



**BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
BERKELEY SCHOOLS EXCELLENCE PROJECT**

2020 Bonar Street, Berkeley, CA 94702

Phone: 644-8717 Fax: 644-8923

MEETING NOTICE

COMMITTEE: BSEP Planning & Oversight Committee
DATE: **Tuesday, May 14, 2013**
TIME: **7:00 p.m. Gavel down: 7:15 p.m.**
LOCATION: 2020 Bonar Street, Room 126
CHAIRPERSON: Chris Martin

AGENDA

- 7:15 1. Call to Order/Introductions & Site Reports
2. Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda
3. Chairpersons' Comments (Chris Martin & Elisabeth Hensley)
4. BSEP Director's Comments (Natasha Beery)
5. Public Comment
- 7:30 6. Subcommittee Reports
• School Site Funds (TBD)
- [Discussion/Action] 7. P&O Committee Statement to accompany VAPA Recommendation
- [Discussion/Action] 8:15 8. Recommendations for BSEP Funds in FY 2013-14:
• Technology
• Public Information, Translation, BSEP Implementation, P&O Support
- 9:00 9. Additional Items for Discussion
- 9:10 10. Approval of Minutes: 4-23-13
- 9:15 11. Adjournment

Next P&O Committee meeting: Tuesday, May 28, 2013

>School Site Plans for FY 2013-14
>Summer Plans & Steering Committee

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

May 7, 2013

BUSD Offices –Technology Room 126
2020 Bonar Street, Berkeley

P&O Committee Members Present:

Juliet Bashore, <i>Rosa Parks (co-Rep)</i>	Chris Martin, <i>LeConte (co-Chair)</i>
Tim Frederick, <i>Cragmont</i>	Dawn Paxson, <i>Willard</i>
Aaron Glimme, <i>Berkeley High</i>	Danielle Perez, <i>Pre-K (co-Rep)</i>
Larry Gordon, <i>Berkeley High (Alt)</i>	Shauna Rabinowitz, <i>Jefferson</i>
Melissa Kaprelian, <i>Thous.Oaks (Alt)</i>	Margot Reed, <i>Longfellow</i>
John Lavine, <i>Berkeley High (Alt)</i>	Bruce Simon, <i>King</i>
Catherine Lazio, <i>Berkeley High</i>	Ellen Weis, <i>Longfellow (Alt)</i>

P&O Committee Members Absent:

Amelia Archer, <i>Berkeley High</i>	Ila Deiss, <i>LeConte (Alt)</i>	Emily Newman, <i>Emerson (Alt)</i>
Keira Armstrong, <i>Washington (Co-Rep)</i>	Maria Einaudi, <i>Ind. Study</i>	Representative, <i>Willard</i>
Lea Baechler-Brabo, <i>Oxford (Alt)</i>	Patrick Hamill, <i>Thousand Oaks</i>	Boyd Power, <i>Emerson</i>
Lee Bernstein, <i>Arts Magnet</i>	Elisabeth Hensley, <i>King</i>	Cecilie Rose, <i>John Muir</i>
Jennifer Braun, <i>Ind. Study (Alt)</i>	Catherine Huchting, <i>Malcolm X</i>	James Shultz, <i>Rosa Parks (co-Rep)</i>
Moshe Cohen, <i>Pre-K (co-Rep)</i>	Rhonda Jefferson, <i>Berkeley High</i>	Abigail Surasky, <i>Longfellow</i>
Shannon Cunningham, <i>B-Tech</i>	Leslie Lippard, <i>Cragmont</i>	Greg Wiberg, <i>Oxford</i>
	Brittini Milam, <i>Washington (Co-Rep)</i>	Hugo Wildmann, <i>John Muir (co-Rep)</i>

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

Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*
Suzanne McCulloch, *Music and Visual & Performing Arts Supervisor*
Becca Todd, *BUSD District Library Coordinator*

BSEP Staff:

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director*
Valerie Tay, *BSEP Program Specialist*
Linda Race, *BSEP Staff Support*

1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports

At 7:18 p.m. Co-chair Chris Martin called the meeting to order by welcoming attendees and by asking P&O members to report on School Governance Council activity at their sites.

2. Establish the Quorum

The quorum was approved with 13 voting members initially present. Margot Reed, Longfellow Rep, arrived late to bring the voting to 14.

