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MR. LaPASK: Good afternoon. I'm Brian LaPask. I'm the Operations and Policy Manager in Program Services at OPSC. With me today is Tracy Sharp. She's the Career Tech Supervisor in our office. You guys probably have worked with her a great deal. You'll know who she is.

Our meeting today is scheduled for two hours. We're here from 1:00 to 3:00 today. So with that in mind, I'd just ask that you keep your comments focused. There's quite a few folks here. We'd like to hear from everybody who would like to speak.

If there's information that's been already stated, we could probably just keep it to that. It'd be appreciated very much. We do have plans for a follow-up meeting to this one. We're going to hold this meeting today.

Our goal is to get as much feedback as we can and then we'll summarize that and bring back another item at a future meeting. I'm not sure if it's scheduled yet, but if not, you'll hear about it in the near future.

And then if there are suggestions that we all come up with together, our goal would be to bring changes forward to the SAB -- the State Allocation Board in time for a sixth cycle. So that's kind of sum and stature for what we're doing.
So what brought us here today? During the last two career tech funding cycles, we've heard a lot of feedback from our school districts and stakeholders and most of it has been an interest in revisiting the funding order for the program and the criteria that kind of outlines our funding criteria and to see if there's anything that we could -- you know, any kind of thoughtful changes we could make to improve it better than it already it.

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

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

So -- as you know, currently, the criteria -- the way the funding order works, we order the applications by the score -- the CT score of the application that's provided by the Department of Education. Then we look at the locale where it's going to be located, urban, suburban, and rural, and we'll talk a little bit about more of that in just a
minute. And then if there's still a tie at that point, we look at weighted scores which is also provided by Department of Ed, whether or not the school district had an application funded in the current or previous cycle, and then if we need to, we would go to a lottery to break a tie after that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

    And before I turn this over to Tracy, some of the nuances in the criteria of the examples we provided -- the examples are just that. They're examples. They're not suggestions or recommendations. They're just to illustrate the way it would look in a few different configurations.
The information you'll see on those is based off of the fifth funding round -- the last funding round -- the projects that we received in that round, so it's that data. I think it might be important to remember that if we were to have a different set of data, we were to look at a different funding round from the past or a future funding round, it would likely result in different outcomes because we really don't know where the applications are going to come from, what kind of locale they're going to be from. So it's hard to sort of predict those things and say, you know, we know it would change it in this way because the makeup of a future round and the past rounds are -- you know, they're a lot different. It just really depends on who applies.

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

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

MS. SHARP: Okay. Thank you again for coming today. Again, my name is Tracy Sharp. I'm the Supervisor in Program Services for Career Technical Education. And, yes, picking up where Brian left off, as he mentioned, we have several scenarios that I'm going to walk you through,
take a look at, and then be ready for your feedback.

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

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

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

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

So if you have the packet available in front of
you, we have some copies here, an abbreviated portion of the packet and the meeting report and the full version is on our website, I'll call your attention to Attachments I, J, and K.

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

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

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

And what we got from you, the stakeholders, is --
are comments about where town fits in. Right now, urban is the 11, 12, and 13 codes. Suburban includes 21, 22, 23, 31, 32, and 33 and then rural is the 41, 42, and 43.

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

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

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

Then in scenario two, we took that same idea and put it within the service region model and looked at the
distribution and by spreading the funds out by high school
attendance area in the 11 service regions within the state,
you can see there what the -- the number of projects funded
would change to 26, 26, and only 8 in the rural category.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And then scenario two, once again the distribution
and now we're actually plugging in the regional cap based on the high school enrollment. The total amount of funding, the 125 million, is spread -- is prorated based on the high school attendance of each region there, that 125 million, so you can see the change in distribution of projects.

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

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

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

However, say there was more than one application that was submitted there that reached the new construction
cap of $3 million. If it was left at just the 2.2 million, you wouldn't really fund one whole project. So an alternative to this scenario could be to say ensure that at least either a minimum amount is allotted to each region or that at least one application is fully funded. So that's what the star is below scenario four.

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

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

With that, we welcome your comments and questions.

MR. LaPASK: Hi, Fred.

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

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

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

MS. SHARP: Absolutely.

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

MS. SHARP: Affect, yes.

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

MS. SHARP: Potentially.

MR. LaPASK: It could be.

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

MS. SHARP: Yes.

MR. YEAGER: So --

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

MR. YEAGER: Um-hmm.

MS. SHARP: Those had different amounts allotted
to them as well.

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

MS. SHARP: Yeah.

