

**BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**May 7, 2019**

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

**P&O Committee Members Present**

Nicole Chabot, *Arts Magnet*

Liz Fox, *Cragmont*

Jonathan Weissglass, *Emerson*

Weldon Bradstreet, *Rosa Parks*

Terry Pastika, *King*

Rita Gaber, *Willard*

Aaron Glimme, *Berkeley High*

Josh Irwin, *Berkeley High*

Bruce Simon, *Berkeley High*

Wim-Kees Van Hout, *Berkeley High (Alt)*

Felicia Bellows, *Independent Study*

**P&O Committee Members Absent\***

Orville Jackson, *Jefferson*

Kate Jordan, *Sylvia Mendez*

Justin Randall, *Sylvia Mendez*

Heather Flett, *Washington*

Rita Gaber, *Willard*

Jenny Sitkin Morgan, *Willard*

Jane Tunks Demel, *Malcolm X*

Tiara Maldonado, *Oxford*

Jill Blue Lin, *Oxford*

Stephanie Upp, *Washington*

*\*Alternates and co-reps are not marked absent if another rep is present. Currently there is not representation from the stand-alone TK, Pre-K, John Muir, Thousand Oaks, Longfellow, or BTA.*

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

Donald Evans, *Superintendent of Schools*

Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*

Lea Baechler-Brabo, *Communications Consultant to BUSD*

**BSEP Staff:**

Natasha Beery, *Director of BSEP and Community Relations*

Elizabeth Karam, *Senior Budget Analyst*

Danielle Perez, *BSEP Program Specialist*

Joann Marshall, *BSEP Clerical Assistant*

**1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports**

At 7:15 pm, Chairperson Pastika called the meeting to order with introductions and site reports from around the table. Chair Pastika stated that the previous night the King SSC approved their Site Plan; it was substantially the same as previous years with an emphasis on counseling services. Chair Bradstreet shared that the Rosa Parks SSC approved their budget and site plan. They also discussed transition for the new principal; the new principal will begin attending meetings to facilitate a smooth transition. Rep Glimme shared that BHS voted on and approved their budget. Due to additional funds granted and

a position that went unfilled there was an unusual amount of carryover so all proposals were funded. Rep Chabot reported that BAM's SSC approved their budget and worked on the site plan to be approved at the next meeting. BAM just completed their 'Big Give' one day fundraising campaign and raised over \$10,000 in one day. Rep Van Hout added that BHS asked everyone to be notified that the budget situation resulting in all proposals being funded this year was unusual, and not to expect the same next year. Rep Fox shared that Cragmont SSC planned to approve their budget and it includes moving funds previously used for ELD to math support next year.

## **2. Establish the Quorum & Approve Agenda**

The quorum was not established with 9 committee members present. Quorum was subsequently established with 11 members present by 7:30 pm.

One change to the Agenda was noted, item 9 was not necessary as there were no changes to the Program Support and Professional Development Plans being presented.

Rep Glimme moved to approve the revised agenda, Rep Van Hout seconded the motion; the agenda was approved unanimously.

## **3. Chairperson's Comments**

*Weldon Bradstreet and Terry Pastika co-Chairs, Planning and Oversight Committee*

Chair Bradstreet extended a reminder to contribute to snack fund. He also reported about the April 25th Q&A meeting organized for parent committee heads with the superintendent candidate.

## **4. BSEP Director's Comments**

*Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations*

Director Beery thanked all for attending. She recognized how much time had already been committed by members to accomplish all of the group's work on such an accelerated timeline this year. She noted that this meeting is the penultimate of the year and hoped that a quorum could be reached to finish pending action this evening.

