

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CALIFORNIA STATE ALLOCATION BOARD
STAKEHOLDERS MEETING

STATE CAPITOL
ROOM 4202
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

DATE: WEDNESDAY, JULY 24, 2019
TIME: 1:02 P.M.

Reported By: Peter Petty
eScribers

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

APPEARANCES:

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES, OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION (OPSC) PRESENT:

BRIAN LAPASK, Policy & Operations Manager, Program Services

TRACY SHARP, Supervisor, Career Tech

P R O C E E D I N G S

1

2

3

MR. LaPASK: Good afternoon. I'm Brian LaPask.

4

I'm the Operations and Policy Manager in Program Services at

5

OPSC. With me today is Tracy Sharp. She's the Career Tech

6

Supervisor in our office. You guys probably have worked

7

with her a great deal. You'll know who she is.

8

Our meeting today is scheduled for two hours.

9

We're here from 1:00 to 3:00 today. So with that in mind,

10

I'd just ask that you keep your comments focused. There's

11

quite a few folks here. We'd like to hear from everybody

12

who would like to speak.

13

If there's information that's been already stated,

14

we could probably just keep it to that. It'd be appreciated

15

very much. We do have plans for a follow-up meeting to this

16

one. We're going to hold this meeting today.

17

Our goal is to get as much feedback as we can and

18

then we'll summarize that and bring back another item at a

19

future meeting. I'm not sure if it's scheduled yet, but if

20

not, you'll hear about it in the near future.

21

And then if there are suggestions that we all come

22

up with together, our goal would be to bring changes forward

23

to the SAB -- the State Allocation Board in time for a sixth

24

cycle. So that's kind of sum and stature for what we're

25

doing.

1 So what brought us here today? During the last
2 two career tech funding cycles, we've heard a lot of
3 feedback from our school districts and stakeholders and most
4 of it has been an interest in revisiting the funding order
5 for the program and the criteria that kind of outlines our
6 funding criteria and to see if there's anything that we
7 could -- you know, any kind of thoughtful changes we could
8 make to improve it better than it already it.

9 There's been lots of interest in the program, so
10 we thought this would be a great opportunity to get together
11 and put our minds together and see what we could come up
12 with.

13 If we do get there and we find some clear issues
14 that need to be resolved and that we get some consensus on,
15 you know, some ideas that we could bring forward, once
16 again, we'd bring those to the SAB for consideration in time
17 for a sixth funding cycle. At minimum, I think we would
18 bring a report describing what we did discuss and some of
19 the ideas that were brought to us.

20 So -- as you know, currently, the criteria -- the
21 way the funding order works, we order the applications by
22 the score -- the CT score of the application that's provided
23 by the Department of Education. Then we look at the locale
24 where it's going to be located, urban, suburban, and rural,
25 and we'll talk a little bit about more of that in just a

1 minute. And then if there's still a tie at that point, we
2 look at weighted scores which is also provided by Department
3 of Ed, whether or not the school district had an application
4 funded in the current or previous cycle, and then if we need
5 to, we would go to a lottery to break a tie after that.

6 So speaking of the funding order, we have heard
7 some concerns about the equity of it and the desire to
8 perhaps examine that and see if it is providing equity or
9 not. Specifically, we were talking about the locale that's
10 designated as town and how it's currently combined with the
11 suburban locale. So we'll talk about that a little bit
12 today and kind of explore that.

13 We've also received a lot of comments about
14 considering returning to the funding model we had for the
15 first two cycles, which basically utilized the 11 career
16 tech service regions in the state and kind of arranged the
17 funding according to those. So that's two of the things we
18 want to talk about today.

19 Other scenarios that we're going to present to
20 you, I don't think that we found any that maybe equalize
21 both of those things in coordination with one another, but
22 we have found a few ways to sort of even out the
23 distribution of the funds based on the local or based on the
24 service regions.

25 So we have some ideas we'd like to present to you

1 on that and then we'll see what you think and then maybe you
2 have some stuff that you'd like to share with us.

3 So once again, I think we have a really good
4 opportunity today to review and discuss any concerns that
5 you all have and to put our minds together to seek any
6 potential improvements to an already great program. I mean
7 CTE's been very successful.

8 We've been oversubscribed I believe in every cycle
9 and I think it's important to remember that the statute for
10 the program set forth pretty clear guidelines that we shall
11 provide equity. So I think that's our driving force here
12 today.

13 We have an opportunity to examine that, see if
14 there's ways for us to collectively improve that. We have
15 had a successful program, but there may be ways to improve
16 it even further.

17 So I invite you to keep that in mind today when
18 you're making your comments. Think about how we can set the
19 tone here and really kind of discover if there are ways that
20 we can work together to improve already good program.

21 And before I turn this over to Tracy, some of the
22 nuances in the criteria of the examples we provided -- the
23 examples are just that. They're examples. They're not
24 suggestions or recommendations. They're just to illustrate
25 the way it would look in a few different configurations.

1 The information you'll see on those is based off
2 of the fifth funding round -- the last funding round -- the
3 projects that we received in that round, so it's that data.
4 I think it might be important to remember that if we were to
5 have a different set of data, we were to look at a different
6 funding round from the past or a future funding round, it
7 would likely result in different outcomes because we really
8 don't know where the applications are going to come from,
9 what kind of locale they're going to be from. So it's hard
10 to sort of predict those things and say, you know, we know
11 it would change it in this way because the makeup of a
12 future round and the past rounds are -- you know, they're a
13 lot different. It just really depends on who applies.

14 And then again, we're not making any
15 recommendations today. Everything we have here today is
16 just to generate discussion and to get your feedback.

17 So I think in summary I'd like to work to create
18 an environment that would allow us to get some feedback
19 today, see if we can make some improvements, and with that,
20 I'll turn it over to Tracy.

21 MS. SHARP: Okay. Thank you again for coming
22 today. Again, my name is Tracy Sharp. I'm the Supervisor
23 in Program Services for Career Technical Education. And,
24 yes, picking up where Brian left off, as he mentioned, we
25 have several scenarios that I'm going to walk you through,

1 take a look at, and then be ready for your feedback.

2 I just want to make two quick comments about the
3 information we've presented and that in our regulations,
4 yes, the funding order as it was originally established in
5 2006 when we got this wonderful set of funding from
6 Proposition 1D had a couple of goals with it in that
7 ensuring equity.

8 And at the time, when we worked with stakeholders
9 such as yourselves, that equity was -- we attempted to
10 achieve it in two ways: distributing the funds statewide
11 using that service region model in cycles one and two and
12 also as funds were distributed statewide, also the locale
13 then helped to bring that funding into various types of
14 communities, if you think about that urban, suburban, and
15 rural.

16 So the goal was spreading the funds statewide and
17 those were the two ways that we put into the regulation to
18 spread the available funds across the state.

19 As you know, we had a bit of hiatus between Prop.
20 1D funds and Proposition 51 which -- that brings us back
21 around to the cycles -- very successful cycles four and five
22 that we've had. And then which brings us to what Brian
23 mentioned that the data we're looking at together is from
24 cycle five.

25 So if you have the packet available in front of

1 you, we have some copies here, an abbreviated portion of the
2 packet and the meeting report and the full version is on our
3 website, I'll call your attention to Attachments I, J, and
4 K.

5 We've set it up in a way that looks at the two
6 factors of locale and service region. First just looking at
7 the locale in Attachment J and then in Attachment K it
8 presents the same data set by -- now split out by service
9 region. What would it look like if those variables -- if
10 certain variables changed in cycle five, what would the
11 resulting funding order look like.

12 So to start with in Attachment I, we have a short
13 narrative of the funding scenarios that we've looked at, if
14 the funding order changed. The first one, if I use
15 Attachment J as an example, is how the -- is based on the
16 current regulations, distribution of the actual funding --
17 of the funding projects using our current designations of
18 urban, suburban, and rural.

19 And I should touch on real quickly, urban,
20 suburban, and rural as you know comes from the National
21 Center for Education Statistics. We use that database for
22 its designation and currently, those are in -- the number
23 designations are defined in School Facility Program
24 regulations.

25 And what we got from you, the stakeholders, is --

1 are comments about where town fits in. Right now, urban is
2 the 11, 12, and 13 codes. Suburban includes 21, 22, 23, 31,
3 32, and 33 and then rural is the 41, 42, and 43.

