



**BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
**BERKELEY SCHOOLS EXCELLENCE PROGRAM**  
2134 Martin Luther King, Jr. Way, Berkeley, CA 94704  
Phone: 644-8717 Fax: 644-8923 [www.berkeley.net](http://www.berkeley.net)

### MEETING NOTICE

**COMMITTEE:** BSEP Planning & Oversight Committee  
**DATE:** **Tuesday, April 10, 2012**  
**LOCATION:** **Malcolm X School Library** **TIME:** 7:00  
1731 Prince St. **Gavel down: 7:15**  
**CHAIRPERSON:** Chris Martin

---

### AGENDA

- 7:15 1. Call to Order & Site Reports  
2. Establish the Quorum/ Approve Agenda  
3. Chairs' Comments (Chris Martin & Elisabeth Hensley)  
4. Public Comment
- 7:35 5. (Acting) BSEP Manager's Comments (Monica Thyberg)
- [Discussion] 7:45 6. ***Revised Recommendation for allocation of BSEP Class Size Reduction (CSR) Funds in 2012-13***  
William Huyett, Superintendent
- [Action] 8:20 7. ***Recommendation for allocation of BSEP Parent Outreach Funds in 2012-13***  
William Huyett, Superintendent
- 8:50 8. Update on Program Evaluation Department and Q&A on next steps for Program Evaluation in 2012-13  
Debbi d'Angelo, Director, Berkeley Evaluation & Assessment
- 9:10 9. Update on the BSEP Manager Position (Thyberg & Huyett)
- [Action] 9:20 10. Approval of the Minutes: 2-28-12, 3-6-12
- 9:30 11. Adjournment

#### Upcoming P&O Meetings:

**April 17: Subcommittee Meeting:** Professional Development and Program Evaluation in 2012-13  
**April 24: Action:** Class Size for 2012-13; **Presentation:** Program Evaluation

## **BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

**TO:** Board of Education  
**FROM:** William Huyett, Superintendent  
**DATE:** April 11, 2012  
**SUBJECT:** Recommendation for a new Site-based Parent Outreach and Engagement Program

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The *Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006* (BSEP) allocates 1.25% of the revenues of the BSEP Measure annually “For a variety of services to support the families of Berkeley’s public school students by providing parent education and promoting greater parent involvement in their children’s education.” (Section 3Biic).

On March 28, 2012, the Board of Education reviewed a proposed new model for providing parent outreach and education services beginning in the next school year and directed the administration to develop the position descriptions and proposed budget for the recommended staffing model.

### **Recommended staffing model**

The recommended staffing model is as follows:

***Site Coordinator, Family Engagement 2.0 FTE***

***Site Coordinator, Family Engagement, Spanish/English Bilingual required, 1.0 FTE***

***Supervisor, Family Engagement and Equity, 1.0 FTE***

### **Position Descriptions**

The work of the **Site Coordinators for Family Engagement** is to be focused on three primary areas: to create a welcoming school environment for ALL families; to provide targeted support to families of specific students in need of academic, behavioral, and emotional support; to increase the involvement of marginalized parents (African American, Latino and Limited English parents) in the school’s leadership committees (ELAC, SGC, PTA).

After analysis of the academic qualifications and job duties of the **Site Coordinator, Family Engagement** position, it was determined that the classification of this new position is proposed to be at Range

50 to account for the increased educational qualifications and job duties of this position. The current Parent Liaison positions, funded by site monies, (Cragmont, BHS) are at Range 45 and would also need to be adjusted according to the applicable rules of the Personnel Merit System and collaborative bargaining agreement. Funds are included in the projected budget to account for a possible compensation differential for employees in the existing Parent Liaison positions.

The **Supervisor, Family Engagement and Equity**, a new district position, has been designed to bring together the closely related work of parent outreach and educational equity. The responsibilities of this are to supervise, evaluate, and provide ongoing professional development to the Site Coordinators, provide professional development in educational equity to other groups, and to coordinate district wide parent education and cultural celebrations. This position is proposed to be classified at Range 69.

Funds for this Supervisor position would become available by eliminating the positions of the Program Manager, School-Linked Programs (Range 72) and Supervisor, Cultural and Linguistic Systems (Range 56).

