

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

May 12, 2015

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

P&O Committee Members Present:

Madhu Marchesini, *Arts Magnet*
Dawn Paxson, *Emerson/Willard*
Shauna Rabinowitz, *Jefferson*
Danielle Perez, *John Muir (co-Chair)*
Molly Jo Alaimo, *Oxford (Alt)*
Mimi Leinbach, *Washington*
Bruce Simon, *King (co-Chair)*

Catherine Huchting, *Willard*
Aaron Glimme, *Berkeley High*
Larry Gordon, *Berkeley High (Alt)*
Catherine Lazio, *Berkeley High*
Louise Harm, *Independent Study*
John Fike, *BTA/B-Tech*

P&O Committee Members Absent:

Lily Howell, *Pre-K (Alt)/Malcolm X*
Moshe Cohen, *Pre-K/Malcolm X (Alt)*
Bill Fleig, *Cragmont*
Martin de Mucha Flores, *Cragmont (Alt)*
Shilen Patel, *Cragmont (Alt)*
Terry Pastika, *Jefferson (Alt)*
LeConte: no representation
Lea Baechler-Brabo, *Oxford*
Laura Babitt, *Rosa Parks*
Patrick Hamill, *Thousand Oaks*
Radha Seshagiri, *Thousand Oaks (Alt)*

Elisabeth Hensley, *King*
Marian Bradley-Kohr, *King (Alt)*
Juliet Bashore, *Longfellow*
Jenny Orland, *Longfellow*
Alma Prins, *Longfellow (Alt)*
Kim Sanders, *Longfellow (Alt)*
John Lavine, *Berkeley High*
Rhonda Jefferson, *Berkeley High (Alt)*
Christine Staples, *Berkeley High (Alt)*
Max Cramer, *Berkeley High Student Rep*

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

Ty Alper, *BUSD School Board*
Charity DaMarto, *Supervisor, Family Engagement & Equity*
Donald Evans, *BUSD Superintendent*
Jay Nitschke, *BUSD Director, Technology*

BSEP Staff:

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

1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports

At 7:15 p.m., Co-chair Danielle Perez called the meeting to order by welcoming attendees and asking them to introduce themselves. They were also asked to give brief site reports.

2. Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda

The quorum was approved with 12 voting members initially present, and 13 voting members present later in the meeting. 12 voting members are required for a quorum as of this date, due to lack of attendance from a couple of the schools. (See Items X – Removal from Membership and XI. Quorum on pages 4 and 5 of the BUSD BSEP Planning and Oversight (P&O) Committee Bylaws:
http://berkeleyschools.net/uploads/bsep/P-O_Bylaws_adopted_4-23-08v3.pdf?864d7e)

MOTION CARRIED (Huchting/Glimme): To approve the agenda of the May 12, 2015 P&O Committee Meeting. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

3. Public Comment

No comments were made.

4. Chairperson's Comments

Co-Chairs Danielle Perez and Bruce Simon

Co-Chair Simon thanked Dawn Paxson and Patrick Hamill for going to the School Board meeting to represent the P&O Committee and read the statement to the Board regarding the CSR Budget.

5. BSEP Director's Comments

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director*

Beery noted that her comments would be covered in the following agenda items and there was no need for a separate item for those comments.

6. Approval of P&O Minutes of May 5, 2015

There was a brief review allowed for the minutes since they were emailed out this date.

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Gordon): To approve the meeting minutes of the May 5, 2015 P&O Committee Meeting. **The motion was approved with a showing of 11 hands, with 0 objections, and 1 abstentions.**

7. CSR 2015-16: Update

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director*

Beery stated that Pasquale Scuderi, *Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services* could not attend this meeting and that she would be giving the CSR Update. Beery noted that the CSR budget was originally on the consent calendar and ended up being pulled. The consent calendar consists of ordinary business items which are all passed together unless someone wants to pull an item and move it to a discussion item. There are also action items for which action needs to be taken and information items. One of the Board members asked that both the CSR and Library budgets be pulled for discussion. At last week's School Board meeting, the P&O CSR Statement was read, Becca Todd, *BUSD Library Coordinator*, clarified the intent of the TSA position, and several Elementary School Library Techs spoke to the importance of a credentialed elementary librarian in amplifying the skills of the classified library staff.

