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MS. MILLER: So I think we're going to go ahead and get started as a subcommittee while we wait for one more member just to respect everyone's time that's here. I guess so you all know you should set your expectations low. This is my second day on the job and my first time chairing the committee. So I always if you set your expectations really low, maybe I'll exceed them. So I appreciate you being here and we'll go ahead and wait until we can establish a quorum, Lisa, to call the roll?

MS. JONES: Yes.

MS. MILLER: Okay.

MS. JONES: That's correct.

MS. MILLER: But before we get started, we have a resolution for Senator Allen who has been the star member of the State Allocation Board and I am not going to read -- Senator Allen, do you want to come up here.

I won't read everything on here, but the numbers are pretty remarkable in terms of his service and all of -- everything that you did with Prop. 51 and the $2.6 billion worth of projects, over 630 projects for the School Facility Program, and all the other programs administered by the State Allocation Board. It's a huge accomplishment and made a huge difference for our schools and it's a big debt of
gratitude both as a former Senate staff and a huge fan and just for your service in general. Thank you so much.

(Applause)

MS. MILLER: And then we have just a couple announcements that he -- a couple items have been withdrawn from the agenda, two appeal items, the Farmersville Unified and San Bernardino City Unified, that are under Tab 6 for those of you following have been withdrawn and the Career Technical Education Facilities Program additional funding cycles under Tab 7, although we're really grateful for those of you that are here to speak on that item today and we'll absolutely have you come up during public comment. But that item itself was pulled from the agenda for discussion and we'll update you with anything else as we go along.

So we're going to wait on approval of the Minutes and we'll move the Executive Officer's Statement, please.

MS. SILVERMAN: Yes. Hi. I'd like to give an update to the Board as far as activity tonight in the agenda.

So a couple action items that we wanted to share with you tonight is the Full-Day Kindergarten Facility Program. So with that is our action item of 37 and a half million dollars. That represents 12 projects and we'll provide a presentation today related to those applicants.

So it's great news for the first round of
applicants that will receive funding and it'll have a direct apportionment. And there is a current opening -- current filing round that's open for the second round of applicants, so that's $60 million that's available for the program, and we wanted to give the Board an update that we have. As of May 3rd, we had over $164 million in applicants that did apply for the program so far.

So definitely very much interested -- folks are interested in the program and anyone who's interested the program has until May 30th to apply.

The second announcement we wanted to share is military base projects that are being funded by this program, we have four projects that in the Consent Agenda, so we're trying to get six members to approve that today.

There is two facility hardship projects and two career tech education projects and that's for the Desert Junior and Senior High School. So that's at Edwards Air Force Base. So we're super excited about bringing those projects forward and that's the last of those base projects at Edwards Air Force Base.

So they were seeking state funding as well as they received over 82 and a half million dollars in Department of Defense funding for those base schools and it's really exciting.

I had an opportunity with my staff, Michael
Watanabe, to attend a ground breaking ceremony and it's really exciting the amount of movement and those projects are going to be moving forward in several phases and it's a great opportunity for that community. So happy to see that we're providing funding for those who serve in the military. It's great news.

Career Tech Education Facility Program as well is an action item today. $125 million will be introduced as part of the action item as well, and those projects that are going to be approved today will have the opportunity to submit for a certification round for the May 8th -- that opens May 8th and it closes June 6th.

So again, so if you have an unfunded approval as a result of a career tech education project, you have the ability to submit a certification.

And for other projects that have an unfunded approval, there again we have a current filing round for priority funding. You have the ability to submit a certification through June 6th and those certifications will be valid from July 1st through December 31st.

And again, it's very important for you have to submit those certifications during that period. So again, once you have the two strikes, unfortunately, you'll lose your project without prior Board notification.

So we do do a lot of reach out and community
efforts to communicate with districts so they're well aware of the priority funding round.

We also lastly want to share with the Board, we have a bond accountability audit that was recently noted on May 1st, and it was a follow-up to some of the corrective action statuses with the follow-up prior audits. And we wanted to share with the Board that there is no additional corrective action at this point in time and that audit could be found on Department of Finance's website.

