

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

February 11, 2014

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

P&O Committee Members Present:

Sergio Duran, <i>Arts Magnet</i>	Keira Armstrong, <i>Washington</i>
Tim Frederick, <i>Cragmont</i>	Elisabeth Hensley, <i>King (co-Chair)</i>
Boyd Power, <i>Emerson</i>	Dawn Paxson, <i>Emerson/Willard</i>
Mara Mahmood, <i>Jefferson (Sub)</i>	Margaret Phillips, <i>Willard</i>
Danielle Perez, <i>John Muir</i>	Aaron Glimme, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Darryl Bartlow, <i>John Muir (Alt)</i>	Larry Gordon, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Chris Martin, <i>LeConte (co-Chair)</i>	John Lavine, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Catherine Huchting, <i>Malcolm X</i>	Catherine Lazio, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Dan Smuts, <i>Rosa Parks (co-Rep)</i>	Ramal Lamar, <i>B-Tech</i>
Patrick Hamill, <i>Thousand Oaks</i>	Louise Harm, <i>Independent Study</i>
Radha Seshagiri, <i>Thousand Oaks (Alt)</i>	

P&O Committee Members Absent:

Moshe Cohen, <i>Pre-K</i>	Kim Sanders, <i>Longfellow</i>
Lily Howell, <i>Pre-K (Alt)</i>	Ellen Weis, <i>Longfellow</i>
Shauna Rabinowitz, <i>Jefferson</i>	Bruce Simon, <i>King</i>
Yusef Auletta, <i>LeConte (Alt)</i>	Austin Lloyd, <i>BHS (Alt)</i>
Lea Baechler-Brabo, <i>Oxford</i>	Orlando Williams, <i>BHS (Alt)</i>
Juliet Bashore, <i>Rosa Parks (co-Rep)</i>	

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

Mark Coplan, *BUSD Public Information Officer*
Donald Evans, *BUSD Superintendent*
Javetta Cleveland, *Deputy Superintendent*
Julie Sinai, *Board Member*
Karen Hemphill, *Board Member*

BSEP Staff:

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

1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports

At 7:16 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 18 voting members initially present. 13 voting members are required for a quorum.

3. Chairperson's Comments

Chris Martin and Elisabeth Hensley

No comments were made.

4. BSEP Director's Comments

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

No comments were made.

5. Approval of Minutes: January 28, 2014

MOTION CARRIED (Lamar/Glimme): To approve the meeting minutes of the January 28, 2014 P&O Committee Meeting.

The motion was approved with a showing of 14 hands, with no objections, and 4 abstentions.

6. Public Comment

No comments were made.

7. Subcommittee Reports: Library/Technology Subcommittee, Music/VAPA Subcommittee

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Last Tuesday, February 4, 2014, there was a meeting of the Music/VAPA Subcommittee. It was well attended and included members of staff as well as parents. The subcommittee discussed music as well as arts funding in general, including why dance, drama, visual arts were not funded at the schools as much as they had been in the past. One of the factors mentioned was space limitation. There was also a general discussion about the transfer of VAPA funds (to the General Fund) for teacher release time, and the affect of the dwindling fund balance on the VAPA program. The next meeting will be held on March 4, 2014.

Martin asked if there was any discussion on how to sustain the program. Beery stated that the Music/VAPA structure shifted during a time when the General Fund needed more support. At that time, BSEP began funding not only supplemental music teachers, but also the music teachers that supplied the release time for 4th and 5th grades. Also, because BSEP pays for release time in both CSR as well as VAPA, there is an unintentional overlap in funding coming from BSEP. That is an area of concern that will become an item for discussion.

Beery stated that McCulloch will be going to the Board in March to talk about the sustainability of the VAPA fund, and present various scenarios of what could be done within the constraints of the current funding structure and what could be done if there is a shift in the structure. Martin asked how the models would be formulated, and Beery responded by saying that she, McCulloch and Deputy Superintendent Cleveland would be working on that together.