A recommendation for the proposed new positions is scheduled to be presented to the Personnel Merit Commission on April 12, 2012.

#### **Schools Selected for the Pilot Program**

Six schools were selected to participate in the pilot year of the new program. These are: Emerson, John Muir, Berkeley Arts Magnet, Malcolm X, LeConte and Thousand Oaks. Four criteria were considered in selecting these schools: that is, schools with a large number of students enrolled in the Free Meals Program; schools with a large number of English Learners; schools with a large number of students with “below basic” achievement in math and/or English; and the schools’ Program Improvement status.

#### **Assessment of the Parent Outreach and Engagement Program**

The district’s Evaluation and Assessment Office will develop evaluation tools and collect data to assess the effectiveness of this new program. The assessment tools will include measurable improvement in attendance, homework completion and/or reduced discipline referrals, and CST and other test scores of the students who are being served at each site. Focus group meetings will be held with include parents and staff at schools in the pilot program so they can provide direct feedback. The School Board and the new Superintendent may wish to consider a district wide Advisory

Committee after the Program has been established. In the interim, the Superintendent will continue to meet with selected parents for advice on the implementation of this new program.

It is recommended that this pilot program be implemented for two years before modification or expansion of the program is undertaken. A progress report should be prepared at the end of FY 2012-13, and a more in-depth program evaluation would be prepared at the conclusion of the 2013-14 school year.

### **Funding**

The funding for the recommended Parent Outreach and Engagement Program is almost wholly from the annual allocation of the Berkeley Schools Excellence Program (BSEP) for *Parent Outreach Services*. This includes the **Family Engagement Program Site Coordinators** (3.0 FTE), the district **Supervisor, Family Engagement and Equity** position (.50 FTE), and the discretionary program expenses (e.g., books and supplies, professional development, consulting services, printing, etc.) The other fifty percent (.50 FTE) of the **Supervisor** position is intended to be funded from categorical monies.

An adequate, but modest, discretionary budget is projected. Sufficient funds are allocated to allow for significant professional development activities in the first two years and for contracted programs, such as Parent Institute for Quality Education (PIQE). Additional funds from the school sites are needed for food at events and child care expenses for meetings and other activities.

### **Additional Considerations**

The current BSEP funding source has sufficient income projected to implement the Parent Outreach and Engagement Program as recommended for two years. The Board may wish to consider one or two additional options.

**Option 1:** A fourth position of **Site Coordinator, Family Engagement Program** could be established at 1.0 FTE. If this option were adopted, .25 FTE of this position could be allocated to each of the four Tier II elementary schools: Cragmont, Jefferson, Oxford, and Washington. This allocation could be supplemented with site monies. A projected budget for Option 1 is approximately \$64,000.

**Option 2:** There would be salary savings in the General Fund from elimination of the position of Manager, School Linked Programs. (Range 72). A **Site Coordinator, Family Engagement** position at .50 FTE could be allocated to BHS to ensure that the positions of the two parent liaison currently employed there could be maintained at

1.0 FTE (those positions may need to be reduced in FTE due to lack of site funds). The cost of Option 2 is approximately \$32,000. It is recommended that any additional salary savings accrued in the General Fund from elimination of the Range 72 position be reserved until the status of the categorical funds and other budget factors are known.

**Additional considerations**

The current funding sources have sufficient funds to sustain this program for two years. Expansion of the model to include other schools, as is fervently desired by parents and staff, could be considered after evaluation of the program proves it to be successful and additional funding sources are identified.

**DISTRICT GOAL**

III. Family and Community Engagement

**POLICY/CODE**

*Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006 (Para. 2A, Measure A of 2006).*

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The BSEP budget for the recommended Parent Outreach Program projected for 2013 and 2014 are displayed in Attachment A.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Approve the recommendation to establish a new model for the Parent Outreach and Engagement Program. The Board may also choose to approve Options 1 and/or 2.

## Attachment A

### Parent Outreach Budget Plan Budget Recommendation

	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>2013/14</b>
<b>Resources Available</b>		
BSEP/Measure A Revenue Allocation	292,123.00	297,965.00
Projected Carryover	212,523.00	183,199.00
<b>Total Resources Available</b>	<b>504,646.00</b>	<b>481,164.00</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
Staff Salary	165,609.00	173,787.00
Staff Benefits	81,531.00	83,755.00
Discretionary Expenditures	55,000.00	44,000.00
Indirect Cost	19,307.00	19,268.00
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>321,447.00</b>	<b>320,810.00</b>
<b>Estimated Fund Balance</b>	<b>183,199.00</b>	<b>160,354.00</b>

### Option A

	<b>2012/13</b>	<b>2013/14</b>
<b>Resources Available</b>		
BSEP/Measure A Revenue Allocation	292,123.00	297,965.00
Projected Carryover	212,523.00	114,802.00
<b>Total Resources Available</b>	<b>504,646.00</b>	<b>412,767.00</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>		
Staff Salary	208,292.00	218,580.00
Staff Benefits	103,137.00	105,935.00
Discretionary Expenditures	55,000.00	44,000.00
Indirect Cost	23,415.00	23,548.00
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>389,844.00</b>	<b>392,063.00</b>
<b>Estimated Fund Balance</b>	<b>114,802.00</b>	<b>20,704.00</b>

### Option B

BHS Site Coordinator (.5 FTE) GF	32,144.00	33,486.50
----------------------------------	-----------	-----------

**BSEP/Measure A PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**March 6, 2012**

Malcolm X School Library  
1731 Prince St., Berkeley

**P&O Committee Members Present:**

Keira Armstrong, <i>Washington (Alt)</i>	Mariane Ferme, <i>Berkeley High</i>	Aaron Glimme, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Larry Gordon, <i>Berkeley High</i>	Patrick Hamill, <i>Thousand Oaks</i>	Elisabeth Hensley, <i>King (co-Chair)</i>
Diana Kuderna, <i>Berkeley High (Alt)</i>	John Lavine, <i>King</i>	Catherine Lazio, <i>Willard</i>
Chris Martin, <i>LeConte (co-Chair)</i>	Jay Nitschke, <i>King (Alt)</i>	Shauna Rabinowitz, <i>Jefferson</i>
Margot Reed, <i>Longfellow</i>	Abigail Surasky, <i>Longfellow (Alt)</i>	

**P&O Committee Members Absent:**

Marjorie Alvord, <i>Berkeley High (Alt)</i>	Lea Baechler-Brabo, <i>Oxford (Alt)</i>	Juliet Bashore, <i>Rosa Parks</i>
Nicole Bowen, <i>Arts Magnet</i>	Brett Cook, <i>Malcolm X</i>	Esther Hirsh, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Ruby Holder, <i>B-Tech</i>	Brittini Milam, <i>Washington</i>	Dialy Paulino, <i>Cragmont</i>
Dawn Paxson, <i>Emerson</i>	Ardel Thomas, <i>Pre-K</i>	Sara Tool, <i>John Muir</i>
Greg Wiberg, <i>Oxford</i>	Evon Williams, <i>Longfellow</i>	Representative, <i>Willard</i>
Representative, <i>Independent Study</i>		

**Visitors, School Board Directors, District Advisory Committee Liaisons, Staff and Guests:**

Judy Appel, *Oxford Parent*   Julie Holcomb, *BHS Parent, former P&O Chair*   Dan Lindheim, *former P&O Chair*

**BSEP Staff:**

Monica Thyberg, *Acting BSEP Manager*   Mary Hurlbert, *Admin. Coord.*   Mark Coplan, *PIO*

**1. Call to Order & Introductions.**

Co-chair Chris Martin called the meeting to order at 7:15 and invited representatives to introduce themselves.

**2. Chair's Comments.**

Chris Martin invited P&O members to contribute to the tea/coffee/cookie fund. He reminded attendees who were neither committee members nor alternates to hold their comments until the *Public Comment* portion of the meeting.

**3. Monica Thyberg's Comments.**

Thyberg thanked P&O members for emailing class-size-reductions questions to her. She clarified that while she welcomed queries by phone, in person, and via Google docs, an online, round-robin-style discussion of P&O Committee matters was a violation of the Brown Act's open committee law.

**4. Public Comment.**

*Julie Holcomb, Visiting BHS Parent and former P&O co-chair.*

Holcomb made the point that although community members were welcome to attend P&O meetings and to make statements during the public comment period, they should not be allowed to participate in general committee meeting discussions. She said that while some controversy existed in the

community around the planning role of this committee versus the planning role of BUSD's paid professionals, there was no controversy surrounding the P&O's role as an oversight working group.

