

## BSEP Minutes for November 17, 2014

### BERKELEY HIGH SCHOOL

**Meeting Room:** Conference Room B

---

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

**Quorum Established:** 4:37pm

**Introductions:** Members introduce themselves to the committee.

**Approval of minutes from last meeting:** JL makes motion approves minutes. ZM seconds motion.

*Motion carries without objections.*

**Approval of Agenda-Additions/Changes:** AM makes motion to approve agenda. SLP seconds motion.

*Motion carries without objections.*

**Public Comment:** Mr. Lawrence Gordon, parent of a BHS student submits his candidacy for alternate representative in the P&O committee.

SH: Asked questions of Natasha about whether to add any more alternates. Make a motion to use the second definition.

AG: Makes a motion to use the second definition of the bylaws to allow Mr. Gordon to be an alternate in the P&O committee. CL seconds the motion.

*Discussion:*

JL: Just to speak in favor of adding another representative. The idea of having more representation is great, and I've also spoken with Larry and I would be in favor of A) additional representation and B) That we vote Larry in as an alternate to the P&O committee.

- Without objections, a change in the agenda is added to vote an alternate on the P&O committee.

CL: Makes motion to nominate Larry Gordon for the alternate position to the P&O committee.

AG: Seconds motion

**Vote:**

1 abstention.

12 approved.

0 Objections

**Chair Report:** No chair report this early in the school year.

**P&O Report:**

AG: The last meeting that we had was where we had the presentation of the class size report. Scuderi came and provided information that was provided to the board about class sizes across the district. BHS is well within the measures class size stipulation. There was discussion around the policy when stuff should come back to the P&O whether there is significant change to the budget that was pre-approved or approved by the P&O.

JL: Would you expand that?

AG: Most of the money for BSEP goes to a variety of tasks that are not site specific. Class size reduction money, money for technology, professional development, and of course VAPA. They put together a budget and they bring it to the P&O and we do a run-through, provide feedback, approve it and send it on to the school board for final approval. If there is significant changes to the way they want to spend the money after that process, we felt it would be good for them to go back to the P&O committee.

JL: To add to that, the way the timeline works is that we are often approving these items to ward the end of the Spring. Sometimes what happens is that we reconvene in the Fall to find out that something has changed. Like someone wasn't hired, etc. So this is an attempt to tighten up the communication so we are aware of it sooner.

SC: How much change is allowed under the law? The reason I ask is because I know that money that was intended to go to music the dept. over several years has been moved on to the general fund. And I wonder about the legality of that.

AG explains that the reason the money from the music budget was moved to the general budget is because it gets used for teacher release time while students are engaged in activities outside of the classroom. While it was not a popular choice, it was still within the realm of what could be done according the language of the measure.

JL: There is this ongoing issue. And we've had discussions in this committee. Monies that get taken out of the BSEP budget that might more properly be general funded; monies for personnel, things like that. I'm sure it will come around again for this committee this year.

### **SSC Report:**

ZM was not able to attend the SSC meeting. He is supposed to get a copy of the minutes, and will make that available as soon as he receives a copy.

### **Principal's report:**

AM: No report. We will have the principal return on Dec. 1<sup>st</sup>. She will stay on for the remainder of the year.

### **Review of Evaluation Framework and Initial Assignment of Tasks for Evaluation of 2014-15**

SH got together with Aaron, and they thought that the best use of the committee's time would be best spent going through the process of the rubric, evaluation and application that the committee will be working on the rest of the school year.

SH passes around copies of the rubric, request for funds and the project evaluation form for everyone to walk-through as a group and determine whether people thought they were largely effective, or if changes are suggested and considered.

The committee first looks at the rubric together. SH explains how the rubric has been used in past committees. The rubric is essentially used to score the proposals submitted to the committee.

AG explains that the rubric is used as a starting point for funding. The project evaluation form ties in to that, but a little differently. The form doesn't use the same rubric, but instead asks questions on how the program has been functioning.

JL: When we have programs that already in place, that have been funded by BSEP money we have the opportunity during the school year to visit those programs and evaluate them. This is something we don't get to do with brand new proposals. The rubric is the only thing we have going for a brand new proposal, and we will read through the proposal form individually and score it according to this rubric. Ahead of that we also have the

opportunity to work in teams and visit all these other programs in action and do this evaluation.

SH explains that the process is a qualitative analysis of the evaluation, and to some extent it is turned into a quantitative measure, that is not a final result, but is a way to draw some initial conclusions.

AM asks if the rubric is used for every single project that comes in whether or not it has been funded previously or whether or not is new. And the evaluation is only done for existing projects.

JL: Correct.

Hector Cardenas, former BHS BSEP chair suggested to the committee that they go through the rubric criteria and either at this meeting or another meeting come to the conclusion of whether they are going to use the definitions in the rubric and make sure they are being used consistently; or whether people have other recommendations.

AG suggests that the committee thinks about the fact that the WASC action plan is currently being revised and that BHS will have a site visit coming up, so the committee wants to make sure they know what the timeline is for that process to make sure that the newest version can be used.

- The committee further discusses the rubric and the effectiveness of its use when deciding funding.

- CL suggests considering changes to improve the language of the rubric. She suggested that last year, an area where the committee struggled with was the concept of “academic performance”. She is wondering if we want to leave that language purposefully vague so the committee can have their own interpretations of the language.

- Committee members will prefer leaving the language purposefully vague.

JW asks whether the rubric is a ranking system.

SH explains that it is a tool to get discussion started.

AM: I’m curious how the correlation? Has it been helpful in the past?

JL: It’s pretty relevant. What happens is the dollar amount requested always exceeds what we have to work with. This rubric is effective in guiding the process of allocating resources fairly.

JLT: Suggests we give rubric to applicants

AG: I agree with Jessica

SLP: Would it be appropriate to make it clear that is a discussion starter?

AG: It also helps us see high and low scoring. Makes it for clear agreements and it simplifies part of our deliberations.

JL: At that level some of the less quantifiable stuff that this becomes helpful.

CL: One comment I want to make this document public too, but with the caveat that they don't need to exceed all the rules to get funding.

SL: Would it be appropriate we think about what the objective of the rubric is. What is our objective?

SH: Perhaps the best thing is for everyone to spend sometime to review this. Discuss this in the next meeting.

Some members suggested voting online (via email) on possible changes to the rubric; however discussion and voting cannot happen. Discussion of changes will take place next meeting.

**BSEP schedule:** Proposals and completing evaluations, create schedules, and do budget piece by March. Need to confirm with Natasha Beery on BSEP schedule on a non-LCAP year.

#### **Discussion on LCAP**

Jed: There wasn't much to report. What is LCAP?

CL: Local Control Accountability Program. It brought more flexibility on how the district spent the funding.

AM: I think we'll have a better idea this year. LCAP also has a second and a third year plan.

JL: How to improve dissemination of application and increase the number of applicants. It can be a double edge sword.

#### **Suggestions on how to disseminate BSEP Application information:**

SLP suggested making announcements on Monday professional development days, or Tuesday morning or afternoon leadership meetings.

CL would also like to see more student directed applications, applications coming from the Leadership office, etc.

MC states that he (and other students) have been unclear about whether they are allowed to apply for BSEP funding. Different people have told them different things.

MC also suggested that BSEP makes it "crystal clear to teachers that BSEP is an appropriate source of funding for student activity."

**Online application:** Back and forth with Valerie Tay. Frustrations with the form. The output was difficult to deal with. They are talking about turning it into an editable PDF file.

**Next Meeting:** December 1, 2014

**Meeting Adjourned:** 6pm