## **5. Superintendent's Comments**

*Dr. Donald Evans, Superintendent of Schools*

Dr. Evans began by stating that there will be lively discussion at the upcoming School Board meeting. The board will vote on REALM's request for Material Revision. REALM's charter has changed significantly since it was granted to the point that the ongoing service is different from what was approved. After the vote for Material Revision there will be a hearing on the notice to revoke the charter at another time. The board will also be asked to approve the 2019-20 plan for LCAP supplemental funds and

also the new Superintendent's contract. He expressed that it is exciting to hear about where committee members' children are headed for college and he looks forward to hearing more. Mentioning the May 22 Day of Action in Sacramento to demand state funding for public schools, he is supportive but acknowledges that keeping the schools open for students with so many staff members attending out of town will be a major task. Work is being done to adjust schedules, the district may be going to a minimum day. Chair Pastika asked if there has been a comparable event in the past that would add insight. An event such as this has not happened in the last 20 years. Dr. Evans added that a lot of districts will have representation but not nearly as many as BUSD; most other districts are sending a few delegates each. Director Beery said leadership will be meeting with principals in the morning to find out what plans are at various sites; it is highly variable at each site as to how many staff members will be away and how many students they are expecting. Once plans at the school sites are gathered, information will be communicated to families.

Rep Van Hout asked when the revocation of REALM's charter would happen and what will happen with funding for that site. Dr. Evans answered that, if the Board approves the Material Revision, the revocation of the charter will not be considered. If the Board decides to close down the charter, the students would return to their neighborhood schools and the money for those students would follow. REALM has very few BUSD students, and has been encouraged to move their charter to WCCUSD, where the majority of their students are coming from.

#### **6. Approval of Minutes from 3.26.19 and 4.16.19 Subcommittee meetings**

Chair Pastika asked members to review the minutes drafts and offer any corrections before approval. Chair Bradstreet corrected in the minutes, at the bottom of page 9 it should read that he clarified that DLI is separate from NPGS.

Rep Irwin moved to approve the 3/26/19 minutes draft with the correction from Chair Bradstreet, Rep Bellows seconded; the minutes were approved unanimously.

Chair Pastika then asked members to review the minutes draft for 4/16/19 and offer any corrections before approval. No corrections were offered.

Rep Glimme moved to approve the 4/16/19 minutes draft, Rep Chabot seconded; the minutes were approved unanimously.

#### **7. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

#### **8. BSEP Audit for 2017-18, Measure A and Measure E1**

*Elizabeth Karam, Senior Budget Analyst*

Ms. Karam distributed the following documents:

- **Financial Statements, Measure A of 2006**
- **Performance Audit, Measure A of 2006**
- **Financial Statements, Measure E1 of 2016**
- **Performance Audit, Measure E1 of 2016**

Ms. Karam began with the Measure A audit by calling attention to the independent auditor's report done in conjunction with the district audit. The the opinion is most important and upfront. Two interesting elements are the balance sheet and statement of revenue and expenditures. The balance sheet is simply assets and liabilities, the format is same for both audits, in this case it combines the 9% resource. Revenues and expenditures and change in fund balance, shows what money was taken in and what was spent. The 3% reserve is based on expenditures and transfers. As the Measure E1 fund balances are built up, most of the fund balance from Measure A has been distributed to other resources based on the allocations of Measure A so they can be spent. There was a strategic plan to leave enough in Measure A to cover things that will happen in remaining life of measure.

Rep Chabot asked about Class Size Reduction at \$543,000. Ms. Karam pointed to where the document says revenues, interfund transfers, \$684,000 came out of one resource and was distributed across other resources, \$442,000 went to class size reduction leading to that much carryover. Rep Chabot asked for clarification as to why other resources spent the money. Ms Karam explained that plans and spending are always on a continuum, plans have been made to spend some of that carryover this year. These numbers are from June 30 of 2018 but as of this meeting spending plans have already been made for the 2018-19 year and the following 2019-20 year. Rep Van Hout asked if there are funds still coming in to Measure A? Ms. Karam explained this is an estimate of what the final payment would be in September, books are closed before the last payment. Rep Van Hout asked if this was from taxes not yet paid? Ms. Karam explained it is from the prior year, the estimate was missed by \$46,000. No more revenue will come in for Measure A, though requests for refunds due to low-income seniors and non-profits or other readjustments can still come in for several years after the initial taxes were paid.

