

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 7, 2017

BUSD Offices –Technology Room 126
2020 Bonar Street, Berkeley, CA 94702

P&O Committee Members Present:

Martin De Mucha Flores, *Cragmont (Co)*
Dawn Paxson, *Emerson*
Terry Pastika, *Jefferson*
Danielle Perez, *John Muir (co-Chair)*
Byron Pakter, *LeConte*
John Eknoian, *Oxford*
Carla Bryant, *Oxford (Alt)*

Weldon Bradstreet, *Rosa Parks*
Aaron Schiller, *Thousand Oaks (Co)*
Bruce Simon, *King (co-Chair)*
Shauna Rabinowitz, *King*
Catherine Huchting, *Willard*
Aaron Glimme, *Berkeley High*
Christina Balch, *Independent Study*

P&O Committee Members Absent*:

Bridget Bernhard, *Arts Magnet (Alt)*
Alex Makler, *Malcolm X*
Josh Chisom, *Washington (Alt)*
Stephanie Upp, *Washington*

Ramona Coates, *Longfellow*
Laura Cho, *Willard*
Jose Luis Bedolla, *Berkeley High*
Ramal Lamar, *BTA*

**Alternates and co-reps are not marked absent if another rep is present. Currently there is not representation from Pre-K.*

Visitors, School Board Directors, Union Reps, and Guests:

Judy Appel, *School Board Member*
Donald Evans, Ed.D, *Superintendent*
Liz Karam, *BSEP Senior Budget Analyst*
Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*
Pasquale Scuderi, *Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services*

BSEP Staff:

Natasha Beery, *Director, BSEP and Community Relations*
Linda Race, *BSEP Staff Support*

1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports

At 7:15 p.m. Co-chair Bruce Simon called the meeting to order by welcoming attendees and asking them to introduce themselves. SGC site reports were given as part of the introductions.

Some members reported using site and door-to-door surveys to be more inclusive and reach out to under-represented families. Other sites looked at how effective interventions were and more deeply at specific data to see which children were benefitting from reading interventions and whether the model should be used with math. Cultural competency for schools, teachers, and parents was an area of focus as well.

Thanks were given to Superintendent Evans and Beery for providing information and inspiration at the District Update and SGC workshop on January 12, 2017.

2. Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda

The quorum was approved with 12 voting members present. 10 voting members were required for a quorum. 14 members were present later in the meeting with 13 voting members present.

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Huchting): To approve the agenda of the February 7, 2017 P&O Committee Meeting. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

3. Chairperson's Comments

Co-Chairs Danielle Perez and Bruce Simon

There was a reminder to contribute to the snack fund. Simon thanked the committee for re-electing him and Perez as co-chairs.

4. BSEP Directors Comments

Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations

Beery provided the following handout:

- *Superintendent's Update and Workshops: Building the Future of our Schools Together, Agenda*

Beery noted her excitement at hearing what the members of the Committee were doing at their SGCs, creatively and intentionally, with the survey data they were gathering. She noted the January 24, 2017 P&O meeting had been canceled to allow for more time to complete the reports that the Committee would be looking at during this meeting. She stated that more work also needs to be done around the logistics of the transition from Measure A to Measure E1 and before the decision-making phase begins.

5. Superintendent's Comments

Donald Evans, Ed.D.

Evans thanked the committee members for sharing their SGC's work on evaluating programs and holding the District accountable by asking difficult questions.

He reminded the Committee that developer fees and an update on RtI² would be on the agenda at the School Board meeting February 8, 2017. He invited members to attend.

Evans noted that Beery received an award from the Berkeley Symphony for her support of public education. The Music In The Schools (MITS) program is a great partner with BSEP in providing an outstanding music program for 4th to 8th grade students. As the speaker honoree at the annual luncheon, Beery explained the BSEP measure renewal process, reflected on community conversations about priorities, and noted how gratifying it was to have the community come together around ways to support kids.