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

MS. SHARP: Um-hmm.

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

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

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

MR. PELLMAN: Hi.

MR. LaPASK: Hi.

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

As I'm listening to the different calculations about what is more equitable versus what is less equitable and is the current program equitable, what I'm hearing are lots of distribution of numbers, but I would like to get a little context sort of what's the context -- what defines
equity because equity can be seen as a distribution of
numbers, but that may not necessarily be equitable.

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

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

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

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

So I guess my comment is could those be considered
addressed in the score already or are they not addressed there. So that's a consideration.

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

MS. SHARP: Um-hmm.

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

MS. SHARP: Um-hmm.

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

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

Without an understanding of why you're making those changes other than, you know, more is distributed to one area or less to another area, it's really hard -- you
know, without understanding what your deliberations are, it's really hard to give feedback.

MS. SHARP: Um-hmm.

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

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

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

MR. PELLMAN: And so -- I'm making my last comment. If there was a broader context in the way that those were affecting, if you were looking -- if you had an objective as far as equity, you know, whether it be
populations, you know, you -- the OPSC and CDE decide that
they want to -- they see a deficit in the amount of CTE
programs in rural areas and therefore, they would like to
have the distribution be such that rural areas get a
better -- you know, have more opportunity to get those
funds, I can get behind that because it's based on data.

    MS. SHARP: Um-hmm.

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

    MS. SHARP: Um-hmm.

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

    MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

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

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

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

MS. SHARP: Not at all.

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

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

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

The recategorization of town remote to rural is
the appropriate one. I mention that not just in the CTE context. I can give my job title which would take a large card, but among the hats I wear, I'm a grant guy. I write grants for us and other districts.

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

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

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

That to me is the biggest thing. If we are appropriately categorized, frankly, it helps the suburban schools. I was sitting next to a person from Pleasanton, the gentleman from Elk Grove, I'm assuming they're also in
the suburban category, maybe not. But it moves that away and I think that's very important.

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

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

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

MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

MR. MURRAY: Hi. Thanks. My name is Rob Murray. I'm with King Consulting and I'm here today because we have worked on behalf of some school districts and just kind of coming on with and elaborating on some of the points that were just brought up by Mr. Bareilles.
We work with some of these districts who competed in the suburban category as what the NCES classifies as towns and especially for some of these districts that are competing in the agriculture or natural resources sector who are running -- or submitting these applications for facilities for their FFA programs.

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

But it is hard for some of these districts and the towns to see a -- you know, a good score but not good enough in the suburban but is significantly higher than some of the scores that are getting funded in rural. I mean that's what we put our finger on the equity issue with just making sure that there was a more even distribution between the categories and especially given that the NCES created four categories and the CTEFP moved forward with three. It does seem like a natural fit to take that fourth category and take it out of the largest CTEFP category and place it into
the smallest to even things out more, especially again
because as we just heard a lot of these towns, whether they
are remote or distant or fringe, a lot of them do
self-identify as being a rural community.
    And that is just what I wanted to point out there,
just on behalf of some of our districts who couldn't be here
today.

    MS. SHARP: Thank you.
    MR. LaPASK: Thank you.
    MR. REISING: Hello. Good afternoon. I'm Alan
Reising. I'm with Long Beach Unified School District.
First of all, I want to take a moment and thank you for
holding these meetings. As you can tell by some of the
comments that you're going to hear -- that you've already
heard and will hear, I think everybody has an opinion about
this as we look at the different service regions across the
state. So first of all, thank you for that.
    And then second of all, I'd like to invite the
opportunity to please bring this a little bit on the road.
I'd love very much if we could bring some of these
discussions down in Southern California area. There are
many districts in Southern California that do have an
opinion in this matter and I'd like to have an opportunity
in the south for some of those opinions to be heard.
    A lot of districts can't make this trek during the
summer and so the opportunity for some of us in the south to
come up and meet with this committee and have a discussion
would be very much beneficial.

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

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

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

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

I was also wondering if there's been some analysis
done that we could see if we did allocate the full
$250 million that was remaining and where this committee
would be on the topic of funding all of the remaining money in one additional funding cycle and whether or not that's something that we are going to be discussing here today or moving forward. I know that has been discussed at the Allocation Board's meeting and how that may impact some of the funding models and whether that distribution would address some of the equity concerns.

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

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

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

So I think that's the end of my comments. I want
to thank you for your time and thank you for holding this
and then again encourage us to bring this down to Southern
California so we can have further conversation. Thank you.

