

LOCAL CONTROL AND ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN
Parent Advisory Committee

March 6, 2014

7:00-9:00 pm

Berkeley Technology Academy
2701 Martin Luther King Jr. Way, Berkeley

1. Welcome

Neil Smith, Superintendent for Educational Services, welcomed participants and asked the table groups (Elementary 1 & 2, Middle School/High School 1 & 2), staff and visitors to introduce themselves. Donald Evans, BUSD Superintendent was in attendance at this meeting.

NOTE: Handouts to participants included the following:

1. *Meeting Agenda March 6, 2014*
2. *CALPADS October 2, 2013 hardcopy handout, sent to participants*
3. *LCAP Priorities Worksheet (Program/Cost/Priority Level, Draft Format)*
4. *LCAP Priorities Narrative (8 pages)*
5. Each table had a reference sheet that listed the LCAP targeted populations.

2. Agenda Review

Smith gave a brief review of the agenda.

3. Public Comment

Richard Boyden, BUSD parent and President of the Berkeley Athletic Fund (BAF), which raises money to support athletics, stated that he wanted to talk about the importance of athletics and the critical underfunded nature of BHS athletics. A few months ago a FITNESSGRAM test was given to 9th graders enrolled in PE at BHS and Boyden stated that they scored one of the lowest scores in the state in terms of fitness. He noted that the results are somewhat skewed due to the fact that the population of students in PE at Berkeley High is 1/6th of the total number of students or approximately 500 students. Half of those are 9th graders and all minority kids. Another half of the students are across the street at the YMCA with PE waivers. He noted that was not a great situation.

He noted that approximately 1/3 of the students at BHS are on an athletic team. The coaches are all from off campus with a few exceptions. The high school does not have the kind of coaches on campus who are motivating our kids, helping them get to college or keeping them eligible, and doing the kinds of things we need them to do. We need coaches to help kids use their interest in athletics to motivate kids in the classroom and that is going to be a key part of closing the achievement gap. We don't see that anywhere. In 2007, during the downturn, the Board cut 13 positions from BHS Athletics and we've been making that up with a little bit of BSEP money here, and a little bit of fundraising there. Basically, the parents have been raising the money to cover those 9 freshman

coaches and 4 assistants ever since. We need that money back, it's not a lot of money, but we need to start doing some things now. We know that there are a lot of demands for funding. We know there are a lot of critical needs. We know that gardening, fine arts and all these other things are just as important as athletics. This is not going to be easy but we have to start somewhere. Boyden thanked the District and the school because they actually started doing something this year. We fought very hard last year for a part-time position for an assistant athletic director to work on athletics, get the coaches motivated, find the kids who need the help and focus resources on them. This year there is a .6 FTE position created for one year and there is a wonderful young guy, very dynamic, a former math teacher, doing this work. This is a great a step in the right direction, but we need to do more. Thirty years ago there were 29 PE teachers, today there are 3 for 3000 kids. We can't solve the problems now but we need to start somewhere.

Boyden thanked the PAC Committee for the opportunity to speak.

4. Overview of Best Practices and Proposals for LCAP

Smith referred to the *LCAP Priorities Worksheet (Program/Cost/Priority Level, Draft Format)*. The District has had public as well as other groups meeting and feedback was solicited. The *LCAP Priorities* list the ideas that people are identifying as important initiatives going on in the District. This also responds to a request last time about what best practices are happening in BUSD that could be replicated throughout the District. Smith then gave a brief background explanation for each item on the list for the participants understanding. He noted that an 8-page document would be handed out later in the meeting with a short paragraph for each item.

Smith stated that the feedback that he was seeking from the participants was:

- A. What is essential to be included in the LCAP Plan in Year 1?** Smith reminded the participants that LCAP was focused on the Supplemental Grant for targeted groups: English Learners, Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students, Foster Youth and Students with IEPs-Individualized Education Plans/Students with Disabilities. **The total cost of the list is approximately \$8.5-9M** depending upon which options are offered and there are two that have options: **Reduced Math Class Size for Grades 7/8/9-\$214K-\$517K** and **Site Coordinators for Family Engagement--\$295K to \$481K**. The LCAP funding for next year is \$2.4M.
- B. What is important to be included in the LCAP Plan to be funded in years 2 or 3?**
- C. This is important for the District but not appropriate for LCAP funding.** The District should seek funding for this initiative from some other place.
- D. This is not my priority, but I understand it may be a priority for others.** This is more of a neutral vote for a program.
- E. These funds could be used for a higher priority.** It is difficult for you to support this program.