The concern for CSR was the use of one-time EIA/Economic Impact Aid funds and some carryover to prevent cuts to the CSR budget. The item was included with the other one-time funding requests to be discussed. Beery and Scuderi were present to answer questions. Beery pulled together a synopsis of the CSR budget that included the trajectory

of the budget during this current Measure in a simplified 3-year snapshot form to discuss with the Board. It included examination of how the intersections of various elements impacted the CSR budget:

- During the early years of the Measure, there were high COLA revenues/high revenues, moderate enrollment numbers, and costs for teachers/FTE were lower.
- The next 3-year slice showed enrollment growing, moderate COLAs in the 2-3% range, “Page 2” of the Measure beginning to grow (after CSR is met through the costs of the teacher template, then funding can be used for the ECO, Middle School Counseling and Program Support). There was a substantial expansion in Program Support during this time when the CSR budget could support that.
- The last couple of years of the Measure, the COLA was less than 1% one year and hovering around 1% another year. Although the General Fund was able to support the teacher salary increase, which meant less demands on BSEP, growing enrollment necessitated an increase in CSR FTE and therefore less funding available for “Page 2” programs.

Beery added that this presentation was to remind the Board about how BSEP and the District stands now and to clear up misconceptions about the General Fund “giving BSEP money” when it is actually the other way around. She noted that what was being asked for was not money from the General Fund but for programs previously paid for by BSEP to be paid for in a different way if the district wants them continued.

Beery gave the Board a one-page snapshot of the language from the Measure and the pertinent paragraph (which can be confusing as the heading differs from the text. See the text of Exhibit B-Full Text of Measure A, 3. Definitions, A. Smaller Class Sizes, Expanded Course Offerings, and School Counseling Services, page 8 of 18: http://berkeleyschools.net/uploads/bsep/Meas_A_2006finalmeasure.pdf?864d7e). She noted that she made a simplified list of the ECO FTE that included the percentages going to labs, music, etc. Lazio noted that it would be nice to know in advance what ECO classes would actually be chosen so as to inform the Site Committee funding decisions at BHS. Beery stated BSEP funds are kept separate from the GF and within BSEP, each resource (budget program) has its own code assigned within the District’s financial systems. CSR is designated as 0841 and Site Discretionary Funds are 0852. When the CSR plan is made and there is an allocation of a certain number of FTE, for instance BHS will receive funding for 6.4FTE, then BHS administration makes the decision for what FTE will be connected to that funding source and designated specifically: Ms. Jones’ specific FTE position may be funded .8FTE from one source and .2FTE funded from another source. In addition, money from Site Discretionary funds or PTA funds could be used to teach before or after-school courses. It was confirmed by Beery and Glimme that there was not yet a proposal for the elimination of .4FTE from the budget based on ongoing decisions and enrollment. Lazio stated that the decisions for the use of the funds was not that transparent. Beery added that at this time of year, the information might not be transparent because the schedule hasn’t yet been put together. Information about how the fund were used this year would be available but not for how they are going to be used for next year. Lazio noted that there had been promises/intentions made for the funds over the past. Beery will send the committee members copies of the information presented to the Board: CSR budget trajectory and one page Measure A synopsis.

At the Board meeting and after, there were some discussion about the ECO funding and expressions of concern about where the CSR budget was headed with cuts, if there would need to be cuts made in the future, and whether to consider more drastic cuts now

and fewer cuts next year. The Deputy Superintendent Cleveland suggested that this was a decision that needed to be made because it was time-sensitive, and the budgets needed to be moved forward. Beery added that despite some frustration around making this decision late in the year, the Board had been given a “heads-up” document about the CSR budget in March that laid out the fact the budget would need to have some changes made. The budget was passed as it had been forwarded to the Board by the P&O Committee. Beery said they are still waiting to hear about the Governor’s Budget-May Revise and hopes were optimistic. Superintendent Evans added that they were hearing that there may be more money, but it may only be one-time money and not ongoing money. There was a brief discussion about the meaning of “one-time money,” and it was noted that one-time money usually comes with “strings attached” and a time frame of a year to be expended. Glimme added that the district also has one-time expenses this year, and the one-time money could be used for one-time expenses – thus freeing up other money - and emphasized there were a lot of moving pieces and decisions would depend on more information from the release of the May Revise. Beery will send out information on the May Revise when available. There was a brief discussion about working on the budgets early next year. Beery confirmed that the Library Budget was also passed.

8. Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Funds in FY 2015-16: Parent Outreach

Charity DaMarto, *Supervisor, Family Equity and Engagement*

DaMarto provided the following handout:

- BSEP Parent Outreach Program – FY 2012 through 2015 (Overview comparing plan year-to-year) as assembled by Tay

It was noted that there were no changes from the original budget plan for Parent Outreach. In response to Paxson’s question regarding Parent Outreach at Middle Schools, DaMarto stated that the Parent Outreach budget was multi-funded and although there was not enough to cover Middle School for next year, there may be for the following year. She is currently looking to cover .4FTE which had come out of the GF for this year. DaMarto emphasized that they wanted to strengthen the current work plan. Paxson noted that she wanted to share some ideas for Willard because she re-read the objectives for Middle School and thought about what counselors do for middle school students that differs from elementary school and how that relates to families of middle schoolers. DaMarto noted that this is something she would like to do with the middle schools: develop the work plan topics that could be adapted for middle schools and high schools (transition times, friendship-making and more). She would like to collaborate on events with the middle school before the middle school years are added. DaMarto stated that her staff cannot do all the case management needs at school sites, but they can plan events with other staff and lead teachers across the district. She noted that the middle schools could have a thriving family engagement program with a few tools and that would be something her department could do. Simon added he thought that would be a great idea. King Middle School is to get two new positions: Literacy Coach and an RtI2 teacher, which could free up time for counselors or vice-principals to implement some of what DaMarto would be proposing at some level. DaMarto said that the principal of King Middle School was collaborating with her on providing some family engagement articles to present on PD day and noted that some of the principals have family engagement ingrained in what they are doing. Beery noted that the plan budgets do not give information on deficit spending, and she will have Tay add a third line so that there will be revenue, expenditures and fund balances. Some of the concern with this budget is that

the new revenue for 2015-16, if you look at the plan, is about \$325K new money and \$221K is fund balance, and the way this is currently structured, the staffing costs alone exceed the new funds. One issue is that the plan had been for the expanding of the OFEE, after the initial pilot program, and was made possible through the addition of LCAP funds. The idea was that BSEP funds would drop down and LCAP funding would move in, but it hasn't been possible to add as much LCAP funding as they had hoped. BSEP is carrying a little bit more, but obviously this is not sustainable and Pat Saddler, Superintendent of Special Programs is aware of and working with DaMartto on this issue. There will have to be an adjustment made going forward unless some other funding source is determined. That is one of the reasons that the middle schools are not yet in the plan at this point. DaMartto reminded the committee of her presentation of the different models for providing parent engagement at the school sites. She emphasized that there are a lot of different models that exist but that her ideal is to figure out different ways to utilize her staff's skills to provide support to the sites. They are a solid group at this point after a difficult beginning recruiting staff. She noted that the data is showing that they are exceeding parent contacts beyond the 5% they were asked to do to 150%. They are experiencing great success with their families and as a program that is serving the highest risk students. Paxson stated that the elementary person for Emerson was amazing, coming to various meetings and supporting staff and IA/Instructional Assistants. DaMartto noted that it took some time to gain the trust of the principals and in the third year, they've gotten that.

DaMartto confirmed that the PTA provides funds for food that is provided for parent meetings. She plans to go the PTA Council to have the PTA support coffee for the first week of school and talk to kids about coming to school. Huchting asked if some PTAs that have extra money could support OFEE, to which DaMartto and Beery responded that it was problematic for PTAs to fund ongoing positions. If the PTA does not continue the funding, the staff person would have to be laid off. Cragmont site funds support their Parent Liaison, but it is not thought of as "ideal practice." DaMartto stated that the PTA collaboration piece could be funding for supplies and gave a brief description of her time in running BUSD afterschool programs with a \$1M budget. Her current budget of \$8K for supplies for 11 sites is something that could be a PTA collaboration. Huchting asked if there was possibility for a contracted position using PTA money, and DaMartto responded that it was more about doing a better job and showing the District, Board, and Superintendent of the benefits family engagement is bringing to the schools. She noted that there was data out there that indicated that family engagement increases academic success for students and is done all over the nation. Simon noted that it is LCAP goal #3. DaMartto was requested to bring data to the committee and bring that to the committee next fall. She noted that the events they had been doing have been bigger, such as the Kinder event, the Posada, the Black Parent Reunion and now that they are part of the schools, they are doing their piece for almost any event that happens at the sites. DaMartto stated that her staff feels really good about their work with families and events.

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Lazio): To approve the *Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Parent Outreach Funds in FY 2015-16 dated May 5, 2015 as presented. The motion was approved unanimously.*

9. Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Funds in FY 2015-16: Program Evaluation

Public Information, Communications, Translation

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director*

DaMarto provided the following handout:

- BSEP Program Evaluation Public Information, Communications, Translation – FY 2012 through 2015 (Overview comparing plan year-to-year) as assembled by Tay.

Beery noted that the department’s staffing was to remain the same. She said the Hourly Support Staff has gone up and down, noting that in 2013-14 there was more money budgeted due to the transitional year for staff. She noted that Equipment and Supplies was stable and included the purchase of the BSEP booth to have at events. There are increasing costs for staffing but still well below new revenues. The department’s budget for the next two years will remain steady, but thoughtful consideration should be given to whether or not this structure is ideal in looking toward the next Measure.

