

BSEP Minutes for December 1, 2014

BERKELEY HIGH SCHOOL

Meeting Room: Conference Room B

NAME	COMMUNITY	ATTENDANCE
Sandi Hunt	Parent	Yes
Max Cramer	Student	Yes
Catherine Lazio	Parent	Yes
John Lavine	Parent	Yes
Zack Mariethal	Student	Yes
Ashley Milton	Vice-Principal	Yes
Kristin Glenchur	Principal	Yes
Nerine Ortiz-Pon	Student	Yes
Jackson Grigsby	Student	Yes
Toni Stein	Parent	Yes
Nia Hampton	Student	Yes
Matt Albinson	Staff	Yes
Sarah Cline	Staff	Yes
Harry Overstreet	Parent	Yes
Susi Lopez-Platt	Staff	Yes
Sarah Cline	Staff	Yes
Jessica Lopez-Tello	Staff	Yes
Rhonda Jefferson	Staff	No
Walter Mitchell	Staff	No

Quorum Established: 5:00pm

Introductions: members introduce themselves.

Approval of Minutes from last Meeting:

TS: makes a motion

CL: seconds motion

Discussion:

Add JLT to the November agenda.

Vote: Unanimous vote

Approval of Agenda-Additions /Changes:

JL moves to approve agenda

MC seconds
Unanimous

Public Comment: No Public comment

Vote on fourth alternate BHS P&O committee representative:

There is one spot open for an alternate position to the P&O committee. Position was also posted on the e-tree in case more people wanted to be an alternate.

No interest from members to be an alternate to the P&O meeting.

Chair Report: No report from the chair.

P&O Report:

MC attended the P&O meeting. They elected chairs for the committee. Learned about taxes and the different sources of funding for the entire district.

SSC Report: No SSC report at this time, next meeting will be tomorrow 12/2. Zack Marienthal will create a folder in the BSEP drive to dump SSC documents to be shared with BSEP committee.

JL: We've had this discussion of holding a joint meeting with SSC to share how BSEP works with the SSC committee. There is a place in the handbook that requires us to hold one or two joint meetings during the course of the school year. Should we act on that?

SH: Hector came to the SSC meeting after BSEP voted and walked the SSC to an hour presentation of what had been done, how, why and what the process was. Having a meeting in the February time frame where the process has already been laid out and there is good dialogue; seems like a good idea. Maybe we can have a few member of this committee attending the SSC and providing some context around what the process is. People can probably come from the BSEP Committee to the SSC to walk them through our process. Is it correct that there is more LCAP funding this year?

KG: Not certain that LCAP is continuing, but this is the sort of thing I'm getting my feet wet with right now.

AM: Yes, it is. Stage one got funded for this year, and when they rolled it out they essentially said "we're approving these items". These are proposed items that will be approved next year as add-on. So, there are things that are secondary priority for the district, so there is essentially a second year plan, as well as a third year plan.

KG: I think it would be worthwhile for us to bring that information to our next meeting so you can get a view of what is being funded.

CL: I'm concerned about the bylaws, that says are "required" to have at least 2 joint meetings. P. 11 of the School Site Handbook says that "BHS will have at least two joint meetings with the school governance counsel. One in the fall...and one in the Spring"

MA: I think that what happened last year will be unlikely to play out again. (referring to a particular budget item last school year).

JLT: I think this is a good time to call a quorum.

AM: Should we have a representative from SSC attending our meetings?

SH: At minimum attend a few meetings to observe.

SH: Should we contact the SSC in February and walk through our process of making an application, how the evaluations are done, etc.

KG: Clarifying question: Should we invite an SSC member to our meeting? Or should we all have a joint meeting.

SH: I think we should go to the meeting and present our process.

KG: would like to have the opportunity to meet with the SSC tomorrow and bring that information to them, so they can decide. And then I can bring that information back to the committee at the next meeting. Or I can communicate that information before that.

Collective agreement.

Principal's Report:

KG is glad to be back, and appreciates Ms. Milton for stepping in. Might ask her to continue attending meetings with her. Also appreciates students for attending the meetings, and appreciates their input. Next meeting will talk about LCAP.