And with that, the next Board meeting is June 26th.

MS. MILLER: Thank you. Are there any questions from the committee? Any public comment? Senator.

SENATOR WILK: No, no. I -- I swallow it down there.

MS. MILLER: Oh, excuse me. So we can go ahead and as a subcommittee just hear the items on consent from Ms. Silverman, if you will, and then if members have any questions when they come back, we will let them ask them at that time.

MS. SILVERMAN: Or we can proceed with the financial reports since it's no action.

MS. MILLER: Oh, perfect. Did I skip that? Yes, please. The financial reports.

MS. SILVERMAN: So on the financial reports, I
just want to highlight to the Board we had updates. No fund releases as far as the agenda is concerned for May, but we did want to highlight as far as the activity in the Consent Agenda.

We had a lot of approvals -- unfunded approvals moving forward in the agenda and I wanted to highlight there's 52 projects that are part of the Consent Agenda that represent over $91.2 million. So that's great news for the program and we actually have a grant adjustment that represents a closeout adjustment of $4.5 million, so a district will have a grant increase as a result of the closeout audit. So that's great news for that district.

So that's the activity we want to report back to the Board, and then we'll show some adjustments next month for the full-day kinder where we'll show a reduction of the funds that was awarded for full-day kinder.

So as a result, I don't have any -- if you have any questions for the financials.

MS. MILLER: Thank you. Are there any questions? Any public comment on the financials? No. Thank you. And then may we do the Status of Funds too.

MS. SILVERMAN: Yeah. I'm sorry. I just -- really quickly on that.

MS. MILLER: That was super-fast. Okay. So then maybe we will do just the consent items, if you just want to
give the explanation and we'll do that as a subcommittee, unless there's -- is there anything else on the agenda that doesn't need -- that has no action items?

MS. KAMPMEINERT: We could perhaps cover the action items and do the presentation and wait for the vote on those.

The Consent Calendar is some standard items in there. We wanted to highlight, as Lisa mentioned, that we have a number of unfunded approvals that are contained inside the Consent Calendar. There are also some facility hardship projects included. We've got one for Benicia for a fire alarm and then another facility hardship for Wasco.

MS. MILLER: Okay.

MS. KAMPMEINERT: And we have an additional Charter School Facilities Program preliminary apportionment, standard items that do meet the program criteria and as part of the Consent Calendar, staff is recommending approval.

MS. MILLER: Okay. Thank you. So then while we're waiting for a quorum and before we go to LAUSD, maybe we can go to the Full-Day Kindergarten Facilities Grant Program. Does that work?

MS. KAMPMEINERT: Sure. So on Tab 7, stamped page 193 of your agenda today, we have an action item related to the Full-Day Kindergarten Facilities Grant Program and this item is asking the Board to approve
apportionments for the first round of funding for this program.

The 2018-'19 budget included a hundred million from the general fund to provide one time grants to school districts to construct either new facilities or to retrofit existing facilities for the purposes of providing full-day kindergarten classrooms.

And at the October 2018 State Allocation Board meeting, the Board approved 37.5 million for the first funding cycle that opened in January of 2019.

That funding cycle was oversubscribed as we received 261 applications from 72 different school districts requesting a total of 324 million for that round, and as a result, staff applied the regulatory criteria for determining the final funding order which provides preference points to financial hardship districts and school districts with a high percentage of pupils eligible for free and reduced price school meals.

And if I can draw your attention to stamped page 195, we've included in the agenda some demographic information for the 12 projects that are receiving funding today. We'd like to note that 11 of the 12 projects are for new construction and we do have one district that is doing a retrofit project.

Also nine of the sites previously offered full-day
kindergarten programs in non-Title 5 compliant kindergarten classrooms. So they have brought in portables or converted teacher workrooms, things like that.

Three of the sites that are receiving funding did not have the ability to full-day kindergarten without the additional facilities, so those will be new full-day kindergarten programs.