Lightfoot asked Smith to provide the participants with what the priority area was intended to influence and any evaluation of the programs effectiveness in terms of outcomes, as he went through the explanation of programs. He hoped to address that but there would be time for discussion around the priorities and people could ask clarifying

questions as well. Smith stated that the *LCAP Priorities Narrative (8 pages)* that he would hand out later would explain in a paragraph or two how the money for each program would actually be used. Alper asked if all the programs listed were currently being done and Smith responded that some were and some were not and that he could go over that. Sowle asked if the ranking of LCAP Priorities would be done that evening or as homework. Smith stated that ideally he would like to have it done at this meeting so that group responses for the 36 priorities could be brought back to begin discussing what seemed to be surfacing as top priorities. He noted that the LCAP Priorities list was still in a draft format and there was a timeline for the District. We are all working on this, trying to bring the information to the PAC at the same time as it is being brought to the Educational Advisory Cabinet, the Principals saw it this week, it is going next week to the Superintendent's Budget Advisory Committee and the BSEP Planning & Oversight Committee. Everyone is looking at this and trying to determine what is most important.

Smith said that he grouped the priorities somewhat on the Priorities list. He began with a focus with the ELL-English Language Learners and the need for an **English Language Development-ELD Teacher at Every Site** to work with ELL to provide ELD instruction. The allocation would depend on the number of ELL at each site, so those schools with larger numbers of ELL would actually have a greater allocation for this. The equivalent is probably 9.5 teachers. Smith was asked if there were such teachers at the schools to which he replied no. He added that some schools use site funds to support English Language instruction and there are a number of ELL coaches in the district, who work on professional development with teachers, but do not provide direct services to students. This would be a change in the model of how ELD would be delivered. The second thing is the **Support for TWI and Bilingual Programs** with a full-time TSA-Teacher on Special Assignment to coordinate the efforts to consolidate the TWI program at LeConte as the program goes away at Rosa Parks and Cragmont as student who want TWI are sent to LeConte. The TSA would also coordinate the bilingual program at Thousand Oaks and look at the TWI program at Longfellow for middle school students. Symmes noted that one thing that was hard to deal with was this list the way it is; 1) how to figure out what's missing, because we have been working from a "bring us a problem and put it on the list," so we don't have sports or other topics on the list. Smith stated that he thought sports would not be part of an LCAP list. He thought it could be said that sports would be important for the district. If people felt something was important it could be added to the list at the end. Symmes went on to ask if there were line items that were felt to be interesting, but should be half as much, given the proportion of the whole pie, how should that be noted? Smith responded that it could be noted on the sheet as well and it would be tracked as we move forward.

Smith said the next group of items were related to a major program in the district called Response to Instruction and Intervention-RtI². RtI² is a way to monitor the progress of students, to assess students regularly, and to provide what they need as soon as it is noted that they need it, rather than waiting or not assessing often enough to note that there are issues. **RtI² Coaches for K-8** would be for staff at sites to work with teachers and students to provide RtI². This program is currently going on at some sites and sites are using their site funds for this. There are currently 3 District RtI² Coaches who work primarily with teachers. **Teacher Hourly Intervention** are funds for paying teachers at an hourly rate to work with students primarily after school. This is aimed at

the targeted students/students who need assistance. **Intervention Materials and Training:** The District found good intervention materials for students at elementary schools such as Marilyn Burns “Do the Math” and the “Teachers College Reading and Writing Project” level literacy kits. We don’t have similar intervention materials in our secondary schools; so to identify those intervention materials when the standard materials are not working is the reason for this request. Smith clarified the definition of “intervention” by stating that intervention meant, for instance, the use of the level literacy kit for students that are 1-1.5 years or more below grade level instead of using the standard materials in the classroom. Different materials are used to provide intervention. The **High School Bridge** program identifies students as they leave 8th grade and pulls them together during the summer and keeps them together for the 4 years of high school. There is a parent component as well. They have a 7th period class after school, a teacher who serves as a case manager and follows up with the students their homework, progress, and home life. Usually that teacher has contact with parents. There are approximately 30 students per grade level as they enter 9th grade at BHS and they are kept together all four years. The first cohort is now in 12th grade. Smith was asked if the **Rtl² Coaches for K-8** was for specialized teachers to which he responded that all staff in BUSD would be involved in this district-wide program, which are at all K-8 schools currently. Smith stated that **Middle School Bridge** was started this year for the first time. It was part of a plan to accelerate the achievement of African American students. 20 students were identified at each middle school and provided with an additional period after school with a teacher who was focused on a model similar to the High School Bridge, which is a successful model. The teacher provides case management, follow ups with each student’s teachers, making contact with the home, following up with the students on their homework to make sure they are staying on track and providing them needed support and tools to succeed in school. This proposal seeks to expand the program next year by continuing the program for this year’s cohort for 7th grade and provide for another incoming cohort of 6th graders, at each middle school. **Intervention Coordinator and Support at BHS** is a proposal for an intervention counselor who could oversee a group of mentors to work with approximately 120 of the highest risk students entering BHS. This would target 9th graders entering BHS and possibly some 10th graders. This program would provide a system of case management that would ensure that students who need resources are connected with the resources they need. Smith was asked what accounts for the \$255,000 cost? He stated that figure would be the cost of the counselor and the 5 mentors who would be paid. Smith was asked if this program would include B-Tech, to which he responded that the program was primarily for BHS and that B-Tech was not a part of this particular proposal. Smith was asked why B-Tech students, who are homeless, whose parents are incarcerated, who have drug addiction in their families, are not a part of this proposal and he replied that they were included in a number of things, just not this proposal, as B-Tech did not have 9th graders and this was a specific proposal for the entering high school class. **Mentoring** was a program to provide a mentoring coordinator and mentors for approximately 75 students in the 5th, 6th, and 7th grades, Smith noted that this was a difficult transition time for a lot of kids. He stated that the district had identified this as a possible program for this year but was unsuccessful at finding the coordinators to mentor the program. They would like to try this again to make it work for next year. Butler stated that he thought B-Tech should be added in the **Intervention**

