

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

June 6, 2017

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

P&O Committee Members Present:

Bridget Bernhard, *Arts Magnet (Alt)*
Dawn Paxson, *Emerson*
Terry Pastika, *Jefferson*
Danielle Perez, *John Muir (co-Chair)*
John Eknoian, *Oxford*

Weldon Bradstreet, *Rosa Parks*
Bruce Simon, *King (co-Chair)*
Catherine Huchting, *Willard*
Josh Irwin, *Berkeley High*

P&O Committee Members Absent*:

Rashay Lankford, *Pre-K*
Martin De Mucha Flores, *Cragmont (Co)*
Victoria Hritonenko, *Cragmont (Co)*
Eric van Dusen, *Cragmont (Co)*
Byron Pakter, *LeConte*
Silvia Torres, *LeConte (Alt)*
Alex Makler, *Malcolm X*
Aaron Schiller, *Thousand Oaks*

Josh Chisom, *Washington (Alt)*
Stephanie Upp, *Washington*
Shauna Rabinowitz, *King*
Bethany Schoenfeld, *Longfellow*
Laura Cho, *Willard*
Jose Luis Bedolla, *Berkeley High*
Aaron Glimme, *Berkeley High*
Christina Balch, *Independent Study*

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

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

Ann Marie Callegari, *Director, Office of Family Engagement and Equity*
Donald Evans, *Superintendent*
Judy Appel, *School Board Director*
Beatriz Leyva-Cutler, *School Board Director*

BSEP Staff:

Valerie Tay, *BSEP Program Specialist*
Linda Race, *BSEP Staff Support*

1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports

At 7:17 p.m. Co-chair Perez called the meeting to order by welcoming attendees. She noted the lack of a quorum for actions on the agenda. P&O Committee members introduced themselves and gave their SGC site reports. Perez suggested that members give their experience of school lunch in their own childhoods as part of their reports.

2. Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda

The quorum was not established due to the lack of voting members present for the meeting. The Agenda was not approved, but it was used as an outline to proceed with the meeting.

3. Chairperson's Comments

Co-Chairs Danielle Perez and Bruce Simon

Simon stated that Beery was ill and apologetic for not being able to attend the meeting. He and Perez also thanked all the members of the committee for their attendance at the P&O meetings during the year.

Simon reminded the committee members that according to the bylaws, the term of the current committee ends on October 31st. A P&O Steering Committee will meet on the committee's behalf over the summer, and a regular meeting, which the members are invited to attend, will be held at the beginning of the school year.

Perez and Simon stated the contingency for the items which required action at this meeting would be for the Steering Committee to convene. The Steering Committee was elected a year ago and all of the members were still a part of the P&O Committee. Those members elected on June 7, 2016 were: Perez, Simon, Glimme, Rabinowitz and Irwin. Their duty will be to follow through on the actions needed at a future meeting to be determined.

4. BSEP Director's Comments

Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations

Perez re-stated that Beery was not able to attend the meeting due to illness.

5. Superintendent's Report

Donald Evans, Ed.D.

Evans stated that there would be a hearing of the LCAP and the BUSD Budget at the next School Board meeting. The meeting will also include the BHS Redesign. The School Board meeting will be Wednesday, June 14, 2017 beginning at 7:30pm.

6. Approval of Minutes May 9, 2017

No action was taken to approve the May 9, 2017 P&O Meeting Minutes because the quorum was not established. The minutes will be taken to the Steering Committee for approval.

7. Public Comment

- School Board Director Judy Appel expressed her appreciation to BSEP and the P&O Committee for its hard work with the transition from Measure A to Measure E1. She noted that they were helpful in the transition that went smoothly. Appel stated in a year when the District will be facing cuts, it was helpful to have the BSEP funds for our kids. She encouraged the members to attend the next School Board meeting to hear about the LCAP budget and noted that the P&O members already know more about LCAP than most people.
- Leyva-Cutler, School Board Director also thanked the committee members for their work at their own schools as well as with BSEP.
- Simon shared that he was one of the P&O representatives on the Superintendent's Budget Advisory Committee/SBAC. He stated they were meeting regularly to look at some possible cuts, some small ones for this year and larger ones for next year. The mandated costs for running a school district (including benefits for teachers and non-teachers) were increasing at a faster rate than revenue received. The new funding formula contribution to the District was becoming less than in previous years. The