Also all of the school districts that are receiving funding qualify for financial hardship and also receive Title 1, Part A funds and in total, 54 new kindergarten classrooms will be constructed with this funding.

On page 196, we've listed the 12 school districts that will receive apportionments and they range in free and reduced price meal school percentages from 84 to 96 percent.

MS. MILLER: Ms. Kampmeinert -- did I say that right?


MS. MILLER: Kampmeinert. Can we just pause to establish a quorum since we have one. Thank you. Lisa, will you call the roll, please.

MS. JONES: Senator Wilk.

SENATOR WILK: Present.

MS. JONES: Senator Leyva.

Senator Roth.
Assemblymember Nazarian.

MR. NAZARIAN: Present.

MS. JONES: Assemblymember O'Donnell.

Assemblymember Gallagher.

MS. JONES: Juan Mireles.

MR. MIRELES: Here.

MS. JONES: Cesar Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Here.

MS. JONES: Daniel Kim.

MR. KIM: Here.

MS. JONES: Gayle Miller.

MS. MILLER: Here.

MS. JONES: We have a quorum.

MS. MILLER: Thank you. Sorry. Do you want to continue with this.

MS. KAMPMEINERT: Sure. So just a few final points on this item. These are cash apportionments because we have the funding from the general fund. So the school districts will have up to 12 months to request the release of funds. They do not need to participate in the priority funding process.

Also the projects are subject to a local audit, pursuant to statute, upon completion, and with that staff recommends approval of the projects summarized on Attachment A, stamped page 198.
MS. MILLER: Thank you. Are there any questions from the committee on this item? Any public comment? Well, this is remarkable to the State Allocation Board that managed to get this up and running. I think it's really exciting. So thank you for that.

Is there a motion from the committee?

SENATOR WILK: So moved.

MR. DIAZ: Second.

MS. MILLER: Moved by Senator Wilk and seconded by Mr. Diaz. Secretary, could you please call the roll.


SENATOR WILK: Aye.

MS. JONES: Assemblymember Nazarian.

MR. NAZARIAN: Aye.

MS. JONES: Juan Mireles.

MR. MIRELES: Aye.

MS. JONES: Cesar Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Aye.

MS. JONES: Daniel Kim.

MR. KIM: Aye.

MS. JONES: Gayle Miller.

MS. MILLER: Aye.

MS. JONES: And that motion carries.

MS. MILLER: Thank you. So before we continue, I just wanted to go back to housekeeping and, Senator
Nazarian, do we want to postpone the audit for the -- or the appeal for the LA Unified School District, just for -- to give us a little bit more time to ask questions and get all the information?

MR. NAZARIAN: Thank you. So I'm happy to accommodate. I think I personally wanted some time to grasp the issue a little better. I just had an opportunity this last week to get better engaged and I still have some questions and I'm not sure if LAUSD wants to make a presentation and be heard, but then push the issue over or if it's just better to wait and make a presentation at a later time.

MS. MILLER: I think if we're gathering additional information and if a member, as a courtesy, puts the measure over, my understanding from Ms. Silverman is that it doesn't count against the district at all in terms of districts get two opportunities to set an appeal for hearing.

MS. SILVERMAN: That's correct.

MS. MILLER: Is that correct?

MS. SILVERMAN: Yes.

MS. MILLER: So I think in that regard if we wanted to gather more information -- I'm trying to look in the audience and see if I see LAUSD out there -- gather more information -- hi -- and hear it in June, we have another hearing set for June 26th.
MS. SILVERMAN: Correct.

MS. MILLER: And so we could put it over until then, gather more information. Obviously the timing in terms of everything going on in the Legislature on the budget, we'll have a little bit more space to gather information.

Are you comfortable with that, sir? May he address the Board? Does that work, Ms. Silverman?

MS. SILVERMAN: Yes.

MS. MILLER: Okay. So maybe just for now, sir, just on the issue of whether or not to put the appeal over to next month so that the committee has an opportunity to gather more information. So if you could state your name for the record, please.