4 So in Attachment J, that first table there at the
5 top is what does it look like today. How would the
6 project -- how was project funding distributed and of the
7 projects submitted, you'll see there in each category those
8 that were funded based on the current funding order of
9 taking one from each locale until the locales are exhausted,
10 the distribution 24, 24, 22 and then -- but if you look at
11 the number of projects submitted, there were definitely more
12 suburban than urban and rural.

13 In our first scenario, we took those same group of
14 applications and as was one of the requests or
15 recommendations from the stakeholders, what would happen to
16 that distribution if those locale codes that are associated
17 with town were moved from suburban to rural.

18 And what you see there is the projects funded
19 would be about -- would be very similar in their
20 distribution, but of the projects submitted, we see 28
21 projects that move over from suburban to rural. So it
22 changes that distribution, like I say, by 28 when we move
23 town locale codes into the rural category.

24 Then in scenario two, we took that same idea and
25 put it within the service region model and looked at the

1 distribution and by spreading the funds out by high school
2 attendance area in the 11 service regions within the state,
3 you can see there what the -- the number of projects funded
4 would change to 26, 26, and only 8 in the rural category.

5 In scenario three then, we took a look at it and
6 said if we were -- if the funding order changed to just
7 highest score only -- because that was another thought
8 presented by stakeholders is, well, if we just looked at the
9 score that applicants receive from the Department of
10 Education, we would see a very different layout of
11 applications. In that case, 18 urban, 36 suburban, and 9
12 rural would be funded.

13 I'll also note here that the value of the
14 applications is based on the raw applications that
15 districts -- or the application amounts that districts
16 submitted. These are the unprocessed applications. We
17 haven't looked at -- processed all of them to determine what
18 their final eligible amount was. This was what applicants
19 requested.

20 Then a variation of scenario 3A is 3B, moving town
21 from suburban to rural, and here you'll see in our packet
22 that we distributed today we made some corrections. You'll
23 see the total projects submitted in 3B under suburban was --
24 actually turned out to be 78 and rural is 51. It moves
25 over -- moves those 28 projects that were submitted and

1 changes the percentages a bit as well.

2 And then in scenario four, we've looked at that
3 service region model as well and applications are spread out
4 into their 11 service regions and then they're ordered using
5 the urban/suburban/rural model, but the town codes have now
6 been moved into the rural area locale. So it changes that
7 distribution.

8 So that shows basically just the variable of
9 locale in the funding order and how it changes -- how the
10 distribution of funding changes when you just change that
11 one -- or that variable in Attachment J.

12 Then if we look at how the funding is spread
13 across the state using the service region model on
14 Attachment K, you see the distribution of projects from a
15 statewide perspective in those groupings of counties under
16 each service region in Attachment K.

17 Once again, in the packet we've presented today,
18 we -- you could see some changes -- some updates. To
19 scenarios number one, the first one is distribution of your
20 actual cycle five applications and where each of those
21 landed in their regions. And then scenario one where town
22 is moved from suburban to rural, the distribution is
23 represented there without change in the town -- or in the
24 definition of rural -- moving town to rural from suburban.

25 And then scenario two, once again the distribution

1 and now we're actually plugging in the regional cap based on
2 the high school enrollment. The total amount of funding,
3 the 125 million, is spread -- is prorated based on the high
4 school attendance of each region there, that 125 million, so
5 you can see the change in distribution of projects.

6 Move onto scenario three, we've taken out the
7 locale factor and it's based on highest score only. And you
8 don't see a breakout of 3A and 3B in scenario number three
9 on the service region chart because it doesn't -- it's not a
10 factor in this one. This one's straight scoring.

11 And then scenario four takes both factors and
12 plugs in the service region and the prorated amount based on
13 high school attendance area and moves town to the rural
14 locale. So it changes both of those factors and you can see
15 the distribution then of funding.

16 We have a little star on that one because, as you
17 can see, if we just applied the straight percentage cap to
18 this, there is a possibility based on how the high school --
19 or based on how the proration works out from just
20 125 million that, for example, in region one, the north
21 coast, the value of the projects currently submitted, those
22 six projects, was 1.5 million and the regional allotment is
23 2.2 million.

24 However, say there was more than one application
25 that was submitted there that reached the new construction

1 cap of \$3 million. If it was left at just the 2.2 million,
2 you wouldn't really fund one whole project. So an
3 alternative to this scenario could be to say ensure that at
4 least either a minimum amount is allotted to each region or
5 that at least one application is fully funded. So that's
6 what the star is below scenario four.

7 And that is just an overview of our Attachments J
8 and K. We did also include Attachment L which is an
9 overview of what would happen if -- because this is just
10 cycle five data. We've applied these various scenarios to
11 just cycle five data as submitted.

12 As Brian said earlier, it's one dataset and we
13 don't know who's coming in the next cycle. So in
14 Attachment L, we have looked at, well, if in cycle six it
15 was just those applicants who didn't get -- didn't receive
16 funding in cycle five reapplied and we didn't have any new
17 ones, then all those projects could be funded using the
18 current model.

19 With that, we welcome your comments and questions.

20 MR. LaPASK: Hi, Fred.

21 MR. YEAGER: Hello. Fred Yeager, Department of
22 Education. So your analysis is based on 125 million in the
23 last cycle, right?

24 MR. LaPASK: Yeah. It's cycle five.

25 MS. SHARP: Yes.

1 MR. YEAGER: And one of the other things, if there
2 were more money, that first box would look different because
3 essentially all that were funded more suburban and more
4 urban would be funded and that distribution would change.

5 MS. SHARP: Absolutely.

6 MR. YEAGER: So the amount of funding available
7 per cycle also affects the equity.

8 MS. SHARP: Affect, yes.

9 MR. YEAGER: Now, moving forward, the Board has
10 made certain decisions as to whether it's 125 and whether
11 those decisions continue going forward or under AB-48, those
12 are concerns as to decisions made on equity. The bigger the
13 pie, the less the equity concern perhaps.

14 MS. SHARP: Potentially.

15 MR. LaPASK: It could be.

16 MR. YEAGER: So if today's analysis is based -- or
17 discussion but just keeping in mind that those charts are
18 based upon one set of funding allocations.

19 MS. SHARP: Yes.

20 MR. YEAGER: So --

21 MS. SHARP: Which is true looking back. We
22 mentioned that cycle one and cycle two was based on the
23 service region model -- or the current model.

24 MR. YEAGER: Um-hmm.

25 MS. SHARP: Those had different amounts allotted

1 to them as well.

2 MR. YEAGER: Right. Yes. The first cycle out of
3 the 500 million, you had 350 million and --

4 MS. SHARP: Yeah.

5 MR. YEAGER: -- almost everybody -- over 105 was
6 funded.

7 MS. SHARP: Um-hmm.

8 MR. YEAGER: So the equity was perhaps -- that was
9 a perhaps more equitable model in that case. So --

10 MS. SHARP: It does change based on the amount of
11 funding that's allotted to it -- to the cycle.

12 MR. LaPASK: I can't imagine nobody else has
13 anything to say. Please feel free to come up.

14 MR. PELLMAN: Hi.

15 MR. LaPASK: Hi.

16 MR. PELLMAN: From Elk Grove Unified, so first of
17 all, thank you. We've participated in the program for the
18 last several years. We really like the program and it's
19 been great and we're happy to have the discussion about how
20 we can make it better.

21 As I'm listening to the different calculations
22 about what is more equitable versus what is less equitable
23 and is the current program equitable, what I'm hearing are
24 lots of distribution of numbers, but I would like to get a
25 little context sort of what's the context -- what defines

1 equity because equity can be seen as a distribution of
2 numbers, but that may not necessarily be equitable.

3 It might be based on labor market demand which is
4 in the application. It might be the amount of students that
5 you're going to serve. It might be certain populations that
6 you're going to serve. So it's hard to evaluate which is
7 more equitable without a discussion of the context of equity
8 and how you're defining it.

9 MR. LaPASK: I totally agree. Thank you. I think
10 that's a really great comment and I couldn't agree more. I
11 think that we would probably rely on you guys for that.

12 Again, the issues that have been brought up that
13 were discussed (indiscernible) been brought to us and so we
14 would like to know what you think would be equitable.
15 Should we look at it more on a locale base or should we look
16 at it more on a service region base. Is there some other
17 way. I think that's what we're here for. We'd like to
18 receive that input from you guys.

19 MS. SHARP: And I would also add to it that the
20 factors that you're bringing up right now are factors within
21 the score that a district receives from the Department of
22 Education. Those are factors that are built into the
23 statute as far as how the score is arrived at and that's --
24 those are components of the score for sure already.