Beery explained the BSEP booth identifies and makes visible our presence at events, especially going into the next Measure. DaMarto is in charge of the Juneteenth event in South Berkeley and will be answering questions and giving out information on how to access services in the district. The BSEP booth will also be at the Solano Stroll in September. Beery confirmed that careful thought must be given to the use of expenditure public funds for “gifts.” Pencils or bookmarks, which have a direct connection to educational purpose, can be given. Are bumper stickers informational or promotional? Stickers that go on instruments or books may be different and thus informational. There are some guidelines for this.

MOTION CARRIED (Paxson/Simon): To approve the *Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Program Evaluation Public Information, Communications, Translation in FY 2015-16 dated May 5, 2015 as presented. The motion was approved unanimously.*

10. Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Funds in FY 2015-16: Technology

Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*

Nitschke provided the following handouts:

- *Memo to BSEP Planning & Oversight Committee, From Jay Nitschke, Director of Technology, dated May 12, 2015 for Recommendation for Expenditures in 2015-16 of Funds Allocated to Technology from the Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006 (BSEP Resource 0862)*
- BSEP Technology – FY 2012 through 2015 (Overview comparing plan year-to-year) as assembled by Tay

Nitschke noted that the budget plan was basically the same with some changes to formatting and corrections of typos. He noted that the budget was reviewed for accuracy, and he has added a summary. The actual numbers stayed the same after typo corrections.

It was noted that the Ending Fund Balance of \$1,882 was low. Nitschke noted that there was some flux in Equipment and Supplies but that it was a goal to spend everything down. Paxson asked about the Microcomputer Technicians on page 3, and Nitschke responded that the techs are housed at the schools they are assigned to. Nitschke confirmed that this was the first year for Technology Teacher Leaders/TTL at the schools. He stated that they were identified by first advertising to all the teachers who would then let their principals know if they were interested. Then the principal would make the decision, sometimes asking Nitschke’s opinion. Nitschke said the TTLs meet

monthly in Technology Room 126, and there is an expectation that they would do some kind of professional development/school collaboration with the teachers at their school. The Berkeley Public Schools Fund is funding a grant for them to do a professional development activity in the summer or in the school year for themselves and a tech buddy teacher. That grant is \$800/each person to go to the PD event. He noted that there are Google summits/Google Apps for Education District held in Palo Alto that happen in the summer. They learn techniques for how to use technology in the classroom and then they spread that information to some of their colleagues in the schools. They are also having a 2- or 3-day collaboration in August for the TTLs and other teachers to meet and do more collaboration. Nitschke confirmed that assessments/evaluations from the teachers are part of this program. When asked if there was a standard of how the teachers should be using technology in the classroom and in responding the parents and students, Nitschke stated that this is a multi-level question. Nitschke said that parent-teacher communication and response time is out of his purview. In general, most teachers make a good faith effort to respond as quickly as they can. He said that Power School is being used in secondary schools for grades and progress reports. Common Core has standards for integrating technology into the classroom, and one of the goals for next year is to try and list those and have them adopted. Alaimo stated that the role of the TTL bridges the gap for those teachers who may not be that comfortable with technology and who may be more open to learning new apps and uses of technology from other teachers such as the TTLs. The Common Core digital standards exist, but we have to teach how to incorporate them into the curriculum and programs, and Alaimo feels the TTLs could also play a major role here. Simon added that there are still some teachers that are philosophically opposed to technology and until the district requires a certain minimum level and monitors it, more widespread adoption won't happen. He added that some teachers don't use it because they don't know how, and Nitschke added that his department is beginning to increase the support but it is all very new. Nitschke confirmed that they have gone from 0 to 17 TTLs for the district and there are also people called Illuminators, which use the Illuminate assessment infrastructure system to provide support. In terms of scaling up, it would be helpful to have more at the larger schools. He noted that they are happy for what they had this year and will have next year and will move forward from there. Glimme stated that there is no one right way to teach, there are lots of good ways to teach and sometimes what is most effective in the classroom is what a teacher is comfortable with that works for that class, for that content. There are a lot of variables. Trying to force any one technique on to anybody is not a successful strategy. People need to get excited about it and use it in their classroom. Having people who can help and show other teachers how to use technology tends to pull more teachers in than not. It also depends on the age level of the kids and the content. He added in addition to teachers for or against technology, there are also parents that don't want screens in the classrooms, who don't think that is the best way to educate especially in the younger grades. He uses technology and noted that it doesn't mean that it is better, it is just different. Lazio added that technology is now a life skills set and wants her kid to graduate from high school knowing how to use Google docs, a spreadsheet, and communicate this way. Simon said teachers need to know what standards and best practices are with technology. Nitschke confirmed that they don't have a science TTL at sites. Harm brought up Independent Study's unique needs and that it would benefit from having a TTL onsite and would volunteer to do it.

