

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

McBRIDE HIGH SCHOOL  
AUDITORIUM  
7205 Parkcrest Street  
Long Beach, CA 90808

DATE: WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 14, 2019  
TIME: 10:01 A.M.

Reported By: Troy Ray  
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:

LISA SILVERMAN, Executive Officer

TRACY SHARP, Supervisor, Career Tech

P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2  
3 MS. SILVERMAN: Good morning, everyone. Hey, it's  
4 10:00 o'clock -- a little slightly after 10:00 and welcome  
5 to our second public meeting on the career tech education  
6 funding distribution order. So I'm Lisa Silverman and I'm  
7 the Executive Officer for the Office of Public School  
8 Construction and next to me is Tracy Sharp and she will be  
9 leading the discussion today.

10 But I want to first thank Long Beach Unified for  
11 hosting this event here and they put out a generous offer a  
12 few weeks ago and I thank them for hosting us today. So  
13 Brooke, Marie, and Al Rising for taking us up on this offer  
14 and thank you for extending that offer and the many folks  
15 here that helped facilitate that today.

16 So thank you again, and we would like to welcome  
17 all the folks that are here in the audience and those who  
18 aren't able to be here today, thank you for joining for our  
19 webcast. So we're looking to have a very robust  
20 conversation and getting some input from you folks and Tracy  
21 will go over some deadlines that we -- if you can't join us  
22 today, if you could submit your comments to us. I believe  
23 we have a time certain and she'll go over those details.

24 So again, our goal is to put this funding out as  
25 soon as possible. So we have \$250 million. Who wants

1 money. Yea. I want to give it out. So let's get this  
2 going. So here we go, Tracy.

3 MS. SHARP: Thank you very much, Lisa, and good  
4 morning from beautiful Long Beach here. So once again, my  
5 name is Tracy Sharp. I've been a supervisor with the Office  
6 of Public School Construction for a number of years and have  
7 enjoyed working with applicants of the career technical  
8 education facilities program since 2006 when this great  
9 program was first established by Proposition 1D and then  
10 reinfused with funds with the passage of Proposition 51.

11 So as Lisa mentioned, this is our second public  
12 stakeholder meeting regarding one aspect of the career  
13 technical education facilities program and that's the  
14 funding order portion of it.

15 As you know, after Prop. 51 passed, there were --  
16 we've held two funding cycles and that was funding cycles  
17 four and five. Previously through Prop. 1D, we were able to  
18 fund funding cycles one, two, and three, and as cycles four  
19 and five progressed, we got -- each of those cycles had  
20 125 million allocated to them from the total 500 million  
21 that was provided by Proposition 51.

22 And through those and during those cycles and  
23 afterward, stakeholders, districts, and others gave us some  
24 feedback on the results of that funding and two main things  
25 came out of it.

1           One was a general concern about the current  
2 methodology. In cycles one and two, we followed a service  
3 region model where the funding was distributed statewide and  
4 then within a particular region -- the 11 services regions,  
5 projects were ordered by score. Each current application  
6 gets a score from the Department of Education and then is  
7 also designated with a locale, urban, suburban, or rural.

8           We take those locales from the National Center for  
9 Education statistics and as we were going through cycles  
10 four and five, some districts noted that while we have three  
11 funding locales, there is a fourth that is in the NCES  
12 database called town. And currently, based on SFP  
13 regulations, the town numbers for 31, 32, and 33 are  
14 included in the suburban group, and there were some comments  
15 received that said, well, really should we take a second  
16 look at that. Should town be not grouped in suburban.  
17 Maybe there should be a consideration for grouping it in the  
18 rural category based on the locations.

19           So as a result of that feedback, following cycles  
20 four and five, we have had, as Lisa mentioned -- or we  
21 developed two stakeholder meetings. The first one was held  
22 July 24th, got some great comments from people who were able  
23 to attend that one, and now here we are again today.

24           So in preparation for these two meetings, the  
25 first one, we have a meeting report that we posted on the

1 website and is also provided here today. I'll be speaking  
2 to those handouts. The first one had a full -- from  
3 July 24th had a full history of the implementation committee  
4 meetings that happened in 2006 as well as the State  
5 Allocation Board item that approved our regulations. And so  
6 those are part of the July 24th meeting report and were  
7 referenced in the meeting agenda for today. So you have  
8 those as backup to refer to.