25 So I guess my comment is could those be considered

1 addressed in the score already or are they not addressed
2 there. So that's a consideration.

3 MR. PELLMAN: Yes. I mean these are complicated
4 topics for sure and if I can respond.

5 MS. SHARP: Um-hmm.

6 MR. PELLMAN: You know, as I look through these
7 different scenarios, obviously I'm looking at what's the
8 region in which I work and how is that affected by the way
9 that this -- how this is distributed.

10 MS. SHARP: Um-hmm.

11 MR. PELLMAN: And I mean I generally like the
12 application. I feel it's a fairly well-written application
13 and I think it does address the concerns about equity. I
14 think the focus is on, you know, the labor market and, you
15 know, the quality of your CTE program and, you know, so I'm
16 very comfortable with the application.

17 I just get a little nervous without more context
18 looking at this because some -- I mean I'm sure everyone is
19 well intended, but this could be interpreted as saying,
20 well, because we didn't get enough projects in the past, we
21 would like to change the way this is distributed so we get
22 more projects into a particular region.

23 Without an understanding of why you're making
24 those changes other than, you know, more is distributed to
25 one area or less to another area, it's really hard -- you

1 know, without understanding what your deliberations are,
2 it's really hard to give feedback.

3 MS. SHARP: Um-hmm.

4 MR. LaPASK: You know, I don't think that we know
5 that there needs to be any changes. I think we're exploring
6 that. Again, the program's been very successful I think to
7 this point. It's always oversubscribed. So I think that's
8 kind of what we're trying to figure out is if we do need
9 to -- is there any issues that we do need to address or
10 maybe the criteria's already okay and we don't need to and
11 maybe that's what comes out of these conversations.

12 So I appreciate what you're saying. I just -- you
13 know, again these were brought to us. We're trying to
14 address them. We really like to work with our stakeholders
15 and get all the input we can for programs like these because
16 they affect so many people and they're so important to all
17 of the districts.

18 So we're looking for input and I think, you know,
19 we've -- we've outlined a few different ways we see that we
20 might be able to possibly arrange them, but there's got to
21 be more ideas I'm sure.

22 MR. PELLMAN: And so -- I'm making my last
23 comment. If there was a broader context in the way that
24 those were affecting, if you were looking -- if you had an
25 objective as far as equity, you know, whether it be

1 populations, you know, you -- the OPSC and CDE decide that
2 they want to -- they see a deficit in the amount of CTE
3 programs in rural areas and therefore, they would like to
4 have the distribution be such that rural areas get a
5 better -- you know, have more opportunity to get those
6 funds, I can get behind that because it's based on data.

7 MS. SHARP: Um-hmm.

8 MR. PELLMAN: Or conversely, if you say within
9 urban areas there aren't enough quality CTE programs and
10 therefore, we need to put more CTE programs. I mean of
11 course I'm going to favor my district, but I can get behind
12 that because there's a rationale.

13 MS. SHARP: Um-hmm.

14 MR. PELLMAN: So from my vantage point working for
15 one district, I don't have that perspective on the state and
16 that's really kind of the information that I would look to
17 OPSC and CDE to say back to us here is why we'd like to
18 change it, but until I'm presented with something that
19 suggests those, I have no reason to want to change it
20 because I'm not given any reason to suggest that it needs to
21 be changed.

22 MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

23 MS. SHARP: Thank you. And just for future
24 presenters, for the purposes of recordkeeping, if you could
25 state your name clearly when you come up, that would be

1 super helpful. Thank you.

2 MR. BAREILLES: Hi. I'm Jack Bareilles from
3 Humboldt County. I'm with the Northern Humboldt Union High
4 School District. I'd give this gentleman a card, but that
5 and my dress pants are in Humboldt County six hours away. I
6 was reminded yesterday I was coming to this from vacation.

7 I mention my sartorial deficiencies partly because
8 rurality is a big deal and I know, poor Tracy, I've harassed
9 you before on this.

10 MS. SHARP: Not at all.

11 MR. BAREILLES: Our schools are town remote and
12 are classified correctly by the U.S. Census Bureau as town
13 remote. I have no problem with that.

14 As I was driving over, I was on the phone with my
15 friends in Crescent City, Del Norte County, which is eight
16 hours from here, who are also classified town remote. I
17 haven't spoken with Alturas recently. They're also town
18 remote, Susanville and others.

19 I agree with the equity. I think that's very
20 important. There are challenges of virality. The first
21 thing is I wholeheartedly, as do all the folks, all of the
22 districts in Humboldt County, those of us who are large
23 enough to have a stake in this, we've met -- in Del Norte
24 County.

25 The recategorization of town remote to rural is

1 the appropriate one. I mention that not just in the CTE
2 context. I can give my job title which would take a large
3 card, but among the hats I wear, I'm a grant guy. I write
4 grants for us and other districts.

5 There are 32 districts in Humboldt County serving
6 18,500 kids down to a district with six. I am our homeless
7 and foster person. I'm involved with mental health and
8 state and federal grants that are serving our local kids.
9 I'm also our Indian education coordinator, among other
10 things -- well, administrator.

11 By us being in the suburban category -- I was just
12 on the phone with DC as I was walking in here. The guy
13 called back and I'm not convinced that I'm going to be able
14 to apply for our Humboldt County schools for a grant that
15 would bring in social work interns into our schools because
16 we're not classified as rural because of that town
17 designation -- or the categorization by the State of
18 California.

19 I know this is more broad than CTE, but there are
20 cascading effects beyond just the CTE world and I just need
21 to bring that up I guess.

22 That to me is the biggest thing. If we are
23 appropriately categorized, frankly, it helps the suburban
24 schools. I was sitting next to a person from Pleasanton,
25 the gentleman from Elk Grove, I'm assuming they're also in

1 the suburban category, maybe not. But it moves that away
2 and I think that's very important.

3 The last thing I'll say is I appreciate equity.
4 When you are in a school that has 400 kids, 200 kids, you
5 might have one career technical education teacher who is
6 teaching woodshop, auto shop, and metal shop. Now, he or
7 she may only have 70 kids across those three labs, but to
8 offer those, you have to do it and I'll take it to life
9 science where I happen to have a credential among other
10 things.

11 You may only have two biology and chemistry
12 classes in a school of 150. The cost of that lab is no more
13 or no less than it would be if I was at a school of 2,000
14 in, you know, north Santa Rosa or something that is the
15 chockablock with kids all day.

16 There are costs that are just part and parcel of
17 this. And so -- that's it. Thank you very much. I
18 appreciate your time and I'll tell this guy how to spell my
19 name. Thanks.

20 MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

21 MR. MURRAY: Hi. Thanks. My name is Rob Murray.
22 I'm with King Consulting and I'm here today because we have
23 worked on behalf of some school districts and just kind of
24 coming on with and elaborating on some of the points that
25 were just brought up by Mr. Bareilles.

1 We work with some of these districts who competed
2 in the suburban category as what the NCES classifies as
3 towns and especially for some of these districts that are
4 competing in the agriculture or natural resources sector who
5 are running -- or submitting these applications for
6 facilities for their FFA programs.

7 These communities identify as rural and a lot of
8 them are -- just can't comprehend how they're told that
9 they're competing in suburban against again some of these
10 what you want to essentially think of as suburban districts,
11 which again not only raises the number of applicants in the
12 suburban locale category and makes that a tougher field, but
13 leaves the relatively small number of applicants in the
14 rural field such that, as we saw this time, literally all of
15 them get funding and that's great for them.

16 But it is hard for some of these districts and the
17 towns to see a -- you know, a good score but not good enough
18 in the suburban but is significantly higher than some of the
19 scores that are getting funded in rural. I mean that's what
20 we put our finger on the equity issue with just making sure
21 that there was a more even distribution between the
22 categories and especially given that the NCES created four
23 categories and the CTEFP moved forward with three. It does
24 seem like a natural fit to take that fourth category and
25 take it out of the largest CTEFP category and place it into

1 the smallest to even things out more, especially again
2 because as we just heard a lot of these towns, whether they
3 are remote or distant or fringe, a lot of them do
4 self-identify as being a rural community.

5 And that is just what I wanted to point out there,
6 just on behalf of some of our districts who couldn't be here
7 today.