SBAC was looking at financial cuts for next year and trying to keep the cuts as far away from the classroom as possible. He stated that any kind of cut would hurt. He added that the SBAC meetings were Brown Act meetings that the public was welcome to attend. There would be hard decisions to be made by the P&O members serving on the committee next year. Simon noted that in the past, when the General Fund was less able to pay for some things they would ask BSEP to pay for those programs where appropriate.

- Huchting stated that as her child moved on to high school, she hoped to be elected to the same position there as she has now. She noted that the SSC meetings at the high school were less flexible and as a working parent, it was hard to get to their afternoon meetings. Paxson noted that the high school SSC and BSEP Committee were separate and meeting times have changed. (BHS website notes BHS BSEP Site Committee <http://bhs.berkeleyschools.net/information/committees/berkeley-schools-excellence-program/> and BHS Site Council <http://bhs.berkeleyschools.net/information/committees/school-site-council/>, meetings at 4:15pm and 4:00pm respectively during 2017.) Huchting stated she was informed they wanted to keep the times the same and was concerned about the early meeting time preventing some parents from participating. Simon noted that he and Huchting could work on that together.

8. Expenditure for 2016-17 Parent Outreach

Ann Marie Callegari, Director, Office of Family Engagement and Equity

Perez noted that there was a possibility there would be no action on this item but the Committee could hear about Callegari's update on an expenditure. Callegari stated that a few months ago, she had the opportunity to apply for a Family Engagement class for one week at Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Karen Mapp, senior lecturer in the Harvard Graduate School of Education, and a leader of Family Engagement in education would be teaching the course. Callegari was pleased to be accepted and submitted a request to have it paid for by BSEP. Beery suggested that she bring it to the P&O Committee for review. Callegari noted it was a conference that would benefit the OFEE Program and be the first major investment in training for OFEE. She would like the committee to consider approving the expenditure of \$4K for the weeklong training and related expenses.

Questions and Responses/Discussion:

- Simon wanted clarification that this expenditure did not change the budget but was to change the training to include wording for "out of state" travel (vs. the wording "in state travel"). Callegari confirmed this.
- Callegari stated that the travel would be for July 24-27, 2017. Simon noted that the Steering Committee could approve this item when they met before Callegari's event.
- Paxson asked what was particularly exciting about this training, and Callegari responded that Karen Mapp, instructor for the class, was the leader and founder of many of the practices and strategies used by the District's Family Engagement staff. Her strategies have been adopted nationally and by Alameda County. Mapp will talk about the dual capacity framework and what OFEE was trying to do was to connect family engagement with student learning. That was going to be the primary focus of the training that Callegari was excited about. Callegari noted that people from all over the world would be attending the training.

9. Updates to BSEP 2017-18 Revenue and Projected Ending Fund Balances

Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations (unable to attend)

The following handouts were provided:

- *0741 Summary from Budget Document 5/31/17 (1 page)*
- *Student Achievement Strategies: Budget Summary (1 page)*

Perez noted Beery's absence and passed out the above-mentioned handouts. She stated that *0741 Summary from Budget Document 5/31/17 (1 page)* was a correction to the information the committee originally received for the Class Size Reduction budget. Perez noted that the main change was in the ending fund balance, which was originally shown as \$1,048,160 and corrected to \$1,049,592.

Perez moved on to the *Student Achievement Strategies: Budget Summary (1 page)*. There was a change in revenues for the Student Support Budget. The projected revenue in May was \$1,053,700 and corrected as shown to \$983,528. The revenue change affected the original fund balance of \$114,153 and it was corrected as shown to \$43,981. Tay noted that the original Student Achievement budget was based on a 3.75% of revenue rather than 3.5%. Perez added that all the expenditures were exactly the same but the fund balance was different.

