really all.

Presentation On The New Funding Formula And Its impacts on BSEP. Natasha Beery is the Director of BSEP and Community Relations.

-Natasha Beery: I'm here to do my best to explain to you a little more fully about the Local Control Funding Formula, and the reason that principal Scuderi was saying that is important for you all to understand what the local control funding formula is about allocating state funds. There may be a way to rethink the way we're using some of our discretionary funds. Essentially, what the local control funding formula does is going to give schools more money for funding. Our district will get \$15.5 million between now and 2021, that is actually restoring us to the level of funding we had in 2007 before everything went south. It sounds like we are getting a lot of money. We are going to be getting \$1.8 million in the first year, then incrementally about that much every year after that until the point when we get \$15 million more by the 8th year. That is a sort of future back of what we used to have. That said, the reason the call it local control funding formula is that the way the funding is structured is that we will have a little more flexibility than we have had. We will have a big chunk of money that will be our "base fund". There are still class size reduction funds, one of the things that BSEP pays for, one thing that changes is that in the past the state was giving funds to encourage people to get down to 20 to 1 in K3. We because of BSEP are able to do that, and because of that we got additional reward money from the State for doing that. We got \$2.6 million. Now, the target is going to be 24 to 1, and

so if we want to keep our class size down, we have to kick in the difference and that is going to cost us \$900,000.00 more to do that. The supplemental funds that we will now be getting under the new formula, that has to do with the idea of providing equity amongst the school districts that are well funded because they have property tax base that is stronger than those in poor communities that don't get enough money. One of those things this is trying to do is resolve inequities and looking at things like low income students and providing more money to the schools that have low income students. The way they determine this is through whether people qualify for free and reduced lunch. Currently this district we are at 39.7% who qualify. We haven't really pushed really hard at the high school to get people to fill out those forms. This is important because at some point next year they are going to freeze it, so we need to be sure to identify as many students as possible who would qualify for free and reduced lunch, because that calculation is part of what determines in what we get in our supplemental funding. There are three ways to qualify for supplemental funding: 1) Low Income Students 2) English Learners 3) Foster Youth. That gives you supplemental funding, an increment of up to 20% more from your "Base Funding", so that is so important. The thing that hasn't become quite clear yet, is how we are suppose to spend those funds. What we need to come up with for the expenditure of all our funds, including the supplemental funds is a local control accountability plan. The Local Control Accountability plan is a district plan and that is a little different from what we have done before. Something different will be happening with the way the SGC and SSC are going to be acting, but we still don't know entirely everything about it and whether there will still be a single plan for student achievement plan, but we think there probably will be, certainly there will still be a need to allocate BSEP funds, there are still federal funds that still need to be allocated. But in terms of the state monies, there needs to be a district plan and there needs to be input from all stakeholders, and there's a review part and that is where the Parent Advisory Council "PAC" comes from. There is also supposed to be an ELPAC as well, this would be an English Learner PAC, and those two review the plan before it goes to the board.

PS: Side note – It's important to know that the API is going to change along with this, how its calculated for schools is going to shift. As most of you know, or may know, right now is our CST scores and our CAHSEE. The new API can include graduation rates, cohort drop-out rates, all kinds of things that I think is for the positive.

NB: This gives you the process piece. The difficulty about this is that is new, and we haven't gotten all the rules yet. At the end January is when the State gives us the rules and regulations. We don't know everything, but what they have told us so far is Step 1) you consult stakeholders within your district, then there will be a draft plan that will be concocted sometime in the Spring and that is where the PAC and the ELPAC will have some input, then it gets adopted by the district. One of the issues here is that BSEP is trying to figure out how to allocate its funds, and it could be that some of the funds that you are currently allocating might actually be candidates for something that the district might decide is a priority, because there is the need to address the needs of targeted groups. There is a mystery here that the target groups are the low income, English Learners and Foster kids that forces us to address key subgroups: so it can be African American, Latino, Asian, White and disabled students need to be addressed in the master plan. As far as the

supplemental funds goes that 20% kick off or in our case 39% those funds are to be used for the people for who those funds are derived in proportion. What does proportion mean? We don't know if it means whether to spend more, do more? Do we need to achieve more? The guess is that anyone of those three outcomes will probably be acceptable by the state. What you all need to think about is what is it that you currently fund might fall into that basket.

PS: Do you have any sense of when we might get the projection of BHS share? Because there is always the issue of March 15th, etc.

NB: By the end of January we will hopefully know a lot more about what we will have to come up with when. Certainly we have the March 15th deadline for layoffs, and the April 15th deadline for the site plan. What will end up happening is this committee thinking of various plans for best/worst case scenario. Another piece is what will be allocated by site.

PS: Is there any sense in how those two parallel one another?

NB: This will be a constant conversation between you and us. And I'll be in close communication with you about it before you have to make a decision.

KL: expected that LCAP will be in place for the 2014-15 budget? And in terms of the timeline, is expected that you will present a budget to be approved. So, the process that we used in the past in terms of feeding the BSEP budget into the general fund, the timeline is relatively the same.

NB: It is more or less the same. One of the biggest chunks of money that BSEP allocates goes to class size reduction funds, and those go to those K-3 class sizes, but funds above and beyond that go to expand course offerings here at the HS, middle school counselors and program support. Including literacy courses and RTI. There a bunch of things we will have to grapple with very early on when those things are set it may leave a little less in other places. You need to be thinking strategically about some of the things we might want to move either this year or next.