9           So in looking at this issue and in preparation for  
10 these meetings, staff decided -- or we decided basically to  
11 look at the actual funding that came -- as a dataset, the  
12 applications that came in in cycle five. And based on the  
13 comments received about the service region model and the  
14 potential movement of town locale codes to -- from suburban  
15 to rural, we developed some scenarios, examples of, well,  
16 what if things moved or what if we changed it.

17           We created what we call scenarios. So in your  
18 meeting handouts for today, I'll be focusing on  
19 Attachments I, J, and Number 1. The Attachments I and J  
20 come from the July 24th meeting report and Attachment 1 is a  
21 variation of what was presented at the July 24th meeting.  
22 As a result of stakeholder comments, we had one more  
23 scenario that evolved from it.

24           So what are these scenarios. As I mentioned, we  
25 took the data from cycle five, actual applications received,

1 and said, okay, what was the distribution because that was  
2 one of the concerns that was mentioned is the basically  
3 equity in the distribution of funding. What was noticed is  
4 that while that lower scoring applications in the rural  
5 group, more or almost all of them got funded versus higher  
6 scoring applications in the suburban group did not get  
7 funded based on the current model which says take all of the  
8 applications, look at their scores received from their grant  
9 application review with the Department of Education, and  
10 fund in order of representing each locale -- the highest  
11 scoring application from each locale and doing sort of a  
12 round robin.

13           And as you go through those, because of the sheer  
14 numbers of, you know, less rural applications and a fair  
15 number from the suburban group and a fair number from the  
16 urban group, what resulted you can see if I refer -- bring  
17 your attention to Attachment J -- has a series of tables  
18 there -- is that of the projects funded, we had an even  
19 distribution based on the current funding model of projects  
20 funded, but the total projects submitted is much higher.

21           So we had 91 in the urban category, 106 in the  
22 suburban category, and 23 submitted in the rural category,  
23 and you can see the percentage there of projects funded is,  
24 as I mentioned, you know, predominantly the rural category  
25 was -- more of them or almost all of them were funded versus

1 the other.

2           So with that -- those stakeholder comments in  
3 mind, we created these various scenarios and the data  
4 represented in the tables on Attachment 5 represents how --  
5 if we made certain changes to the funding order, how would  
6 that play out.

7           So in the first scenario, we just said, okay,  
8 based on the suggestion, let's move all of those projects  
9 that would have been in the town grouping to suburban. How  
10 would the funding fall out and that resulted in moving 28  
11 applications from the suburban category to the rural  
12 category and then you can see in the -- how many projects  
13 would be funded.

14           It changes the distribution of funding for the  
15 rural category and the others a bit. And then we move onto  
16 scenario two. It takes into consideration, well, what if we  
17 went back to the original style we considered the service  
18 region model.

19           The original service region model said take the  
20 total funding available in a cycle, prorate it by the high  
21 school enrollment for that region -- and there's a 11  
22 service regions -- and then use the funding model within  
23 each to allocate the funds. So that was scenario two,  
24 incorporating service regions into the current funding  
25 order.

1           And you can see the layout or how the distribution  
2 of funding occurs there on Attachment J under scenario two.

3           Another way of distributing the funding is in  
4 scenario 3A. If we just went straight score, the statute  
5 requires that projects be reviewed by the Department of  
6 Education. They get a score. If you have a minimum score  
7 of 105, you can submit a funding application to OPSC and if  
8 it was just based on highest score, locales at that point  
9 would not be taken into consideration. But this table  
10 represents what that model would result in, how the  
11 layout -- or how those funds would be distributed.

12           And we see in that one the suburban category ends  
13 up with more projects funded and then urban and then rural.

14           So taking that scenario 3A of just looking at  
15 score and adjusting it just a little bit for purposes of  
16 just looking at how would the distribution be if we moved  
17 town to suburban -- or town from suburban to rural, what  
18 would the funding distribution look like in scenario 3B.