3. Chairs' Comments

Chris Martin

Martin noted that there would not be an action on “The Recommendation for BSEP Technology Funds in FY 2013-14” at this evening’s meeting. A minority report is under consideration, and there will be another subcommittee meeting where it will be discussed in depth.

4. BSEP Director’s Comments

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Beery commented on the P&O attendance and the establishment of a quorum. She stated that because a quorum was not established at the April 16, 2013 meeting, the committee had to postpone moving forward in approving several budgets, as well as approving meeting minutes for 4-9-13. According to the P&O Bylaws, if a representative has missed three consecutive meetings, that seat will be considered vacant, and the quorum may be reduced accordingly. The Chairperson or Chairperson’s designee should follow through by notifying the SGC Chair and/or the school Principal that their school is not being represented at the P&O Committee meetings. There has not been representation lately from Arts Magnet, Cragmont, John Muir, B-Tech and Independent Study, nor two representatives from Longfellow and Willard attending consistently. It was noted that therefore at this meeting the quorum would be adjusted from 13 to 11; and there were 15 voting members in attendance. Tim Frederick was thanked for stepping in as a representative from Cragmont.

The relevant documents are the BSEP P&O Bylaws pages 3, 4 and 5: Sections V. Responsibilities of P&O Representatives and Alternates, VI. Membership, X. Removal from Membership, and XI. Quorum, as well as the School Governance Council Bylaws: SGC Composition and P&O Committee Representation Chart on the last page. **The BSEP Office will track attendance through Google Docs online so that the P&O Co-Chairs may monitor attendance at meetings.**

5. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

6. Subcommittee Reports:

• Technology

Jay Nitschke, Director of Technology

• Communications

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Bruce Simon gave a report of the joint subcommittee meeting that met last Tuesday, April 30, 2013. Ellen Weis, Bruce Simon, Chris Walker, Juliet Bashore, Chris Martin, Jay Nitschke, Natasha Beery, Aaron Glimme, and Becca Todd were in attendance. The group was interested in a technology census of the district schools to ascertain what they have and what they are using it for, what the program plans are, and what kind of vision there is for the District. The BSEP measure allows for the provision and maintenance of computers and technology in the schools, but is not responsible for all use of technology and educational technology programs for the District. Nitschke gave an overview of the last 15 years of technology development in the district. Overall the District’s instructional program has not included instructional technology. It was noted that the District is mandated by law to provide a three-year technology plan to the State. There are possibly some new opportunities for technology use in the District, because there is new technology coming in as a result of preparing for the new Smarter Balanced Assessments. Nitschke has requested

\$300,000 out of the \$1.5 million proceeds from the sale of Hillside School to be spent on Chromebooks to be placed in the schools. Next fall, each school will be getting a Chromebook cart with 30 Chromebooks. Nitschke will be working with Debbi D' Angelo, Evaluation and Assessment Supervisor, in looking for individual teacher leaders to get extra training and work with other teachers in the schools. One result of the Chromebooks coming into the District schools is the possibility that they may not need microcomputer tech maintenance in the future and may be able to reduce the BSEP budget and redesignate funds to other uses. This would need to be seen.

Simon, Bashore, and Weis brought forward a proposal to use some of the funds from the BSEP Measure to a school or schools, on a per pupil allocation, to pilot new uses of technology in the district. Although there is technology in the schools, there is not a lot of money for professional development and there are different degrees/levels of technology proficiency and fund allocations in different places. These schools, "to be determined," could try out a new method of allocating the funds in the pilot program that could then spread district wide.

Bashore stated that there was an unofficial study by some graduate students at the Goldman School of Public Policy recommending that California K-12 schools sites be given technology funds and be allowed to determine how the funds would be spent on technology at each site. The proposal brought forward suggests that a school site be identified to implement a pilot program for this recommendation.

Martin stated there could be another subcommittee meeting scheduled to discuss the minority report in detail. Martin asked that the proposal for the pilot program be circulated without discussion. The proposal would be read on Thursday and brought to the P&O Committee at the next meeting. Thursday, May 9, 2013 was initially slated as a date for the subcommittee to discuss technology and the minority report [after the meeting, the date was rescinded in favor of having an ongoing subcommittee meeting in the summer or fall].