6. Approval of Minutes January 10, 2016

There was a brief review allowed for the January 10, 2017 P&O Committee Meeting minutes. Corrections are to be made for the spelling of members' names as follows: Martin De Mucha Flores and Christina Balch.

MOTION CARRIED (Eknoian/Glimme): To approve the meeting minutes of the January 10, 2017 P&O Committee Meeting with changes as noted above. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

7. Public Comment

Eknoian noted that he was disappointed last year that a dedicated BSEP fund to serve African American students was not created as it's the one group with the largest gap in achievement. He felt RtI² was the nearest thing to a source of money to help them. His questions were: How many students are served? How many of them are of color? Is there any way to track where they were prior to intervention and where they were after the intervention? The model for him was the LLI program where the Lit Coach could tell what any student was doing in terms of their progress through the reading levels. RtI² has been around since at least the 2006 version of the Measure, yet after 11 years, there is still an enormous gap. He felt this was a place to exercise oversight.

Huchting handed out data for Willard Math and Reading: *(2015-16) Berkeley Unified School District Research, Evaluation and Assessment—SBA ELA: Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard* and *(2015-16) Berkeley Unified School District Research, Evaluation and Assessment—SBA Math: Percent of Students Meeting or Exceeding Standard*. She noted that although there had been some improvement, kids of color were lagging behind. How can we collect more data and analyze it thoughtfully? How do we strategize and measure where kids are now and follow them through the years as a cohort? She communicated with Dr. Evans about summer school for math and understood that Pat Saddler, Director of Programs and Special Projects, had a program, but she had never heard of it and did not know how long it had been going. It would be great to talk about how BSEP could support that.

Pakter asked if RtI² wasn't enough, was there summer school? He noted the disparity between kids in RtI² who may fall behind in summer while others are going to programs like Camp Galileo at Lawrence Berkeley and jumping way ahead. Then when kids come back in the fall, teachers are using RTI² to play catch up while the kids could have been in a program over the summer that would have caught them up faster.

Pakter asked Scuderi if their LeConte SGC would have Scuderi and Tim White, Executive Director of Facilities, come to discuss planning? Do you go to every site every year to discuss how to work together better? Scuderi responded that White did the lion's share of outreach in the past. They have discussed doing that in a more integrated way but don't have an immediate plan to visit every school intensively this year. If that is something their SGC wants done, they could take on piloting that experience.

8. First Interim Fiscal Report for 2016-17

Liz Karam, Senior BSEP Budget Analyst

Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations

Karam and Beery provided the following handouts:

- *BUSD Memo to the BSEP Planning and Oversight Committee, from Natasha Beery, Director of BSEP and Community Relations, dated February 7, 2017: First Interim Report of Revenue and Expenditure in FY 2016-17 of the Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006 (BSEP Measure A), (12 pages including memo and all BSEP Resources Revenues and Expenditures)*

Beery and Karam handed out the above documents. Beery noted that the First Interim Report was a financial report from the end of October, showing how expenditures were progressing and if adjustments were necessary. The Second Interim Report will come at the end of March and give some idea where we are headed approaching the end of Measure A and what we will be doing in our first year of Measure E1.

Karam stated that they have to have an adopted budget by June 30th of the prior year and then by statute, the budget has to be revised by October 31st and January 31st. The First Interim reflects who has been hired and refines costs. She encouraged questions. Although they are working on the Second Interim now, not all the budgets have been revised. The ones that have had the most activity are the ones that get the first pass revision. However, all the budgets will be revised by time of the Second Interim Report.

The summary overview was that the projected revenue of **\$25,444,021** was the same as last year. There was no COLA adjustment. Expenses of **\$27,183,557** were higher than the revenue. Karam noted that the District is using “planned deficit spending” because there was money in the fund balances that have been carried over from one year to the next that can now be spent down.

Karam noted that the 3% reserve was different from the fund balance. The State requires that we keep a 3% reserve for all expenditures and transfers. BSEP transfers to the General Fund/GF, specifically for Class Size Reduction and Music, as well as BSEP expenditures are subject to the 3% reserve.