10. Recommendation for BSEP Funds for Communication, Translation and Community Engagement for 2017-18

Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations (unable to attend)

Perez stated that there would have been an action on this item, but since there was not a quorum, this budget would not be approved at this meeting. She asked if there were any questions about the budget. Simon noted there were no changes in the budget from the last time it was seen by the committee members. It was noted this budget would be taken to the Steering Committee for approval.

Questions and Responses/Discussion:

- Eknoian wanted to know if the Parent Outreach Budget was different than the funds for Communication, Translation and Community Engagement. Simon confirmed that Parent Outreach was under Student Achievement Strategies as "Family Engagement."

11. BSEP School Plans for FY 2017-18

Valerie Tay, BSEP Program Specialist

Tay provided the following handouts:

- *Budget Summary 2017-18 (18 pages)*
- *Site Discretionary Summary (1 legal size page)*
- *BSEP Site Discretionary Fund Multi-Year Projection (2 pages with colors)*
- *Berkeley Unified School District Memo, To BSEP Planning and Oversight Committee, From: Natasha Beery, Director of BSEP and Community Relations, and Patricia Saddler, Director of Programs & Special Projects, Dated: June 6, 2017, Subject: 2017-2018 Single Plans for Student Achievement (3 pages)*

Tay passed out the handouts noted above. The elementary summaries included PTA monies, LCAP allocations, Title I, and BSEP. She noted that the summaries reflected the priorities at the different sites, also site differences with respect to populations, funding sources, and use of FTE.

Questions and Responses/Discussion:

- Various members of the committee noted their appreciation for the summary information.

- Tay noted that sites use their BSEP money in different ways.
- When asked if the summaries were shared with the principals, Tay stated that the summaries were part of the school plan every year. Leyva-Cutler thought it was important that the principals see the summaries for the other schools. Tay acknowledged that was a good idea because it was usual for the principals to only get the summary for their own school. Tay also noted that the principals were attending budget meetings with their spreadsheets in hand.
- Huchting noted that the schools that had larger PTA funding could use their BSEP money for other things.
- Paxson stated that it would be helpful for the principals to see the budgets of the other campuses, especially for elementary schools because they vary more. She added there were a lot of ways resources and spending information could be looked at. Several P&O members noted the disparity in the amount of PTA funds at different schools.
- Irwin asked Tay to describe the documents handed out. Tay stated that the Berkeley Unified School District Memo, *To BSEP Planning and Oversight Committee, From: Natasha Beery, Director of BSEP and Community Relations, and Patricia Saddler, Director of Programs & Special Projects, Dated: June 6, 2017, Subject: 2017-2018 Single Plans for Student Achievement (3 pages)* and summary was included in the Site Plan for each school. Irwin noted that something like “Lit Coach” might not mean the same thing at every school, which Tay confirmed and she stated that every site utilized their resources/staff in unique ways. An Rtl² person might also perform a few different functions – art for example - besides what they are described as. The *Budget Summary 2017-18 (18 pages)* was a compilation of all the one-page attachments to school site plans. This particular compilation was done for the P&O Committee but could also be included in the documents to the Board.
- *The Site Discretionary Summary (1 legal size page)* refers to the BSEP Expenditures and the major purposes are shown to the left (Certificated, Classified, Other etc.)
- Tay stated that *BSEP Site Discretionary Fund Multi-Year Projection (2 pages with colors)* was developed in response to questions that the committee had with respect to seeing how the BSEP expenditures “shook out” as the Economic Impact Aid/EIA money went away and were replaced by LCAP funds. She bolded certain expenditures that indicated more than a few percentage points difference. Tay thought these were interesting to note because a lot of them were new things provided by LCAP. An example of this was that LCAP provided each site Extended Day Academic Intervention money, and thus BSEP money was used less for teacher hourly. Another example was that sites were being given a \$12K lump sum to contract with or provide FTE for Behavioral Health, so less BSEP money was going for that as well. A lot less BSEP money was going toward Instructional Specialists and more money from PTAs was going to outside specialists for enrichment. She thought PTAs were experimenting with different programs they were bringing into schools for enrichment and assemblies.
- Huchting noted that King was spending \$114K for Middle School Vice Principals/ Rtl² and wondered how many Rtl² students were being served. Appel responded to the question by confirming that the money was for providing .25 FTE of the three principals. Simon noted that he thought the principal spread the cost among the three principals but he wasn’t sure what their exact Rtl² responsibilities were. They all have a role in Rtl² for the individual grade they travel with. Eknoian thought the number for King could be about 20%, and Simon thought it could be 10% for Special Ed and