MR. HOVATTER: I'm Mark Hovatter. I'm the chief facility executive for the Los Angeles Unified School District. Just so -- do I speak the item now or just --

MS. MILLER: If you could just speak to the question of waiting a month, please.

MR. HOVATTER: Okay. We could wait for a month on this, of course, but I think there's a different approach that we would like to take. We do not necessarily want to challenge the decision on this but rather the process itself. And I wanted the opportunity to explain to these members why this process is unintentionally, I'm sure, but
hurting the children of Los Angeles.

MS. MILLER: Well, I think in terms of the process -- you mean in terms of how the decision is reached for the appeal itself? I think if that's part of the conversation, I'd rather that be reflected in the analysis by Ms. Kampmeinert in the future. Does that make sense? And then -- what I don't think we want to do is discuss an appeal if what we're looking for is any adjustment to the process or any further questions, I think it would make sense to do all of that on June 26th, and then any additional information you'd like the staff to analyze, we could do that in advance of that meeting.

Ms. Silverman, do you want to add anything to that?

MS. SILVERMAN: Yeah. We'd be happy to talk with you post -- conversation post meeting and then gather some more information.

MR. NAZARIAN: So I'm happy to make the motion to push this over -- to postpone this for -- at a later meeting whether it's June or whatever the appropriate next meeting that is.

MS. MILLER: Well, maybe what we can do then is postpone it for today with no penalty to the district and then continue discussions as to the appropriate next hearing to meet your needs in terms of process and the staff's needs
in terms of analysis. So do we have a second to put --

SENATOR WILK: Second.

MS. MILLER: Thank you. Oh, and we don't need a motion to put it over. I told you guys I was new at this.

So with that, we look forward to hearing this appeal at a future date and really do appreciate you being here. Thank you very much in representing LAUSD. Thank you, sir.

Hi, Mr. O'Donnell.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: Oh, Madam Chair.

MS. MILLER: I know right.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: How are you?

MS. MILLER: I'm well. How are you? So Mr. O'Donnell was a fellow with Assemblymember Lowenthal in '99.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: So I know her from going way back.

MS. MILLER: Yeah. Even --

ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: You still don't have gray hair. I do, but you don't, so it works.

MS. MILLER: I have a solution for that.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: Oh, do you. Okay.

MS. MILLER: Yeah. Notice Ariana Grande if you listen to her.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: Okay. Probably a lot
of money too. Well, welcome. I just -- maybe someone said it earlier, but I think it's great you're here. Look forward to working with you.

MS. MILLER: Thank you. So I think with that, we're going to go back to the top of the agenda and just approve the Minutes from last -- April 24th. Thank you. And is there a motion -- any public comment on the Minutes from April 24th? Nope? Okay.

MR. DIAZ: So move.

MR. NAZARIAN: Second.

MS. MILLER: Great. It's been moved by Mr. Diaz, seconded by Assemblymember Nazarian. Secretary, please call the roll.

MS. JONES: Senator Wilk.

SENATOR WILK: Aye.

MS. JONES: Assemblymember Nazarian.

MR. NAZARIAN: Aye.

MS. JONES: Assemblymember O'Donnell.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: Aye.

MS. JONES: Juan Mireles.

MR. MIRELES: Aye.

MS. JONES: Cesar Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Aye.

MS. JONES: Daniel Kim.

MR. KIM: Aye.
MS. JONES: Gayle Miller.

MS. MILLER: Aye.

MS. JONES: And that motion carries.

MS. MILLER: Great. Thank you. And then we're going to go back in line and now we're on the Consent Agenda that I was so desperate for.

MS. SILVERMAN: Consent is ready for your approval.

MS. MILLER: Great. Is there any comment or questions on the agenda?Anyone come in after -- no. Great. Do we have a motion then on the Consent Agenda.

MR. DIAZ: So moved.

MS. MILLER: Moved by Mr. Diaz.

MR. KIM: Second.

MS. MILLER: Seconded by Mr. Kim. Secretary, please call the roll.

MS. JONES: Senator Wilk.

SENATOR WILK: Aye.

MS. JONES: Juan Mireles.

MR. MIRELES: Aye.

MS. JONES: Assemblymember O'Donnell.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: Aye.

MS. JONES: Cesar Diaz.

MR. DIAZ: Aye.

MS. JONES: Daniel Kim.
MR. KIM: Aye.

MS. JONES: Gayle Miller.

MS. MILLER: Aye.

MS. JONES: And, Madam Chair, we'll leave it open for Mr. Nazarian.

MS. MILLER: Thank you. And then we're going to move to -- as we said, the -- on Tab 6, the Farmersville United item was withdrawn from the agenda and the San Bernardino City was withdrawn from the agenda. And we are now -- oh, and LA Unified was pulled from the agenda. So we are now at the final item on the agenda, the Career Technical Education. Ms. Silverman, please.

MS. SILVERMAN: So on Tab 7, I'd like to direct your attention to page 212. So we have an action item for the Board for the approval of the fifth funding cycle for Career Tech Education, and we have -- Proposition 51 had allotted $500 million for the Career Tech Education Program, and the Board back in August 2017 had set two funding cycles of 125 million each.

And so we wanted to introduce the applications before you. There are 70 applications that are ready for your approval for 122.4 million. We still have $2.6 million to present at a future meeting.

The program was definitely oversubscribed, so we wanted to definitely bring that forward next month. And
Attachment A-1 is on page 214 and that's ready to present for you for an approval, and in some instances, we wanted to share with the Board we actually had some tiebreakers in which we had districts that had projects with the same score.

So when necessary, the first tiebreaker is determined with the highest rated score and the second tiebreaker is based on whether an applicant has already received funding for another project. With that, that's how the determination of the tiebreaker was allocated.

So all applicants must participate in the priority funding process as we shared currently underway and with that, once the apportionment is granted, those with the reservation of funds must submit with an approval within the 12-month period and after that, those projects will be rescinded.

So staff recommends the approval of Attachment 1.

MS. MILLER: Thank you very much. Are there any questions from the committee? Is there any public comment on this item? No. And we will open Item 7 up for public comment for those of you waiting. Thank you for being so patient.

So on this item, is there a motion?

MR. DIAZ: Move to approve.

MR. KIM: Second.
MS. MILLER: Thank you. Lisa, will you call the roll, please.

SENATOR WILK: Aye.
MS. JONES: Assemblymember O'Donnell.
ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: Aye.
MS. JONES: Juan Mireles.
MR. MIRELES: Aye.
MS. JONES: Cesar Diaz.
MR. DIAZ: Aye.
MS. JONES: Daniel Kim.
MR. KIM: Aye.
MS. JONES: Gayle Miller.
MS. MILLER: Aye. And we'll leave that open for -- thank you. Thank you for that.

So on the item that was withdrawn from the agenda, I understand we have a few folks in the audience that would like to -- thank you for being here. I appreciate you being up in Sacramento today. Just -- Ms. Jones, do I call everyone up individually or do they just form a line? What's the --

MS. JONES: Yes. You'll go ahead and call each one up individually.

MS. MILLER: Oh, great. Okay. And thank you for filling these out. So -- and I hope I get all your last
names right. Emily Shaeer. Did I get that?

MS. SHAEER: Yes.

MS. MILLER: And then -- and then we'll just have you folks come up maybe and then if we could also have Cheryle Sutton, please, from Washington Unified. And Emily, you're from Santa Barbara Unified?

MS. SHAEER: That's correct.

MS. MILLER: Great. Thank you.

MS. SHAEER: Thank you. I'm going to go ahead and read if I may --

MS. MILLER: Please.

MS. SHAEER: -- that I don't skip anything.

MS. MILLER: And if you could just state your name for the record as well, even though I just said it.

MS. SHAEER: My name is Emily Shaeer and I am here representing the Santa Barbara Unified School District. And I think you for the opportunity to speak today about an item that has been withdrawn and in anticipation of it being addressed in the upcoming meeting, as I understand it on June 26th.