Coordinator and Support at BHS category because about 75% of their students were foster youth. Smith said that could be added just as sports was brought up as an idea that could be added, and restated that these were things that surfaced from the two previous PAC meetings, as well as from the principals, EAC, the P&O, and the Superintendent's Budget Advisory Committee. Smith was asked about the **Mentoring** program and the number of students it would serve. He responded that it would serve 75 students, with approximately 25 from each grade, 5/6/7, district-wide. This would be about 2-3 students at every elementary school, 25-7th graders and 25-6th graders, with an equivalent of 9 at King (with 7 at each of the other middle schools for both the 6th and 7th grades). For **Elementary Summer School** BUSD has a partnership with UC Berkeley Build Tutors, who are trained to work with BUSD students on literacy, to reduce what is known as "the summer slide." When kids who don't have advantages at home return to school in the fall their performance is not as strong as it had been in the spring. The summer program would keep these students involved and active in literacy and this is seen as a real goal. It is a 5-week program targeting socio-economically disadvantaged students. This program is intended to serve 400-500 students. **Secondary Summer School** is primarily for high school students. It is a standard credit recovery program that has been provided year after year that allows students to remain on track for graduation. Most of the classes that are available are for 11th and 12th graders. In answer to a question about extended school year, Smith confirmed that extended school year is only required for Special Ed students who have it in their IEP-Individualized Education Plan. Smith added that the State took all money targeted for specific programs and eliminated those line items. Summer school was a specific line item that the State had. The same would be true for intervention materials, there was line item for instructional materials and that is now gone. It is now one pot of money to be used as the District chooses to use it. Smith stated that the **Secondary Summer School** would serve approximately 400-500 students. Smith was asked how it could cost \$93,000 for students to go to summer school while it costs \$864,000 for 9 ELD Teachers for half that? Smith responded that summer school is part-time and teachers are usually paid an hourly rate. Also summer school usually runs for 20-30 days of the summer. The **English Language Development-ELD Teacher at Every Site** would have 9 full-time teachers; with average teacher salary, benefits and all related expenses the cost projection for next year would be \$864,300. **Student Incentives** came up as an idea, a way for students to attend school or to perform better at school. The District is restricted in what can be given to students though because the education code forbids gifts of public funds to students. While student incentives can work, it has to be funded through the PTA, grants, or some other way. The district could, at most, provide things like pencils, certificates, or stickers, but no significant incentives. The ideas that were coming forward were much more about high school students and what would incentivize them to attend school. **Cultural Competency Training** came up as a theme in a number of places and staff feels strongly about this. There is a need for the District to ensure that all staff members receive the cultural competency training necessary to teach and work effectively with the diverse group of people in Berkeley. A number of people have been through the 3-day basic training and ongoing follow-up is provided. This seeks to continue the training next year. It is funded primarily through BSEP Professional Development funds, which could continue. **Recruitment and Retention of Teachers of Color** has come up in a number of places and Smith stated that the District is seeking to

increase the capacity to do this and fund a .5 time teacher whose responsibility would be to work with the BUSD HR department to improve recruitment practices, as well as to work with current teachers of color to give them the support they need so they stay here in Berkeley.

The third area is counseling. **Mental Health Counseling** would increase contracts that sites have now with the Berkeley Mental Health Department and other outside providers to provide counseling services to students who are dealing with trauma or other severe emotional issues. The District has a contract with the City of Berkeley, which gives each elementary school \$5000, but most of it is about support and connecting students, not about providing direct services. **PBIS/Restorative Justice/Alive and Free (K-12)** provides services at all three levels. PBIS-Positive Behavioral Intervention System is implemented at grades K-8 to provide other ways to handle discipline besides suspension. The program looks to increase student's time in class and to focus on positive behavior rather than negative behavior. The Restorative Justice program would primarily be implemented in the middle schools, BHS and B-Tech. Alive and Free is fully implemented at B-Tech and BHS would like to implement that program next year. Dr. Joseph Marshall is a MacArthur award winner and founder of the Alive and Free program in San Francisco. He comes to B-Tech just about every Wednesday for an assembly for the students. BHS sees the positive impact of that program and would like to replicate it. PBIS is led by a full-time psychologist and funded through soft money. Restorative Justice is a grant funded contract with SEEDS Community Resolution Center and Alive and Free, a non-profit entity, is funded through one-time money. Smith confirmed that the money funds only one staff, the school psychologist. **Social/Emotional Curriculum (K-6)** has come up a number of times from parents. The program that was identified for this priority is called "Toolbox." It is currently being implemented at Malcolm X and John Muir and has brought back very positive reports. This program works with students to provide options for when they become frustrated or angry. The funding is a one-time cost for staff training and materials for one year. **ATOD Counselors at Secondary Schools** would be a contract with an outside agency called the New Bridge Foundation, which focuses on substance abuse and substance abuse prevention. There are counselors from New Bridge at B-Tech and Willard and the District would be looking to expand that program to BHS, King and Longfellow. This funding would be a one-time cost for next year to provide counselors.

The next group of priorities focuses on literacy and implementation of Common Core State Standards. **Literacy Coaches (K-5)** is a high priority for the district elementary schools. Site funds from each site currently fund to pay for almost half of the literacy coaches at each site. The District, through BSEP, pays for more than half. The \$474,000 is the cost of .45 FTE for the 11 elementary sites. Smith confirmed that there is a full-time literacy coach at every elementary school. The coach divides their job between coaching staff, providing Reading Recovery for struggling first graders, and intervention groups for 2nd through 5th grades. The middle schools are looking to fund **Reading Specialists/Literacy Coaches at Middle School**. Most secondary English credentials do not focus on the actual teaching of reading. That is viewed as an elementary teacher's skill. The middle schools are reporting that a number of students are arriving without reading skills needed to access the curriculum. **Math Coaches (K-12)**: Smith noted that there has been a transition in mathematics to "A Story of Units" and "A Story of Ratios"

in middle school for the implementation of the Common Core curriculum, which is a major change. The proposal seeks to fund 4.0 FTE math coaches: 2.0 FTE for the elementary schools, 1.0 FTE for the middle schools and 1.0 FTE for the BHS and B-Tech. **CCSS (Academic) Coaches for BHS (2.0 FTE)** seeks to fund 2.0 FTE teachers to help with the implementation of both English and Math Common Core as the transition is made to the new standards. **Reduced Math Class Size for Grades 7, 8, 9:** Smith stated that for many years the District reduced math class size to 20:1 for the 7th and 8th grades and found it to make a difference for middle school students and Algebra test scores. This class size reduction was paid for through the BSEP Class Size Reduction fund, which cannot continue to pay. The BSEP CSR fund needs to be kept fully balanced so that class sizes can be reduced through the remainder of the Measure (A), which does not end until 2017. Measure A allows for class sizes to be reduced throughout the District and if there is money leftover it can be spent on expanded course offerings at the secondary schools, middle school counseling, and program support. The middle school math class size reduction was considered to be program support and was not funded for this year, so it was placed on this list. This priority is viewed as important, especially as the District transitions to the Common Core Standards. While it was something that was provided to middle schools, the funding will not be there for next year. 9th grade math class size was reduced last year and for this year for the first time. Smith stated that he was not sure that the high school sees it as a priority for next year as much as the middle schools does. The costs for this item will be explained in more detail in the *LCAP Priorities Narrative (8 pages)*. Smith explained that the cost range comes from looking at the possibility of providing an option of CSR at 24:1 instead of CSR at 20:1. **AVID (Advancement via Individual Determination)** was implemented in the District 4 years ago and targets students whose parents have not been to college. The program seeks to identify students with potential at 7th grade, primarily from groups who have been underserved by colleges: African American, Latino, and ELL students. The class starts in 7th grade and helps students to learn organizational skills and Cornell note-taking skills. Significant improvement has been shown in their performance. The group formed in 7th grade stays together and the first cohort is now in the 10th grade at BHS. The cost comes not from the class itself, but for related expenses such as tutors, extra teaching hours, and teacher case management. It is a nationally recognized program and has been proven to get results. **Cal Scholars** is an expensive program that was always grant funded. UC Berkeley's Stiles Hall seeks grants for this and identifies students in 4th grade, again primarily students that are underserved in colleges: African American, Latino, and ELL students, and invites the student and their families to join the Cal Scholar program. They work with those students from 5th grade through 12th grade and provide them with summer programs, Saturday school, after school classes, and parent workshops. Peer support has made a big difference for those students. The program costs about \$100,000/year for a group of 30 students. The \$800,000 cost shown is what it would cost the District to implement the program if a cohort existed at each grade. Whenever Stiles Hall comes forward and asks BUSD to identify a group, the District always agrees and is grateful for the program. The District currently does not have a cohort at every grade level, but has a few cohorts going through. The success rate is great. If the student is there at 12th grade, every one of the students goes on to a 4-year college and a lot of them on scholarship. The average GPA is always and solidly above 3.0. The students appear to be a tight knit

group when they have appeared before the School Board or have been recognized for their achievement. The program does require a commitment on their part. CST scores are used to identify and invite students into the Cal Scholars program, which includes being proficient in English and math. Smith confirmed that if Stiles Hall makes a commitment to fund a cohort, they will fund the cohort for 8 years and Smith wanted to make it clear that it is not a \$100,000 one time expense. Once the commitment is made, you don't drop those students.

The next category of priorities relates to Family Engagement. **Site Coordinators for Family Engagement** comes up a lot in the community responses for LCAP. The cost range of \$295,000–\$481,000 depends on the level of support to be provided. BSEP provides \$351,000 already. This cost would be on top of that. Currently there is a pilot program at 6 elementary schools where a half-time family coordinator was provided. This funding seeks to provide a coordinator at each school site as well as at the middle schools, BHS, and B-Tech. There have been requests for **Parent Education Programs, PIQE/LUNA**. PIQE is a national program that involves parents by providing a series of classes to help them put their kids on track for college and help them with parenting skills. LUNA has been a Berkeley version PIQE that provides an 8-week program for parents.

Gardening & Cooking has come up from a number of places and this is a one-time request to keep the program in place for one more year, on top of money that is already available. The District made a commitment two years ago to support the program for two more years with money set aside for it. The money leftover is approximately \$226,000 and seeks to add \$176,900 (one time) for grades Pre-K–7.

The last items have not been put into a category yet because the *Priorities List* is a draft document. The **College/Career Counselor at BHS**: Smith stated that there are currently two college/career counselors at BHS that are paid for out of BHS site funds. He noted that site funds at all schools will decline next year due because the State will no longer be giving Economic Impact Aid monies to the schools and sites will notice the absence of that money. That is one of the “line items” that disappeared. B-Tech is looking for a **Dean at Berkeley Technology Academy** to work with their Alcohol/Tobacco/Drug Counselor, Principal, Academic Counselor, and Child Welfare & Attendance Specialist to provide services at the site. This position would be full-time with benefits. The **7th Period for Middle School** is the most expensive item on the menu. The middle school students currently have a 6-period day that includes 4 core subjects (English, History, Math & Science), PE, and one elective. A number of students need remediation/interventions and the idea came up that if a student gets a remediation or intervention class, he cannot take an elective such as art or drama. The reason he comes to school is because he loves art or he loves drama. So the question becomes how do you address the needs of the student and ensure that the student is engaged and enjoying some of his time during school. 7th period would create a longer day for 6/7/8 graders and it is a very expensive item. Smith confirmed that the middle schools wanted this program. **Professional Learning Communities (PLC)** is the idea of strengthening the capacity of staff: getting them to work together, looking at data, looking at what needs to be done. This seeks to send a group of administrators and teachers to a conference and then to provide support all year long to try to create PLCs at all the schools. **Career Technical Education (CTE)** seeks to expand the current program. This year a Fire Science class

was implemented and this priority seeks to add a second year of Fire Science and provide certification for EMT-Emergency Medical Technician. This would be for BHS, B-Tech and the Berkeley Adult School. The **Super Saturday Program** primarily targets 3/4/5 graders in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math). This program tries to make STEM fun & exciting and target kids that might not otherwise be engaged in this matter. **Pre-K:** A number of suggestions have come up around Kindergarten readiness and what will be done about Pre-school. The District already contributes \$276,000 from the General Fund into the Pre-school budget. LCAP is a K-12 initiative and Pre-school receives funding separate from K-12. **Technology** will focus on teacher professional development and training on how to integrate technology into the classroom, especially around Common Core.

Smith presented the Priority Levels slide and passed out *LCAP Priorities Narrative (8 pages)*. Smith asked the participants to take a few minutes to read the *LCAP Priorities Narrative (8 pages)* and then he would take questions. Smith confirmed that the programs that were not “one time” funded would be ongoing for multiple years. He also confirmed that additional funding would be coming in and the expectation for Year 2 of the LCAP would be \$3.5M and that would include the ongoing \$2.4M from Year 1 of the LCAP for an increase of \$1.1M for the second year.

After the participants reviewed the *LCAP Priorities* and held table talks, Smith brought them back together for a discussion. Beyeler wanted to know if there were things that participants wanted to add to the list. Symmes stated that her table disagreed with Smith that sports did not have a role here. All of the participants at her table thought that was fundamentally not in alignment with what was started with, that was why she asked about a mission statement. (Sports) very much contributes to pupil outcomes, organization, achievement, and engagement in school climate. Symmes asked how do we get more people participating, measure it, and make kids healthier and more focused? **The proposal would be to ask the sports administrators to create a line item for a modest-sized, incremental program that would fulfill these objectives. Smith stated that the BHS Athletic Director would be asked to make a proposal for a specific program. Symmes stated that she assumed that they could come up with a staff number, ways to increase participation, and monitor kids in some way. That would be a worthwhile thing to consider.** Another participant agreed and added that encouraging kids to participate in sports teaches them how to deal with other people, gain organizational skills, leadership skills, and teaches them discipline. Babitt stated that at BHS the girls basketball team has an average GPA of 3.2, they are winning, and the parents have to carpool their kids to games. She stated that she knew targeted intervention was costly, but have we really looked at these numbers to say “can we do this in a way that is more impactful of more students.” She felt there was a crisis going on and that more students needed to get this help than just 20 here and 30 there. Babitt stated that we were not really going to change the outcomes for some of our subgroups that way in the next five or ten years.

Butler would like to add **Intervention Coordinator and Support (at BHS)** for B-Tech rather than BHS because they have more of a percentage rate of (targeted groups). He thinks that the schools that have the most percentage of targeted groups should get the most funding, rather than the other schools with a lower percentage. He does not think they should be ignored, but it would not benefit BUSD if the money went to a school that

was not in as much of an emergency as B-Tech. **Smith stated that there should be a line item for Intervention Coordinator and Support at B-Tech.**

Beyeler noted that something that came up in the community was that only four of the elementary schools stayed open after school hours and the four that are open are bond-supported schools. He admitted that he did not know the costs of having an open campus but that it seemed that it could address many of the topics discussed, such as parent involvement, a place for children for supplemental tutoring, other activities, and 7th period. It seemed to be a low cost solution for programming BSUD facilities that are not being taken advantage of. It may not be appropriate for the LCAP funding list but because we are leveraging other funding such as BSEP and grant funding, it seemed to him to be a low cost intervention that could provide opportunities for a physical plant that is just not being taken advantage of. Smith stated that idea would have to be explored further in terms of supervision, maintenance, and things like that. Smith stated that a line item for **Extending Time/Use of School Campuses After Hours** could be created.

Lightfoot asked what the District's plan was for evaluating these programs? She felt it was hard to make decisions without knowing how successful they were. A potential thing to add would be a person/evaluation component, so that over time we can keep track of how we are doing with these programs, whether they are worth the investment, or whether there need to be changes. Smith stated that he thought that was a good idea and was often a component in grants funding. Smith stated that a **District Plan for Evaluating Programs/Components/LCAP Use of Funds** could be added to the list.

Dorph stated that as we think about the "puzzle" it would be helpful to understand the process that BSEP is going through, because, for instance, if they are taking math coaches off the list and they are needed, where do the funds come from? It seems like a complicated funding dynamic: what are the sites going to have, knowing what PTAs have in general, understanding the mix of funds. What are high probability items for grant funding to cover? She felt that there might be items on the *LCAP Priorities* list that she could put "C-Important for the District but not appropriate for LCAP"—look for other funding, but she would need some understanding of (the mix of funds). Smith responded that the process going forward was complicated and that this was the first year for districts to go through the LCAP development. Currently Site Governance Councils-SGCs are waiting for the decision on what is LCAP going to fund before they determine what they are going to fund. The PTAs are usually the last ones to state what they will fund next year. BSEP is in a dance with the district as well and a lot of their funds are categorical and specific, such as Libraries, Music/VAPA, Class Size Reduction, and Technology. Smith stated that he wanted the PAC to think of the \$2.4M as a guideline, not a cap. He could then return to the PAC with where he thinks each priority could be funded from. Smith felt that there was very little on the list, outside the ones that were already permanently grant funded, that could be grant funded. A lot of those things are items school districts want and there are not a lot of organizations that are rushing in to provide standard programs in school districts. A good example of that is the Gardening & Cooking program that has been struggling for some time to look for grant funding and thinking that it would be grant funded. Beyeler suggested that the **Gardening & Cooking program not be a "one-time" Year 1 expenditure, but a programmatic expenditure on a baseline basis for the 3 or 6 years of the LCAP.**

In answer to a question about the Pre-school funding, Smith stated that the State funds Pre-Schools separately from K-12 and there would be no set-aside for Pre-school from the LCAP funding.

