MEETING DATE: January 11, 2012
TIME: 6-8 p.m. (with a subsequent agreed-upon extension to 9 p.m.)
LOCATION: 600 McAllister St.
MINUTES ADOPTED ON: March 14, 2012

Members present:
Stevon Cook, Glenn Davis, Magdalena de Guzman, Ana De Arce, Jeff Eng, Caroline Grannan, Mary Jue, Bill Kappenhagen, Ben Kauffman, Michael Reimer, Victor Tam, Clare Watsky, Angelina Wei

Staff members present: Kathleen Fleming, Steve Newton, Inger Nordhagen

CAC business:
The minutes of the previous two meeting were presented for approval. One correction was made in the December 2011 minutes, and the minutes were approved.

There were no members of the public present to comment.

Review information from manager meetings and reporting templates
There was discussion of what process to use to distill the information from the meetings with program managers into recommendations, and how to work with the reporting templates.

Kathy reminded the committee that recommendations should be based on the goals of the SFUSD Strategic Plan (Balanced Score Card). It was pointed out that the template the committee used reflects those goals.

It was proposed that committee members view the gallery of programs, which were posted on the walls around the room on flip chart paper, and then offer comments in turn.

The Board of Education will address the report at its Committee of the Whole meeting on Tuesday, Dec. 17, and the CAC will have 10 minutes to present.

Review SRI report and internal PEEF evaluation report
Upon request, Kathy summarized the SRI report. (This item was taken out of sequence at members' request.)

Return to reviewing the reporting templates
CAC members spent 30 minutes reviewing the displays of reports on each program, as well as CAC members' comments posted on the displays from reviews at the previous working group meeting.

There was further discussion of the process for formulating recommendations. The report should include a description of how the CAC engaged with program managers.

It was suggested that members rank the programs; then it was proposed and agreed upon that we should go around the table so each member could comment on the process in turn. Mary Jue scribed.
Comments focused on the issue of programs that are valuable and worthy of funding, but that might not
meet the criteria for PEEF funding. There were differing views on whether PEEF should fund worthy programs no matter what. Much of the comment focused on direct services to students.

The subject of in-kind services was brought up, and Kathy defined it in case any members weren't clear. A set amount of the City and County of San Francisco's obligation to SFUSD is to be provided via in-kind services – work by city employees or a third party rather than actual funds.

A motion was made that the CAC recommend that the district seek other funds for one program, custodial services, rather than funding it with PEEF money. After further comments, the motion was withdrawn pending further discussion of the process for formulating recommendations.

A motion was made that the CAC vote up or down on each program individually. A member suggested that the CAC discuss the guiding principles first. The motion was withdrawn.

Comments: Should a guiding principle be increasing direct services to students and families? Should the original charter be given priority above the goals of the Strategic Plan? The programs made their presentations based on how they work toward meeting the goals of the Balance Score Card (Strategic Plan).

After further discussion, a guiding principle was defined: Programs should increase direct services to student and families as a guiding principle to foster connections and promote culture in keeping with district goals.

At this point, the CAC agreed by consensus to vote on each program: to recommend continuing PEEF funding or not:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Yes, continue PEEF funding</th>
<th>No, the program should be funded from another source</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translation services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer resources</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher recruitment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career tech ed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness Centers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Academy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Support</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals/Nurses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative assessment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative practices</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A motion was made to recommend against allowing the city to count the Sustainability Coordinator position as an in-kind service as part of the PEEF obligation. It died for lack of a second.
**Draft CAC recommendations report**

In discussion, it was emphasized that the PEEF CAC report to the Board of Education, in addressing the programs that were not recommended for PEEF funding, should state that the recommendation doesn't mean the program isn't worth funding, just that a majority of the CAC members voting felt that it's not appropriate for PEEF; that it doesn't meet the specific criteria for PEEF funding.

It was suggested that the report include a comment that the CAC struggled with the task because there still was lack of clarity around the resolution providing guidance to the CAC.

There was further discussion of next steps and whether to add to the guideline.

It was suggested that the CAC further discuss the appropriateness of PEEF monies going to the reserve funds. The member added that this should be discussed going forward, not for the current report.

It was suggested that the CAC develop principles to use as a guide moving forward.

It was recommended that the CAC report include the comment that not re-funding certain programs would allow others to maintain the same level of services because of rising costs.

Next steps were identified.

The CAC members should attend the upcoming Board of Education meetings, where the report will be presented; at the following BOE meeting, the commissioners will vote on their recommendations.

It was suggested that the report include the comment that the CAC's interviews with program managers revealed that some of the programs are not fully realized and have limited capacity because of lack of funding.

There was discussion of adding the logic model as a next step, to provide more information about the impact of PEEF-funded programs.

There was discussion of access and equity: How it is measured, how is it determined whether programs are affecting student achievement?

The report should include a review of the CAC's research, recommendations and next steps.

**Next steps**

A suggestion was made to meet as a working group on Friday afternoon, Jan. 13, to pull together notes from this meeting and create the report to the Board of Education, based on notes from the meeting. It was moved, seconded and approved to meet as a working group to create the report.

**The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.**