Library and Technology subcommittees met jointly last Tuesday, February 4, 2014 and discussed specific areas of intersection, such as digital literacy and what is currently being done in elementary classrooms. There was an interest in reviving the development of a district-wide survey of the current use and future needs for instructional technology. Beery suggested that type of needs assessment would probably be best done in the broader context of BSEP Measure preparation. She will bring that topic to a preliminary BSEP Measure Planning Group, with P&O Co-Chairs Martin and Hensley, Board Directors Julie Sinai and

Josh Daniels, and Superintendent Evans , who will be meeting together to talk about the next steps in this process on February 19, 2014.

Beery noted that she will be going to the Board on Wednesday, February 12, 2014, to make a brief presentation of the BSEP Annual Report and the First Interim Report. It was presented a month ago as a consent item but was pulled for discussion. The Board of Directors asked Beery to comment on the trajectory for BSEP resources, focusing on areas of expenditure that might not be sustainable through the end of the measure unless changes are made, as well as which resources have stronger fund balances, and the reasons for that. She is currently incorporating the questions that she received from the Board Directors into her presentation.

Charity DaMarto, OFEE Supervisor, was asked by the Board to make a preliminary report on the Family Engagement Pilot Program, and Beery is assisting her with that as well as incorporating questions that came from Board members. This is the middle of the second year of the two-year OFEE pilot program, and there needs to be a proposal going forward as to how to continue it or what might replace it. This is one area of interest for possible LCFE funding. DaMarto put together three models for preliminary discussion: one that is sustainable in the BSEP context and two that are expansions that would require additional funding. The models are not actual proposals; if they were, they would come before the P&O committee first. As the District has been going to various community and district groups to talk about LCAP, one of the things that people have asked for is a parent liaison at every site. They are trying to put together a very simple cost estimate to inform this conversation.

Martin asked what programs were unsustainable besides VAPA. Beery stated that she is reviewing a spreadsheet which Liz Karam, BSEP Senior Analyst, put together and looking at which programs, at the current rate of expenditures, are deficit spending beyond projected revenues and carryover. The information does not account for salary increases and other shifts, but overall, CSR, VAPA, and School Site Discretionary are programs that have expenditure structures that are beyond projected revenues. Other programs have more flexibility in them, with stronger fund balances or other ways to construct their budgets.

8. LCAP Budget & Regulations

Javetta Cleveland, Deputy Superintendent

Cleveland provided the following handouts: • *BUSD Local Control and Accountability Plan: P&O Meeting February 11, 2014* (PowerPoint slide hardcopy), • *Proposition 98 Revenues (Graphs by School Year)*

Deputy Superintendent Cleveland began the presentation with background on Proposition 98 Revenues which fund California schools. The handout shows what the District's funding has been over time. The cuts in funding to all California school districts are shown from 2008-09 through 2011-12. The bar graph for 2013-14 shows the funding getting back to 2007-08 levels, restoring a lot of the revenue that was cut in the past. Many of the cuts and budget adjustments had been to areas such as Adult Education, central office costs, and office costs at some school sites. Funding is projected to increase over the next eight years.

Cleveland highlighted several areas in the PowerPoint for the P&O Committee. She stated that the state CSR funding threshold was increased from class sizes of 20:1 to 24:1. BUSD's state funding to support CSR was reduced from \$2.6M to \$1.9M because of the new class size target. The district is still getting the \$.7M difference, but it is now rolled into the Base Grant, and not specifically designated for CSR. The decision needs to be made on how we handle class size as a district. (slide *Class Size Reduction Funding*-page 2)

