

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

April 28, 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)*
Lea Baechler-Brabo, *Oxford*
Mimi Leinbach, *Washington*
Elisabeth Hensley, *King*

Bruce Simon, *King (co-Chair)*
Alma Prins, *Longfellow (Alt)*
Catherine Huchting, *Willard*
Aaron Glimme, *Berkeley High*
Larry Gordon, *Berkeley High (Alt)*
John Lavine, *Berkeley High*
Christine Staples, *Berkeley High (Alt)*
Louise Harm, *Independent Study*

P&O Committee Members Absent:

Moshe Cohen, *Pre-K/Malcolm X (Alt)*
Lily Howell, *Pre-K (Alt)/Malcolm X*
Bill Fleig, *Cragmont*
Martin de Mucha Flores, *Cragmont (Alt)*
Shilen Patel, *Cragmont (Alt)*
Terry Pastika, *Jefferson (Alt)*
Ananda Esteva, *LeConte (Alt)*
Octavio Munist, *LeConte (Alt)*
Yusef Auletta, *LeConte*
Laura Babitt, *Rosa Parks*

Patrick Hamill, *Thousand Oaks*
Radha Seshagiri, *Thousand Oaks (Alt)*
Marian Bradley-Kohr, *King (Alt)*
Juliet Bashore, *Longfellow*
Jenny Orland, *Longfellow*
Kim Sanders, *Longfellow (Alt)*
Rhonda Jefferson, *Berkeley High (Alt)*
Catherine Lazio, *Berkeley High*
Max Cramer, *Berkeley High Student Rep*
John Fike, *BTA/B-Tech*

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

Ty Alper, *BUSD School Board*
Cathy Campbell, *BFT*
Debbi D'Angelo, *BUSD Director, Berkeley Research, Evaluation and Assessment*
Josh Daniel, *BUSD School Board*
Jay Nitschke, *BUSD Director, Technology*
Pasquale Scuderi, *BUSD Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services*
Michelle Sinclair, *BUSD Professional Development Coordinator*
Becca Todd, *BUSD Library Coordinator*

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. Prins noted that SGC meeting attendance at her school is a challenge this year. She would like to revisit outreach for SGCs, stating that it is important to think about energizing and activating members.

2. Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda

The quorum was approved with 14 voting members initially present and 16 total voting members present later in the meeting. 13 voting members are required for a quorum.

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Harm): To approve the agenda of the April 28, 2015 P&O Committee Meeting. **The motion was approved with a showing of 13 hands, with 0 objections, and 1 abstention.**

3. Public Comment

Lavine announced that BHS Stop Harassing is a group of young women who have formed to address sexual harassment policy at Berkeley High School. They were just notified that they will be honored with a Champion of Justice honor by Equal Rights Advocates, a non-profit women's rights organization, at their annual gala in June. Lavine stated that he had flyers about the Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights investigation of policy at BHS and stated that there were seem to be some problems with gaining access to students. Interested parties can pick up more information from him.

Josh Daniels, BUSD School Board member/P&O Committee Liaison, began by expressing his appreciation of the discussions of the last few weeks but that he continued to have concerns. He stated that various budgets being reviewed at this meeting would exhaust in one year the remaining ending fund balances. He thought that would create a difficult situation for planning for 2016-17, to be in "cut mode," because we would not necessarily be able to fund what we had funded in 2015-16. Often there has been a carry forward, and if it is known to be true for this year, then it may be fine. He encouraged the committee members to think about and discuss this issue. Daniels stated that with respect to the CSR budget, which was an especially difficult, his opinion was that if the committee opted for the option that would ask the General Fund to fund some of the items on "Page Two" that the committee also discuss the other option of no help from the General Fund and provide recommendations to the Board about how that would look in terms of cuts. Daniels stated that he could not stay to hear the CSR discussion at the end of the agenda. He wanted the committee to know his concerns and requests and thanked them.

Gordon stated that there was an article in the SF Chronicle about money that may go to K-12 (<http://www.sfchronicle.com/72hour-sale-event/article/California-sees-a-tax-revenue-surge-6212272.php>). Daniels stated that Proposition 98, which was passed in 1988, (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/TA/ac/sa/prop98.asp>, http://www.lao.ca.gov/2005/prop_98_primer/prop_98_primer_020805.htm) sets a certain minimum guarantee that must go to the school district or must go to schools in certain years. In certain years, when there is a decline in revenue, an IOU is created which is called a Maintenance Factor and over time, the Maintenance Factor has built up. Because of the how

the formula works, for every additional dollar the state takes in over budget, \$1.02-\$1.05 is owed to schools. However, given the current Governor, it may not appear on our books as ongoing revenue. It is likely to appear as one-time funding. We have to wait and see what happens with the May Revise but Daniels would prefer to make difficult decisions now and scale back if we get more money.

