

**To: Carlos Garcia, Superintendent, SFUSD and Board of Education Commissioners,
SFUSD**

From: Public Education Enrichment Fund Community Advisory

Re: Recommendations on the 2012-13 PEEF Expenditure Proposal

Date: January 16, 2012

**This memo was prepared by the Public Education Enrichment Fund Community Advisory
Committee Members:**

Ana de Arce
Stevon Cook
Glenn Davis
Magdalena de Guzman
Jeff Eng
Bayard Fong
Caroline Grannan
Matthew Haney
Mary Jue
Bill Kappenhagen
Ben Kauffman
Tim Lennon
Hannah Li
Windy Ly
Michael Reimer
Victor Tam
Clare Watsky
Angelina Wei
Havel Weidner

The following SFUSD staff members facilitated the work of the Committee:

Kathy Fleming, PEEF Supervisor
Chris Armentrout, Director of Development and Local Government Relations

2011 PEEF CAC Activities

In May, 2011, the Board of Education adopted Resolution 115-10A3 which clarified the support, responsibilities and role of the Public Education Enrichment Fund Community Advisory Committee (PEEF CAC). It was resolved that the PEEF CAC would both provide information to and receive input from district stakeholders in order to assist the Superintendent and the Board of Education in effective PEEF allocation. The resolution specified that the CAC recommendations will be aligned to and support one or more of the District's Goals; the CAC may present its recommendations to the Board 2-4 times annually; and that the reading and approval of the PEEF Expenditure Plan would occur in January.

During spring, 2011, the PEEF CAC invited testimony from PEEF-funded programs. Program staff, students and community stakeholders came to regular CAC meetings to describe their activities and tell their personal stories of impact. These presentations were also opportunities for CAC members to more directly engage in fact-finding dialogue.

By the fall, 2011, the PEEF CAC termed out one member but added seven members, four of whom are SFUSD high school students. Having student voices on the CAC, an important goal mentioned in the 2010 PEEF CAC Feedback Report, provides a critical perspective when considering the visibility, impact and challenges of PEEF funded programs.

In preparation for making recommendations to the Board, the CAC reviewed program plans for 2012-2013 and held in-depth but informal interviews with the 14 program managers in November, 2011. The CAC focused the interviews on discovering how the district's goals of Access & Equity, Student Achievement, and Accountability were being addressed in each program's plan. The PEEF CAC received positive feedback about this process from program managers.

The following recommendations are based on the program testimony from students and community members, the program manager interviews, and each program's 2012-2013 PEEF Spending Proposals. Please note that the PEEF CAC had limited time to analyze an extensive amount of material including the 2012-2013 PEEF Expenditure Proposal, the SRI International PEEF Evaluation Technical Assistance Report, and the PEEF Evaluation Report. The members agreed to move forward with these recommendations based on this initial review and intends to analyze and consider these documents as they move into the spring 2012.

The PEEF CAC continues to value and prioritize their responsibility to outreach to the community, to gather feedback on the impact of PEEF allocations, and to increase awareness among the public on the purpose and uses of PEEF funding. PEEF CAC activities in the spring and fall 2012 will reflect that and will continue to inform its impressions and recommendations.

2012-2013 PEEF CAC Recommendations

The PEEF CAC specifically reviewed and considered presentations made by program staff, interviews with the program managers of the PEEF-funded programs, and each program's 2012-2013 PEEF Spending Proposals. The PEEF CAC noted two critical considerations that existed in PEEF by its 7th year of implementation:

- There has been measurable growth in the number of SFUSD students served by core enrichment programs that PEEF funds: Sports, Libraries, Arts and Music (SLAM) and discretionary enrichment programs (the third-third programs).
- In some cases, programs that depend on voluntary participation found it difficult to report on the demographics of the students they've served because they didn't have the technical support to gather such information.

These two factors in turn became the driving considerations for the following recommendations:

Recommendation #1:

As a guiding principle that should inform current and future spending decisions, the priority of PEEF should be enrichment programs and services that have positive direct student impact AND that contribute toward the district goals of Access and Equity, Student Achievement and/or Accountability.

Recommendation #2:

Applying the guiding principle as stated in Recommendation #1, the PEEF CAC determined, by simple majority votes, that the following programs that have previously been funded by PEEF meet this criterion and should continue to be funded by PEEF in 2012-2013:

- SLAM (Sports, Libraries, Arts and Music)
- Career Technical Education
- Peer Resources
- Reserve Fund
- Restorative Practices
- Student Support Professionals
- Student Wellness
- Teacher Academy
- Translation and Interpretation Services

Recommendation #3:

Applying the guiding principle as stated in Recommendation #1, the PEEF CAC elected, by simple majority vote, that the following programs that have previously been funded by PEEF do not meet this criterion and should not be funded by PEEF in 2012-2013. The PEEF CAC, though, strongly feels that these expenditures have merit and that the district should find other sources of funding to maintain them.

- Custodial Services
- Formative Assessment
- Teacher Recruitment

Recommendation #4:

The savings from removing programs from PEEF funding (approximately \$1,090,000) can be applied to the existing PEEF programs to move them closer to meeting their program goals, with emphasis on increasing access and equity for all SFUSD students, increasing student achievement, and improving accountability to stakeholders.

Recommendation #5:

The district should ensure the updated Student Information System and other available technical support provides PEEF programs with the ability to collect student demographic data in order to show student use and link it to student achievement, attendance, and other measures of impact.

Recommendation #6:

The district should move forward with using the District Wide Logic Model as a more effective way to demonstrate the synergistic effect and impact of the PEEF funded programs on students.

The PEEF CAC recognizes that the public will be scrutinizing how well the district used PEEF funds when the initiative comes back to the voters for renewal in 2015. During 2012-2013, the PEEF CAC will engage in activities to inform the public about PEEF and its importance to schools, students, and families. Of equal importance is for the PEEF CAC to gather feedback from community members on PEEF impact and priorities. With the help of student members on the PEEF CAC, the PEEF CAC can more effectively design outreach strategies to obtain student feedback on PEEF.

The PEEF CAC expects to report again to the Board of Education with more findings and recommendations in May, 2012.