BSEP pays Indirect Costs to the District’s GF for overhead at a rate of 6.41% or **\$1,570,897**.

On page 2 of the Summary memo, Karam noted that the CSR budget, the largest at 66%, was separated out from the rest of the BSEP resources. Also separated out is the BSEP 3% Reserve. Any difference in the total fund balances and the calculated reserve of 3% becomes the BSEP Unallocated Reserve. For instance, under the First Interim 2016-17 the actual calculated 3% reserve is **\$815,507** and the BSEP Unallocated Reserve is **\$8,593**, which is not immediately needed and a very slight amount over the reserve.

Karam confirmed that the Unaudited Actuals 2015-16 dates from June 30th. The fiscal year/FY runs from July 1 to June 30. With June 30th being the end of the FY, the next two months are used to do accruals, make payments, and complete all prior year tasks required by the School Board by the middle of September. Beery responded that there are many factors behind some of the changes that occur.

Karam stated that in general, there was a reduction in revenue in all the budgets. She explained that tax revenue was received in three payments. She had to do an estimate for the third payment and was off by \$36,000, which she said was a little high. There was an adjustment in revenue in 2016-17 to reduce the revenue recognized in the prior year. There have been brief discussions about collecting taxes from UC for a hotel they were building and more discussion may arise.

Karam explained or gave highlights for all the resource budgets:

CSR (Resource 0841): The biggest expenditure was the teacher transfer amount. It was noted there were lower expenditures and fewer adjustments for this budget. Beery reminded the Committee that this resource had been unable to sustain all expenses because of a number of factors, including enrollment growth, fixed costs, and long-deferred wage increases. With the end of the measure approaching, it was projected the District would go beyond revenues to execute plans. Beyond the teacher transfer, the CSR pays for other programs recognized as “Page 2” of the plan. Last year, the District negotiated with the School Board to carry some of those expenses from the General Funds. Footnote (e) on page 2 of the CSR Revenue and Expenses described the FTE last year and this year.

Questions and Responses:

- Pastika asked if the site funds paid for an RtI² did that include benefits? Beery responded yes. Karam further stated that site funds augment what the District provides for RtI².
- Pakter noted that the footnote (e) had a lot of information in it. Could it be seen with more clarity somewhere else? Beery said it might be easier if it were reformatted in a way to see how each item was paid for. There is an opportunity in the new measure to set up the budgets differently. Karam stated that this information was intended as an overview, and more detailed information could be found in the BSEP Annual Report.

School Site Discretionary Program (Resource 0852): The carryover was highlighted. It is generally used to cover expenses other than teachers and staffing and is very flexible funding for sites to use.

Music, Visual and Performing Arts (Resource 0853) This resource currently has enough funding and will be revised for Second Interim.

Public Information, Translation, P&O Committee Support (Resource 0854): There was a slight revision because an open position was filled. There was a savings realized that would be used for a contract in development.

Professional Development (Resource 0855): This budget has been revised since First Interim. It includes Teacher Initiated Professional Development/TIPD money that members may have heard about at their SGCs.

Evaluation (Resource 0856): Karam noted that members could compare this budget to the plan (in the BSEP binder). The shift here was due to the loss of an employee, and some of which was used for a contract for someone to help with supplemental plans for the year. Karam confirmed that the budget director Debbi D'Angelo is the person to assign tasks to salaried staff.

Parent Outreach (Resource 0857): No significant changes. This resource is deficit-spending using fund balance, and according to Beery could spend at this rate for only about another year.

Library (Resource 0860): Karam noted that this was the biggest budget after CSR and Site Funds. This resource had to use some fund balance to make the adjustments necessary for the cost of salaries and benefits. Even with these adjustments, there was more money in the projected fund balance than originally predicted. Beery added that this resource was affected by the Compensation and Classification Study, with the library and support staff who are not certificated receiving new classification at somewhat increased salaries.

Technology (Resource 0862): Karam noted that Nitschke opted to use \$15K of the fund balance to pay for equipment. The allocation for equipment has shrunk, and some of the fund balance was used to bolster the money available for those purchases.