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

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

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

MR. LaPASK: One more cycle.

MR. REISING: Thank you. Thank you.

MS. SHARP: -- cycle six.

MR. REISING: Okay.

MS. SHARP: All right. Thanks.

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

So I wanted to talk to you a little bit about the
equity that has been mentioned several people before me. So
to give you some background. We are a school district of
about 10,000 students. Fairly small. We have two high schools. One is located as a -- tagged as a town fringe competing in the suburban. Another is considered city, small, and competing in the urban.

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

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

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

But then after we get scored, we get placed into these three categories and compete kind of on different
playing fields. So in able to kind of like level that playing field to just use scores, just go straight down by scores, we would have been funded where we weren't because of the different categories.

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

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

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

Thank you for your time. I appreciate it.

MS. SHARP: Thank you.
MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

With regards to the application and equity, maybe to counter what you've heard already today, I would say one aspect of equity is to be on guard for the Matthew Principle. To those who have, more will be given, and to those who have not, even what they have, they lose.
When you're from a bigger district -- and in our county, we have larger districts, smaller districts. They're able to hire or have on staff grant writers, people who know the hoops, know them well, can write particularly glowing applications. Whereas in the smaller districts, you have guys like me doing the best we can to pull together those committees, write it, and serve our kids to the best ability that we have.

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

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

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

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

MS. SHARP: Thank you.

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

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

And, you know, that's a little disheartening to feel like, yes, we have a strong proposal. We have a project that we know will benefit our students, that's in a career pathway that is growing in our region. And then to not have it be funded and then to look at the amount of work that went into preparing that application. Like the gentleman before me just mentioned, you know, although we are, you know, what on paper might look like a better resourced district -- I don't mean to say better, but a district where maybe we would have more resources to put into the application, the bottom line is it was a lot of nights and weekends by a handful of, you know, dedicated educators like my peers in the room.
So the decision on equity, it's definitely not an easy one and I think you can hear, you know, dozens of different ways to parse it out that may or may not be based on the self-interest of the individual in front of you and their organization.

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

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

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

And again, thinking about the manpower, expenses, and energy up and down the state that goes in to preparing these applications and knowing that -- I think there's
something like -- I don't know how many dozens of passing score projects that are there, that are ready and how a decision might make it simpler for everyone by funding those projects that already have been scored, that have already been determined to be passing and awarding them the funds.

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

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

    The reason I bring that up, we -- we actually had three projects submitted by our district that were different career pathways that would go towards creating a CTE building at one of our high schools that currently doesn't have an adequate CTE facility, and so the projects were all pretty similar and were written in parallel by the same
And so it was very interesting when we got those back to see how different the scores were and knowing there are some differences because of the career pathways that they address and there were some reasons that it was clear why one of them was scored differently from the other two. But just for example, one of our projects scored a 133, a 123, and a 93, and those are pretty wildly different scores. We had one that also had a 30 point span between its two scores and so the subjectivity of the scoring is the point that I want to make sure is on your minds as well. So going forward, since we are putting so much time, effort, and energy into these applications, how do we know that there's consistency in the scoring.

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

MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

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

So when we presented the proposal for a next cycle to the State Allocation Board, there were a couple of things outlined that basically in the Board discussion and in approving the sixth cycle and 250 million allotted to it.
In that item, we clarified a couple of things and one of those things was basically for legal reasons, we can't go back to those unfunded in cycle five and continue down the list.

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

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

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

And knowing that that's significant, as you've said and others, workload for a district to prepare that application, that's definitely notable. It sounds like
maybe you've already pursued that option of requesting from
Department of Education your scoring rubric and areas --
comments from the readers to help you move forward. And so
it looks like you've already, you know, pursued some of
those avenues and in part, I'm saying those out loud not
only in response to you, but also for any other listeners
out there who may or may not have taken advantage of that
opportunity to do so.

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

MS. CUTTER: Okay. All right.
MS. SHARP: Thanks.
MS. CUTTER: Thank you.
MR. LaPASK: Thank you.
MS. PERSINGER: Hi, guys.
MS. SHARP: Good afternoon.
MR. PERSINGER: Thank you for holding this
hearing. Alexis Persinger and I'm with Persinger
Architects. So as an architect, I thought I would share my
perspective because I don't represent just one school
district. I have probably 20 in Northern California that I
work with, and I want to kind of advocate for our rural
districts and so the first part of that is this idea of moving folks who got into town back into rural.

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

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

MS. SHARP: Um-hmm.

MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

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

The other thing that I see a lot with -- you know,
we're talking about 10,000-kid districts. My districts are 2,000 kids, 500 kids, 200 kids.

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

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

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

Because what I'm seeing -- and this is a little personal for me because I was a continuation high school kid, right? I was a kid who shop kept me there and so getting kids to college is amazing, but finding a path for kids who aren't going to college is also really important and it's what this program's about, right?
Our real rural towns that are sending kids to be welders and to work on farms, those ag type programs aren't getting funded. They're not sexy. They're not exciting. They're kind of boring, right? But that's what we're supposed to be funding.

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

MS. SHARP: Thank you.

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

MS. SHARP: Hi.

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

And one of the things that I'm looking at, I'm feeling pretty good about scenario one and the reason I'm feeling good about that is that as I see the numbers move over, it looks like what we've got now is you've got 21 of the rural schools getting funded, but of those, it's a bunch of town ones that moved over and had those higher scores and just knowing that now that 21 out of 51 got funded, I think
for those of us that were the grant writers it's not going
to be -- I know some folks who are just let's score down the
line, you know, et cetera, but I think that you know
fundamentally that those scores have gone up in the rural
area now because you've included the towns and the fringes
and I think I did the analysis and I think the lowest funded
score would have been like a 124 in the rural area as
opposed to a 109 and that's because we shifted the towns and
the fringes over to the rural and then the suburban scores
that were there that have a bunch of 131s and higher that
didn't get funded would then at least get a little more
exposure.

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

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

And when you go and you do this model where you
break it up, I'm going to be honest, I don't really get a
total sense of where the regional lines came from, but it feels an awful lot like just gerrymandering, like just artificial boundaries.

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

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

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

And I think that we -- I don't really understand why we would do that. And then the other thing is the number of students that are enrolled in a district -- again
it's just not indicative of even how many CTE programs there are. So you could have an area that has no CTE programs and a lot of students in it and then they're going to get more funding allocated which what that's going to lead to is programs that area, you know, receiving lower scores not getting funded.

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

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

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

And what I've heard from the state is we don't
want to put that information out because it just confuses the people more and I'm like I'm happy to be confused. Give me more data and let me sort through the data and let me decide how confused I'm going to be.

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

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

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

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

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

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

But I'd say that when you see it go round over round over round and you've got a 131 and you just keep going, wow, that is just -- they're funding anything, it really takes away the whole idea of why are we having a competitive process and this is one of the few grant applications and opportunities in the state where you actually can go and compete. A lot of stuff isn't like that and I think that there's value in having that competitive nature and the score really is doing -- as others have said,
it's vetting already that -- those evaluations of the number of students involved in the program, et cetera.

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

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

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

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

MS. SHARP: Thank you.

MR. ABO-SHAER: Thank you.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Good afternoon. Elona Cunningham, Jake Schrader & Associates. I think that the first step in establishing equity for the program is to
re-review the parameters of determining suburban, urban, and rural school districts due to the fact that some truly rural districts are classified as suburban and there are some truly suburban districts that are classified as rural.

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

Thank you.

MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

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

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

Yeah. I think -- well, if we look back for a second, look at some of the great progress the state's made on trying to make it more equitable especially for small school districts and rural and if we look at the original 900 million we had for career tech in the beginning, it was going to be a competitive grant and I literally called the
state superintendent. I said, Tom, I cannot compete against Long Beach and Elk Grove. I've got these little districts. They have been in this business ten years. They've got National Foundation funding. They're unbelievable to steal things from, but to compete with the -- Hoosiers happened in 1950 in basketball and it hasn't happened since because we separate sports specifically so it's a more competitive and equitable environment for small school districts, and I think when it comes to this type of work, we need to keep looking at models that do that.

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

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

A bad decision was the school improvement grants. They were a competitive grant for schools that were in program improvement and beyond, and I sent a map down to CDE
and said, look, here's a map of California. You have not funded one school in the north state either in Humboldt or anything up north and when we applied with nine, we did not get funded and Sac. City Unified got six different funding sources for a huge amount of millions of dollars.

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

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

I will say -- my last thing is I like the idea of
having a competitive grant, but based on -- either based on the rural, the model you have, or really maybe look at the enrollment thing because you may have some districts -- capacity's capacity.

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

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

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

MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

MS. SHARP: Thank you.

MR. McQUEEN: Dave McQueen. I'm the Superintendent at Kelseyville Unified School District which is truly a rural school. We have about 3,000 people in the town. As the architect, Alexis Persinger, pointed out, we were built around homes and no open fields.
I'm here, first of all, just to clarify some things. You have nothing to do with the applications. You're just -- OPSC is just allocating the funds based on what CDE's application process is, right? Correct?

