

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 27, 2015

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

P&O Committee Members Present:

Martin de Mucha Flores, <i>Cragmont (Alt)</i>	Lea Baechler-Brabo, <i>Oxford</i>
Dawn Paxson, <i>Emerson/Willard</i>	Bruce Simon, <i>King (co-Chair)</i>
Shauna Rabinowitz, <i>Jefferson</i>	Larry Gordon, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Danielle Perez, <i>John Muir (co-Chair)</i>	John Lavine, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Catherine Huchting, <i>Malcolm X</i>	Catherine Lazio, <i>Berkeley High</i>
	Christine Staples, <i>BHS (Alt)</i>

P&O Committee Members Absent:

Moshe Cohen, <i>Pre-K/Malcolm X</i>	Elisabeth Hensley, <i>King</i>
Lily Howell, <i>Pre-K (Alt)/Malcolm X</i>	Marian Bradley-Kohr, <i>King (Alt)</i>
Sergio Duran, <i>Arts Magnet</i>	Jenny Orland, <i>Longfellow</i>
Madhu Marchesini, <i>Arts Magnet</i>	Alma Prins, <i>Longfellow (Alt)</i>
Bill Fleig, <i>Cragmont</i>	Juliet Bashore, <i>Longfellow</i>
Shilen Patel, <i>Cragmont (Alt)</i>	Kim Sanders, <i>Longfellow (Alt)</i>
Ananda Esteva, <i>LeConte (co-Rep)</i>	Aaron Glimme, <i>BHS</i>
Octavio Munist, <i>LeConte (Alt)</i>	Rhonda Jefferson, <i>BHS (Alt)</i>
Molly Jo Alaimo, <i>Oxford (Alt)</i>	Max Cramer, <i>Berkeley High Student Rep</i>
Laura Babitt, <i>Rosa Parks</i>	John Fike, <i>BTA/B-Tech</i>
Radha Seshagiri, <i>Thousand Oaks (Alt)</i>	Louise Harm, <i>Independent Study</i>
Patrick Hamill, <i>Thousand Oaks</i>	
Mimi Leinbach, <i>Washington</i>	

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

Ty Alper, *BUSD School Board*
Donald Evans, *BUSD Superintendent*
Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*
Pasquale Scuderi, *Assistant Superintendent*

BSEP Staff:

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director/Public Information, Translation, P&O Support*
Valerie Tay, *BSEP Program Specialist/Site Discretionary Program*
Linda Race, *BSEP Staff Support*

1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports

At 7:16 p.m. co-chair Bruce Simon called the meeting to order by welcoming attendees and asking them to introduce themselves.

2. Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda

The quorum was not established. 11 voting members were present. 13 voting members are required for a quorum. No motions were made or carried due to lack of a quorum. The Agenda for January 27, 2013 was used to discuss items. No actions were taken by the P&O Committee at this meeting.

3. Chairperson's Comments

Co-Chairs Danielle Perez and Bruce Simon

BSEP bookmarks were handed out to P&O members. The bookmarks are part of the effort to raise BSEP awareness. Co-chair Perez thanked the committee for their support of the new co-chairs.

4. BSEP Director's Comments

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director*

Beery provided the following handouts:

- *BSEP Planning & Oversight Committee Calendar 2014-2015 v01-23-15*
- *Berkeley Unified School District: Key Acronyms & Terms*

Beery noted that some calendar changes have been made, the most recent being the February 5 BUSD LCAP Update Town Hall meeting date to February 19. This will be held after the joint meeting of the PAC/EAC/DELAC. Beery will send an agenda for the BUSD Town Hall meeting when it is determined. Generally, it will update the community about the LCAP and other related programs. A second Town Hall meeting will be held on March 4 with a focus on enrollment growth and facilities planning.

Beery and Tay developed *Berkeley Unified School District: Key Acronyms & Terms*, a 5-page handout listing and defining various terms and groups/committees related to BUSD.

Beery stated that professional development sessions, including a focus on full inclusion, were given for classified and certificated staff on January 26th. Evans noted that it was the first professional development day where the principals were included. The presenter gave teachers specific strategies to use in the classroom. Part of the day was videotaped. Evans explained that full inclusion means that most Special Ed students in Berkeley Unified are included in the regular classroom.