The Performance Audit is for oversight purposes, to know that money was spent the way it was supposed to be spent, according to the language of the measure as approved by the Berkeley voters. The opinion of the auditors is a paragraph on page 1, and below the opinion follows summary items. Rep Irwin asked about the cost of the audits. Ms. Karam answered that the cost is approximately \$7,000. BSEP, the Maintenance Fund, General Obligation Bond Funds and the district General Fund audits are included in one BUSD-wide contract with the auditor company. Rep Van Hout asked how long has the Crowe Firm been the auditing contractor. Ms Karam answered that Crowe has been

auditor for 6 years and has worked out very well.

Reviewing the Measure E1 financial statements, see page 2 for the opinion and note that the balance sheet is a snapshot from June 30th. The distribution of funds is slightly different in this new measure from that of Measure A. High Quality Instruction is 66%, four programs from Measure A are combined as Essentials for Excellence, while Family Engagement, Counseling and Student Achievement strategies are combined as Effective Student Support. The ending fund balance in total is about \$6.9 million across all resources. The document shows tax revenues and interest; interest won't be quite so high this year because budget transfer based on teacher template will happen earlier in the year. Net revenue takes into account transfer into the GF. The document also shows transfer of indirect cost to the GF. Note that on page 10 there are no audit findings.

Director Beery added that the lack of findings is attributed to the hard work of many people, especially Ms. Karam's oversight to ensure funds are expended and documented as they should be and Danielle Perez assisting school site councils and principals ensuring their documentation and procedures are correct.

The performance audit is to show whether funds were used appropriately. The opinion finds that funds were spent only as mandated in the measure language. The document also explains the transfer to GF, and methodology was reviewed. Rep Van Hout asked if BSEP site funds are included in Essentials for Excellence. Ms. Karam answered yes, it is now called School Site Programs and it typically has a large amount of carryover.

## **9. Recommendation for BSEP Funds FY 2019-20: Communication, Translation, and Community Engagement**

*Natasha Beery, Director of BSEP and Community Relations*

Director Beery distributed the following documents:

- **Recommendation for Expenditure of BSEP Funds for Communication, Translation and Community Engagement in FY 2019-20**

Director Beery thanked the subcommittee for their work helping with the particulars of this 2% budget for Communication, Translation and Community Engagement. The plan has not changed greatly, one main thing that the subcommittee committee discussed was print vs. online/social media communications and how to reach a wide variety of audiences with different needs. The mailing of the annual report to voters was discussed as well as whether the costs and/or staff resources required could be scaled back. The subcommittee felt there is value in print especially to reach those who are not digital natives and far removed from the schools. Parents also appreciate something well put together in the mail and it is not realistic to expect people to search the internet for information. The subcommittee discussed the contractor work, less about PIO work. A lot that PIO does is core to Communication mission, both print and digital. For example, the

weekly bulletin has grown and is helpful to staff morale in sharing the great things that are happening in our schools, it helps to connect those who do not work on school sites and between school sites. The question of social media was a big topic: which platform and having bandwidth to monitor those channels and dealing with opening up a public forum that may not be representative of community. Social media privacy concerns were mentioned and that social media tends to be scrolling through images and headlines, rather than providing in-depth or targeted information. At least for now, social media expansion is not being pursued but this is a moment of transition, and with a new PIO and other turnover this direction may change. A change from the last document is that the use of carryover funds has been detailed.

Shared with the subcommittee was a look at this purpose in the final years of Measure A, 97% of the allocation was spent on staffing, drawing upon fund balance for other costs, and currently under E1 staffing costs are in a more sustainable 80% range. During this time of transition it may be desirable to use Measure A carryover funds for contract work to ease the transition as people depart during the summer.