Revenue Question and Responses:

- Karam confirmed that the negative revenue came from her slight overestimation of the revenue from the county. The adjustment that had to be made was .03% overall. Because the District didn't get as much as expected, the reduction was recognized in 2015-16 and had to be written down in 2016-17.

CSR Question:

- Huchting referred to the *Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Class Size Reduction Funds in FY 2016-17, To: Donald Evans, Ed.D., Superintendent, From Pasquale Scuderi, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services and Natasha Beery, Director of BSEP and Community Relations, and dated March 23, 2016* (See BSEP Annual Plan 2016-17 Binder under Class Size Reduction tab), showing a Net Shortfall of \$1,874,747 (page 4). She asked how the new measure would impact this. This moved the discussion into Item 9. BSEP Revenue Projection and Allocations for 2017-18 as follows below.

9. BSEP Revenue Projection and Allocations for 2017-18

Liz Karam, Senior BSEP Budget Analyst

Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations

Karam and Beery provided the following handouts:

- *Comparison of Measure A and Measure E1 Frameworks, April 2016 Projections*

Beery stated that the numbers on the *Comparison of Measure A and Measure E1 Frameworks, April 2016 Projections* had not been revised. This handout compared the structure and budgets for the measures. She noted under Measure A, the revenue for 2016-17 was **\$16M**, and the expenses were **\$18.1M** ending with a shortfall of **\$1.87M**. This was where the GF stepped in to carry those expenses, but this could not be sustained for more than two years. There was an expectation that the new measure would be structured in such a way that BSEP would be able to carry those expenses or equivalent once again. It was also looked at how the various pieces related to each other and what kind of flexibility the District should have to meet student needs across time.

Class Size Reduction and associated costs continues to be the primary goal of the new measure, receiving 66% of the total revenue under the framework of “High Quality Instruction.” The CSR/High Quality Instruction budget is made up of two pages: “Page 1” being the CSR Teacher Template costs, and any money left over becomes “Page 2” or what was referred to in Measure A as Middle School Counseling, Expanded Course Offerings/ECO and Program Support. In the new measure, Middle School Counseling was moved to Effective Student Support (mustard colored box) and most of what fell under Program Support (such as Lit Coaches and RtI) are now part of “Student Achievement Strategies” in that same section.

The new “Page 2” continues to include ECO, but also includes Professional Development and Program Evaluation, which are primarily carried out by Teachers on Special Assignment/TSA. Both “Page 1” CSR and “Page 2” Support for Teaching belong to the 66% that go to High Quality Instruction (classroom practice/green box). There is also the possibility of allocating funds to “Classroom Support” which is a general enough term to describe providing for student needs. The word “Reserve” in this section was created in the measure to provide for setting aside funds in the early years of the measure, as costs may exceed revenue in later years, a situation which arose under Measure A. There was a concern that could happen again over the time of the new measure.

Questions and responses:

- Beery confirmed that RtI² was folded into Student Achievement Strategies.
- It was confirmed that Middle School Counseling was just called Counseling. Beery noted that currently Middle School Counseling is provided, but there may be enough money to do other kinds of counseling, but in any event putting the “Counseling” funds in the “Student Support” section calls more attention to it, and does not mix it in with the teaching/TSA kinds of things that are now on page 2.
- What had been called Parent Outreach was moved into Effective Student Support (7%) and is now called Family Engagement and Access.
- It was confirmed that Lit Coaches & RtI² were rolled into Student Achievement Strategies, which could also include other things going forward. Scuderi noted that in the previous Measure A, Lit Coaches could be found in two sources of BSEP funding: Professional Development and Program Support. This represents the new transition of purposes and what can or cannot be included is open for discussion.
- Beery confirmed “Technology” became “Instructional Technology” because people were confused by whether technology meant the wiring or what reached the kids.
- The TWI program support was being phased out. Scuderi stated there were three schools with TWI that existed prior to the consolidation at LeConte. Next year they will have one cohort left. Historically that money gave them the ability to buy one ½ day teacher/an additional

FTE to do regroupings to avoid class size imbalances and give kids English- or Spanish-pure instruction at different parts of the day. The intention was that line item would not be there, but the principals had a different opinion on whether or not it should be there.