Simon added that the Berkeley Federation of Teachers/BFT was sponsoring a film on Thursday, April 30th, called “Defies Measurement” There will be pizza and childcare, film and discussion. It was noted that the film was about a school that transforms from a public school to a charter school and was about more than standardized testing. It is an hour-long film.

4. Chairperson’s Comments

Co-Chairs Danielle Perez and Bruce Simon

No comments were made.

5. BSEP Director’s Comments

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Beery noted that the CSR budget item had been moved to the end of the meeting to accommodate Scuderi’s schedule. She also mentioned that a link was sent out via email by Tay dated April 28, 2013 for a presentation by Scuderi and Javetta Cleveland:

Scuderi’s presentation: See Part One: <https://vimeo.com/125931833>

See Part Two: <https://vimeo.com/125931834>

Beery noted that there was a Budget priorities document which was in the April 22 Board Packet that she could send out to the committee that would give an idea of what the various competing interests are outside of BSEP that are being considered as well as those inside of BSEP.

Beery also thanked the committee for their patience with respect to staff’s attempts to send plan documents, agenda, the revised agenda and the minutes ahead of time. She noted that this was the time of year when all of the decisions are interlocking and interdependent, and this was as soon as the documents could be sent to the members of the committee.

Beery noted that several of budgets would be presented at this meeting including Program Evaluation, Technology and Professional Development. Next week will be the first look at the Public Information and Parent Outreach budgets. Tay will send out a Doodle poll to the members regarding whether to hold a Public Information and Parent Outreach subcommittee meeting before the next P&O meeting on May 5th to review the draft budgets.

In response to the Longfellow point about SGC recruitment, Beery stated that she knew some of the committee members have been talking this up at the various sites and know how valuable it is to be talking up participation at this time of year to get new folks involved. Tay and Beery will be sending out new recruitment materials to the committee members. She also set aside time on May 27 to talk with the P&O about BSEP Measure planning and the various pieces that staff members have been working on. Beery noted that May 27th might also be an opportunity to outreach to new folks who are in SGCs, affinity groups, or new parents. Beery will be asking committee members, principals and affinity groups to spread the word, and hopefully it will appeal to people interested in BSEP Measure planning that will begin in the fall.

Beery updated the committee on BSEP Measure planning and noted that this spring was the time for the groundwork to be laid through conversations, surveys, members thoughts on individual budgets and where they are headed. At this point there are three groups starting to prepare some portions of the foundational pieces. This will provide the information that people might need before next fall. There is a fiscal group doing various models on various permutations of budgets such as CSR or Professional Development. The Educational Priorities group is starting to lay out the programmatic piece based on topics such as best practices in professional development so that when we are ready to engage with the public discussions in the fall, a lot of those pieces will be available. In collaboration with the committee members, Beery would like to design a good public engagement process that connects the budgets, priorities and the desires of the public to each other that will help us do some thoughtful planning, polling and focus groups.

6. Approval of P&O Minutes of April 14, 2015

MOTION CARRIED (Paxson/Lavine): To approve the meeting minutes of the April 14, 2015 P&O Committee Meeting with the correction as noted below. **The motion was approved with a showing of 13 hands, with 0 objections, and 3 abstentions.**

Corrections to be made to minutes:

- Remove the word “paltry” from page 6, third bullet point, third sentence.

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

Debbi D’Angelo, *Director, Berkeley Research, Evaluation & Assessment*

D’Angelo provided the following handout:

- *Memo to BSEP Planning & Oversight Committee, From, Pasquale Scuderi, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services & Debbi D’Angelo, Director of Evaluation and Assessment, dated April 28, 2015 for Recommendation for Expenditures in FY 2015-16 for Funds Allocated to Program Evaluation from the Berkeley Public School Educational Excellence Act of 2006 (BSEP Resource 0856)*

D’Angelo noted that her department provides neutral evaluation not only for BSEP, but as well, a variety of programs and projects throughout the district. She noted that this year was a tight year for budgets and that her department was excited about direct site support through the “Illuminator”, a site evaluator/support person/model teacher that the teachers could go to immediately on site. D’Angelo stated that pages 2 and 3 of her Memo outlined the Program Summary. Last year, there was a reduction of the TSA allocation from 2.1 FTE to 1.9 FTE to allow for Illuminators at each site. This year, D’Angelo proposes to raise it back up to a 2.1 FTE. TSAs have extra duty assignments before and after school. Before-school involves helping to get class profiles ready for every K-9 teacher. Class profiles include information such as demographics, academic performance, attendance, discipline, and interventions. They also help to provide school information sheets and training for the upcoming year of Illuminators. There was a reduction made in school year staff development. This year there were 65 different staff members that participated in one or more Illuminate training days, and there is a plan to expand that. D’Angelo noted that this staff development was essential in helping the teachers have control of what they see in Illuminate. Teachers can create their own formative and summative assessments. This year Illuminators will continue. The first half of the year there will be an Illuminator teacher

stipend which will support the teachers within the use of the new Common Core report card within Illuminate, the formative and summative assessments, and those Illuminators will attend 5 meetings in the first part of the school year to be the Illuminator go-to person. In the second half of the year, due to the loss of Common Core funding for her department, there is a mandated cost of the mandated test from the state, so there will be a stipend for those or other teachers to help with the mandated testing. That cost will come from the General Fund.