Rep Fox agreed with printing of materials, many people are inundated with digital content and it nice to have paper, and agrees that social media is not benefit added. Director Beery and Director Nitschke found an unused district Twitter handle that could be used for emergencies. Rep Glimme mentioned he does enjoy the occasional Ed Services tweet. Rep Van Hout asked about the difference between the amount of ending fund balance listed between this document and the amount listed in the audit documents. Ms. Karam responded that the audit was from info as of the previous year, whereas this plan takes into account what was spent this year ('18-19) from Measure A: approx \$100,000. Director Beery explained that amount as being used primarily for the Superintendent's Speaker Series and an upgrade to the district's translation equipment. Ms. Karam added that this amount is the budgeted fund balance.

Chair Pastika expressed gratitude to BSEP staff for visiting the individual SSCs, although it surely was not easy it made a big difference and made it easier to understand a broad perspective. Director Beery added that there were many obstacles to making this happen and it wouldn't have without Danielle Perez's focus and support.

Rep Glimme motioned to approve the Plan for Communication, Translation and Community Engagement in 2019-20 , Rep Simon seconded; the plan was approved unanimously.

## **10. High School SSC and BSEP Site Committee Bylaws Update**

*Natasha Beery, Director of BSEP and Community Relations*

Director Beery discussed the high school's bifurcated process and that it is being

considered whether or not having two committees there still makes sense. Currently there is an SSC that is tasked with the school plan, WASC, and the Safety Plan, but which doesn't decide site funding allocations. Rather the BHS BSEP Committee evaluates proposals for funding and creates a budget, which the SSC has veto power over and may vote to approve or reject the total budget. If there is a vote to reject the budget the School Board, with input from the Principal, has the final say in what is and is not funded. Rep Glimme explained that at the time the two-committee system was established, there were concerns about how different the budgeting process at the high school was, as well as concern about the culture of some committees. The Principal and Committee chair at the time along with staff support decided it would be easier and more functional to keep the processes separate. Now things have changed, and it might be a good time to combine committees. Some of his concerns are that the current  $\frac{1}{3}$  students,  $\frac{1}{3}$  parents,  $\frac{1}{3}$  staff ratio of the BSEP committee could not be maintained due to state laws about SSC composition, which require  $\frac{1}{2}$  staff and  $\frac{1}{2}$  community members. There is a certain logic and appeal to having community members (in the form of  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority going to students and parents/guardians) in control of funds provided by the community via the BSEP taxes. Though the staff is also very deeply involved as well.

Chair Pastika asked if the process is different at the high school because of the larger amount of money being allocated. Rep Glimme answered that it is historical and has been done this way for the past 25 years. Director Beery added that it could be due to the amount of funding. Chair Pastika commented that it seems to be a muddled process and confusing to have the site council and BSEP funds together in one process at the elementary and middle school level. Rep Simon recalled that there used to be more pots of money, so the SSC used to have Title I and Title IX funds and principals were having to attend multiple meetings so they brought it all together. At the high school BSEP is substantial on its own. Chair Pastika commented that it is easy for everything to get muddled if there is not clear designation. Rep Glimme feels that the primary job of the SSC will be BSEP committee, there will be some time spent on safety committee and school site plan, etc., but the work of the BSEP committee will be primary with a different distribution of membership. Rep Van Hout agrees that a benefit of the current model would be that the principal would not be able to attend so many meetings. Chair Pastika's reasons for separation make sense, but on the other hand, great strides have been made towards streamlining the process. Rep Glimme stated that at an earlier time, the role of committee was problematic and that prompted the recent streamlining. Even though he witnessed the need at the time for the current structure, he now thinks it can work to combine the committees.