Cleveland enhanced the graphs in the slide *LCFF Funding Increase over 8 years* (page 3) by indicating the areas of funding in more detail. Under the Prior Formula in 2012-13, the district received \$66M from state funding sources. The new formula aims to provide equitable funding to all school districts. Every school district will get the same amount per student for its Base Grant funding, whereas each district got a different amount per student based on the old formula. All school districts will receive the same amounts, according to grade spans, with the exception of supplemental funding and concentration funding. The Supplemental Grant funding will be based on the population of Low Income (based on Free and Reduced Lunch eligibility), English Learners or Foster Youth. In looking at 2020-21, the formula is based on the Governor's budget and the amount per student, and then there is a gap between where district is now (2012-13: \$66M) and the target (of \$82M). The gap of \$16M will be funded over an 8-year period. In 2013-14, the Governor funded 11.78% of the \$16M gap for a small increase. In 2014-15, the Governor is projected to fund 28% of the gap, which gives another \$4M to the district, and it increases both the Supplemental and Base Grants. The goal is to get districts back to what they were getting in 2007-08 (including a COLA), at a minimum. In 2013-14, the Supplemental Grant calculation is \$.8M, the higher of the Supplemental Grant calculation or the district's EIA (Economic Impact Aid: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/eia.asp>). BUSD's EIA was .8M/year, and the districts have to spend at least what is spent in EIA. Even though EIA is no longer a program or a grant coming into school districts, Berkeley will have \$.8 Supplemental Grant money that will be rolled into the plan. In 2014-15, the Supplemental grant money will increase from to \$2.4M. By 2020-21, the Supplemental Grant funding will be \$5.9M/year. In short, there has been a reduction in money specifically tied to CSR, even though the Base and Supplemental Grant money is increasing.

The slide *LCFF 2020-21 Target Calculation* (page 3) outlines the rates that are used to determine the target. The first line shows that every school district gets the same amounts for the Base Grant for those grade spans per student. The CSR is included for the amount per student for the K-3 calculation. The second line indicates the amount that every school district gets from the 20% of the Base to calculate the Supplemental Grant. The third line indicates that BUSD has 42% actual, unduplicated count of the targeted student populations (Free and Reduced Lunch, English Learners, and Foster Youth) and that percentage is used to calculate the supplemental funding of \$650 (42% of \$1,548). The fourth line shows the 2020-21 LCFF target amounts. Every year the target could change based on the Governor's budget and COLA. This target on the slide is based on the 2014-15 state budget. Every year the target will be recalculated based on each year's budget, and then a portion of the gap will be funded.

Every school district must develop a *Local Control and Accountability Plan-LCAP* (slide-page 4) that supports the targeted student groups specifically but is not limited to those students. The LCAP is a three-year plan and is due July 1, 2014. The state passed regulations related to the LCAP plan, which also included a template for a district-wide planning document. The plan must include the following items: Annual Goals and Progress Indicators, Actions, Services and Expenditures, Process used to Engage Stakeholders, and Focus on the Eight State Priority Areas along with the local priorities.

9. LCAP and BSEP: State Priorities and District Goals, Focus on Family Engagement and School Climate

Donald Evans, Superintendent and Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Evans continued presenting the handout: • *BUSD Local Control and Accountability Plan: P&O Meeting February 11, 2014* (PowerPoint slide hardcopy)

Superintendent Evans reviewed *The State of California's Eight Priority Areas* (slide-page 4). He went on to present *Which Students are Monitored in the LCAP?* (slide-page 4). Evans stated that in this process the consideration should be: “what is essential for some, (the target groups), and good for all (students).” The targeted students are high-need students: Low Income Students, English Learners and Foster Youth. There are also “Numerically Significant Subgroups” which are groups of more than 30 students, such as African American, Asian, Filipino, or Hispanic or Latino, among others.

Superintendent Evans reviewed district data with the committee. He began with *Vision: All students will meet state academic targets* (slide-page 5). The slide presented the Academic Performance Index (API) for the district for all students taking the test (Grades 2-11) and for 2013 the index was 821, which showed an increase of 31 points from 2011. What is alarming about the data is that it shows a gap of almost 250 points between the African American/Hispanic/Latino students and White students. Even though there are increases for all groups, it was still not enough and he feels that there should be some urgency around this data. What does the district need to do to get scores up and improve the performance of students who have not been performing?

Vision: Every Child Will Read Proficiently (slide-page 6) shows the percentages of third graders that are reading at target in 2013 with 72% meeting the “proficient” level. Despite the overall increase in students meeting proficient levels, it is still low for African American and Hispanic/Latino students.

