MEETING MINUTES
PUBLIC EDUCATION ENRICHMENT FUND
COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING DATE: December 12, 2012
TIME: 6:05 PM
LOCATION: 555 Franklin Street, San Francisco, CA, 94102 – 601- Main
MINUTES ADOPTED ON: May 8, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bayard Fong, Jeff Eng, Bill Kappenhagen, Rain Talosig, Mary Jue, Angelina Wei, Clare Watsky, Magdalena de Guzman, Victor Tam

STAFF PRESENT: Kathy Fleming, Chris Armentrout, Monica Lopez

- Meeting was called to order at 6:05 PM by Mary Jue and Angelina Wei, Co-Chairs of the PEEF CAC

General Public Comment
- There was a call for public comment.
- There was no public comment.

Adoption of Meeting Minutes
- Meeting Minutes from 10-10-12 and 11-14-12 are pending. Will be submitted at a later meeting.

1. “off” Agenda Item: Ana De Arce
   - Mary Jue publicly thanked Ana De Arce for her service. She has “timed-out” of her service on PEEF CAC. Suggestion to do something nice to thank her for her years of service.

2. Chris Armentrout
   - Chris will be taking over when Kathy Fleming takes maternity leave.
   - Feel free to email her while she is away. Kathy might not respond to emails but wants to stay “in the loop” while she is away.
   - Chris thanked PEEF CAC for their service
   - Chris pointed out the difficulty in understanding how our committee in terms of how we fit in the “Political Activities of School District Officers and Employees.”
   - Legal team is still trying to clarify our position in how we fit in.
   - Chris distributed the restrictions set by the District as detailed in the “Political Activities of School District Officers and Employees.”
• New information will be coming shortly in terms of ways that PEEF CAC can participate.
• Unsure how rules apply because we have SFUSD staff participating during their “off duty” times.
• Conflict: When PEEF CAC defines how SFUSD employees participate during their off-time.
• STUDENTS? Can students share what they believe is right?
  o Can they campaign on campus?
  o Rules are much looser for students.
  o Activity sanctioned by PEEF CAC may be a problem.
  o Students during off-hours off campus can act however they want.
  o Eg. C: first one on p. 3; 2nd on p. 4:
• Kathy Fleming and Chris Armentrout will be consulting the District Legal Team for clarification on these items.

3. Recommendations to the BOE: Review Recommendations from 2011-12 (Discussion Item)

• Working group meeting on 11.28.2012.
  o Prepared a DRAFT of RECOMMENDATIONS to the BOE.
• Time given to the PEEF CAC members to review the DRAFT recommendations.
• GALLERY WALK: members asked to review the responses from PEEF CAC members
  o Make notes on WOWs and WONDERs on the 14 programs on the numbered pads.
  o Can review the detailed files for each program on the table.
• DRAFT Interim Evaluation Report Draft has been submitted.
• In-kind services: are these programs that need to be evaluated?
  o No.
  o Three additional supervisory positions were added.
  o More funds dedicated towards evaluation to support managers in supporting their evaluation duties.
    ▪ Monica has been meeting with managers to support their work in addressing the logic model for evaluation of programs.
    ▪ More measures; more outputs; more outcomes;
    ▪ Desired upward trends were noted
• Discussion on programs – overarching themes:
  o Underfunding
  o Access to Programs
  o Human Capital; Custodial; Formative Assessment?
    ▪ More relevant this year than last?
    ▪ These should be coming from General Fund
    ▪ Money should be reaching direct service to students
    ▪ Spirit of PEEF is to ADD services . . . NOT fund outright!
• Is CORE ACADEMICS appropriate for PEEF funding?
  o A deep, rich discussion ensued amongst the PEEF CAC members around various programs.
    ▪ Questions arose regarding equity and access
    ▪ Questions came up around best practices and effectiveness
    ▪ RECOMMENDATION: to focus on GUIDING PRINCIPLE
    ▪ Questions around equity in funding for each level: elementary; middle; high school levels
    ▪ How can we synthesize programs so that they can work closely together rather than feel that they are competing against each other for funding?
  o If trend of increasing revenue for PEEF continues then it’s okay to add allocations.
  o Choose themes that are tangible and “actionable” for the Board
  o PEEF should not be funding programs that do not directly serve students.
  o Priorities
    ▪ Not wanting to supplant
    ▪ Direct service to students before programs
    ▪ Discussion around access and equity

  o **MOTION:** to approve recommendation #1 but to fine-tune to include specifications PEEF funding to “onsite enrichment programs” and emphasize “direct services to students”
    ▪ Clare Watsky made the motion; Bill Kappenhagen seconded.
    ▪ **VOTE:** 8 APPROVE; 0 NAYS; 0 ABSTENTIONS
  o **MOTION:** to eliminate #2 and #3:
    ▪ Mary Jue made the motion; Clare Watsky seconded
    ▪ 5 YEAs; 2 NAYs; 1 ABSTENTION
  o **MOTION:** Current funding and any increases in future PEEF funding should be applied to existing PEEF programs that provide
  o **MOTION:** To empower Kathy Fleming to wordsmith to synthesize Recommendation #1 and Recommendation #4 into a new recommendation. We grant the next working group the power – whether or not there is a quorum – to approve.
    ▪ Bill made the motion; Magdalena seconded; Approved unanimously
  o **MOTION:** The CAC encourages the Board and the Superintendent to consider synthesizing programs to maximize the results to students. As an example, using Peer Resources as the vehicle to drive the theme of Restorative Practices to the practices at the sites.
  o **MOTION:** To authorize the next working group the authority to wordsmith the recommendations and memorandum according to the recommendations and in the spirit of the meetings approved by members at the 12.12.12 meeting.
    ▪ Victor made the motion; seconded by Mary Jue: approved unanimously.
- **MOTION**: Bill recommended motion: New rec number 2 - The cac encourages the supe and BOE to consider synthesizing programs to maximize results to students e.g. utilizing the Peer Resources program as one vehicle to drive Restorative Practices at the sites. unanimously
do to encourage the Board and the Superintendent as read on the screen.
  - Bill made the motion; Maggie seconded it; unanimously approved.
- #6: was okay
- Funding CORE academic programs is essential but would not be in accordance with the intentions of the PEEF CAC especially when present programs are not fully funded.
- Working on addressing funding
- **MOTION**: Rec 3 motion made by Victor seconded by Clare- The 2013-14 proposed PEEF budget includes the mention that STEM may be budgeted in future PEEF. We strongly feel that until students have full access to existing PEEF programs, new initiatives should not be considered for future PEEF funding. UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED!!!
- Future allocations and budgets should be analyzed based upon Elementary, Middle, and High School levels.

  - WORKING GROUP MEETING: Kathy to put out e.mail survey to the PEEF CAC group: TUESDAY or WEDNESDAY of next week: perhaps 2 groups???

**Adjournment**

- The December 12, 2012 meeting was adjourned at 10:06 PM.
- The next regular committee meeting will take place January 8th, 2013 at 555 Franklin Street, San Francisco, CA, 94102 – 601- Main.