Beery stated that Debbi D'Angelo, Director of Evaluation and Assessment, was developing a district-wide survey that focuses on the goals of the LCAP process. D'Angelo would be sending out the district survey in the spring. Each school also has its own Survey Monkey account to create a site-specific survey of ten questions. Beery asked if the schools needed assistance with developing surveys. Committee members Simon, Paxson, Rabinowitz, and Huchting noted that there were a number of questions/concerns about surveys in the past:

- What's the connection between the site survey and the district survey and are people going to fill out both surveys?
- How can we get the surveys translated?
- How do we get other families who do not traditionally participate to fill out the surveys? How do we get other families involved?
- Could D'Angelo link the surveys to function as one survey? It's hard enough to get families to complete one survey.

- There's concern about survey length.
- If each site has specific things going on/things that need to be funded/areas that need attention, and if the district takes over the survey process, how will they get at those site issues?
 - Could site surveys be done and then "rolled up" to the district to develop a comprehensive report that represents all the schools instead of developing a second district survey?

Nitschke stated that there was a great need for a district-wide survey. Surveys could become lengthy, and he noted that despite the need for some base of standard questions, some customization was also appropriate. He added that there was no way to combine 11 different (site) surveys because they become too disparate too fast and the content cannot be controlled very well.

- de Mucha Flores asked if there could be a valid, reliable survey developed with a practical "menu" of questions broken up by categories such as school climate etc., instead of finding/using questions from other places that affect the fidelity of the survey. He noted that Cragmont is trying to pull from survey instruments that have a high fidelity such as the Healthy Kids Survey from the CDE.

- Translation of questions was problematic, especially if they required a high level of analytical thinking or were very vague, e.g., Do you have a meaningful relationship with an adult at this school?

- It was noted that it might be more meaningful if 5 or 10 really thoughtful questions were developed and asked in the fall, with a check-in around spring to see how perceptions/climate/experiences may have changed. It was expressed that this comparison – instead of annual data during which time the student population changes -- might provide more meaningful information .

Beery confirmed that the district-wide survey workgroup would meet January 28 at 6pm and noted that she would send out more details.

5. Approval of P&O Minutes of January 13, 2014

No motion to approve the meeting minutes of January 13, 2014 was made. Approval of minutes was tabled until the next meeting of the P&O Committee.

Simon thanked Tay and Race for getting the minutes out for committee members to review prior to the meetings.

6. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

7. Parent Outreach and Public Information Update: Parent Resource Center

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director*

The following handouts were provided:

- *Parent Resource Center Floor Plan dated 01/25/15*
- *Parent Outreach Center Expenditure*

Beery stated that the Parent Resource Center was an expenditure mentioned as "hoped for" but not included in the FY2014-15 budget. Over the summer, some changes happened

and space in the 2020 Bonar Street building became available. The small office will provide space for Charity DaMarto, Supervisor of Family Engagement and Isabel Parra, District Translator, as well as a corner for parents and children. The cost does not represent a huge change in direction or expense and thus does not trigger either of the new P&O budget change guidelines. The expense for furnishing the Center will be charged 50% to Public Information (Translator) and 50% to Parent Outreach for a total of \$6,511. This would be a place for parents to get information or an orientation. Future items for the center would be signage and Chromebooks. It was noted that if Chromebooks are provided, the center might be a central place for parents to do surveys. Beery noted that assistance with surveys, technology and Chromebooks are also provided at the sites. Beery confirmed that the Parent Outreach Coordinators funded by LCAP do not work out of the central office.

8. Technology Program Budget Revision-moved to the end of the meeting

9. Focus on BSEP Class Size Reduction Fund: Teacher Template and Teacher Transfer, Counseling, ECO/(Expanded Course Offerings) and Program Support, Changes at State and Local Level Affecting CSR Fund

Pasquale Scuderi, *Assistant Superintendent* and Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*

The following handouts were provided:

- *BSEP CSR Multi Year Projections, V2014-04-09 and BUSD Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document (pages 1 & 2)* (included in the BSEP Binder)
- *BUSD K-5 Enrollment Trends: 1994-Present* (Color Graph)
- *A Comparison of Class Size Scenarios*