**5. BSEP Class Size Funds – A Historical Perspective and Analysis of the Administration's Recommendation for the expenditure of the BSEP Class Size Reduction Monies in FY 2012-13**

*Dan Lindheim, former P&O co-chair*

Lindheim noted that when he was co-chair, he had always been acutely aware of the importance of adhering to the Measure so BUSD could return to the voters in good faith and ask them to renew it. He stated that Measure A of 2006 monies had become so integral to the District, that a failure to reaffirm the BSEP Measure would have disastrous consequences that could lead to huge class sizes and even bankruptcy. Lindheim said that although Berkeleyans had supported the Measure thus far, things could change. Then he cautioned the P&O to continuously look forward to the next election and to avoid situations that might give fodder to opponents. By way of example he said every single Berkeley neighborhood association had voted against the Measure when it was last on the ballot.

**Analysis of Class Size Reduction Staffing Ratios in the 2012-13 School Year**

*Dan Lindheim, former P&O co-chair*

Lindheim said that from his perspective the most critical thing for next year was whether or not there would be enough FTE to meet the BSEP Class Size Goals (20:1 K-3, 26:1 4-5, 28:1 6-12). He said he had looked at the BHS class-size data to see how BHS was adhering to or veering from the Measure's specifications. Having studied the Superintendent's recommendations for the expenditure of CSR monies, he said he wanted to determine what difference it would make if, as proposed, BUSD adjusted the BHS enrollment used for allocating FTE by staffing PE classes at a higher figure, and removing ROP classes, and pro-rating students who take less than a full class load.

Lindheim said he was surprised to find that current class size average at BHS, excluding PE and ROP is actually lower than last year, 26.7:1 compared to 28.7 last year. Saying that there were fewer large outlier classes and much more compression around the 28:1 class-size this year, Lindheim asked the P&O to consider whether BUSD was in compliance with the Measure's terms with a 28:1 class size, a 28:1 average class size, or a 28:1 median class-size. Lindheim said that this year if you eliminated all BHS classes below 23:1, BUSD would still meet the required 28:1. He said this was not only remarkable but might also explain why the administration had reviewed the numbers and had concluded that BHS was overstaffed. However, Lindheim warned that if BHS lost 6 FTE, the student teacher ratios might not look so good in the future and class-size spread would quickly grow.

**The Administration's Proposal to Staff PE Classes at a 38:1 Ratio**

Lindheim said he had no problem with this plan because the Measure explicitly excludes PE from the Class Size Goals. As an aside, he pointed out that PE had never been clearly defined in the Measure's language and that begged the question as to whether dance, for example, should fall under PE, under art, or even, in certain cases, under anthropology. He cautioned P&O members that they should be clear about what classes actually fell under this PE umbrella.

**Regional Occupational Program (ROP)**

Lindheim said that at first he had been confused as to why the administration wanted to subtract ROP classes from the total BHS enrollment when calculating 28:1 staffing requirements. He said he then realized that what the administration was saying was that ROP classes are already funded by ROP.

Providing BSEP staffing for ROP class sections is double-funding. He noted that, since there are so few ROP classes, removing the ROP classes would make very little impact.

**Proposal to add FTE to the Universal Learning Support Systems Program (ULSS)**

Lindheim said that if the administration had concluded that the ULSS program was important for students' success, he questioned the P&O Committee's legitimacy to contradict or to override the District on that issue.

**6. Discussion of Administration's Recommendation for BSEP Class Size Funds in FY 2012-13**

**Issue: The proposed change in the way the secondary enrollment would be counted for purposes of class size staffing (adjusting for PE, ROP, students taking only 5 periods).**

Q Worried about the effect of fewer FTE at BHS on class sizes in the Academic Choice (AC) program.

A Academic Choice's current class size average is 28.3. Two years ago a mistake was made, whereby all mid-year transfer students were assigned to AC, which made class sizes balloon. That is no longer happening.

Q Worried about the loss of FTE at BHS. What if enrollment grows next year, and class sizes become huge? This feels like an over-correction.