8 MS. SHARP: Thank you.

9 MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

10 MR. REISING: Hello. Good afternoon. I'm Alan
11 Reising. I'm with Long Beach Unified School District.
12 First of all, I want to take a moment and thank you for
13 holding these meetings. As you can tell by some of the
14 comments that you're going to hear -- that you've already
15 heard and will hear, I think everybody has an opinion about
16 this as we look at the different service regions across the
17 state. So first of all, thank you for that.

18 And then second of all, I'd like to invite the
19 opportunity to please bring this a little bit on the road.
20 I'd love very much if we could bring some of these
21 discussions down in Southern California area. There are
22 many districts in Southern California that do have an
23 opinion in this matter and I'd like to have an opportunity
24 in the south for some of those opinions to be heard.

25 A lot of districts can't make this trek during the

1 summer and so the opportunity for some of us in the south to
2 come up and meet with this committee and have a discussion
3 would be very much beneficial.

4 So equity really just seems to be the question
5 here and really looking at how the different service regions
6 all obtain some level of equity.

7 In my mind, as I thought through this and I looked
8 at some of the data, I really brought myself back what I do
9 many times as I do my job and focus on the children and ask
10 the question who are we serving and what is the goals of the
11 CTE program and really the ability for these dollars to
12 serve the most children and serve the kids that actually
13 need these kind of training and these kind of opportunities.

14 So I'd ask if there was some analysis that could
15 be done to really look at how many dollars per child was
16 being allocated and how those monies were being distributed
17 to the enrollments that are each of these sites.

18 I do have a little bit of an affinity towards
19 scenario four. Some of that is selfish in that it does put
20 more money into the rural districts -- or excuse me -- the
21 urban districts, but I'd really like to focus on some of --
22 how this money can impact children more directly.

23 I was also wondering if there's been some analysis
24 done that we could see if we did allocate the full
25 \$250 million that was remaining and where this committee

1 would be on the topic of funding all of the remaining money
2 in one additional funding cycle and whether or not that's
3 something that we are going to be discussing here today or
4 moving forward. I know that has been discussed at the
5 Allocation Board's meeting and how that may impact some of
6 the funding models and whether that distribution would
7 address some of the equity concerns.

8 And lastly, really looking at using more influence
9 towards the relative merits of the project. The process
10 already goes through a round of screening that's headed by
11 California Department of Education. That really defines one
12 project versus another regardless of locale whether or not
13 the merits of that project are sufficient to meet
14 established goals and established criteria.

15 Really using that as a little bit more of a metric
16 for funding. As I looked at the prior funding cycles, both
17 cycle four and cycle five, there were some -- you know, some
18 issues there with how those funds were delivered and were
19 put out.

20 There were projects that were materially lower
21 scores that were receiving funding from other regions and
22 being able to solve that is very, very important. So
23 relying more heavily on that process that we go through with
24 CDE to have our projects scored I think would be beneficial.

25 So I think that's the end of my comments. I want

1 to thank you for your time and thank you for holding this
2 and then again encourage us to bring this down to Southern
3 California so we can have further conversation. Thank you.

4 MS. SHARP: Just one thing I wanted to clarify
5 real quick. Your comment about the 250 million because it
6 was the Board's decision to dedicate all 250- remaining to
7 cycle six. Is that what you were referring to?

8 MR. REISING: Yes. Yes. That is what I was
9 referring to.

10 MS. SHARP: Okay. We don't have the specific
11 application dates set for it, but the good news is that all
12 250- is dedicated to one more cycle --

13 MR. LaPASK: One more cycle.

14 MR. REISING: Thank you. Thank you.

15 MS. SHARP: -- cycle six.

16 MR. REISING: Okay.

17 MS. SHARP: All right. Thanks.

18 MS. SALCIDO: Good afternoon. My name is Katie
19 Salcido. I'm the Director of Curriculum Projects in the
20 Lucia Mar Unified School District. That is in Arroyo
21 Grande, California, very small central coast town if you
22 would.

23 So I wanted to talk to you a little bit about the
24 equity that has been mentioned several people before me. So
25 to give you some background. We are a school district of

1 about 10,000 students. Fairly small. We have two high
2 schools. One is located as a -- tagged as a town fringe
3 competing in the suburban. Another is considered city,
4 small, and competing in the urban.

5 Those two distinctions are based on school sites
6 only and if you look at applications, all the schools are in
7 a category fund based on a school site that the CTE program
8 is going to reside in, not based on the district size.

9 So in that instance, throughout the state, I've
10 known some districts -- some being as much as 38,000
11 students, much bigger than we are, bigger resources, more
12 staff, a lot more to draw on, competing in rural because
13 they happen to choose a school site that lies on the outside
14 of their big base city.

15 So in that instance, I don't think it is equitable
16 for us to have to compete against unlike circumstances. So
17 in order to address the equity, the application -- if you've
18 seen it. It's huge. Takes months to prepare. It asks for
19 all of the information that could possibly be related to the
20 CTE program. What does your program look like, what's your
21 growth, how is your community involvement. Everything that
22 is equity is in that application and we get scored based on
23 that.

24 But then after we get scored, we get placed into
25 these three categories and compete kind of on different

1 playing fields. So in able to kind of like level that
2 playing field to just use scores, just go straight down by
3 scores, we would have been funded where we weren't because
4 of the different categories.

5 For example, we received 131 points in the last
6 funding cycle in the suburban category. Rural schools were
7 funded at a significantly lower score. Understanding that,
8 there are rural schools that come from a district of 38,000
9 students. We have 10,000. We get scored than them, but
10 then didn't get funded.

11 So that's where I think looking at -- your
12 examples, looking at just the scores and funding based on
13 scores makes it equitable. Because that application is so
14 thorough in itself that it asks for all of the details to
15 look at equity and that score from the CDE does tell the
16 district are you ready for a CTE program. Have you just
17 demonstrated all the things that you need to demonstrate in
18 order to show that you're ready for that.

19 So the application in itself I believe is enough.
20 So I do agree that all of the towns being in suburban is
21 unfair and it does need to be addressed. I think the most
22 equitable way of doing that is to look at just scores and
23 then fund down based on the scores.

24 Thank you for your time. I appreciate it.

25 MS. SHARP: Thank you.

1 MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

2 MR. DAVIS: Good afternoon. Don Davis,
3 Superintendent of Waterford School District in Waterford,
4 California, in Stanislaus County, and thank you for
5 convening this meeting today.

6 So I heard earlier that equity is important. You
7 mentioned it, sir, and it's -- and how do you define that
8 was important. I also heard -- said a few times already
9 today, what a successful program this is. Successful --
10 it's a successful program. I think maybe three or four
11 times from the dais I heard this.

12 Well, how is successful defined. Because from a
13 school district who has applied over and over and given our
14 best effort, not to be funded, I don't feel it's too
15 successful to us.

16 I brought a couple visuals for you. I don't know
17 if the audience -- can you see a lot of green? Okay. We're
18 identified as suburban. How many of these -- our little
19 school district. You can see the track and the football
20 field there and there we are.

21 With regards to the application and equity, maybe
22 to counter what you've heard already today, I would say one
23 aspect of equity is to be on guard for the Matthew
24 Principle. To those who have, more will be given, and to
25 those who have not, even what they have, they lose.

1 When you're from a bigger district -- and in our
2 county, we have larger districts, smaller districts.
3 They're able to hire or have on staff grant writers, people
4 who know the hoops, know them well, can write particularly
5 glowing applications. Whereas in the smaller districts, you
6 have guys like me doing the best we can to pull together
7 those committees, write it, and serve our kids to the best
8 ability that we have.

9 On a straight scoring model, I almost -- I'm not
10 sure this is worth the effort. I would propose that you
11 take a real look at scenario one, place the schools that are
12 town/town fringe into the rural category and distribute --
13 let the rurals compete with rurals.

14 I'm not aware of that many districts that are huge
15 with ADA or enrollment in a city and have an outlying rural
16 school. Maybe there is one or two in the state here. More
17 (indiscernible) I'd like to see that situation.

18 But speaking for the situation that I've
19 described, the feeling is -- and why it's been brought to
20 your attention is those of us in what we would self-classify
21 as rural get skipped over. Just aren't able to compete at
22 the level of the suburbans.

23 So in closing, please consider scenario one. Let
24 the town designations be identified as rural and let the
25 rurals compete against rurals for the funding. Thank you.

1 MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

2 MS. SHARP: Thank you.

3 MS. CUTTER: Hello. My name is Beth Cutter. I'm
4 with Pleasanton Unified and it's been really interesting
5 hearing the comments from others and reflecting on a
6 conversation I had earlier this week with our CTE lead in
7 our district and my director and myself.