Rep Chabot asked to clarify that the proposal is to re-merge the groups into one committee that oversees the BSEP budget of approximately \$1 million dollars and the other major change is the committee will be  $\frac{1}{2}$  teachers,  $\frac{1}{4}$  adults and  $\frac{1}{4}$  students. The change in representation of the committee is substantial. Director Beery added that it will be going from 5 to 4 parent/guardians and 5 to 4 students. Many agreed that the students

are a great asset. Mr. Nitschke added that he remembers when it was more dysfunctional and it could become challenging again. Rep Simon responded that this sentiment points to importance of keeping eye on bylaws and maintaining oversight. The recent visits by BSEP staff were very effective in furthering this goal. As long as oversight and support from the BSEP office continues, he feels very optimistic.

Chair Pastika is interested to her how the discussion evolves, in her opinion it's tough having SSCs and site funds merged because the purposes of each task is unique. Clarity depends on the principal and the composition of the committee. Rep Van Hout agrees that it's great that Rep Glimme is at BHS now, but what would happen when he's gone (as institutional memory), it could be a real problem. Ms. Baechler-Brabo remembers when elementaries had BSEP, ELAC, Site Council all had separate fund and it was really challenging for the Principal, having to pass budgets when you don't know what other groups will provide. In her experience the schools ended up spending more wisely because this combined method provides more engaged diverse perspective that understand more how the funds interrelate. Rep Glimme added that, if we could merge the site committee into BSEP we would, but state law doesn't allow that, so merging can only happen with the BSEP group being absorbed into the SSC. there is a lot of redundancy between the two meetings and between the two groups, if we transplant that into a different committee the same work can get done but it does change the representation of the community in the decision making process. the group is thinking about this, but is keeping in mind that it seems to work at the other levels.

## **11. Site Plans and SSC Processes**

*Natasha Beery, Director of BSEP and Community Relations*

*Danielle Perez, BSEP Program Specialist*

Danielle Perez began by discussing the site plans process from a district perspective. Principals are extremely busy at the moment due to unusual challenges with the budget process this year requiring extensive budget meetings and district support. The challenges to the budget process this year include a change to the template for SPSA, the 2019-20 plans are being produced in an entirely different format. Most problematically, the online interface that the principals log into to update and publish their budgets was missing entire columns of information, requiring much more work on the Principals' parts to explain approved funding to allow BUSD staff to create functional and accurate budgets for use from Title 1 and BSEP Site Program funds. District staff had to do a lot of problem solving to create usable document. Dr. Saddler is no longer with the district, her expertise and assistance during the SPSA process has been greatly missed, especially for the new principals. With these and other challenges, this year has been especially time consuming for our two new principals requiring extra support, and next year there will be three new principals also needing increased support. This process is still ongoing, the current deadline for Plans and Budgets from each site is May 15th but some sites may need longer.

Rep Simon added that the governor's new state budget may be released before the May 15th deadline and asked if that would create more difficulties with this process. Ms. Perez answered that LCAP staffing might be a bigger issue but didn't think the governor's new budget would have an impact at the site level. The current challenge to LCAP staffing is due to the disruption in the PAC process after Dr. Saddler's departure. LCAP staffing allocations are still not set or approved by the School Board, making planning and staffing decisions difficult to impossible in some cases. Chair Pastika asked if the district will need to recreate documentation? Ms. Perez answered that principals were asked to recreate in each strategy line descriptions for each expenditure. Chair Pastika asked if that will be part of the site plan? Ms. Perez answered that it will be a part of the SPSA and will be a lot of extra work for principals.

Ms. Perez shared thoughts generated during SSC visits and during the subcommittee meeting about communication lines between school and district run websites, specifically regarding information about SSC meetings. There is a need to post meeting notices and agendas in a way that is more consistent and accessible to ensure transparency and facilitate public requests for information. Rep Glimme noted that the BHS website posts all meeting agendas and minutes. Ms. Perez shared feedback from principals requesting that elections be held in the spring because the fall is proving to be too busy to be effective. Director Beery added that this request comes up every few years and the concern has been that it leaves out incoming K-6-9 families. Ms. Perez mentioned a compromise would be to distribute recruitment material in the Spring that would allow more effective elections in the Fall.