So I'm here to talk about the remaining 250 million for the CTEFP program and I'm here to make a recommendation about how to allocate it. And I'm joined tonight by some other representatives from school districts who will also be speaking to this issue, and I have been in
contact with over 20 school districts throughout the state in recent weeks regarding this current fifth funding cycle, which as Lisa Silverman, mentioned was oversubscribed.

And I have been collecting letters in support of the recommendation that I'm going to be speaking about today. It is our understanding, as I have said, that this is going to be addressed and perhaps voted on on June 26th.

As you know, the CTE facilities program funding is a competitive application process. Programs must demonstrate through the applications that they are high quality based on a number of criteria, including strong industry partnership, strong enrollment strategies and student outcomes, and strong evidence of facilities project viability.

Something unique about the CTE facilities program is that the funding requires a 50 percent local match for the proposed project, be it modernization or new construction. So when this Board approves 125 million in funding to be released, as happened for the first two cycles, 250 million was actually released because it released local funds.

This is important because there are numerous high scoring projects that are sitting in limbo right now simply because the state has not released enough money to fund them and these projects are for high quality programs that have
earned very high scores from the CDE and are shovel ready
with millions of dollars sitting in accounts waiting to be
spent to bring them to fruition.

For example, about 60 projects in the most recent
fifth funding cycle that you just approved scored over
86 percent. That's over 121 out of 141 possible points
which are very high scores, and they were not funded.

And please consider that it takes an incredible
amount of resources to put these competitive applications
together to revise or resubmit them and it's labor intensive
for the CDE to rescore them and it's redundant to rescore a
very high scoring application.

If the next funding cycle is limited to only
125 million as the first two have been, these high scoring
applications are not necessarily going to be funded again
because as we have seen, it's oversubscribed and then the
money runs out and high scoring applications are not funded.

We ask that the remaining 250 million be released
during one final funding cycle so that more of these
projects will receive funding and the intention of
legislation to support innovative CTE facilities projects
throughout the state will be realized more effectively.

And finally, we ask that you consider the
efficiency of perhaps allocating some of the remaining
250 million to fund down the line of unfunded projects from
the fifth funding cycle.

As I mentioned, these projects have high scores and they're ready to go. They have been fully vetted by CDE and they are just sitting in a holding pattern. All they need is funding to be released for them to move ahead.

And these projects will inevitably turn up during the sixth funding cycle anyway, so why not speed the process along. In the name of efficiency, I propose releasing 50 million to fund down the list of unfunded projects from the fifth funding cycle and then allocating the remaining 200 million in one more funding cycle.

If the Board decided to release 50 million more to fund the projects -- fund more projects from the fifth funding cycle, approximately 30 more projects with scores of 90 percent or higher would be able to move forward and I think we can agree those are very, very high scores.

It would also streamline the sixth funding cycle by removing these high scoring projects from the mix of applications that need to be reviewed and accounted for and the CDE has already scored them and vetted them and it makes sense to expedite the process of funding them.

I understand from my contacts at OPSC that there is a legal question regarding releasing more funding for the fifth funding cycle and I respectfully request that legal counsel look into this to resolve the legal question and to
report to the Board members so that they have the
information they need to make a decision.

I also respectfully request that this item be
added to the agenda for discussion at the June 26 meeting as
part of the action item related to how to allocate the
remaining 250 in Career Technical Education Facilities
Program funds.

I would appreciate hearing discussing about the
idea of releasing additional money to capture more high
scoring projects currently on the unfunded list of the fifth
funding cycle.

Thank you for your time and your consideration of
this matter.

MS. MILLER: Thank you very much. Can you please
state your name for the record.

MS. SUTTON: Hello. My name is Cheryle Sutton and
I came from Washington Unified School District over in West
Sacramento and I came to talk a little bit about -- to build
on what Emily was talking about -- creative and innovative
places to teach students how to be efficient and successful
in a competitive work force and releasing extra money and
having programs being built with state of art, innovative,
and creative technologies to teach students. They come out
of school with an excitement about starting a career that
might not be related to college but is career training.
And so these innovative spaces create competitive programs where students can find a home both academically and train for something in a career and it just -- it takes more than just an upgrade in the facilities to be creative and innovative with these CTE programs. The technology needs -- component really needs to be there as well.