A Enrollment projections are done now, again in June, and again during the first 10 day of school. If there is a dramatic shift upwards, teaching staff can be increased.

Q Could FTE be reapportioned within Berkeley High? It doesn't feel equitable now.

A Berkeley High, like all schools, makes its own internal decisions about how to allocate classroom teachers. Many times what looks like inequity is a school or department decision, to deliberately keep classes lower in some classes (often those with struggling students), and let honors and AP classes be larger.

Q Regional Occupational Program (ROP) funds can't be guaranteed. What if they go away?

A ROP funds are given to the district on a contract. That contract will be known in June.

Q Why not leave the BHS enrollment alone (i.e. don't make these changes—ROP, PE, students who take 5 classes) and just be more conservative in projecting BHS enrollment?

A BSEP has traditionally over-allocated FTE to BHS, by 1) allocating FTE for classes that are taught by ROP-funded teachers, 2) allocating FTE as if PE classes were 28:1 when they are much higher, and 3) treating students who take less than a full load (6 periods) as if they did take a full load, and allocating full FTE for them.

Q What is the unadjusted secondary enrollment that is projected for next year?

A Thyberg will provide the unadjusted projected enrollment and Teacher Template to the Committee.

Q Why are we being asked to make these changes?

- A These changes are needed in order for the General Fund to cut its portion of classroom teacher cost, as part of its Cut Target of \$1.4 million from next year's budget, due to the dire state of the California budget.

Other Comments:

- The effect of the Superintendent's recommendation is likely to be an additional 1-2 students in each (non-P.E.) class at BHS.
- BHS class size varies significantly, depending on the time of year it is measured. Fall enrollment is highest. In spring, class size typically drops between .7 and 1.
- BHS enrollment is harder to project than Kindergarten enrollment.
- Doesn't see the necessity of making these changes, but what is the problem with doing so?
- Concerned about voter perception. Why change the staffing formula now? Voters could see it as a violation of the Measure.

**Issue: The Superintendent's CSR Recommendation would reduce classroom teachers at Berkeley High by approximately 5.5 FTE, while at the same time increasing BSEP funding for 5.5 ULSS FTE at the middle schools.**

Q It doesn't feel right to take from BHS to give to the middle schools.

- A The Superintendent's proposal does not "take from BHS and give to the middle schools." The fact that the FTE is identical is coincidental. Two points:
- The refinement of secondary enrollment is proposed in order to allow the General Fund to pay for fewer teachers. The Superintendent could instead have simply recommended that the GF fund class sizes of 40:1. BSEP would have had to "buy down" from that figure to achieve the BSEP CS goals.
  - The proposal that BSEP fund 5.5 middle school ULSS teachers is not an increase of ULSS FTE at the middle schools. It is shifting the funding from the GF to BSEP, again, so the GF can save money.

Q Class size should not be sacrificed for ULSS/RtI. Class Size Reduction is the most important thing.

A The Superintendent's proposal does not reduce class size. The proposal maintains the district-wide class size averages (20:1 for K-3, 26:1 for 4-5, 28:1 for 7-12).

Q ULSS/RtI seems like a basic service, not Program Support.

A If ULSS/RtI is important, does that mean BSEP shouldn't fund it? ULSS FTE is "above and beyond" the regular classroom teacher allocation.

Other Comments:

- Berkeley High needs ULSS/RtI. Why not expand this program to the high school?
- Concerned about how ULSS is implemented across the district. Not all schools have an exemplary ULSS program.
- How effective is ULSS/RtI without additional site funds for coordination?

Thyberg referred to the questions that had been submitted prior to the meeting, beginning with a clarification of the ULSS/RtI program. She noted that:

- ULSS is not a Special Ed program.
- The goal of ULSS is to help all students overcome whatever barriers they may have to learning. It serves the entire range of BUSD students, not simply identified Special Ed students.
- Two years ago, when it was first suggested that ULSS/RtI be funded (partially) by BSEP Program Support, Thyberg had reservations about it, and her successor, Nancy Hoeffler, also had reservations. However now, having listened to descriptions of the program and its effectiveness, including a major improvement in BUSD's STAR test results which has been attributed to ULSS, she has changed her mind. Much research says that early intervention is the best, and she sees the benefit of this approach.
- She believes that ULSS/RtI does meet the criteria for Program Support in the Class Size portion of the BSEP Measure.
- The total ULSS FTE is 22 FTE for the K-8 program: 11 FTE @ K-5 and 11 FTE @ 6-8. The Superintendent's recommendation that BSEP CSR fund half of that FTE (5.5 at each level = 11.0 FTE). Other teachers participate in the ULSS/RtI program as well.