Ms. Perez gave a report on her experience visiting SSCs, highlighting best practices. Out of 19 programs only BTA and Independent Study remain to be visited this year with plans to visit the remaining 2 in the coming weeks. Every group demonstrated thoughtful intention and collaboration to address the issues specific to each site. It was positive to see strong leadership from both principals and non principal chairpersons. The approaches to starting the year varied, some groups were data heavy, others started with looking at the School Plan more conceptually; King started with evaluating Goal 3, "Safe, Welcoming and Inclusive School Climate." It was a smart starting point as all members, staff or community, new to SSC or not, could equally contribute input on that common goal. All groups are working according to bylaws. Some struggle with getting enough reps, and we want to encourage all to continue to connect to their wider community as much as possible. Many are still working to smooth the process of posting and advertising meetings.

Director Beery noted that some schools were quite successful in using the SSC as a unifier with reps from other groups like PTA, ELAC, PAC, etc. Ms. Perez also noted that in having more groups at the table it was at times interesting to hear how "myths" or urban legends filter back to groups, and to realize that nuance of district information was

sometimes lost between representatives and SSCs. We need to continue to keep in mind how to give groups useable information that can be taken back accurately, particularly important this year due to questions, concerns, and confusion around district budget cuts.

There were a couple of points when an “us vs. them” mentality appeared, either as staff vs. parents, or school site vs. district. Director Beery wondered if cabinet meetings could be occasionally held at sites to spread out district leadership’s visibility. Director Nitschke added that PTA council meetings represent a huge division in information, and thought it might be useful for BSEP staff to try to be involved on that level at some point. Most school districts don’t let PTA pay for positions but BUSD does, and this can in part lead to the feeling of PTA Council that the PTAs only ever have time to fundraise to save positions that would otherwise not exist. It would be good to somehow find a way of communicating to stop this us vs. them mentality that can crop up.

Rep Van Hout wondered if it would be possible to provide to sites a comprehensive overview showing how different district-level sources of funding interlock into the overall district budget, to give a total picture. That may help alleviate some of the friction. Chair Pastika asked if this example would include funds the PTAs raise. The response was likely not, given their protection of what they consider proprietary information. Rep Chabot felt it would be helpful to show who is putting in money for each expenditure, because at the district level there is the same argument as at the PTA, that one shouldn’t be paying for things that we feel should be provided from a higher level, such as things that BUSD can’t pay for because of a lack of state funding. She likes the idea of showing what overall resources exist and how they are being applied to needs across the district. Ms. Perez expressed that she hopes visiting sites consistently over multiple years, representing the district in a supportive role, will help ease some of the contention. Chair Pastika suggested that asking sites what info they need would be helpful. Ms. Perez shared that each visit resulted in a list of questions from sites directed toward the District Office. Many were not directly BSEP related, but it is often hard for site-based staff, parents or principals to know exactly who to ask to get needed information. Gathering these questions and connecting the principals to the appropriate people to get their answers became a part of each visit follow-up.

Ms. Perez shared highlights of the takeaways that will be added to committee best practices for the coming year. They might not work at every site but could be helpful for most. Director Beery’s appreciated that when Oxford sent out its family site survey the principal promised to share the results back with the community as incentive to get more participation. Rep Simon asked why the best practices weren’t attributed to the sites that inspired them, so that other SSCs could direct questions their way. Ms. Perez explained that though there were takeaways from each visit, for this one-page condensed version she didn’t want it to incorrectly appear that some schools didn’t have any best practices to be borrowed. Additionally some items, like the process of holding focus group meetings rather than conducting a survey, require a lot of time to process and explain,

and she worried about an SSC bearing the burden of explaining a complex process over and over again to other interested groups; it might be preferable for the BSEP staff to record that information and share it as needed, saving the time of SSC volunteers who already put a lot of time and energy into the initial process.

**12. For the Good of the Order**

There were no items presented.

**13. Adjournment**

Rep Van Hout moved to adjourn, Rep Simon seconded the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm.