

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 11 2014

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

P&O Committee Members Present:

Sergio Duran, <i>Arts Magnet</i>	Ty Alper, <i>Longfellow (Sub)</i>
Tim Frederick, <i>Cragmont</i>	Elisabeth Hensley, <i>King (co-Chair)</i>
Boyd Power, <i>Emerson</i>	Bruce Simon, <i>King</i>
Shauna Rabinowitz, <i>Jefferson</i>	Dawn Paxson, <i>Emerson/Willard</i>
Danielle Perez, <i>John Muir</i>	Margaret Phillips, <i>Willard</i>
Chris Martin, <i>LeConte (co-Chair)</i>	Aaron Glimme, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Catherine Huchting, <i>Malcolm X</i>	Larry Gordon, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Lea Baechler-Brabo, <i>Oxford</i>	John Lavine, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Dan Smuts, <i>Rosa Parks (co-Rep)</i>	Catherine Lazio, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Keira Armstrong, <i>Washington</i>	Representative, <i>Independent Study</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>
Darryl Bartlow, <i>John Muir (Alt)</i>	Austin Lloyd, <i>BHS (Alt)</i>
Yusef Auletta, <i>LeConte (Alt)</i>	Orlando Williams, <i>BHS (Alt)</i>
Juliet Bashore, <i>Rosa Parks (co-Rep)</i>	Ramal Lamar, <i>B-Tech</i>
Patrick Hamill, <i>Thousand Oaks</i>	

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

Donald Evans, *BUSD Superintendent*
Javetta Cleveland, *BUSD Deputy Superintendent*
Mark Coplan, *BUSD Public Information Officer*
Liz Karam, *Senior Budget Analyst - BSEP*
Suzanne McCulloch, *BUSD VAPA Program Supervisor*
Richard Boyden, *BHS Athletic Fund*
Georgette Cobbs, *Berkeley ATOD Task Force*
Karen Hughes, *Berkeley ATOD Task Force*
Cathy Campbell, *Berkeley Federation of Teachers*
Julie Sinai, *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 7:15 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, with 19 total voting members present later in the meeting. [13 voting members are required for a quorum.]

3. Chairperson's Comments

Co-Chairs Chris Martin and Elisabeth Hensley

No comments were made.

4. BSEP Director's Comments

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Beery provided the following handouts:

- *Pilot Evaluation* Slide as presented to the School Board
- Davis Demographics & Planning: *BUSD SY 2013/14 Report District Wide Projections*
- *BSEP Measure Planning Timeline (To Board 3.12.14)*

Beery handed out Charity DaMarto's *Pilot Evaluation* Slide as presented to the School Board, and briefed the P&O Committee on DaMarto's report on the Office of Family Engagement and Equity. According to the slide, 10 students from each of the pilot school sites were selected to follow during both years of the pilot, with academic, behavioral and attendance outcomes as part of the data on the pilot program that will be reported in May. In addition to the student information, the report will include data on school-parent interaction, parent feedback from focus groups, survey data, and SGC/ELAC nomination and election data.

Beery handed out Davis Demographics & Planning: *BUSD SY 2013/14 Report District Wide Projections*, which shows enrollment projections through year 2020. This is from the January 2014 School Board packet. Beery noted that there was a 26-page document online (http://www.berkeleyschools.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/01-29-14_packet.pdf, beginning on page 81 of the January 29 Board Packet pdf). Beery stated that the projections for the next few years, beginning in year 2013, indicated growth of approximately 200 students per year, with increases more or less across the grades.

Beery announced that she would be attending the March 12, 2014 School Board meeting to update the Board on the BSEP 2016 Measure Planning Timeline. She handed out the latest timeline, *BSEP Measure Planning Timeline (To Board 3.12.14)* to the P&O members. Beery noted that the current version of the timeline includes getting an RFP out to consultants in August so as to bring one on board next year to begin the Stakeholder process. She will also be reminding the Board about the implications of the successful challenge to the split roll parcel tax in Alameda USD. In that case, commercial properties and residential properties were assessed differently (a "split roll"). Commercial properties were assessed on a per square foot basis, while residential properties were assessed at a flat per parcel rate. [This [article in EdSource](#) clarifies the legal challenges and issues.]

Assuming that for the next measure it may be necessary to assess both commercial and residential properties at the same rate, if the commercial rate (+/- \$0.42/sq. ft.) gets lowered to the residential rate (+/- \$0.27/sq. ft.), it would result in a loss of \$2.5M to BSEP. In order to have the same level of revenue to the District, it would be necessary to raise rates to \$0.31/sq. ft. If there were an increase of about \$2M to current revenues, it would mean about a \$0.33/sq. ft. (This tax is on sq. footage of improvements, i.e. the building, and would include a flat rate for empty lots.) There was a brief conversation about possible changes to the state law.

Beery mentioned that she was contacted by a *Berkeleyside* reporter about out-of-district kids being in the district. The reporter had questions about BSEP and how state funding works. Beery said she did not know when the piece would be published but wanted the P&O Committee to be aware that it could be. Coplan added that the article may clear up some myths about this topic.

5. Approval of Minutes 2.25.14

MOTION CARRIED (Smuts/Glimme): To approve the meeting minutes of the February 25, 2014 P&O Committee Meeting. The motion was approved with a showing of 14 hands, with no objections, and 2 abstentions.

6. Public Comment

Georgette Cobb and Karen Hughes of the Berkeley ATOD–Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs Task Force spoke to the P&O Committee about the high rates of substance use by Berkeley youth and gave statistics from the California Healthy Kids Survey done in 2012 that indicated that students in the BUSD middle schools and high school have higher rates of drug and alcohol use than the national and state averages. They stressed the importance of having strong counseling support available to students. Cobbs and Hughes wanted to ask the P&O Committee to consider adding a dedicated FTE counselor at BHS and a shared FTE counselor for King and Longfellow in addition to the counseling being provided currently, which is at risk.

Richard Boyden, President of the Berkeley Athletic Fund, raises funds for athletics when there are budget shortfalls. He stated that he felt that although BUSD has a great reputation for athletics, the program was not meeting the needs of the kids in the program. Boyden stated that there are only three PE teachers at BHS for a population of 3200 students. There are only 500 students taking PE; half the school is on PE waivers and are not playing sports. There was a budget cut that eliminated 13 coaches, and they have not been replaced. He mentioned Fitness Gram statistics from fall of 2013 that showed that only 21% of BHS 9th graders were proficient in all five fitness measures, as compared to a state average of 36%. Boyden noted that there was no one in the District that coordinated physical education and athletics; the BAF had been talking to administrators about this issue and has received much feedback.

7. Subcommittee Report: Music/VAPA Subcommittee

Suzanne McCulloch, *BUSD VAPA Program Supervisor*

McCulloch stated that the Music/VAPA Subcommittee held meetings on February 4 and March 4, 2014. She noted that at both meetings there were many questions about the funding structure. For instance, there were questions about music offered during classroom teacher release time, as well as why music received more funding than the other arts, and how BSEP was structured. She thought it would be good to put out a FAQ sheet regarding Music/VAPA funding. She addressed the focus on music by explaining that music was included in the program because the District had cut all music funding in 1994, while the other arts were still somewhat supported in the schools. The Music program has grown at a rate of about 200 students/year for the last 3 or 4 years. Beery and McCulloch will be working on a report for the March 26th School Board meeting which will be made public at that time. She wanted to know if the P&O Committee had any more questions that she should include in the FAQs. Beery stated that they would be

giving a presentation to the Board to help them understand the trajectory of the fund, how the program has grown and how enrollment impacted the program.

McCulloch noted that people in the district formed the Berkeley Community Arts Team last year and, along with an outside consultant, did a survey of parents and staff members at school sites and of arts organizations in the city. They also did a mapping of where the arts are and are not taught in the schools. McCulloch went on to say that approximately 98% of the people that responded were in favor of arts education, and almost as many people supported the statement that the “arts are an essential part of the core curriculum at any school.” She stated that the arts help with parent engagement and student engagement, where students that were struggling in other subjects were much more successful in the arts and that was their “hook.” The information will be published, and some of it will be included in the presentation to the School Board. There was a brief discussion regarding facilities because the art and science rooms have virtually disappeared, and McCulloch stated that would be part of her report. Music is being taught in hallways and on stages during lunch and arts from a cart. Glimme added that the reason why the art and science classrooms were turned into regular classrooms was due to the tremendous growth in enrollment in a short period of time.