19           We haven't changed it. We're still working off of  
20 the highest score, but if we -- if those projects --  
21 definitions -- the locale definitions changed, how would the  
22 distribution be as far as types of projects and their  
23 locale. And so scenario 3B represents that distribution.

24           Scenario 4 then takes another turn and adds back  
25 in the service region model. So we have the service region

1 model applied to the urban/suburban locale and scoring, but  
2 now town has moved into the rural area locale for this one.  
3 And you can see the change in the distribution.

4           So we presented these scenarios on July 24th in  
5 Sacramento and got some comments on them and one of the  
6 comments that came out afterward is a scenario that we had  
7 not considered beforehand or put into our options. So  
8 that's where, if you look at Attachment 1, you see a  
9 variation in the scenario where -- we call it 1B. It moves  
10 town from the suburban locale to the rural locale and as a  
11 further change, it looks at it and says let's consider  
12 putting the -- taking the funding for 125 million and  
13 prorate it based on the number of applications that come in  
14 for each locale and then go through the funding order  
15 process.

16           This came from stakeholders -- this suggestion.  
17 So you see the funding there, 125 million, is prorated by  
18 the number of applications in each group and it provides  
19 a -- once again, the distribution of projects funded is  
20 represented there in scenario 1B on Attachment 1.

21           For purposes of demonstrating the distribution  
22 regionally is one the things that in the original planning  
23 for in cycles one and two is how do we spread the funding  
24 that's available statewide. That's where that regional --  
25 the 11 service regions came from.

1           You'll see on Attachment K how we've taken each  
2 one of the funding models and said if we apply this funding  
3 model or scenario as it were, where do funds end up at that  
4 point on a regional basis if we're -- based on those  
5 scenarios.

6           So Attachment K is informational in that it  
7 demonstrates the regional distribution of funding with each  
8 of those variables applied to the scenarios.

9           So I know there's a lot of data there to absorb  
10 and a bunch of attachments and hopefully, you've had an  
11 opportunity to look at that maybe look at that before the  
12 meeting or if you didn't, you're kind of absorbing it now.

13           We also included in today's meeting report a  
14 summary of the comments that we received from the July 24th  
15 meeting and that's in the August 14th meeting report. Our  
16 goal is to take those comments as well as what we receive  
17 today, kind of summarize those, and moving forward, take  
18 them to the Board.

19           The Board's heard some comments at our past  
20 meetings about this issue. It did in June designate the  
21 next sixth cycle to utilize all the remaining -- or allocate  
22 all the remaining 250 million. The dates for that will be  
23 announced hopefully sometime soon. We're working on that.

24           But with those factors in mind, I would like to  
25 open it up to questions and public comment at this time. So

1 in giving your public comment here, what I would ask is as  
2 you come up, give your name for -- it'll help us keep track  
3 of where our comments are coming from and follow up as  
4 needed. And we'd really like to hear your thoughts on any  
5 of these scenarios that we've presented or if you have a new  
6 idea on something that hasn't been considered here.

7           These are certainly -- the options are truly  
8 unlimited. We've taken some examples here based on the  
9 cycle five data as our, you know, kind of jumping off point  
10 and so we look forward to your thoughts on where we are  
11 right now. We have a microphone right here at the base of  
12 the stage and so at this time, feel free to come up, and  
13 even if you just have a question or need a clarification on  
14 something we've presented or in our packet here, questions  
15 are welcome as well.

16           MR. ISBELL: Good morning. My name is Don Isbell.  
17 I'm the Director of Career Technical Education for Santa Ana  
18 Unified School District in Orange County. We're currently  
19 about the second largest school district in Orange County  
20 servicing approximately 50,000 students; Capistrano right  
21 around 51,000 students as well to give you an idea for the  
22 two largest districts in the county.

23           I think I could speak on behalf of both of us.  
24 We'd also like to be moved to rural. We may have challenges  
25 in being able to do that, but I think that's actually

1 something that it does lead to in that in urban districts,  
2 addressing the Southern California region, you know, whether  
3 it's LA, Long Beach, our many different communities that  
4 we've got here locally, that we definitely, as far as the  
5 way the numbers have been playing out, seen a disparity in  
6 the way that our students are being serviced as far as four  
7 new CTE facilities, that due to the way the distribution  
8 works, it is wonderful and it's providing additional  
9 resources towards our Central Valley and Northern regions  
10 which often get ignored, often within sequences where this  
11 has happened in the past as far as funding for other types  
12 of activities.