Beery stated that the CSR is the first budget looked at during the planning process for the coming year, since it is the largest BSEP budget fund. She said that the committee would see actual CSR budget proposals in February and the School Board would see them in March. Beery noted that BSEP funds are tightly woven into how things work in the district and that Pauline Follansbee, Director of Fiscal Services, would make a presentation at the next P&O meeting explaining the “mechanics” of the CSR funds and the “Teacher Template.” Scuderi’s presentation included the issues for the CSR in the short term - sustainability of the fund before the next measure, ECO - and the long-term issues with regard to the next measure and changes at the state and local level that affect the CSR funds. Scuderi presented “page 2” of the *BUSD Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document* which includes the breakouts for ECO, Middle School Counseling Services and Program Support. At the bottom of the page, there was a further breakout of Program Support: Literacy coaches, 3/4/5 Coaches, and RtI² teachers. Scuderi noted that the 3/4/5 Combo classes are provided for the schools that are phasing out Two-Way Immersion program and given extra support. The RtI² teachers are being funded through various sources in addition to BSEP. This provides funding for special ed teachers that allows them to work with students that are in General Ed. The RtI² that is funded by LCAP provides for a person that would be similar to a site coordinator to assist in identifying students that need specific supports around a content area or socio-emotional behaviors. They are looking at all the different funding sources for RtI² and the considerations and analyses around making sure people are in the right place providing services effectively. Scuderi noted that there need to

be more discussions around RtI² before he could return to the P&O with any budget recommendations.

Scuderi stated that issues around deficit funding were being addressed by looking at things like Common Core or LCAP funding possibly being redirected to something like literacy coaches. They are also looking at other short term funding sources like the 3/4/5 combo classes that will eventually be phased out. Program support around math has been moved elsewhere, and there would have to be further discussion around using LCAP funding or BSEP Program Support for it due to the changes happening with math instruction, particularly for next year. Scuderi stated that the EAC looked at LCAP as a three-year process, but perhaps there needs to be an 8-year process to 2021 to get a clearer process for classroom planning as the funding from the state increases to 2007-08 levels.

Beery brought the newer P&O members up to speed by referring to the *BSEP CSR Multi-Year Projections, V2014-04-09* which provides long-range forecasting to FY 2016-17 and projects a negative ending fund balance in the years 2015-16 and 2016-17 (bottom of page). She stated that expenses will need to be moved out of the CSR budget. Beery noted that the only way to increase the BSEP revenue was with increased COLA or tax revenues and noted that the past COLAs were fairly low. Next year, it was forecast that the COLA was projected to be 0.022, but she understands that the Governor's budget is looking at a 0.0158 COLA, which is lower and means less revenue. Another variable is the Indirect Cost, which is dictated by the State, and salary and benefit increases.

It was noted that there are expenses made that are "institutionalized" or "per pupil" allocations without knowing if there is a need or equal need at each campus for these services. Scuderi stated that the bulk of expanded course offerings were at the high school for AP/IB and science labs, a range of electives including additional music sections, and AP Augmentation program (AP prep/enhanced content). Scuderi asked if there was a specific need or something programmatic that they could target with ECO. He noted that it has been shown that interventions for students need to be embedded within the school day. Scuderi also agreed that some of the expenses are fixed at this point except for the electives, which have shifted a bit.

The question was posed as to whether there is data that CSR is having a positive impact on student outcomes other than feeling positive about lower class sizes for our students? Nitschke noted that, at the time when the state instituted the K-3 class size of 20:1, it happened to be at a time when BSEP could provide the funds to make it happen. BUSD was one of the few districts in the state that was able to go to 20:1 because there were facilities and the money to do it. It became part of BSEP for class size to be K-3rd/20:1, 4th-5th/26:1 and BHS/28:1. With subsequent measures, these targets were often not met and by 2006, class sizes began creeping upward to 4-5th at 29:1 and BHS at 35:1. In 2004, there was a vote to augment BSEP by 80% and class sizes went back down today, aided by the state provided funding support for K-3/20:1. Now that the state benchmark is now K-3/24:1, Scuderi stated that the question could be asked whether there are tangible benefits from CSR and are they measurable? He noted a well-known study in Tennessee which looked at the benefits of a class size reduced all the way down to 15 students. Scuderi noted that the use of the CSR and teacher release time used in specific ways to bring the teacher to student ratio down to 8 or 6:1 to make gains with some students would be considered by teachers to be indispensable, but he does not have data.

Simon noted that the voters have voted for the Measure and smaller class size attracts teachers to the district. Lavine noted that despite metrics, the common perception was that smaller class sizes are better and larger class sizes are worse and politically, as we approach the refunding of the Measure, a shift away from this paradigm is difficult.