Hensley mentioned that one of the FAQs could include a response as to why there is not BSEP arts funding at the high school, and McCulloch said that the Measure was written for grades 4-8 and not specifically meant to leave out the high school. Lazio said that the people interested in programs at the high school could make a proposal to obtain site fund monies.

Beery and McCulloch announced that the Performing Arts Showcase was coming up on March 23, 2014 at BHS Community Theater 1-3:30pm. Over 500 students will be performing in chorus, bands, orchestras, and jazz bands. Beery added that there would be a new BSEP banner that will be unfurled at this event, as planned by the Communications Team. The BSEP Public Awareness Subcommittee will meet Tuesday, March 18, 2013.

8. Recommendation for BSEP Funds in FY 2014-14: Class Size Reduction (BSEP

Resource 0841)

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Beery provided the following handouts:

- *Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Class Size Reduction Funds in FY 2014-15 from Neil Smith, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services to the BSEP Planning & Oversight Committee, dated February 25, 2014*

Beery stated that at the last meeting Neil Smith, Superintendent of Educational Services, brought the proposal for CSR fund expenditures for next year and usually the recommendation are discussed again action taken at the next meeting after the presentation. However, in discussions with Superintendent Evans and Deputy Superintendent Cleveland about how to align BSEP decision-making process with LCFF/LCAP process, it has become clear that adjusting the timing of decisions would improve alignment. Cleveland recommended that the P&O not take action on the recommendation of the CSR allocation at tonight’s meeting to give the process enough time so that the other parts of various budgets being decided could be determined. One of the parts under consideration was the reduced middle school math class size, which may have an option of going to 24:1, which would be less costly than the 20:1. Cleveland said that another part that was being changed was moving RtI² into the Special Ed budget, which could result in some savings, about \$580K

on an annual basis. She was recommending slowing down the process to see what else could be moved out, monitoring the process, and weighing the balance of the options that could be beneficial.

The 20:1 CSR is definitely being funded for this year and for 2014-15. In general, the P&O Committee has stated its preference for maintaining 20:1 CSR. There was a discussion about funding and budget considerations and when to take action, approve a proposal, or revisit a decision. A statement could be made about what the P&O Committee would like to see considered. Martin stated that the process was complicated and the P&O Committee needed to be as patient as it could, while helping to support the decisions that are representative and supportive of the Measure. He thought an additional meeting would be needed to complete the process. There was a question regarding the sequencing of the budgets. CSR is the first due to its larger impact on staffing (increases/decreases). There was a general consensus that it was appropriate to wait to see what the options were, and where the shifts and cuts might be.

Martin asked for other comments but recommended moving on to the other agenda items. No action was taken on *Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Class Size Reduction Funds in FY 2014-15 from Neil Smith, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services to the BSEP Planning & Oversight Committee, dated February 25, 2014*. The P&O would plan to approve a plan for CSR Allocation on April 8, 2014.

9. LCAP: State Priorities and District Goals, Focus on Student Engagement and Student Achievement

Donald Evans, BUSD Superintendent and Javetta Cleveland, BUSD Deputy Superintendent
Evans provided the following handout:

- *LCAP Priorities* (narrative for items with attached costs 3-7-14)

Donald Evans, BUSD Superintendent, stated that many groups were working on Student Engagement and Student Achievement priorities. There was a meeting with the EAC, which is prioritizing this now, and the PAC will be prioritizing through Survey Monkey.

Student Achievement will focus on how to improve the academic achievement for targeted populations by grade level: Pre-K, K-5, Middle School, High School, and K-12 in general. Evans briefed the participants with a few examples of programs for targeted students such as reading programs, RtI², tutoring, the Bridge program, TWI Coordination, Counseling, etc.

For Student Engagement, Evans noted that some of the programs could include mentoring, family liaison/truancy programs, more professional development for teachers and classified staff, more support for McKinney-Vento students, etc.

Evans reminded the Committee members that the targeted populations include ELL, Foster Youth, and Free & Reduced Lunch, as well as other populations, such as African American and Latino students.

Evans explained “fidelity” to a program with an example of using a reading program that requires students to complete several rotations of reading/reading aloud. When they are not able to work with the program the way it was meant to be structured, it takes away from their learning. Evans noted that he had some data for programs such as Build and Bridge. However, most of the data he has is anecdotal, not quantitative. He is still trying to get the information that he needs for some programs.