13           And I think the intent of the imbalance was, is  
14 knowing they didn't have necessarily the resources or the  
15 ability to be able to pull together an application that  
16 maybe would be strong to a committee, that that had been  
17 something that is early on and what has been a reason for  
18 part of this way of addressing it.

19           Since now virtually every rural project has been  
20 funded that had a score that qualified, I think we should be  
21 looking at a potential new option and that would be of just  
22 removing that. I think we've given balance for our Central  
23 Valley, for our Northern region to be able to fund those  
24 many important projects that they do have, but the idea was  
25 that we were trying to build equity across the system.

1           Maybe we need to be taking a look at that a little  
2 bit differently and being able to look at the scores and now  
3 looking at the application based on their individual merit  
4 as opposed to looking at individual regions.

5           And I think that should give some better equity  
6 for some of the urban districts which honestly have not had  
7 as large of a share due to the way the current funding cycle  
8 works.

9           I have my -- Jeremy Cogan is our Director of  
10 Facilities. Jeremy.

11           MR. COGAN: I'm not as tall as Don, so I'll pick  
12 up the mic. Good morning. I'm Jeremy Cogan, Director of  
13 Facilities Planning for Santa Ana Unified, and I'll echo  
14 some of what Don said.

15           I can't help but think of the cartoon that maybe  
16 some of us have seen of the three children trying to watch a  
17 baseball game and the first pane of the cartoon is equality  
18 because they're all standing on the same platform, but one  
19 child is taller, one child's medium size, one child is  
20 short. So they can't all see over the fence to the baseball  
21 game.

22           The second pane of the cartoon is equity and  
23 equity, they're given different platforms to stand on so  
24 they can all see over the fence, and of course, the last  
25 pane is without barriers because the fence is simply

1 removed.

2           And I thought it was so apropos, that cartoon, to  
3 this urban/rural/suburban locale comment. I agree with my  
4 colleague and with some of my colleagues in other districts  
5 around the state that when it comes to funding these  
6 programs, if we look at the voters in California that  
7 approved Proposition 51, the voters weren't delineated by  
8 urban, rural, and suburban.

9           If we look at the taxpayers that are paying for  
10 Proposition 51, we're not changing the amount of tax based  
11 on urban, rural, and suburban. In fact, the suburban and  
12 urban communities are probably contributing more to that tax  
13 base in support of Proposition 51.

14           I'm very much in support of any efforts you can  
15 take to expedite the process and I think it was said earlier  
16 that you want to get these funds in the hands of school  
17 districts as fast as possible.

18           One of the things that school districts are  
19 fighting a very uphill battle with right now is cost  
20 escalation. Projects are getting more costly at and  
21 increasing rate. We have a strong and vibrant economy and  
22 as a result of that economy, construction costs are changing  
23 rapidly.

24           Projects that might have been submitted in round  
25 four that were then resubmitted in round five probably cost

1 5 to 10 percent more to build now. Projects that will be  
2 submitted in round six will be the same issue.

3 So in a perfect world, we would take all of those  
4 applications from round five that received a passing score  
5 and we wouldn't wait until the May or June SAB meeting to  
6 fund those. We'd fund them right now and we'd get those on  
7 the street right now for design and construction because  
8 ultimately it would save quite a bit of tax money statewide  
9 by pursuing those projects earlier.

10 Obviously, from the standpoint of equity as  
11 opposed to equality, we'd like see that areas where we're  
12 serving a large number of high school students that those  
13 high school students have that opportunity.

14 Scenario 2 and scenario 4 appear to be provide  
15 more of that and I'm certainly open to hearing comments from  
16 others and learning more about the scenarios through the  
17 course of today's commentary before giving any final  
18 recommendation on that, but we believe that we'd really like  
19 to see the grant application score -- which by the way, and  
20 I think others have mentioned this too, considers high  
21 school enrollment, industry needs, and labor market trends.  
22 So that CDE process is already looking at that.