- Beery stated that Measure E1 should be in the BSEP Annual Plan 2016-17 binder. If not, copies will be distributed. The overarching purpose of Student Support is to “provide programs designed to provide effective supports and help students reach their highest academic potential while addressing the needs of the whole child. These revenues may be allocated to programs in any District-operated school for such purposes as counseling and behavioral health, family engagement & access, and student achievement and strategies.”
- The measure language tries to give the P&O Committee enough guidance for oversight along with enough flexibility to direct more funds where they can be effective.

10. Measure A to E1 Transition Planning and Implications (new CSR page 2, new Student Support section)

Pasquale Scuderi, *Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services*

Scuderi provided the following handouts:

- *BSEP/Measure A of 2006, FY 2017-18 Revenue Projection as of 2/6/17—DRAFT*

Beery noted that the handout showed where we may be headed with Measure E1. Karam provided *BSEP/Measure A of 2006, FY 2017-18 Revenue Projection as of 2/6/17—DRAFT*, which is in line with the April projections. It is a few dollars off for various reasons but should provide a picture of how things will play out in the first year of the new measure.

Karam outlined the Revenues and Allocations as follows:

- She noted that the City of Berkeley prepares the tax rolls that then go to the County which updates the information they have (the part that show up on your tax bill). She estimated there would be **\$29.1M** in revenue from that based on **the new rate of \$0.37/sq. ft.** The City of Berkeley owns properties that are for-profit businesses, like a restaurant on the Marina. Those properties generate taxes and the City pays that to BUSD.
- Rebates are returned to Over-65 and Low Income Seniors and for Non-Profits that are paid back for the taxes they paid.
- The interest rate is climbing a little, so we will get more in interest.
- **\$75K** would be set aside for the 3% Reserve.
- Fees and Audit/Legal Expenses were estimated at **\$6K**, leaving a **Net Revenue of \$26,674,300.**
- **2% of the Net Revenue or \$573,486** would be provided to the Public Information/P&O Office.
- **The remaining \$28,100,814 would be allocated to the Resources as noted.** (Color coding to the *Comparison of Measure A and Measure E1 Frameworks, April 2016 Projections* was incorrect. Class Size Reduction should be green to match High Quality Instruction box and the items in green should be blue to match the Essentials for Excellence box.)
- Beery noted the costs for CSR for the April projection was **\$18.59M** and on the draft CSR **\$18.54M.**
- The Indirect Costs would be lowered from 6.41% this current year to 5.96% in the coming year.
- The Indirect Costs subtracted from the Projected Budget leaves the Net balance available for each Resource to spend.

Beery confirmed that the *BSEP/Measure A of 2006, FY 2017-18 Revenue Projection as of 2/6/17—DRAFT* was in alignment for what they estimated last April. She emphasized that it was good news and structurally, the current programs could continue to be paid for, although she noted

there was deficit spending in Family Engagement and Public Information, and there may need to be adjustments made in a year or two for those, assuming nothing changes.

Beery said that Scuderi would first be bringing a plan for BSEP's largest expenditure, which is the CSR budget and the pieces that go along with it, at the next meeting. Shortly after, Scuderi will bring a plan for the Student Support Section.

Questions and responses:

- Responding to a question about what the final fund balance after this year would be, Karam thought there would be a close scrutiny of it for the Second Interim report at the beginning of March, especially around what was happening with the CSR Teacher Transfer and the amount of the transfer. Beery noted that any remaining funds must be spent in accordance with the previous measure. Karam confirmed there would be a new fund for the new measure. Beery said the purposes between the measures mostly align and added that funds left over from the 1994 measure were finally spent last year.
- Beery confirmed that BSEP is structured so that each specific resource has an allocation, such as the Library resource, and each year the budget manager would present a plan as to how these funds would be best used to meet the needs of kids. Beery said the new measure was written not just from the perspective of a blank check of "money for the schools," but that the District would promise to do some specific things, but with some flexibility for how it carries out those things. BUSD will have music and libraries, for example, but the managers come up with ideas on how to carry out each of those things and bring these proposals to the P&O and ultimately to the Board.
- Flexibility was written into the Measure so that if something was getting more expensive or more important there would be the capacity to take some funds from one pot and move it into another. Up to 10% can be shifted wherever the need is greatest. It is not rubber-stamped. Director Appel added that as proposals were made, there would be lots of opportunity to ask questions about why and how decisions were made, holding managers and Board accountable.
- Beery spoke to the review process of the BSEP resources and budgets. The beginning of the year starts by looking back to the prior year, then briefly looking at the current year, but where the greatest interest is when we begin looking at the plans for next year.
- There was a discussion around the ways in which the plans were developed by the budget managers and presented to the committee for input and discussion. Beery confirmed that the budget managers, in addition to setting up their plans and their budgets, have recently included specific "smart goals" for the year and how they were to be measured.
- Appel added that the Committee provided oversight and were the stewards of the money. The School Board usually looks to the P&O for their approval. Appel also noted that BUSD has one of the best data analysis departments and with a very sharp focus on equity. She noted that the data was very frustrating and that they were very aware, more than most districts, where they saw kids falling behind, especially African American and ELL kids. She also stated that they could not go out and privatize services for something like evaluation and there always needs to be systems of accountability. Appel applauded the members for asking such great questions and noted that was the role of the Committee. She added if there were concerns, the Board wanted to hear them. Simon added that in the statute, it clearly stated that the P&O's responsibility was "to enhance the effective use of the revenues as provided by the measure and to review District compliance." Beery also stated that there were other sources of funds and perspectives held by other parents and staff involved with the Local Control and Accountability Plan/LCAP. LCAP funds are to be used by specific groups of students. There will be a new dashboard created at the state level to be released later this

month that will have specific metrics for the use of those funds. One thing that was struggled with was how BSEP and other funds were being maximized. Beery stated that Pat Saddler, Director of Programs and Special Projects, would be coming to the P&O committee, mostly likely in March, to talk about LCAP funds and where the funding intersections are.

- Simon stated that the Committee had sent strongly worded recommendations to the Board in the past, which resulted in changes. Beery stated that the budget managers are thinking about the P&O Committee when they are putting their plans together and inviting the members to the subcommittee meetings. She also frequently hears managers concerned about what the P&O Committee will think about a proposal.

Scuderi said he and the Ed Services team have been talking about developing goals for this particular budget and want to continue to do a lot of what they're doing new, creative and positive. They also want to be thoughtful about the finances of all their considerations so that in the long run they don't get into trouble with a great idea that lasts two to three years and then has to be squeezed to where it is not recognizable anymore. There are a lot of things they would like to continue and acknowledge there is room for improvements and modifications. He noted that under High Quality Instruction, Professional Development was extremely fortunate to have a concurrent amount of funding from designated general funds for the implementation of Common Core and Next Generation Science Standards/NGSS and other new forms of curriculum.

The District has been able to spend the BSEP PD budget on a few workshops for upping our personnel and our ability to coordinate that work. The amount of teacher training BUSD has done in the last couple of years under the direction of Maggie Riddle, Director of Schools, and Michelle Sinclair, Coordinator of Professional Learning has profoundly grown the number of learning opportunities for teachers. He noted that accountability was coupled with capacity building and investment in professional development for teachers. They will be looking to optimize those expenditures.

Their team has also anticipated the possibility that some of the funds for Common Core may have to take a notable reduction because of the pressures coming to the GF with increases in benefits costs. There has been a fund of \$1.1-1.3M in the last couple of years which may not be quite that wealthy next year, and there may be some effect on PD.

His team wants to look at program evaluation, to sharpen things there. There might be less data production and more data analysis to add to the decisions we make. He noted they may want to do fewer things really well, rather than to solve every problem every year. Scuderi added that there was a way in which the urgency of all the things we have in front of us makes us undisciplined in how we approach problems, which he would like to modify and approve.