Vision: Every Child Will Be Safe, Responsible and Respectful (slide-page 6) shows the disproportionality in the percent of students suspended from school overall - 4% K-12 in 2013, while for African Americans, it was 10%. Even though that is a decrease from 16% in 2011, the district would like to see it down to 0%. What types of programs and supports do students need to get the number of suspensions to 0%?

Vision: Every English Learner Will Become Proficient in English (slide-page 7) Even though the percentages of students “making progress” in the district are better than what is happening state-wide, how do we get that to 100%? We need to look at more than 30-minutes of ELD a day (required) and what more does the district need to put in place to make sure more students are “proficient?”

Vision: Every Child Will Attend School Every Day (slide-page 7) indicates that in 2013, there were 20% of students 9-12 missing 10% or more of the school year. The data also shows that 35% of African American students and 24% of Hispanic/Latino student miss 10% or more of the school year. There is an overall decline in the percentages. How does the district help get the students to engage and attend every day?

Superintendent Evans asked the P&O committee members to consider programs, supports and resources that those students might need. What do the schools have that are best practices that are working that could be looked at and implemented district-wide that would make a difference in students’ performance?

According to LCAP, the district will have to have a plan, consult with groups, review the plan, have public input, and adopt a plan by June 2014 (slide-*Adopting and Updating the LCAP*, page 8). Evans stated this was an opportunity to be transparent about the work. The district has had the opportunity to meet with the PAC, ELAC, Superintendent’s Budget Advisory Committee, BSEP, EAC, SGCs, and students as well. The district trained facilitators to work with community organizations and to get feedback from them on what

the district needs to do to move students forward (slide-*Consultation Groups*, page 8). BUSD plans to have the all the site plans align to the priorities.

Superintendent Evans then asked the members of the P&O Committee to participate in an exercise to get input on School Climate and Parent/Family Engagement. Each member was given colored dots to attach to posters set up on either side of the room. The items on each poster included input from previous groups. The members spent a few minutes attaching their dots on what they would consider “high leverage” programs and note what the district should focus on. If the participants wished to add something they think the district should provide to students, they could write it in. After the exercise, Evans noted that under School Climate, the top three items were Counseling and Mental Health Services, Botany (Gardening)/Nutrition, and Literacy and Math coaches. The top three items under Parent/Family Engagement were Parent Liaison at each site, more funding for translations, and involve parents that have been traditionally less involved. The information will be incorporated and suggested program and activities developed. Superintendent Evans will return to the P&O Committee on March 11, 2014, with more information and have the committee members be involved in developing other elements of the priorities.

Fredericks asked about the statistics around the achievement gap relative to other districts in the state, specifically what targets does the district have, what is progress? Evans replied that not only the state, but the country, is dealing with the achievement gap, especially with African American students. He noted a recent visit to Culver City, a district that has a small achievement gap (approximately 20-30 points), to see what they were doing with their students of color. They had high expectations for all students and how they engage students in the classrooms. They expect every student to be in a club and for students who were targeted as having problems, a counselor had 25 of them for 10 months, and each teacher commented on that student via email every day. There was a 20-30 point difference, but all the students were at 800 level. Fredrick asked how the district would know if it was allocating the appropriate amount of the budget to addressing that gap? Evans replied that what is being done now is not closing the gap as much as the district would like. He noted that the district needs to look at which programs are working, because if a program is not working to close the gap, should it be discontinued? What will the district do with the money that it will be given for those targeted groups that will make a difference in achievement? That will require the district to look at what it is already doing and whether it is working. That requires the district to have conversations with the Educational Advisory Committee.

Mahmood asked, in terms of the achievement gap, especially with the African American students in Berkeley, are we assuming most of those students are addressed under free and reduced lunch? Smuts stated that trends show that the gap is smaller in younger grades and increases significantly in upper grades. In one statistic, if parent educational achievement and income held the same, you would still see African American students performing at a lower level than their counterparts, and so it is not tied only to income. A lot of people assume that the district-wide achievement gap stems from income but it is clearly something more than that.