23 We'd like to see those scores be set up in such a  
24 way -- the OPSC process set up in such a way that recognizes  
25 those high scoring applications. As my colleague Don

1 mentioned earlier, if we were rural, every single one of our  
2 projects would have been funded and so unfortunately that  
3 wasn't the case, but we're very much in support of the  
4 efforts you're doing.

5           We appreciate very much you having the stakeholder  
6 meeting in Southern California today. That's a huge support  
7 to us as many of us can't get up to Sacramento and we  
8 appreciate all the efforts you're doing to try to fund these  
9 projects as rapidly as possible. Thank you.

10           MS. SHARP: Anyone else have thoughts on the  
11 subject, current scenarios, or other options?

12           MS. SAPINOSO: Good morning. My name is Erin  
13 Sapinoso. I'm with the Los Angeles Unified School District.  
14 Thank you for this opportunity for comment and regarding the  
15 funding order for career technical education facilities  
16 program, Los Angeles Unified School District supports  
17 scenario 1B as an alternative strategy for promoting equity  
18 in funding order.

19           LAUSD agrees with removing National Center for  
20 Education statistics locale codes of 31, 32, and 33 from  
21 suburban area and reclassifying them to rural area. LAUSD  
22 also agrees with determining the proportion of submitted  
23 applications based on locale, rural, urban, and suburban.

24           For each current cycle, determining the  
25 corresponding maximum monetary allotment each locale can

1 receive given the grant authority for the cycle and  
2 apportioning grants based on California Department of  
3 Education application scores within each locale up to the  
4 maximum amount.

5 Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

6 MS. SHARP: Thank you. I would also like to add  
7 that, as Lisa mentioned earlier, as part of our meeting  
8 announcement on our webpage, we are, for those of you who  
9 couldn't be in Sacramento or were not able to attend today's  
10 meeting or maybe you just need a little more time to gather  
11 your thoughts, if you would like to submit written comments,  
12 there is a dedicated CTE email address as part of the  
13 meeting notice that you can submit a -- send a letter, send  
14 an email from your district representing your thoughts on  
15 it.

16 We would like to have those if possible by this  
17 Friday to help -- to give us time to gather our thoughts and  
18 make a complete report prepared for the State Allocation  
19 Board's consideration. So if possible, we'd love to get  
20 your written comments by this Friday to that email address  
21 that's on there. Or if you find my email address on the  
22 website as part of our directory or Ms. Silverman's, it will  
23 certainly get to us as well. So we appreciate those written  
24 comments very much as well for anybody who might be watching  
25 and for those who are in attendance.

1           Looks like we have another speaker. Please join  
2 us.

3           MR. PACE: Tom Pace representing San Bernardino.  
4 It's casual Tuesday for us -- or Wednesday. I'm not sure.  
5 I've been on vacation for a couple weeks.

6           I just wanted to say that many in the Los Angeles  
7 area consider San Bernardino rural. So like my colleague  
8 from Santa Ana, we'd love to be considered a rural  
9 community. We too represent 50,000 students. We are an  
10 urban area.

11           I would say that the distribution has not landed  
12 in our favor. Of all of our applications, every one of them  
13 received a qualifying score and had we been rural, would  
14 have been funded. We have only had one of our applications  
15 funded.

16           The majority of our applications scored in the  
17 high 120s. I would say looking at the previous funding  
18 cycles, many high schools received -- in the rural area, a  
19 single high school I think received more than eight  
20 applications.

21           I would look at limiting the amount of  
22 applications per high school so that you get an equal  
23 distribution amongst high schools within a district. I  
24 would say that the more that we file, I think the intention  
25 is to build a brand new high school where each wing is a CTE

1 component. I would say that it's looking for individualized  
2 areas that need specific investment. I think merit should  
3 stand on its own rather than locale.

4 I agree with my colleagues from Los Angeles. Of  
5 the proposed options, I would say 1B favors urban, but we're  
6 open to other ideas as well. Thank you.

7 MS. SHARP: Thank you for your comments. Any  
8 other attendees -- you're welcome to come up and as I said,  
9 I welcome questions as well. If there was something that --  
10 in this that you would like clarification on, please feel  
11 free.