Nitschke asked for further subcommittee meetings because there were two issues raised during the subcommittee discussion. One is the question of whether to take some money out of the fund balance and allocate it to a pilot school. The other is whether to develop a service model approach to district services, which means schools would "buy" services, i.e. services from the technology department. The service model would require more change than the subcommittee or the P&O could authorize. It would have to be discussed at the Cabinet and Board levels as well as with bargaining units. Nitschke felt, that going forward, the proposal would need to split apart of these two ideas. He elaborated on the case of Bill Gates giving money and people to the Oakland School District for three years in a service model. During those three years the funding was reduced each year until it reached zero and then the program fell apart. If the service model were to be used, processes such as a billing system for services would not be intuitively clear. Giving money to schools is one part of the proposal, but trying to change the service model for the entire district seems like something that is not easy to implement without a lot of discussion.

Martin stated that without seeing the proposal it would not make sense to continue the discussion at this time. He suggested sending the issue back to a Technology subcommittee, and moving on with the Communications portion of the subcommittee report.

Beery stated that in addition to the joint subcommittee meeting last week, there was a meeting of the Communications team on the morning of May 7, 2013 to discuss the plan for the budget of the BSEP Office and the Public Information and Translation. In both instances the discussion focused on making BSEP more comprehensible and visible to the public with a clearer identity. Some people know what BSEP is; know there is a tax, but not in ways that

are easily identifiable. We need to continue to ensure public awareness and transparency with the public knowing where their tax dollars have been spent, and building towards a public process for the next Measure. **Martin requested the timeline slide presented at the Wednesday, April 10, 2013 Board meeting be sent out to give people an idea what the process looks like for the next four years. Beery will send that out. She noted that the slide was a draft and there will be changes as she and Judy Appel, School Board member, work on it.**

7. Recommendations for BSEP Funds in FY 2013-14 (Action items):

- **Library Program**
- **Music and Visual & Performing Arts (VAPA)**
- **Technology (Tabled)**

Library Program

Library Coordinator Becca Todd provided the following handouts:

- BSEP Library Program (Resource 0860): Comparative Report
- Memo to the BSEP P&O Committee from Neil Smith, Co-Superintendent and Becca Todd, Supervisor, District Library Coordinator, dated May 7, 2013, Recommendation for Allocation of funds from the Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006 for the Library Program in FY 2013-14.

Todd stated that the only adjustment to the document presented at the last meeting, Memo to the BSEP P&O Committee from Neil Smith, Co-Superintendent and Becca Todd, Supervisor, District Library Coordinator, dated April 23, 2013, Recommendation for Allocation of funds from the Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006 for the Library Program in FY 2013-14, was in the area of the inclusion of additional funds for schools that are getting a new pre-school/High Fives, and Spanish Two-Way Immersion shifting to LeConte: **Todd had neglected to include the bi-lingual program at Thousand Oaks continuing up through 5th grade, a \$300 increase.**

Beery noted that a comparative report was generated at the P&O Committee's request. Of note was that the comparative report shows the audited actuals for the first three years, the current budget as of 5/3/13 and the last column shows the current proposed budget. The numbers that were produced on the comparative reports are based on what is in the system as of May 3, 2013. Between the proposal numbers and the comparative report numbers, the beginning and ending fund balances may differ slightly because of the use of Karam's auditing dates, as well as codes used by the accounting system. They may differ in the budget plans but the numbers do add up eventually.

There was a question about the Library Program collaborating with the Technology department, to which Todd stated that she was on the Technology subcommittee. Todd further elaborated that the libraries all have a bank of computers and any of the e-books the Library Program is considering are to function on everything they have in the schools. The two models being considered are the simultaneous multi-user format, which is mostly used streaming, projected, and used online at home, and one that is downloaded onto a device for a finite amount of time, similar to what is used at public libraries. The Library Program is leaning toward the multi-user, unlimited access format because many of the titles they would use it for initially would be for instructional purposes, and they would like the titles to be accessed anywhere, on any device. In response to questions about access to devices, the Library Program would consider using a portion of their budget for readers for the

students who don't have access to computers, in collaboration with the Technology Department.

MOTION CARRIED (Simon/Glimme): To approve the allocation of BSEP Library Program Funds in FY 2013-14 per the BSEP Library Program (Resource 0860): Comparative Report and memo to the BSEP P&O Committee from Neil Smith, Co-Superintendent and Becca Todd, Supervisor, District Library Coordinator, dated May 7, 2013, Recommendation for Allocation of funds from the Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006 for the Library Program in FY 2013-14 as presented at the May 7, 2013 P&O Committee Meeting by Becca Todd, BUSD District Library Coordinator, with the change as noted above.
The motion was approved with a showing of 13 hands, with no objections and no abstentions.