Across the board, they would like to be more strategic in their support when looking at the Expanded Course Offerings/ECO classes to consider. They were looking to address some of the issues around disproportionate allocation of resources at the school sites, such as Lit Coaches and RtI², noting that there was an elementary school of 685 students with the same allocation as one with 325 students. The disproportionality manifests as unseen problems such as teacher turnover and training new teachers, and digging into issues with teachers and principals could alter how services such as Lit Coaches, RtI² and math coaches might be delivered to students. Allocations were complicated by ways in which some of these services were multi-funded through LCAP, BSEP and Common Core funding. Scuderi felt that they needed to look at budget planning strategically with regard to Instruction and Student Support that considers those things all at once.

Questions and responses:

- Eknoian repeated his questions about RtI² from Public Comment to Asst. Superintendent Scuderi. With regards to RtI²: How many students are served? How many of them are of

color? Is there any way to measure where they were when they came in and where they were at the end of the process? Was there a way to come up with a per-unit cost? Scuderi responded that RtI² holds the space for service/care teams at the sites that look at student outcomes and who needs help directly under those supports. The filters that are used or those teams use to identify the kids they are going to reach out to tend to be kids of color, ELL kids and those that have IEPs. RtI² reaches out to the kids most at risk. Scuderi added that varies from site to site and gave the example that there were 80-85 kids at Rosa Parks they were watching, and a smaller school like Oxford would have 40-45 kids, and there was triage within those groups. Eknoian wanted to know if there was a district-wide number of kids being served. For example, if \$1M pays for all schools looked at together, how many kids would be 10% – 1000, 800, 500? Scuderi stated that if you look at the general RtI² model that says 15-20% are going to need something above core instruction and when he looks at who is getting served and supported, those numbers are fairly accurate. Appel added the Board looks at and makes sure the supplemental dollars that are for specific students go to those students.

- Eknoian said that in looking at the numbers over the past eleven to twelve years, he had not seen a lot of movement in the number of African American students in particular who are proficient in Math or in English. How many are being served, and is there some movement that is global? How does the problem get addressed? Scuderi noted that was a fair question and clarified that RtI² was not necessarily a program but a way of working, and noted that it was an investment. He felt that if there was not someone holding the space and information to regularly cycle back with the kids who were struggling and able to customize the supports those kids get, you were going to be in trouble. Scuderi felt the question of investing in the RtI² process was complicated. He felt the processes were growing and getting better at every site, and there was a person at every site that could tell you what's going on with every kid and what resources they were getting and cycling back if something didn't work. We have to do more to make the pace of the gains greater than they are now, but we are going to continue to see at least incremental improvement. He noted he believed there would be some serious improvement in K-5 reading this year.
- Hutching stated that before Scuderi arrived, she handed out Willard results and noted the same groups were struggling. She felt it would be good to know more about summer school with some specificity. Scuderi thought that making more strategic use of these funds involved looking at where we were not optimizing the reach to struggling kids academic lives after school, during the summer and Saturdays/weekends. He felt there were not top-shelf summer programs or afterschool supports for kids. There were well-intentioned folks such as college students or others that were not trained reading specialists or didn't have the expertise to help a 6th grader reading at a 2nd grade level for example. She asked whether the District can talk with the union leadership or whether the work year can be reconsidered for select employees? Can we have certificated leadership running summer literacy camps and programs? Is there a different way of thinking about those spaces? Hutching noted there was not a lot of time to implement something between this month and summer.
- Pastika stated the data that they are provided with tells a very specific kind of story to achieve a certain end result and added that it sometimes conflicted. She felt that less data and more analysis was important because the data was used inconsistently, emphasizing certain aspects more than others depending on what the principals and the teachers wanted approved for the site plan. She was looking forward to the data aspect because it would be helpful in educating parents about what's happening in a way that levels the playing field with respect to where the teachers are coming from and saying, "Trust us, we know," and the parents

saying help us to understand what's going on.