Regarding the Special Ed budget, Thyberg noted that Special Ed revenue covers only about half of what BUSD spends on the Special Ed program. The other half of the cost (approximately \$13 million) is paid by the district's General Fund.

Jay Nitschke distributed a document showing the effect of lower class sizes on middle school math scores from 2007 through 2011. Eighth grade math classes were lowered to 20:1 beginning in 2006-07; 7<sup>th</sup> grade math classes were lowered to 20:1 in 2007-08. (Honors classes are larger.) The number of eighth graders scoring Proficient on the California Standards Test (CST) increased from 30% in 2007 to 55% in 2011. For 7<sup>th</sup> graders the change was 50% in 2007 to over 70% in 2011. (All 8<sup>th</sup> graders now take Algebra, except for a few who take Geometry.)

A straw poll was taken.

- 6 were in favor of the Superintendent's recommendation,
- 7 were opposed to the Superintendent's recommendation.

When asked, 4 Reps said they had problems with the refinement of secondary enrollment for BSEP CSR purposes, and 2 Reps said they had problems with increasing BSEP funding for ULSS FTE at the middle schools, from CSR Program Support.

Thyberg noted that the P&O Committee could respond to the Superintendent's recommendation by making its own recommendation, for example, that additional funds from CSR should be allocated for Lit Coaches, or middle school Counseling, or ULSS coordination. She added that the role of the P&O Committee is to ask "Is this an appropriate use of BSEP funds, as we interpret the Measure?"

## **6. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:55 p.m.

**BSEP/Measure A PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**February 28, 2012**

Longfellow School Library  
1500 Derby St., Berkeley

**P&O Committee Members Present:**

Keira Armstrong, <i>Washington (Alt)</i>	Lea Baechler-Brabo, <i>Oxford (Alt)</i>	Juliet Bashore, <i>Rosa Parks</i>
Aaron Glimme, <i>Berkeley High</i>	Larry Gordon, <i>Berkeley High</i>	Patrick Hamill, <i>Thousand Oaks</i>
Elisabeth Hensley, <i>King (co-Chair)</i>	Esther Hirsh, <i>Berkeley High</i>	Diana Kuderna, <i>Berkeley High (Alt)</i>
John Lavine, <i>King</i>	Catherine Lazio, <i>Willard</i>	Chris Martin, <i>LeConte (co-Chair)</i>
Brittini Milam, <i>Washington</i>	Jay Nitschke, <i>King (Alt)</i>	Dawn Paxson, <i>Emerson</i>
Shauna Rabinowitz, <i>Jefferson</i>	Margot Reed, <i>Longfellow</i>	Abigail Surasky, <i>Longfellow (Alt)</i>
Sara Tool, <i>John Muir</i>	Greg Wiberg, <i>Oxford</i>	

**P&O Committee Members Absent:**

Marjorie Alvord, <i>Berkeley High (Alt)</i>	Nicole Bowen, <i>Arts Magnet</i>	Brett Cook, <i>Malcolm X</i>
Mariane Ferme, <i>Berkeley High</i>	Ruby Holder, <i>B-Tech</i>	Dialy Paulino, <i>Cragmont</i>
Christine Mattson, <i>Willard</i>	Evon Williams, <i>Longfellow</i>	Ardel Thomas, <i>Pre-K</i>
Representative, <i>Independent Study</i>		

**Visitors, School Board Directors, District Advisory Committee Liaisons, Staff and Guests:**

Cathy Campbell, <i>President, BFT</i>	Mary Cazden, <i>Jefferson Teacher</i>	Josh Daniels, <i>Board of Education</i>
Pauline Follansbee, <i>Director, Fiscal Svcs</i>	Julie Holcomb, <i>BHS Parent</i>	Neil Smith, <i>Asst. Superintendent</i>
Mary Wrenn, <i>Willard Teacher</i>		

**BSEP Staff:**

Mary Hurlbert, *Admin. Coord.*      Liz O'Connell-Gates, *Staff Support*

**1. Call to Order & Introductions.**

Co-chair Chris Martin called the meeting to order at 7:20 p.m., and invited representatives to introduce themselves.