12 And maybe what I'll add too, something that came  
13 up as we were talking earlier that was part of our item --  
14 our report to the State Allocation Board when we took the  
15 discussion forward in June regarding the next cycle,  
16 something that was in there that we want to make sure is  
17 broadly known I that if you have a score letter from cycles  
18 four or five going into cycle six that you are content with,  
19 you believe it's a good score and you can use that score  
20 letter moving forward to support your application in cycle  
21 six.

22 There is a caveat to that, though, is that that  
23 score letter represents the grant application that was  
24 submitted to CDE at the time and received that score. So we  
25 wouldn't accept changes to that application. It would have

1 to be the CDE grant application that achieved that score,  
2 would be there to support your funding application to OPSC.  
3 So it wouldn't allow for changes of scope or budget or  
4 industry sector or anything like that. But you can use it.

5           So moving forward, as I mentioned, we don't have  
6 solidified dates at the moment for cycle six of when you  
7 would have the opportunity to resubmit grant applications to  
8 Department of Education and then to OPSC, but those score  
9 letters are still valid when they come in with the same  
10 grant application.

11           And we do understand that that may or -- you know,  
12 it's a local decision to use that because we have heard you  
13 mention from a number of you outside of the actual public  
14 comment that costs are escalating. So that is a point that  
15 is important if you're looking at your grant application to  
16 consider those costs.

17           And if you're reapplying because you didn't get  
18 funded previously, changing up your budget is definitely  
19 something you'd want to take into consideration.

20           MS. SAPINOSO: Hi again. I had questions about --  
21 I know that you had just said that there's no solidified  
22 deadlines for cycle six. Do you have an estimation as to  
23 when this might be moving forward given the stakeholder  
24 meetings, where you're presenting to SAB, and then when  
25 those deadlines might occur?

1 MS. SILVERMAN: So the goal is actually to take a  
2 policy item to the Board in a matter of weeks and whether or  
3 not we have some recommendations as a result of your  
4 feedback because your feedback is really important about the  
5 funding order. So that's really vital on how we receive the  
6 remaining 250-.

7 So again, depending on the feedback we receive by  
8 Friday, we're hoping to share some thoughts with the Board  
9 on how we'd like to proceed, if they want to change -- if  
10 there's a desire to change the funding order. So that's one  
11 item we need to knock out that recommendation.

12 And then if it does follow through with a  
13 regulation change -- and that's something that we would  
14 proceed as well. So that would be the second component of  
15 that, if the Board is fine with changing the funding order.

16 And then what we really have goals is to announce  
17 at our August Board meeting is the timelines. Absolutely  
18 with -- you know, and that is coupled with Department of  
19 Education.

20 So their application timeline is coupled with our  
21 funding timeline. We're actually hoping that they mirror  
22 the same timelines as last year. So that's really our goal  
23 is the same mirrored process. So that's what we're shooting  
24 for.

25 I can't commit to that at this point in time

1 because, you know, it's a multi-agency process and we're  
2 open and we all want to eat cake at the same time, but,  
3 yeah, our goal is to get those to mirror the same timeline.

4           So really 250- is what we want to get out as  
5 quickly as possible and to streamline that process as  
6 quickly as possible as well and again, our goal is to bring,  
7 if there are any, changes to the Board as rapidly as  
8 possible as well, so you know what the funding order is  
9 going to be and that makes it a very clear process for you  
10 as well.

11           So -- and hopefully the scenarios were clear as  
12 far as how this all shakes up and how this potentially  
13 shakes up for the future. And if you folks didn't have an  
14 opportunity to file this last round, here it is. One and  
15 done. Your opportunity to file for this round is open now.  
16 So let's not drag. Let's dust those applications off if you  
17 haven't done already. Let's apply for the program because  
18 we want to do whatever we can to invest in the future of our  
19 kids.

20           So let's not sit around. Let's do it. So let's  
21 get the kids the education they need and let's have the  
22 facility we want to build. So again, let's have a robust  
23 conversation. Let's bring this forward. So we're looking  
24 forward to having these applications pushed through and  
25 across the finish line.