Smith stated that the process is not clean cut and that the road map is being discovered as we go forward. He added that when the PAC meets again in two weeks he would like to give the committee the feedback from the *LCAP Priorities Worksheet (Program/Cost/Priority Level, Draft Format)*. The voting would not be set in stone but it is a way for discovering the priorities of the group. Smith felt that it would be interesting for the participants to see how their colleagues were prioritizing these items. Smith instructed Linda Race to add the items that were added today.

Smith was asked if the document could be sent out prior to the next meeting in an Excel format to be viewed during the next meeting. Another participant stated that she wrote notes on her worksheet and wanted to keep it. Babitt asked that another item to be added was **Programs to Reach More Students**. Smith stated that he wanted the participants of the committee to be aware that adding more kids dilutes the level of service that is intended. You could increase the services and then increase the number of students.

Sowles asked if a program is designed to serve 30 students is it because there are only 30 kids that need that particular kind of service? Smith responded “Not necessarily.”

Smith wanted the participants to have something on the worksheet from participants now rather than later. We could take them no later than Monday.

Navidad-Franco asked if we could get outcome data, number of students served, success rate on programs such as Cal Scholars. Smith responded that there might be data on some of the programs but not all of them and he was not sure how soon he could get that data to them.

Beyeler asked how school sites would be rewarded for doing a good job? how do we incentivize those programs, balanced against how do we address needs where we can see targeted student populations that we should really be giving services to? Has the idea of some set-aside, some kind of block grant set-aside, some kind of incentive set-aside so that the school sites themselves who have generated a lot of these programs through partnerships with the PTA, and the District, and the charismatic quality of their leadership or their student/teacher population. How do we actually get at that? Although he was not criticizing the menu approach, Beyeler felt that it left something lacking in a way in which we can focus on both where the need is and where we've been really successful at addressing that need. Because we all don't have that information at our fingertips, should we micro-manage and line item the expenditures for all these funds for those who are going to have to carry them out? And what role should they have in the expenditure of those funds? Because we have had a district that has somewhat autonomy at the school site and somewhat controlled at the central district and some partnerships with external funding. How does that get discussed or has that even come up in this kind of allocation process? Smith stated that in terms of the allocation of funds the District is consulting with a number of groups. It is “consult/review.” The process is that the PAC has the opportunity to review the plan and to provide feedback to the District unless we hear the District is doing the best things. What we are looking for initially in consulting with the PAC is what do you see as priorities? It is not that the PAC is the decision-maker but Smith felt it would be interesting for the PAC to see the opinions of what 30 parents

in the district were bringing forward to the District. In terms of best practices and incentives we have not talked that way about schools. Smith thought that staffs take great pride in what they do at school sites, so seeing good results in kids is really the satisfaction that they are looking for. Smith stated that he was thinking of what other incentives would be motivating. He felt the motivation for educators would be seeing kids do well, the feedback from kids, when you see students making progress and seeing good results on assessments, you know you've done a good job. That is mutually motivating, team building, and furthers the effort to continue. Dorph asked if it was an option to not allocate (the funds) all centrally and hand out some to individual schools to continue to allocate with the discretion that they used to have SGC by SGC? Or is that not an option in the way the new rules are set up? Smith stated that the District is accountable and the District is the decision-maker. He felt that would be viewed as the District abdicating it's authority. Going through this process and then turning around and handing the money back to the sites, Smith felt that as a District leader he would not have fulfilled his goal. He is meeting with principals, educators, the PAC and ultimately going back to the old way of handing money back to the sites. Smith confirmed that principals still have BSEP funding and Title 1 funding at the K-8 schools. They received their allocations yesterday so it is not as if there is no site decision making. The sites lost EIA money, which district-wide, ended up being about \$800,000. The biggest gap is at the high school.