Bartlow mentioned that students that become disengaged from education are fodder for the criminal justice system and efforts made on this front would do a lot more for the individual than putting them in the penal system on the back end. Evans noted that at BUSD, it is a top priority for everyone; we know we have to do something and what is that something? What are those high leverage programs/resources/supports that will give us the biggest bang for our buck? Lazio said that BSEP school site funds are actually addressing

some of these efforts now, and BHS has been funding intervention services, ELL home school liaisons and other small programs. She noted that there was a lot written about them and there was data for them.

Evans stated that the EAC - Education Advisory Committee - was examining programs at all schools sites and data about particular populations in determining whether specific programs were good and why. Hamill asked where the gap originates and accelerates or whether it was a steady increase? Evans stated it depended on what research was looked at; some say third grade, some say second grade, was the time when schools started losing African American boys. More were lost after middle school and by the time they were in high school, they can't check out because of the law, but they are "checked out." Evans stated that he could get more information for the committee, but the district was losing kids in numbers. He stated that he liked the LCAP process because the district really has to hone in to what they are doing for the targeted populations. Glimme added that what you cannot see in the data from internal assessments is that there is a narrowing of the gap over the school year and then it widens over the course of the summer. When you look at the end of year gap vs. start of next year there is a really big difference between different subgroups. Higher achieving subgroups are stable or go up in proficiency over the summer, while high risk students tend to go down over the summer. That may be a high leverage place to start. Evans stated that people have mentioned extending the year as well as extending the school day. Lamar reminded the group that there was a history in Berkeley of African American Studies departments and a living history that is not recorded in the data per se and that needs to be acknowledged and those resources tapped into.

10. Class Size Reduction Discussion

Co-chair Martin opened the discussion about CSR funding from the state by stating that the P&O Committee has a responsibility as stewards of the Measure to revisit CSR funding because it represented a change specific to the K-3 class size terminology in Measure A-BSEP. Hensley took the lead for the discussion as to what the P&O Committee was responsible to on the Measure as far as the considerations were of potentially moving from 20:1 K-3 to 24:1. Hensley stated that the District and Board could be looking to the P&O Committee to make a recommendation about CSR. She asked: What happens to 20:1 under the new state funding structure? Hensley wanted input on the pros and cons of moving toward 24:1 across the board, and to figure out what questions the P&O Committee might need answered before it could make a recommendation to the Board. Beery stated that the CSR budget would be going before the Board in March. Hensley pointed out the wording in the Measure: "*Average class sizes in the K-3 grades shall be reduced to 20:1 as long as state class size reduction funds are provided for that purpose at a level not less than currently funded by the State.*" (Measure A, 3. Definition of Purposes, A. Smaller Class Sizes, Expanded Course Offerings, and School Counseling Services, ii.) The P&O Committee has to ascertain whether funding has changed such that class size reduction is not funded at the same level by the State, in which case the question arises of whether 20:1 must continue. The designated CSR funds were reduced by \$.7M but that amount went into the Base Grant. Hensley asked the committee members if they had questions or concerns.

Frederick asked if, according to the spirit of the measure, the P&O Committee would be violating the trust of the voters if it were to recommend raising it from 20:1. Glimme thought it was clear that the way the Measure was intended, if the money from the State was not specifically designated for K-3 CSR, the "as long as" clause is triggered. Nevertheless, with a new measure on the horizon, it might be a bad time to talk about raising class sizes.

Gordon thought it was up to the School Board to determine whether to keep 20:1. The District has the money; it just wasn't designated for class size. Hensley stated that the Measure does not require BSEP to continue funding at 20:1, but does the committee have a responsibility to consider whether it should? Smut said that he felt the goal was clearly stated as 20:1 and referred to the sentence: "*The goals for the class sizes to be achieved with these revenues are District-wide Average Class Sizes of 26:1 for the elementary schools grades K-5...*" (Measure A, 3. Definition of Purposes, A. Smaller Class Sizes, Expanded Course Offerings, and School Counseling Services, ii.) Hensley said that the Measure does carve out that the class size is 26:1, with 20:1 as a special circumstance.