**2. Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda**

The quorum was established with 16 voting members present.

**3. Chair's Comments**

*Chris Martin, Chair*

The Chair apologized for the recent scheduling changes and said that the March 6, 2012 meeting would go forward as planned.

**4. Public Comment**

*Cathy Campbell, President, Berkeley Federation of Teachers (BFT)*

Campbell said she was pleased that tonight teachers Mary Cazden and Mary Wrenn were going to speak about Response to Intervention (RtI) at their school sites. She said that BFT was very

committed to RtI, that RtI is data-driven , based on specific needs of students, and that it needed to be expanded.

**5. Universal Learning Support System (ULSS)/Response to Intervention (RtI) in Practice**

**Neil Smith, Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services**

Neil Smith said that several years ago, while BUSD was developing its ULSS program, the rest of the country had been developing a similar program called Response to Intervention (RtI).

Berkeley has since adjusted ULSS to bring it in line with the national RtI. Because ULSS/RtI is included in the administration's proposal for BSEP Class Size funds, Smith invited two teachers to present a view of ULSS/RtI at the elementary and middle school levels.

**Mary Cazden**

**Mild/Moderate Special Education Teacher/ULSS Site Coordinator, Jefferson Elementary**

Cazden said she had been a district parent for 15 years and a district teacher for nine years. Cazden said her belief in RtI stemmed from personal experience. She explained that when her now college-student son was in elementary school at BUSD, he had struggled academically and teachers were not able to provide adequate support. Cazden noted that times had changed for the better and eleven years later when BUSD teachers noticed that her first-grade child was struggling with reading, there was a different approach, and staff immediately implemented a remediation plan that had her child reading at grade level within three months.

Cazden explained that RtI at Jefferson comprises a team that includes an educational specialist, and a reading specialist, who work collaboratively with classroom teachers to develop an individual program for each child. She said that at Jefferson, huge gains have been made in academic and socio-emotional development since the ULSS/RtI program had been implemented. Assessment starts in kindergarten with a 'Gentle Beginnings Program' that allows specialists to identify children needing extra support.

She said specialists rely heavily on assessment data to guide them as they craft individual programs for children, monitor their progress and shift supports as needed. She said that by the time students return to school in the fall, educational specialists have already used spring data from the prior year to identify students who finished the year below grade level. She said this allows educational specialists to immediately start in with reading, writing, and math support.

Cazden gave the Committee snapshot of her day. She said that in the morning she does reading-curriculum intervention with small groups of kids who are divided into comprehension groups, accuracy groups, spelling groups, and fluency groups. On a daily basis she also provides individual support for students with IEPs. She said that she also conducts a spelling group for 5<sup>th</sup> graders and works for an hour on math with 4<sup>th</sup> graders.

She said the educational specialists kept abreast of students' needs and progress through bi-weekly ULSS/RtI meetings to pinpoint obstacles to progress so they could tailor academic intervention, as well as fall/spring Student Needs Assessment Program [Snapshot meetings], and SST (Student Success Team) meetings which include families. She explained that before kids transition to middle school, she has a chance to meet with the 5<sup>th</sup> grade principal and educational therapists to set supports in place incoming 6<sup>th</sup> graders.

**Mary Wrenn (Willard)**

***Speech & Language Therapist/Special Education Department Chair, Willard Middle School***

Wrenn said she had worked at Willard for 18 years. She said the school's overall vision was one where all teachers are responsible for all kids, and that support services should involve everyone. She added that although the school believes in inclusive education, they also provide specialized supports. She said that providing support to all students when they needed it was the original idea behind ULSS.

Wrenn said that instead of a ULSS team, Willard has created SNAP teams (Student Needs Assessment Program.) The model of service delivery at Willard involves co-teaching, where teachers with special education credentials team teach in classes with teachers with general education credentials. Wrenn explained that special education teachers play an integral role in planning the curriculum and providing modifications for struggling students. She noted that the biggest thing helping the school make progress with kids was the collaborative relationships that had developed the identification of kids who were struggling, and the team approach of finding ways to support the student. She emphasized that the team approach means that all students receive the support they need not just those as identified as "special needs."