10% on top of that would be a safe guess. Irwin wondered if Huchting had a concern. Huchting responded that she wondered how King evaluated that. Simon stated that he had been on the SGC at King for five years and the cohort model (providing a principal and a counselor for each cohort) was brought up every year. If they wanted to keep that model, this funding source was the only way to pay for it. The cohort model pre-dates the current principal and members of the King SGC. Appel stated they had dealt with it during times of cuts and thought there was a benefit to having the cohort model. Huchting asked if they could see the effects of that model on the identified students over the period of time they were at King. Simon stated it affected every student at the school. Leyva-Cutler noted that LCAP funded the targeted students while BSEP funded all students. The discussion concluded that the use of the description of Vice-Principals for RtI² was confusing. Tay stated that this should be corrected because it was not accurate. Simon stated that Huchting's question was important because it raised the question of how something could be evaluated and how something that had become institutionalized over time could be changed. Everyone including the principal has struggled with it in the time Simon has been involved at King. It was difficult to figure out those things that were institutionalized before site council members were there.

Paxson stated that her understanding of RtI² was that there were different models, which brought up the question of how RtI² was delivered. She felt RtI² served an important purpose targeting and serving kids they wanted to move forward. It was a good thing to have each campus think about their needs, but the RtI² conversation should keep happening. Appel said an RtI² presentation was recently made to the Board and Maggie Riddle, Director of Schools, would be taking a closer look at this. Hopefully they would determine how to bring more uniformity and best practices to the sites.

- Pastika asked for a highlight of the expenditures on the *BSEP Site Discretionary Fund Multi-Year Projection (2 pages with colors)*, for example the Literacy Coach. Tay explained that BSEP pays for part of the Lit Coaches and the District pays for part of that as well. They are supposed to serve all students not just the targeted students. That was why every site had a commitment to the Lit Coaches. Pastika referred to the last paragraph of the memo: "In order to serve the target populations specified in the LCAP, the District has designated funds for FTE (salaried positions) for Literacy Coaches, RtI and ELD, as well as lump sum and per pupil dollars for academic intervention and counseling." Pastika wanted clarification on how much was being spent on non-LCAP related goals. Though E1 says money can be spent on art and music from discretionary funds, she did not see that reflected on the spreadsheet, in other words it looked like not many schools were spending money on enrichment. Simon thought they might be covered under Instructional Specialist/Instructional Assistant, Materials, as well as Other Contracted Services. Appel stated that sites were using their money effectively and they could not pay salaries out of PTA funds. Tay stated that there was a process for that but it was difficult to do. She thought that LCAP contributed .20 to the Lit Coach and regardless of whether there would be that contribution under LCAP specifically for the targeted students, there would still be a Lit Coach at the school for all the students. That was why the District paid for .55 of a Lit Coach and a lot of the sites chose to bring the Lit Coach to a 1.0 FTE with some of their site funds. The Lit Coach was a purpose in the LCAP as well a district purpose to serve the entire population. LCAP supports that

specific purpose for the targeted students.

Paxson noted the decision-making at the sites for specific purposes and that PTA funds were putting money into enrichment, extra music and dance. She thought it was interesting to see how the money was spent and noted that it looked consistent.

Tay stated that Scuderi had written a paper on excellence in education prior to the BSEP Measure and added that Berkeley codified enrichment as a part of education, in other words, a lot of the things that look like enrichment were already a part of the core curriculum. When sites look at their daily instructional minutes, they do have a lot of time devoted to things like art, music, and cooking and gardening. Schools might be looking at where particular needs may not be filled and at the budget meetings, it seemed that needs were identified for the instructional or academic minutes, time and support.