Music and Visual & Performing Arts (VAPA)

Suzanne McCulloch, Music and VAPA Supervisor, provided the following handouts:

- BSEP Music, Visual and Performing Arts (Resource 0853): Comparative Report
- Memo to the BSEP P&O Committee from Neil Smith, Co-Superintendent and Becca Todd, Supervisor, District Library Coordinator, dated May 7, 2013, Recommendation for Allocation of funds from the Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006 for the Library Program in FY 2013-14

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director, initially presented The Music and VAPA budget at the P&O Committee meeting of April 23, 2013 for McCulloch, who was absent due to injury. McCulloch noted that the majority of the funds were for staffing (music teachers, Music and VAPA Supervisor and Music Librarian, as well as smaller amounts for tutors, teacher substitutes for Special Events and teacher hourly for Performing Arts Rehearsals). Initially, when the Measure A was being written, the subcommittee for VAPA wanted some funding beyond music, thus the budget for Performing Arts Teachers for the Middle Schools was established. McCulloch plans to move the Professional Development and Arts Anchor Schools towards integration of the arts supporting the Common Core language and math. She commented on the national group working on common arts standards for the nation, which California will likely adopt.

About 3600 students are in the music program, which includes 3rd graders playing recorders. Most of the musical instruments played by the 2800-2900 students belong to BUSD.

Beery reiterated that the budget numbers on the proposed budget and the comparative report differ because of the way they are put together. Karam is generating the comparative report from the accounting system. It was noted that there were some small differences in accounting in the music budget and Beery was asked to review this with Karam.

Martin asked what McCulloch would do next year with a smaller fund balance. McCulloch was hoping there would be some relief from the General Fund, as otherwise the only possible reductions would be in professional development, instruments, and staff reductions. She went on to state that it would be difficult to cut back on consumables for the students such as music workbooks etc. The P&O Committee members expressed concerns about the knowing whether and where funds would emerge to sustain the Music and VAPA program. Beery said that the Cabinet and the Board are aware that this is an issue and they are waiting to review the May Revise and COLA to know what the actual revenue is going

to be before making any final decisions. Concerns were brought forward about the ramifications in the community, if funds weren't available to keep the program at its current level of quality.

In responding to a student/teacher ratio question, McCulloch said that they try to keep it at 13 to 1. There are many factors involved in administering the music program, e.g., students are divided according to instrument, causing variation in class sizes, classes are held in different spaces in the schools, and middle school groups get larger (60-65 students). McCulloch noted that there were over 200 more middle school students participating than the year before and that over 50% of the students at Longfellow participated in music.

There was a discussion regarding calculating the average cost of music teachers, and the committee determined that the budget worked out based on the salary ranges.

Martin stated that the Music/VAPA budget will be managed to zero soon and noted that fund balances were inconsistent across the various BSEP budgets. The Music/VAPA budget has less than \$35,000 in its fund balance, primarily due to the growth in enrollment without an equivalent increase in revenue. Cuts to this program, as well as others, next year are of great concern. Martin, in answering a question about actions that could be taken, noted that it would be best not to delay the Music/VAPA approval, because all budgets have to move forward to the Board so they can get the whole picture for next year's expenditures. It was suggested that the P&O recommend that some of money currently transferred from the Music/VAPA fund for release time teachers could be returned to BSEP from the General Fund.

Frederick suggested that now was the time to make a formal statement about this, whether as a precursor to the next year's budget or whether in this budget. The P&O Committee could recommend to the Board that BSEP be reimbursed for the transfer of money to the General Fund or some portion of it, to restore the reserve this year, and let the Board make that decision. The statement would include the suggestion that since there is a growth in enrollment, which seems to be what is driving the costs (more students taking music), that the General Fund should support the additional costs, as the expenditures are outpacing the growth of the fund as it is currently allocated. Martin would like the statement to be explanatory to the Board and felt that it should be written in the next week, revised at the next P&O Committee meeting, May 14, 2013, and read it to the Board the next evening or on the 22nd. Beery said the soonest it could get to the Board for discussion might be May 22nd for discussion, with a possible May 15 reading as a precursor to the May 22nd meeting.

It was suggested that the Music/VAPA budget comparative report include more columns for the school years 2014/15 and 2015/16 (to indicate the projected draw-down).

McCulloch stated that there would be a slow growth in enrollment over a number of years with no plateaus.

Glimme noted that in perusing the Measure, the fund between the Libraries, Music/VAPA and Parent Outreach allowed for some shifting of funds so there might be some flexibility there. (BSEP ANNUAL PLAN FY2013 Binder–See page BSM-5 (second page of the Measure) of FULL TEXT OF MEASURE A: Exhibit B: 2.ALLOCATION OF FUNDS, ii. School Libraries, Music, Visual and Performing Arts, and Parent Outreach Programs, (d) Flexibility of Funds: “To maintain quality programs with the revenues available for these three purposes, up to ten percent (10%) of the allocations for these District-wide programs (School Libraries, Music and Visual and Performing Arts Programs, and Parent Outreach Services) may, on approval by the Board, be redistributed among these

purposes provided no purpose receives more than 15% over its designated allocation in a given year.”)

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Gordon): To approve the allocation of BSEP Music and Visual & Performing Arts (VAPA) Funds in FY 2013-14 per the BSEP Music, Visual and Performing Arts (Resource 0853): Comparative Report and the memo to the BSEP P&O Committee Recommendation for Expenditures in FY 2013-14 of revenue from the Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006 (BSEP) for the Visual and Performing Arts Programs in 2013-14 as presented at the May 7, 2013 P&O Committee Meeting by Suzanne McCulloch Music and VAPA Supervisor.

The motion was approved with a showing of 13 hands, with no objections and no abstentions.

This is budget was approved with the acknowledgement that the P&O Committee will write, review, and read a public statement to the BUSD Board of Education regarding the P&O Committee’s recommendations for the sustainability of the Music and VAPA Fund for the current BSEP Measure. Prior to adjournment, Co-Chairperson Martin confirmed that Paxson, Perez, Glimme, and Bashore would work on the statement.

8. Recommendations for BSEP Funds in FY 2013-14:

• Public Information, Translation, BSEP Implementation, P&O Support:

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Beery provided the following handouts:

- Public Information and Translation (Resource 0854): Comparative Report
- Memo to the BSEP P&O Committee from Natasha Beery, Director of BSEP and Community Relations, dated May 7, 2013, Recommendation for Expenditures in 2013-14 of Funds Allocated to Public Information, Translation, and Support of the Planning and Oversight Committee from the Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006 (BSEP Resource 0854)

Beery stated that the Measure provides for 2% of the revenues of the special tax to be allocated to this purpose (called Public Information/BSEP for short), before distribution to the rest of the funds and there are no indirect costs charged to this allocation. Beery outlined the five program objectives of the Public Information/BSEP budget as 1) communication to the Berkeley community and families about District programs, 2) providing information to the District’s non-English speaking families, which includes translation programs, 3) support of the BSEP P&O Committee, 4) support of program managers and staff in their oversight of BSEP funded programs, and 5) train and support SGCs and the BHS BSEP Site Committee.

The Communications team meets bi-weekly and continues to work on a number of objectives outlined in the communications study done in 2011, including website improvements, improved *A+ News*, etc, and next objectives include working with Parent Outreach to improve dissemination and two-way communication with sites, as well as the use of website and email analytics to better target topics.

Since 2011 there has been a District Translation/Interpreter Specialist who provides services at the District level focusing on document translation into Spanish, i.e., Special Ed, Student Services, summer school and the *A+ News*. This position is funded ½ time through BSEP Funds and ½ time through General Funds. There are also on-call hourly translators.

Beery clarified that translation is done for documents and interpretation is done between people. There is a need to establish clearer protocols for use of translators and training/standardization. There is a concern about uneven school-based volunteer translation skills. The district also uses a Language Line contract service that is allocated \$1000/year for on-call telephone interpretation. The greatest use has been for Cantonese, Mandarin, Spanish, and Farsi. It could grow as more people become aware of it.

There was a question about IEP translation: does that come out of BSEP Funds? Beery noted that is something that she would like to track; requests are currently paper-based, and Beery would like to see an online request system developed to track who is requesting what language and what it will be used for.

Beery confirmed that translation and interpretation at parent teacher conferences requests are often being handled through her office. They are usually able to fill these requests from sites. Bashore brought up that there were problems around survey translation, can sites get help for that? Beery confirmed that she has been discussing providing sites more support with translating surveys and with the creation of clearly worded items in English as well.

Martin noted that Public Information has a significant fund balance and suggested that some of the money be used for rebranding BSEP and increasing translation support.

There was a discussion about branding/making a logo for BSEP. It was noted that BSEP pays for one out of three teachers in the district, and there is not a widespread awareness of this fact. Beery stated that there is a new logo for the school district. Beery noted that she had left the same amount in the budget for contracted graphic services for next year, in case there was a need for creating updated materials for BSEP. The current logo is old and not widely recognized; there could be opportunities at public events to make BSEP more identifiable. It was also noted that there could be more use of the BSEP logo and name at events which are supported by BSEP, such as music and performing arts.

The Public Information budget supports the salaries of BSEP Director, BSEP Program Specialist and hourly support for the P&O meetings. Beery noted that the Director position was expanded the duties of the prior BSEP Manager, to include responsibilities for Communications and Community Relations, and that she has been in place since October of 2012. Valerie Tay, Program Specialist has been onboard since March 2013. The BSEP Director supports BSEP and the P&O Committee by working with staff to produce plans, documents and reports, while Tay, as the Program Specialist, works with the principals, SGCs, and SSCs, in the development of their discretionary fund plans within the context of their school site plans. The Senior Budget Analyst supporting BSEP is funded from the General Fund.

In response to questions, Beery confirmed that BSEP funds cannot be used for campaigning/advocacy but can provide information to the public, including such things as the BSEP logo and information. That is part of the purpose of the measure, to let the public know how their money is being spent. Beery and her staff were complemented on their communications work on the *A+ News*, news and information dissemination, and website improvements. A discussion was held around having a central portal or “wiki” to access logins, access codes for information, and textbook codes. Nitschke confirmed that the middle schools send a letter home at the beginning of the year and parents could contact school counselors for access codes. **Nitschke said there was a page for accessing links and information that he could send out to the committee.** Beery stated that she and Charity DaMarto, Supervisor of Parent Engagement and Equity, had discussed the use of a portion of *A+ News* for parent tips and links. Beery said that there would need to be some thought put into what information belongs on the District website and what would need to

be on school sites, PTA sites, etc. Martin noted that a wiki-style website with comments would have to be hosted and moderated.

Beery stated that she would revise the budget to include more money to branding and translation.

9. Additional Items for Discussion

There were no additional items for discussion.

10. Approval of Minutes: April 23, 2013

MOTION CARRIED (Reed/Bashore): To approve the meeting minutes of the April 23, 2013 P&O Committee Meeting.

The motion was approved with a showing of 14 hands, with no objections and no abstentions.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 8:55 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Linda Race

BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

TO: BSEP Planning & Oversight Committee
FROM: Jay Nitschke, Director of Technology
DATE: May 14, 2013
SUBJECT: Recommendation for expenditures of funds from
the Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006
for Technology in 2013-14

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

In compliance with *The Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006* (BSEP/Measure A), the BSEP Planning and Oversight Committee works in conjunction with district staff to develop annual recommendations for the allocation of funds for each Purpose of the Measure.

Purpose

The following recommendation is for the allocation of funds for the Purpose of Technology in accordance with BSEP Measure A of 2006, Section 3.C:

... providing and maintaining computers and technology in schools. All costs attendant to providing these services are permissible.

Objectives

Working, effective technology is an asset for schools in several ways:

- Technology engages students in learning, improves attendance, increases graduation rates and facilitates parent involvement.
- Technology improves learning skills, such as thinking and problem-solving skills, information and communication skills, and interpersonal and self-directional skills.
- Technology helps schools meet the needs of all students.
- Technology promotes equity and access in education.
- Technology improves school efficiency, productivity, and decision-making on all levels, from the teacher in the classroom, to grade-level collaboration, to principals and school leadership.
- Technology helps teachers meet professional requirements.

PROGRAM EXPENDITURES

The following are recommendations for the expenditure of BSEP Technology funds in FY 2013-14.

Staff		\$600,564
• Microcomputer Technicians	6.2 FTE	
• Student Systems Specialist	0.60 FTE	
• Director of Technology	0.20 FTE	
• Instructional Technology TSA	0.33 FTE	

Microcomputer Technicians (6.0 FTE)

- 2.0 FTE positions are at BHS (of which 0.2 FTE is devoted to B-Tech Academy),
- 1.6 FTE support the middle schools, and
- 2.6 FTE support the elementary schools, Independent Studies, and preschools, and provide support for site technology purchases.
- Since all but one of these positions are 10-month positions, an extra \$3,000 is budgeted for extra duty work over the summer.