MS. SHARP: Basically.

MR. LaPASK: By the score, yeah.

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

MS. SHARP: Two steps.

MR. McQUEEN: Two steps.

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

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

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

So when you are talking about equity, I think you really need to look at that NCES and I know that -- because
when I called and talked to you -- and thank you so much. I just want to thank you, getting back to us and the whole -- I really appreciated the process -- that nobody really ever looked at it and I know that it's an issue of having enough employees and this and that, but it's really an algorithm type of thing that's coming from the federal government and were all those codes.

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

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

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

MS. SHARP: Okay. Thank you. I'll just make a quick comment on that. I think another speaker mentioned it as well is that when we're looking at the NCES data for establishing the locale, it is a school site basis currently, not a districtwide basis. So I think that just
to add that to the conversation. We're looking at it based on where your school site is, not the district as a whole at this point in time. So thank you.

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

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

I did also want to bring to awareness to this group that the 250 million being approved for the sixth cycle was approved, as you mentioned, and it came as a result of a lot of us rallying around that to really say and to point out as you did earlier, Tracy, that of the unfunded projects that are remaining from cycle five, all of them could be captured with 250 million.
And so that was why we were advocating for that, for the money to go deeper because as we saw in cycle four and five, there were a lot of -- there was a bottleneck of high scoring applications that were unable to be funded.

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

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

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

And so I just wanted to reflect to people that in a way that's not a human issue. That's a legislative issue that was already predetermined.
I do want to voice that I support wholeheartedly scenario one and reclassifying the town locales so that overall what I and others see that the town locales really would be more appropriate in the rural category and so that rural scores can be competing against rural scores, urban against urban, suburban against suburban.

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

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

I also finally just want to voice that I do not support the service region model because I truly believe that there is some real arbitrariness of associating CTE programs with the number of students enrolled in a region. There's really no correlation there. I think that's really faulty and I -- just I can't support it at all. So I just want to say clearly I support scenario one. Thank you so much.

MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

MR. PELLMAN: Back again. John Pellman. Again,
appreciate the opportunity to be able to speak and I'm ---
it's eye opening to hear the different comments and I
appreciate how complex this issue is for you and for all of
us to get right. So I just would like to make my comment.

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

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

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

So I think this is a very complicated question. I
just would like to say I don't want that point to be lost,
that when we talk about what is rural, it is not necessarily
the district. It is the school and maybe that you want --
you may want to revisit how you classify districts or where
the applications come from based on the size of the district
as opposed to the school itself. I certainly can empathize
with those school districts.

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

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

And I would encourage OPSC to look at a broader
definition of what equity is because I think ultimately --
obviously, we're all here to serve kids and while the
districts that support these applications need to be served
and their voices need to be heard, we're really looking at
how do we serve kids and the kids -- if we're talking about
equity, the kids who have the greatest need.
But complex questions. Again I appreciate the opportunity to speak and it's been eye opening hearing the comments from everyone. Thank you.

MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

MS. SHARP: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

MR. LaPASK: Two of you.

MR. ADAMS: So I just encourage you to look at your review process and have consistency in the review process. We did go over to CDE and have a meeting with
regard to trying to look at how our applications became so inconsistent with regard to the different reviewers and we think that some work on making that process more consistent between the reviewers so that people don't have questions about whether their application was really read by somebody who understands the programs that are being applied for.

Thank you very much.

MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

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

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

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

And then also I would be in favor of scenario one for the equitable distribution of funds as well as for just
the -- you know, in order to fund those high scoring applications for several years, that we've already spent thousands of dollars on and man time to be approved and move forward for our students. Thank you very much.

MR. LaPASK: Thank you.

MS. SHARP: Thank you, Melanie.

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

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

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

I don't have a time when we might take this to the SAB. We haven't discussed exactly when that would be yet,
but we do intend -- if there are changes that come about, we do intend to try to implement those for the sixth cycle. It would make sense to do that, so we plan to try to get them into the sixth cycle. I don't know what the timeline would be yet.

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

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

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

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Have it in Kelseyville.

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

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

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

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

MR. LaPASK: Yeah.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) Long Beach is beautiful this time of year.

MR. LaPASK: Long Beach is beautiful.

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

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

(Whereupon, at 1:29 p.m., the proceedings were adjourned.)
TRANSCRIBER’S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO ) ss.

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