- The PTA resources columns were blank or the numbers small for the middle school level, while the elementary schools looked to be close. Some of the PTA monies were projected or preliminary because the budgets may not have been finished.
- Irwin suggested that the schools use a standardized form so that comparisons could be made “apples to apples.” Tay noted that a lot of the sites lost their Title 1 funding and previously they were a lot more standardized. They could put things back in and note where the differences were and why.
- Simon asked if the sites reported their finalized PTA budgets or forwarded them to Tay’s office. Tay responded that sites did not report to them but when they come to budget meetings they have that information in hand and that helps them to decide how to spend their BSEP and Title 1 dollars. There were different guidelines associated with different funding sources.
- Eknoian stated he was familiar with the Oxford budget and their SGC has a liaison to the PTA that attends the SGC meetings. Proposals to the PTA for money gets voted on by the second to the last meeting. He noted that the PTA and SGC were working close enough together that there was not a lot of disagreement. He felt that Oxford was fortunate to have that kind of parental support.
- Paxson asked who made decisions for TK and Early Childhood Education. Tay responded that there was a change to the bylaws to help small schools and small programs to get enough people to come together to serve on a mini SGC and then to come up with a plan. There will be a stand-alone TK SGC at King with Isabel McDaniel, Principal. Maria Carriedo, Principal, at Franklin, Hopkins, and King CD , usually has an SGC made up of parents from all three sites.

Tay pointed out the SMART GOALS in the memo. This moved the discussion to the next item below.

12. SGC/SSC Bylaws Workgroup Update

Valerie Tay, BSEP Program Specialist

Bruce Simon and Danielle Perez, Co-Chairs

Tay stated the Bylaws Workgroup had met and Perez, Simon and Pastika had attended. The list below outlines some of the items that need to be addressed, in addition to the list Beery handed out at the meeting of the Workgroup (not detailed at this P&O meeting):

- Power-sharing and empowering parents
- School leadership - how meetings can be run so everyone has a voice
- Clarifying the purpose of the SGC/SSC
- Recruitment and training of parents

- Building capacity for parents to become effective participants
- Rules and procedures
- Revising the bylaws

Questions and Responses/Discussion:

- There was a discussion around the definition of “discretionary” funds.
- Although the ways in which monies were being spent are valid, there needed to be a discussion about discretionary funds: are they discretionary or institutionalized? Simon noted that SSCs became SGCs and all the funding sources were brought to one place under one governance structure. Now that there’s only one set of discretionary funds and no real restrictions as to how the monies are spent, this has led to the current situation where we’re in now. How do we balance this?
- Irwin stated that he thought the principals had certain ideas and then got the SGC onboard for what their agenda was.
- Eknoian stated that while he was on the Oxford SGC, the expenditure of money was directly related to the parent survey. The things the parents wanted were ranked in order of importance and that informed how the funds were divvied up. What the parents wanted to see happen was revealed by the survey. What about those that didn’t turn in the survey? He stated they doubled the response this year by offering a movie night. He was also one of the volunteers that got parents to respond to the survey at after-school pick up times.
- Paxson referred to the way King ran their SGC slate which led to a discussion about the various ways to elect SGC members, non-voting members/parents attending meetings, adhering to certain laws, and doing more research on ways to run an SGC. Bradstreet stated that Rosa Parks SGC used the slate format in elections and had dynamite parent participation. He acknowledged that meetings were longer because the SGC was large.
- Simon appreciated Eknoian’s comments and said that the SGC bylaws directed the surveying of the parent body. He noted that when the District took over the parent survey, it took surveys out of the SGCs’ hands. That led to SGCs not doing their own or finding a different way to survey the parents.

The SSC/SGC Bylaws Workgroup is open to all those who would like to attend. Perez suggested that anyone interested could send Beery an email so they could be included. Meetings times are to be determined.

13. 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. BSEP bookmarks made by Race were passed out to committee members and celebratory snacks were provided from the snack fund.

14. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 8:50 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support