The members of the Committee were asked to place dots on the listings under Student Engagement and Student Achievement. After the exercise, Evans passed out *LCAP*

Priorities (narrative for items with attached costs 3-7-14) that laid out the some of the programs that aligned with District goals and listed them along with costs to implement them. Evans stated that the programs could be paid for from different funds: Base Grant, BSEP or other sources. Beery noted that the total for all the programs listed was about \$9M, and the Supplemental LCFF funding is at \$2.4M.

Evans explained that Number 8, Intervention Coordinator and Support at BHS, would be a program that would coordinate “advisors” (college students or other mentors) to provide support to the highest-risk students. This would be in place of an “at-risk counselor.” Paxson mentioned that she would appreciate seeing more about extending the school calendar and how some of these programs might be better included if there was more time. Evans noted that there had been discussions on extending the day without extending the workday for teachers, by having some coaches come in later, for example at 10am, and stay until 6pm, where they could provide for extended day/afterschool. Evans, in response to funding an afterschool bus, said that there had been this discussion about funding a bus for those kids who can’t stay. Harm stated that IS was not mentioned anywhere in the programs, that IS was seeing more and more at-risk students, and monies definitely need to come to IS. IS students are a small group of 100-125 and are students that wrap into the at-risk situation. Evans noted that IS support has not come up and stated that he would look into that for them.

Evans was asked how many people voted on the Student Engagement and Student Achievement Priorities, and he estimated several hundred.

10. Site Discretionary Funds Allocation

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Beery provided the following handout:

- *BSEP Resource 0852, Site Discretionary Funds 2014-15 Allocation*

Beery handed out *BSEP Resource 0852, Site Discretionary Funds 2014-15 Allocation* and stated that School Discretionary allocations were \$233/student last year and the year before and has dropped to \$230/student for 2014-15. However, a few years ago, it was only \$170/student. She explained that for next year the COLA is .086% and without a substantial fund balance we need to be very careful about this resource. The way the allocations are done currently is to look at current enrollment, not projecting what the number of students will be next year. Some funds were set aside to account for sites like Jefferson, where it is known there will be some additional classrooms left next year. Also noted that TK is part of the Kindergarten count.

There is a special calculation for B-Tech and Independent Study, where they are given a fixed amount. Their enrollment can go up and down, but they still have essential needs. BHS is getting less per student because enrollment is down slightly.

In response to questions about alignment of site plans with LCAP, Beery stated that part of the LCAP process was that the SGCs were to contribute their input to the process. Beery added that the way the sites might work in this process would be to have a decision tree based on possible changes coming from the district. Beery will be sharing a “map” of the LCAP process with the Cabinet, and it looks like the LCAP consultation pieces will be done by the end of March, and the first draft of the LCAP will be done around April 14th. The site plans will have to be later than that.

Beery reminded the committee that the LCAP is a 3-year plan that allows for updates and revisions.

11. BSEP Audit for 2012-13

Liz Karam, Senior Budget Analyst - BSEP

Karam provided the following handouts:

- *BUSD Measure A of 2006 “Berkeley Schools Excellence Program” Financial Statements, June 30, 2013*
- *BUSD Measure A of 2006 “Berkeley Schools Excellence Program” Performance Audit, June 30, 2013*

Karam presented the audit process. She stated that the Financial Audit was an independent auditors report from an unbiased point of view, and it was a “clean audit” and conformed to the Measure. She noted that page 5 of the Financial Audit listed the “Summary of Significant Accounting Policies” and that the money is held in a pool by the Alameda County Treasury. The Balance Sheets are a snapshot of the District’s books on June 30, 2013. The history is shown in the Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance (page 6) and shown by resource.

The Performance Audit opinion is on page 1 and basically states that the money was spent in compliance with the Measure. Karam explained that the Methodology shown on page 5 were tests of how the funds were spent.

12. Adjournment

In response to questions about how to ensure that LCAP and SGC decision-making is aligned, Martin and Beery confirmed that the information received at the P&O meeting could be taken back to the SGCs, discussed between the SGCs and the School Principals, and any concerns could be written as a letter to Superintendent Evans with a cc: to Smith, Cleveland, and the Board.

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:15 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support