The job of the technicians is to work with teachers and staff to keep computers, tablets, projectors, printers etc. working, to help integrate technology with the curriculum, to support teachers in using the Illuminate assessment data system, which was introduced district-wide in 2012-13, and PowerSchool, as well as to help technology committees and School Governance Councils make decisions about technology money.

Teacher on Special Assignment – Instructional Technology - 0.33 FTE

Since 2010-11, the Professional Development budget has included a Teacher on Special Assignment for Instructional Technology, filling a gap in providing teachers with knowledgeable expertise on how to integrate technology into classroom practice. The recommendation is to continue co-funding this position equally from the BSEP Technology budget, the BSEP Professional Development budget, and district categorical funds (0.33 FTE each).

Student Systems Specialist - 0.60 FTE

The recommendation is to continue funding of 0.60 FTE of the Student Systems Specialist from the BSEP Technology budget. This position supports PowerSchool, as well as various other systems, including the associated servers used for communication to students and families (such as the one that principals use to do phone blasts), and ensuring student information is correct in the library and nutrition systems. *(Funded to 1.0 FTE with 0.40 from the General Fund.)*

Director of Technology - 0.20 FTE

The recommendation is to continue funding 0.2 FTE of the Director of Technology from the BSEP Technology budget in 2013-14. *(Funded to 1.0 FTE with 0.80 from the General Fund.)*

Technology Equipment for Schools, Repairs, Software Licenses \$100,153

Funding for technology in the schools is about \$10 per student, a decrease of \$3 from 2012-13.

Fortunately, the passage of Measure I (BUSD's Prop 65 facilities bond) in November 2010, has enabled about \$250,000 per year to be dedicated to

technology, per the plan adopted by the School Board. In 2012-13, Measure I funds completed the installation of wireless access at all elementary and preschools (thus completing wireless functionality at all district sites). In August 2013, the district received a donation of 350 HP computers; additional BSEP and Measure I funds were spent on monitors to make these donations functional.

Study Topics for 2013-14

The amount of BSEP funds for technology hardware has declined from a one-time high of \$24/student to \$13/student last year, and \$9/student in 2013-14. This amount will be supplemented by one-time funds and bond funds in 2013-14, but there is a concern that the amount of school-directed funds for technology has become so minimal as to be insufficient for any significant project aimed at piloting the use of new technology. The Technology Subcommittee will study the various needs over the course of the 2013-14 school year, including the allocation of funds for computer technicians, professional development both in the form of direct instruction to teachers and in coaching from the Teacher of Special Assignment for Technology, and hardware/software.

BUDGET SUMMARY

Any additional BSEP Technology carryover monies beyond the projected estimate of \$25,000 will be added to the budget for instructional technology for the schools, or for additional extra duty support of microcomputer technicians, the Teacher on special Assignment, or teacher professional development, as needed.

BSEP Resources

Revenue Allocation for FY 2013-14	\$772,406
Projected FY 2012-13 Carryover	25,000

Total Resources	797,406
------------------------	----------------

Projected Expenditures

Staffing (7.33 FTE)	600,564
Hourly Extra Duty/Summer Work	3,000
Equipment and Supplies	62,301
Printer Supplies and Repairs	25,000
Reserve for Personnel Variance	32,836
Indirect Cost of 6.73%	48,705

Total Expenditures	772,406
---------------------------	----------------

Estimated Fund Balance	20,000
-------------------------------	---------------

Planning for the Next BSEP Measure

Draft Timeline

Presented to Board of Education
April 10, 2013

Spring 2014 - Spring 2015:

Strategic Planning Process Begins

- Begin bringing together information and recommendations of key groups and individuals as background for large-scale community processes

Summer 2015:

Planning and Preparation for Large Community Processes

Fall 2015:

Community Process Begins

- Build on the work of small groups in 2014-15
- Identify major purposes of the Measure (iterative process)

Early Spring 2016:

School Board considers key decisions:

- Tax Rate
- Allocations to each purpose of the new Measure

Late Spring 2016:

Public Opinion Survey(s)

- Test proposed tax rate and educational purposes

June 2016:

Final version of Measure

- Adopted by School Board

November 2016:

Ballot Measure