So I'm here to advocate that -- build on what Emily was talking about for those programs too and I can't tell you how many students have come to me and said if it wasn't for culinary, if it wasn't theater, if it wasn't for robotics, if it wasn't for a number of CTE programs, I don't know if I would have made it through school.

And so from the teacher's point of view, it's -- we get to help those students because of that.

MS. MILLER: Thank you. We appreciate you being here today.

MS. SUTTON: Thank you.

MS. MILLER: Thank you for being here. And then if we may have Katie Salcido and Kathy Pon and Melanie Patterson, please. If you could all state your names for the record as well, we'd appreciate it.

MS. SALCIDO: Good evening. My name is Katie Salcido. I'm the director of curriculum projects for Lucia Mar Unified School District in San Luis Obispo County.

I'm here today to talk about the Prop. 51 CTE
funding matching funds for CTE facilities. To build upon what Emily was talking about, I wanted to give a person face to some of the districts.

So our district services a very small area. We have no major cities close to us. We have about 10,000 students, 3 high schools, 3 middle schools, 11 elementaries. We have a population of about 55,000 people in our area and our school district services all of those people.

So being very isolated geographically, we have limited resources, but we have fantastic people doing amazing things for kids and we have amazing kids who need the facilities to explore options for their future.

With that, we applied for Prop. 51 funding and did everything ourselves. I think you'll see a lot of districts hire consultants or grant writing firms and we are not in that situation. So I personally with the help of teachers wrote the applications and those are very labor intensive. A lot of passion goes into those. I just want you to give kind of a personal face to that that is.

We also have amazing business partners, community organizations who put up not only their time and energy in supporting us, but also their fiscal match in pledging to us that they will support whatever matching funds that we get, which is an amazing place to be.

We also raised a local bond for matching funds for
facilities. So the ask is that the release of all 250 million at one time and in one funding cycle would help the funding of additional projects down the line because it is a competitive grant and the scores are so high.

With the competitive application process, the opportunity to fund more at a single time will help not only districts like ourselves, but districts across the state because as time passes, construction costs are continually rising.

So what we thought it would cost us a certain amount at the beginning of a grant writing, by the time this entire process is finalized, we can no longer afford because construction cost is rising so quickly. And so the quicker we can release money and get these projects going, the more we're going to have some backing with our money.

We also are using the local bond funding to support the matching funds in Prop. 51 and by securing matching funds, we are raising our CTE projects on the bond list, which helps us kind of get priority for those programs.

The additional ask would be how schools are assigned to categories and the round robin style of assigning -- of funding those applications. So the first categories -- there's three categories, suburban, urban, and rural.
It's an interesting characterization for districts. We are considered suburban, which is kind of hard for our local people to understand and we are then competing against true suburban districts and those are very difficult for us to compete against.

So a look at those three categories, I think would help to eliminate some of the barriers for some of the smaller school districts, but then funding down the line competitively. It's a competitive grant. Let's look at the scores as they are because in the round robin style with the three different categories, many school districts are being funded in a certain category at a much lower score than in a different category.

So I would just encourage the look at that particular phenomenon to see how the funding is happening within those categories to see if it really is equitable for all of our districts.

So with that, I just wanted to kind of present that personal aspect on our personal case and ask for the discussion in June.

MS. MILLER: Great. Thank you very much. We appreciate you being here.

MS. PON: Good evening. I'm Kathy Pon. I'm the deputy superintendent at Rocklin Unified and I have a partner here who's also from Rocklin Unified.
We have submitted two CTE grants and our projects in cycle four received -- they received fairly good scores, 85 and 88 percent -- were not funded. We also did not go to consultants. We spent a lot of nights and weekends writing them ourselves.

The next funding cycle, we worked very hard. One of them went down to 77 percent and we worked very hard to improve it and even some of the same verbiage that was used in the first grant was used in some places and those were scored differently -- lower than the others. And then one did get a little bit more of a bump to 91 percent.