8 And, you know, right away, we look to see, well,
9 gosh, how would these affect us and our projects and like I
10 gather from many of the other organizations that are here --
11 the other schools that are here, districts, we had two
12 projects that received passing scores that were unfunded.

13 And, you know, that's a little disheartening to
14 feel like, yes, we have a strong proposal. We have a
15 project that we know will benefit our students, that's in a
16 career pathway that is growing in our region. And then to
17 not have it be funded and then to look at the amount of work
18 that went into preparing that application. Like the
19 gentleman before me just mentioned, you know, although we
20 are, you know, what on paper might look like a better
21 resourced district -- I don't mean to say better, but a
22 district where maybe we would have more resources to put
23 into the application, the bottom line is it was a lot of
24 nights and weekends by a handful of, you know, dedicated
25 educators like my peers in the room.

1 So the decision on equity, it's definitely not an
2 easy one and I think you can hear, you know, dozens of
3 different ways to parse it out that may or may not be based
4 on the self-interest of the individual in front of you and
5 their organization.

6 I mean certainly looking at the number of students
7 by service region for me, kind of my initial glance --
8 scenario -- and, you know, my glance before and then after
9 your description today, scenario four does seem to account
10 for the percentage of California students that are in the
11 service regions.

12 And my -- my district isn't as, you know,
13 intimately affected with the decision for the town locale to
14 be considered suburban versus rural, but I absolutely
15 understand, you know, the argument to have it be a part of
16 the rural category based on thinking about the towns that
17 who are considered suburban which don't seem suburban to me.

18 A couple of things I want to mention, though, for
19 your consideration going forward is the idea of looking at
20 those projects that received passing scores that did not
21 receive any funding and how might the next funding cycle
22 address that.

23 And again, thinking about the manpower, expenses,
24 and energy up and down the state that goes in to preparing
25 these applications and knowing that -- I think there's

1 something like -- I don't know how many dozens of passing
2 score projects that are there, that are ready and how a
3 decision might make it simpler for everyone by funding those
4 projects that already have been scored, that have already
5 been determined to be passing and awarding them the funds.

6 So that's what I would propose for your
7 consideration is for cycle six to utilize that funding to
8 fund the already passing projects that have been submitted.

9 Along those lines, assuming that there will be
10 resubmission, I just think that we'll need some
11 clarification about what changes to a project would require
12 resubmission. So, for example, as we looked at our own
13 projects that we would like to resubmit, if that's the
14 direction things go, if there are only budget changes
15 because of, you know, slight change in costs, what would be
16 required to resubmit and if projects are resubmitted, would
17 they be subjected to new scoring. If so, would they be
18 allowed to receive the higher of the two scores should they
19 get scored lower on the second pass.

20 The reason I bring that up, we -- we actually had
21 three projects submitted by our district that were different
22 career pathways that would go towards creating a CTE
23 building at one of our high schools that currently doesn't
24 have an adequate CTE facility, and so the projects were all
25 pretty similar and were written in parallel by the same

1 team.

2 And so it was very interesting when we got those
3 back to see how different the scores were and knowing there
4 are some differences because of the career pathways that
5 they address and there were some reasons that it was clear
6 why one of them was scored differently from the other two.
7 But just for example, one of our projects scored a 133, a
8 123, and a 93, and those are pretty wildly different scores.

9 We had one that also had a 30 point span between
10 its two scores and so the subjectivity of the scoring is the
11 point that I want to make sure is on your minds as well. So
12 going forward, since we are putting so much time, effort,
13 and energy into these applications, how do we know that
14 there's consistency in the scoring.

15 I know that's not on your guys, but just in your
16 conversations with CDE and thank you for your attention.

17 MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

18 MS. SHARP: Thank you. And I would like to maybe
19 comment on a couple of other things related to your
20 comments, in particular, the applications that have already
21 been submitted.

22 So when we presented the proposal for a next cycle
23 to the State Allocation Board, there were a couple of things
24 outlined that basically in the Board discussion and in
25 approving the sixth cycle and 250 million allotted to it.

1 In that item, we clarified a couple of things and one of
2 those things was basically for legal reasons, we can't go
3 back to those unfunded in cycle five and continue down the
4 list.

5 So what we did looking forward to cycle six said,
6 okay, we're -- we don't have our dates, you know, down yet,
7 but trying to basically keep it open. Then also for
8 districts who want to resubmit that there are limitations.
9 Like if you want to use your score letter and you feel like
10 it was a good solid score from a past cycle, four or five,
11 that definitely you could do so.

12 There are limitations, though, because all of the
13 elements in that score are prescribed in advance. Any
14 changes, it's unknown what they -- how that could impact
15 your score in the next round.

16 So if your application -- your grant application
17 and your budget doesn't change at all and no change to the
18 scope, it's going to come back in with the same score
19 letter. However, if there are changes to the scope and/or
20 the budget because the budget is a component of your score
21 from CDE, it would have to go back through the scoring
22 process with Department of Education.

23 And knowing that that's significant, as you've
24 said and others, workload for a district to prepare that
25 application, that's definitely notable. It sounds like

1 maybe you've already pursued that option of requesting from
2 Department of Education your scoring rubric and areas --
3 comments from the readers to help you move forward. And so
4 it looks like you've already, you know, pursued some of
5 those avenues and in part, I'm saying those out loud not
6 only in response to you, but also for any other listeners
7 out there who may or may not have taken advantage of that
8 opportunity to do so.

9 But it is a component in making sure that when a
10 score is given it's for that specific project and all the
11 details that was in it. So if there are changes, it would
12 have to go back basically and be -- go through the process
13 again.

14 MS. CUTTER: Okay. All right.

15 MS. SHARP: Thanks.

16 MS. CUTTER: Thank you.

17 MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

18 MS. PERSINGER: Hi, guys.

19 MS. SHARP: Good afternoon.

20 MR. PERSINGER: Thank you for holding this
21 hearing. Alexis Persinger and I'm with Persinger
22 Architects. So as an architect, I thought I would share my
23 perspective because I don't represent just one school
24 district. I have probably 20 in Northern California that I
25 work with, and I want to kind of advocate for our rural

1 districts and so the first part of that is this idea of
2 moving folks who got into town back into rural.

3 What you may not realize is the way that scoring
4 code works that we're using, if there's any sort of group of
5 three or four businesses within a certain distance from a
6 high school, you're not going to get a rural score. You
7 have to be surrounded by empty fields. That only happens
8 for high schools that are maybe ten years or less. 30, 40,
9 50-year-old high schools, it's the nature of towns that they
10 will be surrounded by buildings.

11 So if we're using that scoring rubric, none of
12 those small towns throughout the state are going to be able
13 to make rural just because that's the nature of how those
14 little towns develop. So I thought that would be a
15 perspective you might want to know.

16 MS. SHARP: Um-hmm.

17 MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

18 MR. PERSINGER: I think everybody in the room
19 supports this idea that there should be funding for rural
20 projects and urban projects and suburban projects. So since
21 we believe, I think we all agree that that's an equity
22 position. We need to put actual rural projects in rural and
23 that would -- moving those town projects into rural would
24 accomplish that.

25 The other thing that I see a lot with -- you know,

1 we're talking about 10,000-kid districts. My districts are
2 2,000 kids, 500 kids, 200 kids.

3 The amount of effort involved -- and I'm just
4 going to dovetail on what's been said before. The amount of
5 effort in putting these applications together is sometimes
6 almost insurmountable for our small school districts and
7 particularly when you're sort of -- you're applying and
8 you're not getting it and you're applying and you're not
9 getting it.

10 What I would suggest would be -- maybe there's a
11 way to effectively give a bump to folks who've applied
12 before, give them 20 points, you know, per cycle, right?
13 Because you've got these small districts that are applying
14 and applying and applying and then never getting it and
15 they're seeing folks coming in in front of them.

16 So they may not have the staff to be able to score
17 as well as a bigger district, but they certainly have the
18 staff to teach their students and so giving them the ability
19 to get there.

20 Because what I'm seeing -- and this is a little
21 personal for me because I was a continuation high school
22 kid, right? I was a kid who shop kept me there and so
23 getting kids to college is amazing, but finding a path for
24 kids who aren't going to college is also really important
25 and it's what this program's about, right?

1 Our real rural towns that are sending kids to be
2 welders and to work on farms, those ag type programs aren't
3 getting funded. They're not sexy. They're not exciting.
4 They're kind of boring, right? But that's what we're
5 supposed to be funding.