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Harm): To approve the *Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Technology in FY 2015-16 dated May 12, 2015 as revised from initial plan. The motion was approved unanimously.*

11. School Committees Spring Outreach & June 2 Meeting

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director*

Beery provided the following handouts:

- BSEP Meeting Notice for Tuesday, June 2, 2015: Proposed Agenda

Beery noted that the committee would not be meeting for the next three weeks. All of the budgets have been reviewed and passed with the exception of the School Site Plans which will be heard in June.

The June 2nd meeting will be used also to reach out to people who may be interested in learning more about the BSEP P&O and SGCs. Beery noted that BSEP plans are scheduled for the June 3rd Board meeting. The Board will also be focusing on BSEP Measure planning. Beery feels the Board will have questions about the current and future Measure. She plans to devote a limited amount of time on an overview of the Measure, how it was structured, and FAQs. She will answer questions about issues for BSEP going forward, what the public process will be like. Beery will send out another Measure planning timeline.

Beery said she had a slide of how the Measure has evolved over time, what the consistencies are, what has always been funded, and what has moved in and out of the Measure. She also has a slide that summarizes what each of the current resources are, where they are heading, what the challenges are, and what the concerns are for next year that would mean for the next Measure. Perez thought that BSEP is funding what might be considered LCAP priorities, wondering about shifting that funding to LCAP. Beery noted that there are both differing rules and philosophies about what should be funded. Huchting said that the multi-year BSEP trajectory and its details that Beery covered in Item 7 above, was an overarching view that the School Board audience could understand and see that small or moderate changes in the budgets could have drastic results from those changes. Thinking strategically and critically about the elements that are part of the Measure now and should they be included/not included in the Measure and why/why not. Lazio thought the document of the multi-year projection beyond the end of the Measure with conservative assumptions such as: don't include a COLA, assume average step-increases, conservative revenue; would we see a pattern if held steady, and would the General Fund have to re-absorb \$200-300K a year, because we would be out of program support and counseling services, would be useful to see. She added that she would love to see a document in graph form from 2008 in comparison of what the General Fund was to see what portion was the growing contribution from BSEP. Now we are too big to fail and having the BSEP funds were critical. There would be an understanding the trends. Simon stated that despite the celebratory feeling around what BSEP has done, he suggested that keeping the information simple and less confusing for everyone. Beery took the bookmark as a reminder of how BSEP could be celebratory.

Paxson wondered if it would be helpful for the Board to hear how the BSEP funds go straight to the sites as that seems to be an area that the Board holds onto. Lazio asked if class size modeling should be part of the conversation and Beery responded that that is something that the Superintendent's work group has been looking at. You want to raise the question if it is a likely a possibility in the next Measure. By the June 3rd meeting Beery may speak about it. Some scenarios may not be worth doing. The modeling would

be available in the fall for the work group. Educational priorities would also be working over the summer.

Beery noted that the public process would be beginning in the fall and was wondering about what comes next with how to use the P&O and was there any value to spreading the word about a preliminary discussion at the June 2nd meeting. Would there be another section for SGCs or a focus on BSEP? Simon thought it was a nice idea and would work on getting some people there. Glimme noted that was the same night as the King band concert. Beery said that the October workshop was open to principals and would it be helpful to have principals here in June? Several people affirmed having principals attend. SGCs could benefit from understanding what BSEP does and Beery noted that she was meeting with the mayor to explain BSEP. She would also be giving a BSEP 101 to the management team that consists of principals and other members of management. Beery will tweak the agenda for June 2nd and roundtable meeting with principals and SGCs with a BSEP 101.

Beery noted that the next Board meeting on May 20th will be about the Governor's May Revise, the Final Draft of the LCAP, and a first reading of an updated Board policy on Admissions and Enrollment. The Board policy subcommittee reviews policies, changes in laws/regulations and our policies on admissions, intra- and inter-district transfers etc. that have not been reviewed in 12 years. The Board approves policy which is general, then the approach and the AR/Administrative Regulation that comes out of that for staff to implement. The documents are drafted by staff and reviewed by the Board. There will be some minor changes, such as re-registering for middle school implemented this year and next year, re-registering for high school.

12. For the Good of the Order

No comments were made.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:11 p.m.

The next P&O meeting will be held June 2, 2015.

Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support