Beery noted that there were differences of opinion about what how small a smaller class size needs to be. A very tiny handful of districts have made it to to 20:1 even with supplemental funding. A question that could be raised was: what are the trade-offs in putting large sums into achieving specific class sizes, and is there some way the money might be focused on achieving the [differentiated instruction/individualization] goals of CSR. Meanwhile these questions are becoming urgent not just for BSEP Measure planning and the current CSR budget, but in the best way to use facilities because our district is growing.

Paxson noted that it was not just class size but a combination of different class offerings (music, art) that adds a qualitative component and teachers consider these as “tools” for the students with different learning abilities and styles. Scuderi said that it has been shown that lowering the class size alone is not the answer, and referred to the Gates Foundation pulling funding from the small school movement because those schools didn’t do anything different programmatically or layer on any supports. Smaller class sizes just make already effective teachers more effective because they have more time with students individually.

Staples asked if it might be cost effective to have a classroom aide to free up the teacher to have time to work with small groups. It might solve the psychological problem for parents (in lieu of smaller class size) by providing teacher support and not require an extra classroom.

Scuderi confirmed that in February there would be a preliminary look at next year’s enrollment. There was a discussion about enrollment fraud, and Evans assured the committee that the District is verifying students’ residency, including home visits. A working group and the policy committee are putting together recommendations for this for the Board. Bachelor-Brabo confirmed that there were 436 home visits this year and 76 were denied. Beery said that students are being asked to re-register going from 5th to 6th grade and also may be asked to do so 8th to 9th grade. Evans stated that 300 of 700 fifth grade families have re-registered so far. Bachelor-Brabo confirmed that there are 1192 students enrolled in the district with approved permits that do not live in the city of Berkeley (502 of them are McKinney-Vento/Homeless Education Act students and 168 are children of staff). She also stated that data is being gathered to dispel myths and create an accurate body of information. Evans stated that the process will tighten up further as the policy becomes more developed. Students that move in the middle of the year will still be able to attend BUSD schools, but any further amnesty has yet to be determined. Scuderi noted that Culver City uses the inter-district permit process to make agreements for academic and behavior standards, which are then reviewed. The permits can be revoked for failure to meet the agreements.

Nitschke presented *A Comparison of Class Size Scenarios* to explain how adjustments in class size K-5 would save classrooms. The scenario at the top of the page is the current K-3 20:1 scenario that needs 200 classrooms. The middle scenario shows 24:1 across K-5, and he noted that if class sizes change, there would need to be negotiation around release time for teachers. The net savings in classrooms (shown at the bottom of the page) would be 20 classrooms, phased in by year 6. Baechler-Brabo asked if the net savings represented about \$2M worth of classroom teachers, and Nitschke confirmed this. Scuderi noted that the

current combo classes to solve class size issues moving from 20:1 to 24:1 is not a good option when the teachers are dealing with new curriculum changes.

Nitschke presented the *BUSD K-5 Enrollment Trends: 1994-Present* (Color Graph) and noted that the black line was the average for BUSD in the middle. Reconfiguration got rid of the earlier K-3, 4-6, 7-8, 9th grade, and 10-12 at BHS facilities. Basically the K-3 schools tended to have higher enrollment and the 4-6 schools lower. The brown line represents Malcolm X, which had 640 students as a 4-6 school. The City of Franklin information was difficult to tease out for 1996 to 2000 for use of facilities to house Cragmont, Rosa Parks, and Thousand Oaks.

10. Technology Program Budget Revision-moved to the end of the meeting

Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*

The following handout was provided:

• *BUSD Memo To: BSEP Planning & Oversight Committee, From: Jay Nitschke, Director of Technology, dated January 27, 2015: Recommendation for additional expenditure of funds from the Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006 for Technology in 2014-15*

Nitschke presented the above budget revision to provide additional funds for up to 17 Tech Teacher Leader positions for the second semester of the 2014-15 school year with stipends of \$902 per position for a total of \$15,334. Providing Tech Teacher Leader positions would help increase teacher's capacity at the school sites by providing professional development in the area of technology.

No motion to approve the Technology Program Budget Revision was made due to lack of quorum. This was tabled until the next meeting of the P&O Committee.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:05 p.m.

The next P&O meeting will be held February 10, 2015.

Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support