KL: We have impressive evaluations for things we are funding over the years. The sooner we get those into the hopper we can present to the PAC. I can do those and send over right away.

AG: As we wait for regulations. Still unclear if we can use that money to supplant things we're already doing? It's unclear.

NB: What you certainly cannot do is use state funds to supplant. We can do this sort of shell game where you're moving one category to another. Is less clear to me whether BSEP funds can be used to supplant. We'll know soon.

To think about: What is effective in what serves these target populations. But also that these are sort of permanent positions. We are in this weird situation where discretionary funds, whether BSEP or PTA fund positions really ties your hands in a way.

PS: Who will be running point person for LCAP? Do we want to make submissions for that?

TS: Can we write a letter because these regulations aren't yet formed? They might like the input

NB: How do you proof that whatever you're doing is working with those targeted groups?

JB: We never decided timing on dates we decided. Maybe we can wait until HC gets back.

PS: That is a good point. Scheduling in general is tough. We might want to wait for HC, not sure we can decide that without him.

Report from WASC Alignment Subcommittee:

Glimme: The WASC subcommittee met with Daniel Roose for 15 to 20 min. and went over the long-range action plan. This is work in progress document, but what we wanted to talk about was the general structure, what kind of data we're looking at and questions like that.

Later in the year there will be another round of looking at the Action Plan and we can set new goals. Daniel was clear with us is that the Action Plan will have a lot of long term goals, not all of which are being focused on right away. Highlighted is what we are primarily working on. Not Highlighted things we want to work on, long term goals. There are five main goals as you can see in the document.

We also talked quite a bit about in our committee were that the historic legacy of BSEP was as an enrichment program, and that has changed to the measure we are currently under. Where enrichment was removed. This is why we tend to use the money in different ways. We spent sometime talking about WASC. These goals are core academic goals, and how do we reconcile that with some of the ways we may like to spend the money, and that feeds into a lot of what we talked about. We used to ask for teachers to ask for supplies. Doesn't happen anymore.

JL: Look at GOAL 5 – This is where we usually tend to put money on. We get a number of the programs where we were putting our dollars, and very little of that money has shown up in these programs.

AG: BSEP is mentioned in several places. Not just our site money, some of it is money we do not control. We didn't come up with a grand vision. We spent sometime getting a look at this as a preliminary document servicing some of the concerns and how we want to use it.

JL: There are programs and people that have stopped putting in proposals because of a shift of where the money is going. If we want to have the conversation of rethinking where we want money to go and then make it public as soon as possible to encourage people to write proposals once more.

KL: I want to comment on historic description of BSEP. Enrichment was not removed. It was more broadly defined. But it used to be exclusively enrichment.

Review of Evaluation Framework and Assignment of Tasks for Evaluation of 2012-13 programs

CL: I was a little confused when I was reviewing some of the evaluations from last year? Is the evaluation and application the same doc?

No.

We should create a short application for smaller amounts depending on how much money they need to have. A different application for those asking for \$1000 as opposed to \$40,000 – some questions can be answered in chart form rather than written form. It may make for better grant writing for those who are not familiar with the process.

VT: Worked over the summer to simplify the application process. We put the application into a google doc. It was a nightmare to look at pages and pages of application. All this data can get dumped into an excel spreadsheet. I think is great idea to do a different application for people who are asking for smaller grants.

Tied in is the evaluation portion – not complete yet, but maybe is good to have your input before we proceed. It was a rather lengthy document that we might want to streamline. You might want to email me with your ideas.

AG: We should definitely be involved because those are our documents. We need to decide how we want to use this document.

VT: The evaluation form is rather lengthy. Has already been shared with HC.

CL: Applications go out in January.

AG: One of the things we need to consider is: Do we want to change that form? In what ways do we want to change them? If there are people who are particularly interested they can get together to come up with a draft to finalize changes to get ready to go. We should definitely revisit.

TS: Would like to volunteer.

CL: We can start an email chain and put together an idea.

MS: We can re-evaluate the rubric.

AG: If we are going to change how we might consider proposals, we need to be very clear with proposal writers what we are looking for. Because if we are judging on something we are not telling them about, that doesn't seem like a very fair process to me. **There is a valid concern:** historically the evaluation of the proposals doesn't necessarily match how we decide to fund. There are a lot of reasons why that happens.

RJ: We need to deal with both before our meeting in January.

CL: Let's circulate an email with the evaluation rubric to get feedback.

RJ: For our meeting in January we are asking for the evaluation committee to email or use google docs

CL: Valerie, do you have a copy of our evaluation to the committee?

JL: I'm wondering if we should be considering if our January meeting should be a little bit longer so we can come out with an Application and a Rubric ready to go.

RJ: We might need to extend 3 meetings because we definitely need the extension of our meetings at the end.

JB: we also need to figure out who will be in what evaluating groups. It will be a long meeting.

CL: Will send out emails over break.

RJ: Do we need to vote on our January meeting should be extended.

AG: Send agenda out right away with times.

MA:

Do we have a google groups just for us? We should have that so we can all share.

AG: Can someone create a google group?

MA: I can be happy to create a google group.

JB: We need to decided how long will the meeting go for?

PS: Should go to 6:30pm

All agree.

Adjourn: 5:45pm

-