6 So by giving folks who keep applying a little bit
7 more of a boost, you're helping some of those maybe not so
8 flashy projects achieve the funding that they should. Thank
9 you very much.

10 MS. SHARP: Thank you.

11 MR. ABO-SHAER: Hello, Tracy, Brian.

12 MS. SHARP: Hi.

13 MR. ABO-SHAER: Thank you for holding this
14 meeting. So I think as one of the folk in this room that
15 actually wrote the grant as a teacher/grant writer, I think
16 that what we found was just the disheartening nature of you
17 look and you see someone look like a 109 get funded and
18 someone with a 131 not get funded.

19 And one of the things that I'm looking at, I'm
20 feeling pretty good about scenario one and the reason I'm
21 feeling good about that is that as I see the numbers move
22 over, it looks like what we've got now is you've got 21 of
23 the rural schools getting funded, but of those, it's a bunch
24 of town ones that moved over and had those higher scores and
25 just knowing that now that 21 out of 51 got funded, I think

1 for those of us that were the grant writers it's not going
2 to be -- I know some folks who are just let's score down the
3 line, you know, et cetera, but I think that you know
4 fundamentally that those scores have gone up in the rural
5 area now because you've included the towns and the fringes
6 and I think I did the analysis and I think the lowest funded
7 score would have been like a 124 in the rural area as
8 opposed to a 109 and that's because we shifted the towns and
9 the fringes over to the rural and then the suburban scores
10 that were there that have a bunch of 131s and higher that
11 didn't get funded would then at least get a little more
12 exposure.

13 So the concern I have -- because I feel pretty
14 good that that's solving a lot of the issues, at least from
15 a person who, like I said, was on the grant writing side and
16 went through the big heavy lift to do that. The concern I
17 have are the service region models and the -- there's a
18 couple things that I have concerns about.

19 One is I think the most important thing I think
20 what gets solved in one is high scoring applications getting
21 exposure to funding. And I think what we see by moving
22 those town/fringe, you know, over to the rural, you end up
23 with higher scores getting more exposure to funding.

24 And when you go and you do this model where you
25 break it up, I'm going to be honest, I don't really get a

1 total sense of where the regional lines came from, but it
2 feels an awful lot like just gerrymandering, like just
3 artificial boundaries.

4 And then on top of that, you've got -- it's based
5 on high school enrollment and high school enrollment is not
6 an indicator of the number of high quality CTE programs.

7 So you've got a situation where you take this
8 arbitrary region, you look at it. Maybe they have a bunch
9 of up and coming high quality CTE programs. Now they're all
10 competing against themselves for a small pot of money
11 because we've divided it all up and what you end up with is
12 this potential that there's a lot of regions where the
13 bottom two or three that aren't -- the closest two to
14 getting funded are significantly higher scored than some of
15 these bigger areas and you can see that with the percentage
16 layout.

17 So you've got areas as low as 13 percent of the
18 projects get funded in a region, whereas another region, you
19 know, gets funded as high as 30 percent. And to me that
20 just shows that what -- it shows fundamentally and for a
21 statistical standpoint that you are limiting the exposure of
22 high scoring applications to the funding.

23 And I think that we -- I don't really understand
24 why we would do that. And then the other thing is the
25 number of students that are enrolled in a district -- again

1 it's just not indicative of even how many CTE programs there
2 are. So you could have an area that has no CTE programs and
3 a lot of students in it and then they're going to get more
4 funding allocated which what that's going to lead to is
5 programs that area, you know, receiving lower scores not
6 getting funded.

7 So for me -- and then there's the last point I
8 guess that I want to make on that is it also adds to the
9 complexity of the situation. So I know -- I don't know how
10 many people in this room did what we did, but we got our
11 score and then you don't really get any information from the
12 state other than a score.

13 And we're a small district, so we go and we look
14 and we try to identify. We went to actually the website
15 where you look up the rural locale codes and we went and we
16 proceeded to spend a day, as I'm sure some people out here
17 have done, and assign all the codes and we still don't know
18 the dollar amount.

19 And the reason this is important is we've all got
20 matching money sitting on the table. We're all trying to
21 find out whether we can proceed and on top of the complexity
22 of even just doing the granting process, we're all wondering
23 now for another six months what's the likelihood of us
24 getting funded.

25 And what I've heard from the state is we don't

1 want to put that information out because it just confuses
2 the people more and I'm like I'm happy to be confused. Give
3 me more data and let me sort through the data and let me
4 decide how confused I'm going to be.

5 I'm fairly confident that more information is
6 good. What I see here, what's going to add to the
7 complexity is every one of these regions is going to have a
8 remainder value associated with it. So now you've got 11
9 remainders and then you have to go and say, well, now what
10 do we do with those 11 remainders. Then you got to go out
11 to the 11 regions and say, hey, School X, are you happy
12 taking 37 percent of what you asked for and you have to do
13 that region by region.

14 And I think again now you have that aspect added
15 onto the fact that you've taken high scoring projects and
16 given them less exposure and you're taking a problem that I
17 think has a more simple solution and making it complex.

18 Here's what I think. I think when those region
19 areas came out on the first round -- I don't write policy,
20 but I suspect this was the reason -- there weren't any CTE
21 programs. It was new. It was this new thing. They had
22 just written CTE legislation. They had just put out -- the
23 career technical education standards came out roughly 2006,
24 2007. They defined all those and so it was kind of like a
25 blank slate and they wanted to make sure that every area

1 probably had -- was going -- had some opportunity to get
2 some funding to start these things.

3 But now CTE has been around for, you know, 10, 15
4 solid years and I think people have had the opportunity to
5 decide whether they want to be onboard and create a solid
6 program.

7 And so again the whole notion of breaking out our
8 regions just seems like another complexity that just seems
9 unnecessary.

10 So what I would propose -- what I would suggest is
11 go with scenario one. From my perspective as a suburban --
12 from a small suburban school that is still struggling as
13 we're writing our own grants, I look at it and go I can
14 stomach that because I know it's like if we get out with a
15 131 and the next lowest score was a 125, that was the
16 lowest, that's in the noise.

17 But I'd say that when you see it go round over
18 round over round and you've got a 131 and you just keep
19 going, wow, that is just -- they're funding anything, it
20 really takes away the whole idea of why are we having a
21 competitive process and this is one of the few grant
22 applications and opportunities in the state where you
23 actually can go and compete. A lot of stuff isn't like that
24 and I think that there's value in having that competitive
25 nature and the score really is doing -- as others have said,

1 it's vetting already that -- those evaluations of the number
2 of students involved in the program, et cetera.

3 So that's pretty much what I have to so. I
4 just -- I would encourage you not to make a situation that
5 makes it so that it's more complex. It's confusing on the
6 other end and then leaves us all wondering whether we got
7 funded when we're already trying to see if we can get funded
8 and our projects are all escalating right now.

9 The cost escalations -- we're already -- we're
10 getting priced out of our projects. It'd be nice if after
11 the sixth round was over we could all in this room look at
12 where we stand and be able to say, hey, we know we're going
13 to get funded and proceed, you know, accordingly knowing
14 that the funding will show up, you know, eight or nine
15 months later after it goes through the process of SAB,
16 et cetera. So thank you for your time.

17 MS. SHARP: Thank you. And can you -- what was
18 your name again?

19 MR. ABO-SHAER: It's Amir Abo-Shaer. I'm from
20 SBUSD, Santa Barbara Unified.

21 MS. SHARP: Thank you.

22 MR. ABO-SHAER: Thank you.

23 MS. CUNNINGHAM: Good afternoon. Elona
24 Cunningham, Jake Schrader & Associates. I think that the
25 first step in establishing equity for the program is to

1 re-review the parameters of determining suburban, urban, and
2 rural school districts due to the fact that some truly rural
3 districts are classified as suburban and there are some
4 truly suburban districts that are classified as rural.

5 So I think that that would be the first step, and
6 then once the districts are correctly classified, then
7 determine the distribution of funds based on the locale.
8 Thank you.

9 MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

10 MR. TAYLOR: Tim Taylor. I'm the new Executive
11 Director of the California Small School District Association
12 and we represent over 500 small school districts which in
13 Ed. Code qualifies for districts under 2,500 kids. And
14 thanks for your time. Great conversation.

15 My previous job was at Butte County Office of Ed.
16 and I look forward to you guys' solution. I think trying to
17 explain equity and trying to come up with a perfect solution
18 for this would take forever. So thanks for having the
19 courage to try.