6. Discussion Process to Develop LCAP Plan and Role of PAC

Alpers stated that some of the participants had asked Smith for a little time on the agenda to bring up any questions that the PAC had for Smith or to discuss with each other about substance or about the question that Dorph just asked. Alpers stated that the PAC committee does not have many more meetings, although they are each serving two year terms and the committee itself will last longer. For example one of the process questions or concerns was to have materials ahead of time if possible. It would have been great to have the *LCAP Priorities Narrative (8 pages)* ahead of time. Others of us are able to pick up things as they go while some of us need more time. Beyeler asked if Smith was waiting for the parent group to acknowledge some priority list or for individual parents to review the priorities that have been laid out, that we've added to, and then Smith would aggregate/add them up? Smith stated that it was his intent to aggregate the list and bring it back to the PAC in two weeks for the next meeting. If he can get the worksheets ahead of time and add them up ahead of time, Smith would send it out ahead of time, so the PAC would get to see "this is what other parents are thinking." He would also like to This appears to be if he is putting together yours, the EAC, the principals, the P&O, the Superintendent's Budget Advisory Committee: these seem to be the priorities for LCAP and these will likely get funded whether it is through the General Fund, the Base formula or BSEP so this looks like like items for next year, and these are items for Years 2 and 3 as priorities by all groups. These seem to be the choices that are about to be made. So it gives you a chance at the next meeting to say, for instance, "We strongly agree with these three." When we meet again in April, we will present the whole draft plan for the PAC to review. Kaufer stated that this was helpful to hear. Her table discussed their responsibility they hold to their school site in terms of communicating back to the SGC or the parent population in general. She felt that a lot of people don't

know what LCAP is or what's going on, so she has mentioned it to people. Is there an expectation that they would be communicating with people or representing what our parent community wants or are we just here as ourselves? Smith stated he did not have a definite answer for that, but he felt that it was their responsibility to talk with their SGCs and maybe the PTAs. Smith felt that communicating information to the school site was the principal's responsibility. Smith stated that he felt it was important that the PAC members were in communication with the principal so that the principal hears what happens at the PAC through the committee members. In referring to the *LCAP Priorities Narrative (8 pages)*, Smith noted that the document was in a much earlier form the day before for the Principals Meeting and the version handed out to the PAC was done the day of the meeting. Smith noted that the document was a work in process. Smith confirmed that the high school will have a very large BSEP pot of around \$800,000. They won't have Title 1 money. Dorph asked Smith if he thought the PAC committee should prioritize some of the things that the high schools need because the elementary schools might have more ability to choose school by school to do things that work for their populations. Smith said no, he felt that if he was looking at the list he would look at the list of students that LCAP is intended to serve, such as services to ELL, RTI2, and the Literacy Coaches and that the priority does not have to be the high school.

7. Agenda for Next Meeting

Smith stated that he hoped to give the PAC their feedback and if possible, as soon as he has it, what items would be funded, so that the committee members could respond before meeting again. Smith wanted the committee members to complete the Priority List worksheets before they left this evenings meeting. **If the committee members could not complete the worksheet at this meeting they were asked to email the sheet to janajandra@berkeley.net with the subject heading of "PAC Ratings" by Monday, March 10, 2013. It was suggested that the "Priority List" worksheet and the A to E "Priority Levels" be sent to the PAC committee members with the return email so they would have those documents as well as the email address to respond to.**

Cook asked Smith to clarify the distinction between "A-An essential LCAP priority for Year 1" and "B-Very important to include in LCAP Year 2 or 3." Smith stated that "A" would begin next year (2014-15) and "B" would begin in 2015-16 or 2016-17. All of the items except for those marked "one time" which are Social Emotional Curriculum (K-6) and Gardening & Cooking are ongoing. So once the program gets on the list in Year 1 there is an assumption that it will continue in Years 2 and 3.

Babitt inquired if the **Student Incentives** could include funding for group travel for students that might not ever have an international travel experience through a program? That would be an incentive that was attached to a program that might help to engage them and expose them to a different opportunity. Smith responded that it would have to clearly be an educational experience as opposed to a gift of public funds. It cannot appear to be a gift to any individual from public funds. All our funds are generated by public taxes so it must be spent appropriately. If it were for an educational program an argument might be able to be made.

8. Adjournment

Smith thanked the PAC members and adjourned the meeting at 9:00 pm.

Notes:

- News for the LCAP Parent Advisory Committee, as well as links to the BUSD LCFE and LCAP can be found on the BUSD website:
<http://www.berkeleyschools.net/2014/02/06/new-parent-advisory-committee-meets-feb-5/>
- More information on the Common Core State Standards can be found on the BUSD website: <http://www.berkeleyschools.net/teaching-and-learning-2/curriculum-standards/common-core-state-standards/>
- PIQE <http://www.piqe.org/>
- LUNA <http://www.berkeleyschools.net/departments/family-engagement-equity/parent-education-involvement/latinos-unidos-para-nuestros-adolescentes-luna/>