1 I'm not sure. Does anyone else want to comment  
2 or -- no? All righty. Yes. We'll give the gentleman a few  
3 more minutes.

4 MR. LAMPKIN: So my name is Dr. Edgar Lampkin and  
5 I am the Superintendent of Williams Unified School District,  
6 located an hour north of Sacramento. So I am a lone wolf  
7 here.

8 I have applied for the CTE FP funding over the  
9 last two rounds. In the first round, our funding  
10 qualification was missed by one point with a score of 124  
11 and qualified -- the qualification was 125.

12 I appealed it and was denied. Even though there  
13 was a high number of suburban grants funded because of the  
14 higher number and the competition with suburban areas, we  
15 did not get funded.

16 For the second round, based on the data that I  
17 received from CDE and looked at the most recent postings of  
18 schools that were denied funding on this round, it is my  
19 belief that the categorization model that OPSC used was  
20 unfair to schools designated town locale.

21 Furthermore, I feel it is inevitable -- or excuse  
22 me. I feel it is inequitable to depressed communities that  
23 further lack resources and bond power due to its low  
24 socioeconomic demographic because that is not taken into  
25 account or seen as a criteria for selection.

1           Any school designated as town was placed in the  
2 category of suburban and because of this, a computer  
3 driven -- I believe it's a computer driven designation by  
4 NCES, no humans really have looked at these designations or  
5 labels.

6           I find it kind of ludicrous that Oxnard, Elk  
7 Grove, Kern Union, San Lorenzo Valley, and other schools in  
8 high population areas were designated by NCES as rural while  
9 Williams and Kelseyville were designated in the suburban  
10 category as town.

11           Williams is truly rural with a population of about  
12 5,300 and no more than 15,400 in our entire county. So  
13 we're very small. But according to the NCES model, we  
14 aren't considered rural.

15           Of course, this large district and others in rural  
16 will be funded and because we are in the suburban category,  
17 we are not funded.

18           In reflection, I see a problem with the current  
19 methodology in addition to a problem of socioeconomic  
20 disparities not being considered. I feel it is not fair and  
21 puts smaller and high socioeconomically depressed school  
22 districts at a disadvantage by being placed in the suburban  
23 category.

24           I truly hope that some consideration can be made  
25 to help address this situation. Your proposals are

1 attempting to address more equitably the allocation of  
2 funding based on region or NCES codes. However, I do not  
3 see OPSC taking into consideration communities that are  
4 depressed socioeconomically and so small that state funding  
5 match is essential to accomplish CTE projects in such  
6 communities.

7 My small highly rural school district with  
8 92 percent of our students being low socioeconomic was  
9 designated as town and placed in suburban in the last  
10 go-round. If it had been designated as rural, we would  
11 probably have been funded.

12 As OPSC decides on the changes of funding order,  
13 please consider also taking into account small, depressed  
14 communities as a criteria. Our voice is small in the big  
15 picture of California. Nevertheless, I came here all the  
16 way from Williams, California, a small rural community to  
17 speak on their behalf. Thank you.

18 MS. SHARP: Thank you for your comments. I  
19 appreciate it. Anybody else? All right. Well, if that's  
20 the end of our public comment here -- last chance. Going  
21 once, going twice. All right. Everybody appears to be  
22 satisfied with the comments that they have given so far. So  
23 I think with that, we can close the meeting, a little  
24 earlier than planned.

25 And once again, thank you for your participation

1 and please feel free to put any additional comments in  
2 writing. We have this webcasted. It's livestreamed and it  
3 will be saved on our website. We also will have a  
4 transcript of it and so, you know, there's lots of  
5 documentation, I guess is what I'm saying, of everything  
6 that we heard and then, of course, anything you choose to  
7 add via written communication after the fact.

8           We very much appreciate your time in coming here  
9 today and I know -- well, for myself personally, the school  
10 year kicks off for my family tomorrow and I'm sure it's  
11 kicking off for many of you this week and in the coming  
12 couple of days. So hope you all have a great school year  
13 and we look forward to the next steps in this conversation.

14           Thank you for coming.

15           (Whereupon, at 10:44 a.m., the proceedings were  
16 adjourned.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