20 Yeah. I think -- well, if we look back for a
21 second, look at some of the great progress the state's made
22 on trying to make it more equitable especially for small
23 school districts and rural and if we look at the original
24 900 million we had for career tech in the beginning, it was
25 going to be a competitive grant and I literally called the

1 state superintendent. I said, Tom, I cannot compete against
2 Long Beach and Elk Grove. I've got these little districts.
3 They have been in this business ten years. They've got
4 National Foundation funding. They're unbelievable to steal
5 things from, but to compete with the -- Hoosiers happened in
6 1950 in basketball and it hasn't happened since because we
7 separate sports specifically so it's a more competitive and
8 equitable environment for small school districts, and I
9 think when it comes to this type of work, we need to keep
10 looking at models that do that.

11 I think the MTSS grant for \$30 million that Butte
12 County and Orange County had, we gave every school the same
13 amount of funding, 25,000, no matter what your size because
14 work is work and that was a very big win for smalls.

15 I know in the arts funding that came out, the
16 33 million, it was done by regions and they gave 3 million
17 to each region. So up in our region, the north state, that
18 was a huge win for us. We thought that was very courageous
19 to do that. Other counties didn't like that and they said,
20 well, we have more kids, but it's really about building
21 capacity of that region and they split it 3 million. That
22 was a shocking and I think a very courageous decision.

23 A bad decision was the school improvement grants.
24 They were a competitive grant for schools that were in
25 program improvement and beyond, and I sent a map down to CDE

1 and said, look, here's a map of California. You have not
2 funded one school in the north state either in Humboldt or
3 anything up north and when we applied with nine, we did not
4 get funded and Sac. City Unified got six different funding
5 sources for a huge amount of millions of dollars.

6 And I looked at the state and said, look, are you
7 hiring a good -- are you hiring people that really have a
8 need or are you hiring a good writer because they were
9 funding things as a written document and I thought it was
10 really interesting in the MTSS funding, we had to interview
11 to get -- they had a score which was 40 percent. 60 percent
12 was the interview, so you knew it was not being written by a
13 grant writer but that the county sups knew what you were
14 writing, what your needs were.

15 So I think some of these people that are stuck in
16 that zone were not funded. You may want to look at
17 something where, okay, if you're at 130, you should be
18 funded. That's a great score. But if you're in that middle
19 zone, maybe an interview. I know it's -- we're talking
20 millions of dollars. Then you really grapple around is
21 this -- these people really know what they're doing, why
22 were -- they were short because it's not really -- it's
23 really a matter I think not having the capacity and team to
24 help with that.

25 I will say -- my last thing is I like the idea of

1 having a competitive grant, but based on -- either based on
2 the rural, the model you have, or really maybe look at the
3 enrollment thing because you may have some districts --
4 capacity's capacity.

5 If you only have 500 kids in whatever type of area
6 you're in, you don't have the same capacity that you would
7 have if you're in a district with 60- or 70,000 kids. So I
8 know in the original CTIG we did do the enrollment. I think
9 it was under 150, unless a thousand and a thousand and above
10 allocated and there was money sent.

11 And again where some people were upset were the
12 super smalls got a lot more funding per kid than the bigs
13 and they were not happy, and I said, well, welcome to our
14 world. That's what happens to smalls is they usually don't
15 get enough funding to do proper things.

16 And we look forward to working with you at the
17 Small School Districts Association and thanks for your time
18 and good luck with everything.

19 MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

20 MS. SHARP: Thank you.

21 MR. McQUEEN: Dave McQueen. I'm the
22 Superintendent at Kelseyville Unified School District which
23 is truly a rural school. We have about 3,000 people in the
24 town. As the architect, Alexis Persinger, pointed out, we
25 were built around homes and no open fields.

1 I'm here, first of all, just to clarify some
2 things. You have nothing to do with the applications.
3 You're just -- OPSC is just allocating the funds based on
4 what CDE's application process is, right? Correct?

5 MS. SHARP: Basically.

6 MR. LaPASK: By the score, yeah.

7 MR. McQUEEN: Yeah. So today's hearing -- because
8 I'm hearing a lot of people mixing up the application with
9 your process. It's really two different --

10 MS. SHARP: Two steps.

11 MR. McQUEEN: Two steps.

12 MS. SHARP: It's a two-step process.

13 MR. McQUEEN: And so I really don't -- you know,
14 as far as the application process, that's a totally separate
15 issue and, you know, we're working ourselves on how to do
16 that better, but that's really not your gig.

17 My observation and feedback is I'm not sold on
18 this whole NCES data and that's what spiked my whole
19 interest in this entire process because if you looked on the
20 schools that were funded in the rural, you had Oxnard on
21 this last one and I think -- no. Don't get mad at me, Elk
22 Grove. I know you're here -- but like Elk Grove, which are
23 really -- they're suburban cities. Okay?

24 So when you are talking about equity, I think you
25 really need to look at that NCES and I know that -- because

1 when I called and talked to you -- and thank you so much. I
2 just want to thank you, getting back to us and the whole --
3 I really appreciated the process -- that nobody really ever
4 looked at it and I know that it's an issue of having enough
5 employees and this and that, but it's really an algorithm
6 type of thing that's coming from the federal government and
7 were all those codes.

8 But it just comes down to me commonsense. You
9 look at, okay, here's Oxnard, here's Kelseyville. There's a
10 difference there. So that's the whole thing and not beating
11 a dead horse here, great suggestions. I think just keeping
12 it simple, scenario one, move the town locale codes from
13 suburban to rural. I'm all for competitiveness.

14 Hey, if you got to get your grant more points, you
15 got to get them more points and, you know, that's the
16 fairness of it, but I think the equity is just the fact that
17 you're having a school of 1,500 competing against a school
18 of 10,000 or 20,000. You know, just not there.

19 So thank you very much and we hope to hear back
20 more. Thanks.

21 MS. SHARP: Okay. Thank you. I'll just make a
22 quick comment on that. I think another speaker mentioned it
23 as well is that when we're looking at the NCES data for
24 establishing the locale, it is a school site basis
25 currently, not a districtwide basis. So I think that just

1 to add that to the conversation. We're looking at it based
2 on where your school site is, not the district as a whole at
3 this point in time. So thank you.

4 MS. SHAER: Hello. My name is Emily Shaer and I'm
5 from the Santa Barbara Unified School District and I
6 appreciate the opportunity to speak today. I did want to
7 reflect to the group that is here in attendance that I have
8 been working with over 28 districts in recent months and
9 have been to the last two State Allocation Board meetings in
10 an effort to advocate for awareness of these issues, which
11 there are many and they are varied, everything from the
12 application to the scoring to the funding, et cetera,
13 et cetera.

14 And many of the districts that I have been in
15 contact with in recent months are in the town locales and
16 they would have received funding in cycle four or five had
17 they been classified as rural, and I am in favor of them
18 being reclassified.

19 I did also want to bring to awareness to this
20 group that the 250 million being approved for the sixth
21 cycle was approved, as you mentioned, and it came as a
22 result of a lot of us rallying around that to really say and
23 to point out as you did earlier, Tracy, that of the unfunded
24 projects that are remaining from cycle five, all of them
25 could be captured with 250 million.

1 And so that was why we were advocating for that,
2 for the money to go deeper because as we saw in cycle four
3 and five, there were a lot of -- there was a bottleneck of
4 high scoring applications that were unable to be funded.

5 And I do want to also reflect to this group kind
6 of in conversation -- this is a strange way to have a
7 conversation, but to address the things that people have
8 addressed that I did meet personally with every single Board
9 member on the State Allocation Board and I communicated the
10 nature of the grant that people have brought up the huge
11 amount of human resources and time and effort that it takes.

12 I communicated the bottleneck of high scores going
13 unfunded because of the limit on the 125 million. I
14 communicated giving consideration to applications that had
15 already applied. I communicated the idea of maybe funding
16 down the line of the ones that were there.

17 They were all sympathetic to these issues
18 sincerely and I wanted to voice that today and I also wanted
19 to just bring to bear as you said that legal counsel for the
20 State Allocation Board and legal counsel for the CDE
21 independently arrived at the illegality of doing those
22 things.

23 And so I just wanted to reflect to people that in
24 a way that's not a human issue. That's a legislative issue
25 that was already predetermined.

1 I do want to voice that I support wholeheartedly
2 scenario one and reclassifying the town locales so that
3 overall what I and others see that the town locales really
4 would be more appropriate in the rural category and so that
5 rural scores can be competing against rural scores, urban
6 against urban, suburban against suburban.