Hensley asked whether it was BSEP and the CSR funds responsibility to address the \$.7M gap? Armstrong asked if there was data to show that a 20:1 ratio helps student outcomes in K-3? And if so, then it could be argued that it could be one of the strategies used to help serve those subgroups. Others agreed that the data was a mixed bag and there was acknowledgment that it was an important question that could not be answered in this meeting. Armstrong asked if there could be a different sharing ratio between the General Fund and BSEP to get to 20:1? Hensley responded that parts of the CSR budget were going to things other than reduction of class size, such as middle school counseling, expanded course offerings and programs. Paxson was interested in what the teachers and principals wanted, whether 20:1 was a key number, and whether jumping to 24:1 right off the bat could be a big leap. Perez wanted to know who would be making the decision, and the response was that the Board would decide. Hensley stated that the District Staff generally makes the proposal for the budget. Deputy Superintendent Cleveland stated that for the current 2013-14 school year the District was supporting CSR by using the \$.7M Base Grant funding for class size reduction. No decision has been made for the 2014-15 school year.

Glimme stated that the P&O Committee was not a decision-making body. It does not control the money but only provides planning input and oversight. The School Board controls how the money is used, based upon proposals from the administrative staff. The District makes decisions every year with respect to CSR and the program support money. Hensley stated that the P&O Committee's role includes pre-input on how it believes the budget should be structured. For example, is it appropriate for BSEP to pick up more of what it will take to get class size to 20:1 this year, and then other things in the CSR budget will have to be cut. Right now the committee is focusing on what the Measure allows, what it suggests or guides as appropriate, and it clearly indicates 20:1 is not a requirement. However, if the district wants to make sure that 20:1 continues, is it appropriate for BSEP to be the one that is footing that bill? If not, does that then put class size at risk of changing? Glimme thought it meant that the committee could go to the Board and state what they believe is appropriate, and Hensley added that the P&O makes recommendations but we don't get to decide.

Hamill reminded the committee that the class size number is just an average and recalled that when the budget was shrinking, the then-superintendent asked BSEP for money because the District was losing money in the GF and wanted to keep those programs. He felt that it was ironic that 3 years ago the discussion was about the appropriate use of funds and to carve RtI² and middle school counselors out of the BSEP CSR budget. Now we have turned it around and that since money was supposedly coming back into the GF, he felt that the GF should pick up more of the program support that in the lean years was shifted over onto BSEP. Hensley pointed out that middle school counseling was called out specifically in the CSR budget as a specific expenditure. Fredrick stated that as he read the measure about deciding what to fund, it specified CSR first and middle school counselors are in there, but

fund CSR first, then if there is money left over, fund other things. The only worry he had was for setting precedent. He felt that as long as it could be projected to meet the numerical CSR targets and the other things that are mentioned specifically, he thinks BSEP has an obligation to attempt to do that. What he does not want to do is, if it is projected that we will not meet those class size reductions over the course of the remainder of the Measure, because of population growth, COLAs, reallocations in the GF, we should have that discussion now and not set a precedent that BSEP takes all of that on. Hensley asked what were the key questions that people would want to have answered before they could take action on a proposal from the District about the CSR budget?

Beery confirmed that 24:1 was the bar that allowed the district to qualify for CSR funding, which is a separate question from what the Measure states, which was that you begin with 26:1 and then bring it down further, so long as funds are available, to 20:1. This was already a class size reduction from 34:1, which is what the GF provides. Smuts stated that it was his understanding that under the new CSR rules, if any school site exceeds the 24:1 average, the money would be lost for the entire district.

Lamar asked about the last statement “*Alternative methods to reduce class sizes in a particular year may be adopted by the School Governance Council and implemented as approved by the Board of Education.*” (Measure A, 3. Definition of Purposes, A. Smaller Class Sizes, Expanded Course Offerings, and School Counseling Services, ii.) Glimme stated that he thought that phrase was primarily about places in the middle schools and the high school where class sizes are reduced in various ways, for instance providing for very small math classes by offsetting that with other larger classes.