Review and Agreement on evaluation framework, rubric language, and Request for Funds documents, including how to improve dissemination of application from and increase number of applications:

The committee will look at the Rubric from last year to review and make suggestions to change it from its original form.

We are going to look at the evaluation form and the request for funds, and make potential edits to them, and vote on them today if we can, and at worst at the January meeting.

Rubric:

SH wants returning members to give feedback on how well these documents work, and if there were challenges with them. For those who weren't in the committee in the past, it gives a fresh look at the approach.

CL: Have the WASC goals changed from year to year?

AM: There are five WASC goals, and they wouldn't have changed; there were set out in our last WASC plan. The progress that we've made for the action plan have definitely changed.

SLP: I don't know if it would be appropriate, but it might be a good idea to print the WASC goals in the rubric for reference.

CL: Language of the measure should also go in the back of the rubric.

SH: This is the same rubric that was created in 2010 and it has not been changed since then.

Members of the committee engage in a lengthy discussion on the purpose of the rubric, how is used, the language used and the validity in the use of the rubric. Returning members of the BSEP committee explain that the rubric is simply a tool used by the committee to grade proposals. Each member grades the proposals submitted to the committee individually, and it helps the committee to make ultimate budget decisions in an objective manner. Returning members explain they found the rubric to be very useful.

Suggestions are made to perhaps break down "enrichment" into two categories as it might help clarify some of the confusion with language used in that category.

JG: Do we take into account the history of funding of the program?

MA: Yes, we evaluate the programs that we have already funded.

HO: Approximately how many proposals do we get? How many of them are repeat proposals? How many of them are proposals that were funded last year that will come again this year?

JL: Last year we had about 18 proposals that were evaluated. Some are new, some returning proposals.

HO: For those proposals that have shown up year after year, and have been funded year after year; why hasn't the district looked at these proposals and included them in their budget? So, that this committee can then look at new proposals.

JL: Great question! The short answer is that there isn't enough money.

Members discuss the reasons why the district doesn't fund certain programs that are funded year after year by BSEP. HO suggests that the BSEP committee should send the superintendent a letter suggesting to include some of the programs funded by BSEP in his annual budget.

CL informs Mr. Overstreet that the committee sent out a letter last year, and offered to give him a copy of the letter for his records.

SLP: Under "evidence" language talks about improvement, but I'm wondering improvement of what? It is not clear they type of improvement we are talking about.

JL: I believe is the improvement of the program itself. So, it is based on the program goals.

CL: Quick recommendations for the form itself: For 0 below standard, it might be useful to add “or not N/A” because there are some places where it doesn’t apply at all.

KG: I’m wondering if we can break down the categories under “enrichment” as “academic” and “enriched experiential learning”. Would that be helpful to break it into the two categories that way?

SH: Are splitting enrichment into two categories? Or are we leaving it as is.

CL: I would say two distinct categories.

JL: I wonder if when Hector was putting this together, he was using enrichment with an earlier language in the measure for enrichment?

SH: Does someone want to propose language?

CL: I would suggest you do enrichment/enhancement – “The program addresses the whole student either in enrichment, such as in the arts, athletics, or student activities; or enhancement services such as tutoring/counseling.” Is just a different way to think about it, so you are not excluding a score for some category that should be scored.

JL: I think that what would be more appropriate to take out the tutoring and counseling and put them with academic outcomes...and striking those examples from enrichment.

A member also raised a question about the portion of the rubric that refers to “Accessibility”. There was confusion as to whether “accessibility” means its open to *all* students, or if it meant, students with special needs.

Discussion about the rubric needed to end due to timing. The committee needs to decide on meeting dates moving forward.

SH suggests that meetings are moved from the first Monday of every month to the second Monday of every month. Seems like the first Monday of every month falls on a day following a break (ie: winter break, spring break, etc.)

Meeting dates are moved to the second Monday of every month.

Adjourned: 6:01pm

Next Meeting: January 12, 2015 4:30-6:30