- Pastika felt the RtI² discussion was interesting because she wanted to learn more about how much the BSEP funds RtI². From looking at the school site plans, there was supplemental funding for RtI² and when she went to her SGC, she said she didn't understand why their site plan reads like an LCAP plan. Why is it all going to RtI² and goals that appear to be from LCAP? She felt there needed to be clarity but had not gotten a satisfactory answer as to what site plans are for, in terms of what can they fund, what is the money and where does the money from? Providing information and clarity on the moving parts of Site Discretionary funds and LCAP funds would be very beneficial. She was confused about whether it was a Site Plan or an LCAP Plan. Scuderi stated that when the LCAP Plan was approved, there were specific purposes and recommendations, like .4/.6 FTE in RtI² in all the K-5 sites, that were predetermined. Pastika stated that when there was an opportunity, it would be helpful to know what was the LCAP funding, how does that funding specifically relates to the schools, and what are the Site Discretionary funds specifically for?
- Pastika had attended a site meeting and heard an administrator's argument about how he wanted to change the way the SGCs allocated money, but she didn't have a good understanding of why that was. To make the accountability aspect meaningful, she thought the site committees needed to have their capacity built to be equal partners in these discussions. Now the site committee members are not on an equal playing field with the teachers and the administrators to be able to have a good discussion. The end result may be excellent, but everyone is not on the same page.
- Glimme stated this was a tension they felt at the high school a lot, especially in terms of the Site Discretionary funds. They are used for a lot of things including supplementing support systems for students that are struggling. There was a significant tension in the committees between how much money would be allocated to support a particular group of students, a narrow targeting of funds, versus funds that might be open to all student. There was a natural tension on these kinds of committees where you have to look at something like funding three FTE student support services. People are always asking if we could use that to fund more dance, etc. Pastika stated her issue was more about getting clarity for what the funds should be spent on. Simon stated that a previous measure was written with specificity as to how the money was to be spent, and Measure A was written to open that up a bit more. What Simon had seen was that some of the expenses Pastika was talking about became institutionalized over time because individual sites wanted to support certain functions. They were technically discretionary and how those decisions were made to change how those funds were spent was very complicated.
- Pakter stated that he was hearing a lot about creativity and new options. He wanted to make sure that if he started doing something like that at his SGC, he would not hit a brick wall because things had been normed. For kids learning to read, how much of that goes along emotionally with not caring about reading and suggested making an effort to be curious about why the kid did not care about reading, what were their goals in life, how reading can be made valuable to them, and then relating that to how money was spent. Appel stated that ingenuity and new ideas are really helpful and encouraged the members to step forward with inquiry, because she felt the disparity was not because nobody was paying attention to it or putting resources into it. The District made some improvements last year that were big enough to celebrate, but there was still a discrepancy. She said start with inquiry: what are you doing, why are you making these decisions, how are they going? It's really good to understand why the District is trying the innovations it is trying.
- Scuderi stated that he was interested in using simplicity to gain depth and developing the data

systems and explanations of investments that are clearer. Can we build some key and clear points on the K-12 continuum in the service of closing gaps in outcomes for kids?

- Paxson stated that she had some of the same concerns and questions and wanted to underscore that she appreciated that Scuderi heard their voices about the analysis of the data. She noted that Emerson parents did not know that RtI² exists, and there is an unfortunate miss around that. Parents don't know how it works or how their kids can benefit from it.
- Bryant wanted to know what the plans were for multiple years and have the ability to understand all of it. She had tried to do it on her own but could not figure out what the bigger plan was.

11. For the Good of the Order

For the Good of the Order is time set aside for members to bring up items not discussed or addressed during the meeting.

Huchting passed out a handout from the New York Times entitled *CALPERS Cuts Investment Targets, Increasing Strain on Municipalities*, dated 12/21/16 (downloaded 2/7/17). It was noted that the teachers used the California State Teachers Retirement System/CALSTRS, and Karam noted that they knew what changes were coming.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:29 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support