7 That seems appropriate to me. It also seems in my
8 view to support the competitive nature of this process which
9 I really believe in and that's part of what we're doing
10 here. We're all putting skin in the game because we believe
11 there's going to be a competitive field and that's why when
12 you're like that feels unfair the way this is coming down.

13 You know, you want to play a fair game when you go
14 to play basketball. You want to believe in the calls the
15 refs are making. So that's part of it.

16 I also finally just want to voice that I do not
17 support the service region model because I truly believe
18 that there is some real arbitrariness of associating CTE
19 programs with the number of students enrolled in a region.

20 There's really no correlation there. I think
21 that's really faulty and I -- just I can't support it at
22 all. So I just want to say clearly I support scenario one.
23 Thank you so much.

24 MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

25 MR. PELLMAN: Back again. John Pellman. Again,

1 appreciate the opportunity to be able to speak and I'm --
2 it's eye opening to hear the different comments and I
3 appreciate how complex this issue is for you and for all of
4 us to get right. So I just would like to make my comment.

5 I don't want it to be lost. You know, we in Elk
6 Grove -- and our district has been mentioned a few times.
7 We in Elk Grove span all three of those areas: rural,
8 suburban, and urban. And I'd like to suggest that -- and
9 again this is a complicated question, but it seems to me
10 that the issues around equity really have more to do with
11 the district's ability, in essence based on staff and the
12 scale and size of the districts, to get an application out
13 and that's what you're comparing when you're talking about
14 urban, rural, and suburban.

15 So the rural districts here have a concern and I
16 certainly understand their concern that they don't have the
17 staff to complete the applications. That seems to me to be
18 a fair question to analyze.

19 I think, though, it then becomes complicated how
20 you evaluate districts. Is the size of the district then
21 what classifies it as urban. We're fifth largest in the
22 state, but we have almost all suburban and rural schools. I
23 don't know that we have -- I think we have one urban school.

24 So I think this is a very complicated question. I
25 just would like to say I don't want that point to be lost,

1 that when we talk about what is rural, it is not necessarily
2 the district. It is the school and maybe that you want --
3 you may want to revisit how you classify districts or where
4 the applications come from based on the size of the district
5 as opposed to the school itself. I certainly can empathize
6 with those school districts.

7 We did have an application that was funded as a
8 rural school. That was how the numbers played out. It was
9 to our benefit, but I can understand if you're coming from a
10 rural district that you would say, well, why is Elk Grove in
11 the rural category. So I do get the complexity of the
12 question.

13 And my last comment is this discussion around
14 equity really is based on, as I see it, the capacity of a
15 district to write an application and that is what this
16 revolves around. The more complicated question is really
17 how are we serving kids and, you know, what is the needs of
18 certain groups.

19 And I would encourage OPSC to look at a broader
20 definition of what equity is because I think ultimately --
21 obviously, we're all here to serve kids and while the
22 districts that support these applications need to be served
23 and their voices need to be heard, we're really looking at
24 how do we serve kids and the kids -- if we're talking about
25 equity, the kids who have the greatest need.

1 But complex questions. Again I appreciate the
2 opportunity to speak and it's been eye opening hearing the
3 comments from everyone. Thank you.

4 MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

5 MS. SHARP: Thank you.

6 MR. ADAMS: Thank you for having this. I'm around
7 when vocational programs were completely cut out and
8 congratulations on reallocating funds towards the Career
9 Technical Education Program.

10 There's been a lot of very good things brought up
11 by everybody and I'm not going to repeat any of that, but it
12 occurred to me sitting here listening that one area hasn't
13 been addressed yet and that has to do with the equity in the
14 review process that happens of the applications.

15 It was mentioned by one other person about the
16 inconsistency from 99 all the way up to 131 in a particular
17 application. We saw that in our application both years
18 and -- by the way, I'm from Kelseyville.

19 The -- we're well represented here. Even -- the
20 entire community's here today. So that's how small we are
21 even though we are suburban.

22 MR. LaPASK: Two of you.

23 MR. ADAMS: So I just encourage you to look at
24 your review process and have consistency in the review
25 process. We did go over to CDE and have a meeting with

1 regard to trying to look at how our applications became so
2 inconsistent with regard to the different reviewers and we
3 think that some work on making that process more consistent
4 between the reviewers so that people don't have questions
5 about whether their application was really read by somebody
6 who understands the programs that are being applied for.

7 Thank you very much.

8 MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

9 MS. PATTERSON: Hello. Good afternoon. Melanie
10 Patterson, Rocklin Unified School District. We, for the
11 past two funding cycles, have submitted two grants that have
12 received high scores and have gone unfunded, and so I just
13 wanted to quickly clarify a couple things that are important
14 to me.

15 While I know you may not have a lot of say in
16 necessarily the process for scoring, I would just say in the
17 sixth funding cycle -- the last funding cycle for Prop. 51
18 funds, it is important to me that it remains the same. If
19 it is changed that all applications, I believe, should be
20 then rescored and so it would be equitable at that -- you
21 know, if that makes sense.

22 So just because people are mentioning that, I
23 think it's important to share.

24 And then also I would be in favor of scenario one
25 for the equitable distribution of funds as well as for just

1 the -- you know, in order to fund those high scoring
2 applications for several years, that we've already spent
3 thousands of dollars on and man time to be approved and move
4 forward for our students. Thank you very much.

5 MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

6 MS. SHARP: Thank you, Melanie.

7 MS. SHAER: Hello again. Emily Shaer from Santa
8 Barbara Unified and I realized I forgot to ask this
9 question.

10 There are many districts that I have been in touch
11 with who are unable to attend today and I wanted to know
12 what is the appropriate forum for them to communicate their
13 opinions. Would that be letters to the OPSC? Is that in a
14 follow-up stakeholder meeting? If you could clarify that,
15 that would be great and also if there are potential
16 timelines around when a vote may be brought to the State
17 Allocation Board.

18 MR. LaPASK: Yes. Thank you. Actually, that's a
19 great question. I'm glad that you asked. Anybody can feel
20 free to email them to us. If they want to send a letter to
21 the office, that's also fine. They can email them to Tracy
22 or to me or anybody on the career tech team and then if they
23 want to send a letter to the same spot.

24 I don't have a time when we might take this to the
25 SAB. We haven't discussed exactly when that would be yet,

1 but we do intend -- if there are changes that come about, we
2 do intend to try to implement those for the sixth cycle. It
3 would make sense to do that, so we plan to try to get them
4 into the sixth cycle. I don't know what the timeline would
5 be yet.

6 The next meeting I think will be in about three
7 weeks -- the next -- the follow-up to this meeting. And so
8 depending on what comes out of that one, we could probably
9 have a better idea about when it might go to the SAB if we
10 need to do that.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Would that be
12 (indiscernible-away from microphone)?

13 MR. LaPASK: I don't know. I don't think we've
14 determined that yet. We'll have information on that soon,
15 though.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Have it in Kelseyville.

17 MR. LaPASK: Have it in Kelseyville? That'd be
18 fine with me.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible-away from
20 microphone) county.

21 MR. LaPASK: I also like it up there. It's a
22 great drive. Yeah.

23 MS. SHARP: Are you talking about the six-hour
24 drive or the eight-hour drive?

25 MR. LaPASK: Yeah.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) Long Beach
2 is beautiful this time of year.

3 MR. LaPASK: Long Beach is beautiful.

4 MS. SHARP: Or a one-hour flight to Long Beach.

5 MR. LaPASK: Do I hear San Diego? Okay. Is there
6 anybody else that would like to come up and share any
7 thoughts? Okay. Well, I think that will conclude our
8 meeting then. Thank you so much for coming. We got a lot
9 of really good feedback today. Really appreciate
10 everybody's interest and we look forward to speaking with
11 you again soon. Thank you.

12 (Whereupon, at 1:29 p.m., the proceedings were
13 adjourned.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO)

I, Mary C. Clark, a Certified Electronic Court Reporter and Transcriber, Certified by the American Association of Electronic Reporters and Transcribers, Inc. (AAERT, Inc.), do hereby certify:

That the proceedings herein of the California State Allocation Board, Public Meeting, were duly transcribed by me;

That the foregoing transcript is a true record of the proceedings as recorded;

That I am a disinterested person to said action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name on August 1, 2019.

Mary C. Clark
AAERT CERT*D-214
Certified Electronic Court
Reporter and Transcriber