Paxson wondered about whether there were numbers for what the GF funds for the ratio and how BSEP buys it down. Maybe the committee needs to see that again so that it is really clear that BSEP is still buying down quite a bit, from 34:1. As a clarification, are we recommending BSEP pick it up or are we recommending that we go to the GF and for what time frame? Hensley stated that for 2013-14 it was already determined, the GF is picking up CSR. Hensley did not think we had to say what we have to do for the remainder of the Measure, but there are not a lot of years left and what happens next year sets a precedent. Beery noted that recommendations would be for three school years through 2016-17. Mahmood asked if the committee was talking about making a recommendation for just one year? Martin stated that the P&O committee should not be making a recommendation, but that a statement could be made as to how the committee feels as stewards of the Measure, relative to the words in the Measure and the changes in funding. Mahmood added that in order to be responsible stewards of the Measure, we would need to know the exact cost. A statement to the School Board would have to be based on fidelity to the Measure, as well as some actual numbers on what it would cost and what the potential detriment could be to the existing services. What would it look like if the District continued to fund this vs. what would it look like if BSEP funded this and these are where the cuts would be and this would be what the implications would be. Lazio stated that she felt that the Committee needed more information before making a statement.

Martin said that the money was there and that the question is whether the Measure requires/asks/intends us to fund K-3 at 20:1, and that we think for reasons relative to renewing the Measure in 3 years, we feel that it is important maintain K-3 at 20:1. Glimme stated that he thought the statement could have two parts; in what we feel is a plain reading of the Measure, 1) what can be done and 2) what should be done. He felt that CSR funds have decreased and that activates that clause, CSR can be changed, but we think for the reasons stated class sizes should probably be kept at 20:1. Smuts stated that if the same

people that make the decisions on how to spend the general fund make the decisions to spend BSEP money, isn't the overriding principle to convey that keeping class sizes small in K-3 could be important. And if for budgetary reasons, money needs to be freed up for that \$.7M, give it to one class; make the transition start at grade 3, with six classrooms. The idea was widely stated that what the general public knows about the Measure and identifies with universally is class size reduction. To raise the class size on the verge of renewing the Measure seems problematic.

Hensley said that the committee had not touched on the things that would potentially be cut as a result. It is a reality that people need to take into account that the budget that comes to us may suggest there will be cuts to expanded course offerings, middle school counseling, RtI². Martin stated that the committee did not have time to put together a statement for the next evening's School Board meeting. It could try to prepare one for the next meeting for the Committee to review and to hopefully enforce a budget that represents the desire. Lamar asked if the costs could be split.

Martin suggested a statement: *We, as a committee, feel that it is important to maintain 20:1 as per the Measure for reasons relative to renewing the Measure in three years and relative to what we feel is important given the priorities in the Measure.*

Smuts mentioned that student outcomes are really important, so what the committee was doing was providing an interpretation of the public's desire and he was trying to get a sense of what the committee's purview was. Martin responded that many aspects of the Measure could be argued and have been over the years, and the committee's charge was to look at what the voters intended, look at student outcomes, assess what the administration recommends and act with all those things in mind.

Cleveland stated that very few districts have class sizes at 20:1, and in fact most of the other school districts have increased class sizes to well above 24:1 and for them to qualify for state class size reduction funding they have to show progress toward getting to 24:1 in the next eight years. Cleveland also confirmed that under the new rules, each school site must meet 24:1 and they cannot exceed that or the funding is lost for the entire district. Previously it was averaged district-wide per grade level. Hamill reiterated that during the lean years for the General Fund, increased program support came out of BSEP and now that the CSR was coming under pressure because the District lost \$.7M out of that, shouldn't the GF shift it back? Hensley responded that the way CSR got calculated shifted over the last couple of Measures. There is also more than \$.7M a year that goes beyond just CSR and the committee will have to take a look at that and send a message about what it thinks is important. Lazio said that she charted the value of the leftover funds after allowing for teachers salaries. In 2008 or 2009 it was around \$1M, and more recently, it has been close to \$3M range for the ECO and program support monies.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:31 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support