**6. Recommendation for BSEP Class Size Reduction (CSR) Funds in Fiscal Year 2012-13**

***Neil Smith, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services***

***Pauline Follansbee, Director of Fiscal Services***

Smith began by stating that that this CSR recommendation meets the BSEP class size goals, maintains important programs funded under Program Support, and, unlike in past years, adds to the CSR Reserve. He highlighted the Program Support portion of the CSR proposal because it includes found in this recommendation. Reminding the Committee that last year BSEP had picked up 5.5 FTE for ULSS/RtI in the elementary schools, he noted that this year's proposal includes an additional 5.5 FTE for RtI at the middle schools, for a total of 11.0 FTE for ULSS/RtI. He then distributed the recommendation for the expenditure of the BSEP Class Size Reduction monies in FY 2012-13 and asked the group to read the first paragraph.

Smith said that next year there were no plans to change the class size ratios as mandated by BSEP/Measure A of 2006: 20:1 for grades K-3, 26:1 for grades 4 & 5, and 28:1 for grades 6-12. However he said BUSD would take the following action to make staffing more efficient at the secondary schools, while maintaining the proscribed class-sizes:

- Physical Education classes in grades 7-12 will be allocated FTE at a ratio of 38:1 while all other classes will be continued at 28:1.
- Berkeley High students enrolled in only five classes (mainly seniors) will be counted as 5/6<sup>th</sup> of a student. He said in the past these students were counted as one student taking six periods, although they only took five.
- Regional Occupational Program R.O.P enrollment (students taking a class funded by ROP) will be subtracted from the total BHS enrollment used to calculate staffing.

When questioned whether this might be in conflict with the Measure, Smith said that the Measure's primary goal is to achieve academic class sizes of an average of 28:1 for secondary schools. He noted that the Measure's formula for calculating student-teacher ratio assumes that all

kids take 6 periods, which is not true. He said that the above adjustments actually make the staffing more accurate.

Discussion followed, including the following comments:

- ◆ The recommendation appears to take assets away from BHS and add assets to the middle schools.
- ◆ Are BSEP funds being used for basic services which are just called it RtI?
- ◆ Shouldn't BHS have an RtI program?
- ◆ Will there be enforcement of the minimum ECO class size of 20 students, for classes with more than one section at BHS, as stipulated by the P&O?
- ◆ Is this the best use of BSEP funds?

When asked how the recommendation could add funds to the CSR Reserve, and at the same time increase Program Support programs, Neil cited three reasons:

- A 3.17% Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA), which increases projected CSR revenue by roughly \$450,000,
- Declining enrollment, which means BSEP dollars, which are increasing due to the COLA, provide services for fewer students, and
- More efficient staffing.

Smith and Pauline Follansbee then walked the P&O through the *Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document* (Teacher Template). On page two, Smith noted the increase of 5.5 FTE for middle school ULSS/RtI. While there were no cuts to Expanded Course Offerings (ECO) or Middle School Counseling, Smith confirmed that Berkeley High, which is currently overstaffed, would lose approximately 5.88 FTE total. It was noted that this would amount to an increased class size of roughly 1- 2 students in non-P.E. classes. (P.E. classes are already staffed at 38:1.)

## **7. Report from Superintendent's Budget Advisory Committee (SBAC)**

### ***Larry Gordon and Greg Wiberg***

Larry Gordon reported from the SBAC committee, which met just before the P&O meeting . He said that BUSD is preparing for the following three budget scenarios: Scenario A **Low**: a \$3 million budget reduction, Scenario A **High**: a \$3.6 million budget reduction, Scenario B: Use \$3.2 million in reserves if Governor Brown's November 6<sup>th</sup> 2012 ballot initiative fails. Gordon distributed a document entitled *Staff Recommendation for Budget Reductions* so the P&O could review the different scenarios.

## **8. Approval of the Minutes – February 7, 2012**

**MOTION CARRIED (Reed/ Glimme): to approve the February 7, 2012 P&O minutes, as amended.** The minutes were edited to reverse the figures \$4.6 and \$3.3 on the third bullet in Section 4. The motion was approved unanimously.

## **9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:35 p.m.