As you've heard, it just takes an incredible amount of time and resources for school districts and school board members, our teachers, our partners, and other personnel to put these competitive grants to -- applications together and revise and resubmit them. Very labor intensive and it just seems very redundant to CDE to rescore applications that have already been scored and have fairly high scores in previous cycles.

I'm going to say also having a project rescored at 121 points in cycle four be rewritten and improved and then after extensive work, rescored at 109 was rather disheartening, and so we are questioning -- and I know you don't have a lot of control over that piece of it, but just a consistent process for calibrating and scoring the
rubrics.

Many projects with a high range, as you've heard, in the suburban category have not been funded and that also feels very inefficient. And again, if we had the remaining 250 million released in one final grant cycle, more of our high scoring projects, including at least my partner's, would be funded.

We also have to -- through developer fees, we are holding onto and really have frozen in our budget $6 million matching funds for each of these. Now we're going on two years sitting on that money, just waiting to spend it, and, you know, the most important thing is that there are students -- that's two years of a cohort that are working towards a Capstone project that won't ever get to work in state of art facilities because we're just -- we have, you know, 91 percent here and we're not able to move forward with some state of the art facilities for our students.

So we would ask again that that be considered on June 26 and we thank you very much for consideration.

MS. MILLER: Thank you. Thank you very much for being here.

MS. PATTERSON: Thank you. Good afternoon, Board members. My name's Melanie Patterson, Rocklin Unified School District. I'm a program specialist for our LCAP and strategic planning and spent the last two years working very
hard with our instructors, our students, and our community
members and the industry sector partners to develop high
quality applications for the CTE facilities grant for our
Building Industry Technology Academy.

And there's a couple of things. I know Dr. Pon
mentioned this already, but this was the application that
received in the fourth cycle a score of 124 and we just
missed the funding by a few points, and then again worked
very hard with ourselves on our own time to increase that
score to 127.5, to a very high quality project that
established the need in the industry sector which our
students are working as interns and can enter the work force
immediately and even while they're still in school, as well
as enter the programs in college to continue their education
through Sierra College and other community colleges and
four-year universities.

And so I would say that with the project, you
know, we -- to be able to provide -- initially, when our
school was built, while it's not extremely old, it was built
with a cabinet making, old school, if you will, industry
standard and it needs to be updated to the current industry
standard in order for our students to be relevant and also
efficient and safe in the classroom as well as in the work
force and be ready to be employed in this high demand
industry and in the State of California.
And so I won't belabor it, but just to say that, you know, missing it by that much and working hard for two years is not easy, as you might expect, but really mostly for our students who we just want to provide for them the highest possible quality education and to be college and career ready as possible upon graduation.

And the asks that I have is please consider allocating some of the remaining resources to those grant applications that are high quality and passing already and then releasing the remainder of the funds so that those that are sitting there waiting with $6 million behind it and additional mass amounts of human and school resources to make those grants happen, they would be honored.

Thank you for your time. Appreciate it.

MS. MILLER: Thank you. We really appreciate you all being here and letting us know the personal touch on the programs. Thank you for your time.

So we're just going to go back through the agenda quickly and make sure that everyone votes on the open items. The Consent Agenda, Ms. Jones, if you could call the absent members.

MS. JONES: Assemblymember Nazarian, how do you vote on the Consent Calendar?

MR. NAZARIAN: Aye.

MS. JONES: Thank you. Then that motion carries.
MS. MILLER: Thank you.

MS. JONES: And then we have the action item for our full-day kindergarten and Assemblymember O'Donnell, how do you vote on that item?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER O'DONNELL: Aye.

MS. JONES: And that motion carries. And then we have the Career Tech unfunded approvals and that would be Assemblymember Nazarian, how do you vote on that item?

MR. NAZARIAN: Aye.

MS. JONES: Okay. And that motion carries too.

MS. MILLER: Great. Thank you. And with that, we are adjourned for today. Thank you, everyone.

(Whereupon, at 4:50 p.m., the proceedings were adjourned.)
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