D'Angelo noted that the Contracted Services were also reduced because her department is choosing not to use one of the item banks this year. Very few teachers were using that item bank and with a cost benefit analysis, they made the decision to eliminate that item bank. She plans to purchase SPSS, a statistical analysis software package for BREA's use.

D'Angelo stated that Professional Development money was for training other than the staff's weekly PLC/Professional Learning Community. This PD training allows for staff to expand their repertoire of using data to inform instruction and would include attending the SBSS Conference or Illuminate Conference.

The ending fund balance of \$10,896 is low but D'Angelo is looking at transferring funds for the mandated testing and its costs, which will increase the ending fund balance. She noted that they do receive categorical funds to help with mandated tests, the GATE program and others that are not BSEP specific. (See *Program Evaluation Appendix A: Services Provided through Categorical or LCFF Base/Supplemental*, beginning on page 9.) The FTE for Evaluation under the LCAP Supplemental falls under D'Angelo's supervision and she also helps with that.

D'Angelo pointed out that page 11, *Program Evaluation Appendix B –Proposed Staffing (with Categorical Funds)*, outlines the staff assignments and how they are assigned to sites to be as close to the classrooms as possible. D'Angelo works with the Board and the principals while the TSAs work hand-in-hand with the principals and teachers at the sites.

Questions/Responses:

- Gordon noted that last year's ending fund balance was \$22,000 and this year's budget starts off with \$80,000; what happened? Beery noted that the prior year plan, which uses projections, is different from the year-end report, which uses actuals. It was noted that there was a savings over the past year. D'Angelo stated that she hoped there would also be savings for this year.
- Simon noted the various areas of savings/reductions from last year to this year and asked about the increase in Personnel Variance, which went from \$10K last year to \$25K this year. Beery added that those reserves are adjusted each year in each of the budgets based on best guesses as to the range of possible changes in costs.
- D'Angelo pointed out on page 12, for the "Pending 1.0 CCSS/NGSS TSA" .8FTE of that would be focused on new assessments for 9 different math assessments next year for elementary and middle school: each grade level is different and there is a lot of support that would come with that. She is hoping for some common assessments for both the CCSS/Common Core State Standards and the NGSS/Next Generation Science Standards. To make the TSA a 1.0FTE, they would also be helping with the LEARNS evaluation.
- Huchting asked how the middle schools are using the data. D'Angelo noted that this was a transitional year, and a decision was made at the beginning of the year not to

have summative assessments that were common throughout the middle schools. Instead, many of the math middle school teachers are using formative assessments, creating their own assessments to look at that. The RtI² student profile is used for the RtI² “snapshot” conferences and in language arts, there is a writing assessment, which is used to compare and contrast how students have done with writing over time. PowerSchool is the student information system and Illuminate is the data management system. It would be ideal if we had both systems together; at this point we don’t. It is something we are exploring for the future, but a full evaluation is needed.

- Hensley thought D’Angelo stated that last year TSAs went down to 1.9FTE. D’Angelo responded that was for TSAs funded out of BSEP. There were 2.1FTE, and they were able to move expenses for .2 FTE. Hensley asked if the student profiles were an automated process in any way, to which D’Angelo responded that it was not, and it was building on what they have. She went on to explain that you can build any report you want in Illuminate; it is like a data warehouse, but you need to explain what you want on the profile. Each year is about updating that, putting in a new assessment, adjusting an old assessment, and we have been in a very transitional process where every single year, the assessments are different. It is not where we can automatically put in a new assessment. This is the first year for the Common Core report card to be included in Illuminate, and we are just beginning to learn how we can use that. We have a lot more data on Toolbox. D’Angelo confirmed that Illuminate was being used in all grades and the teachers can only see their own kids. It is very specific, unless someone like the RtI² Teacher Leader needs to see the whole school. She stated that the TSAs are the trainers of trainers, so that when they leave, the people they work with are able to do a lot on their own.
- Paxson asked how the teachers get linked up with district support services and heard that a decision was made not to do some things with middle schools. She noted there seemed to be not as much collaboration or resources at middle school. Paxson stated that the statistical piece was important at middle school, and they have a great SGC group at Willard, making decisions at the SGC, parents pushing for data and asking for them to be very deliberate. D’Angelo noted that they were there to help and the TSA assigned to Willard was Dana Gray. She said that the TSAs work deliberately at the beginning of the school year around the Single Plan for Student Achievement. There are district indicators of progress that align with the LCAP, and that is presented to each of the SGCs in coordination with the principal. The principals either choose to present it themselves or they ask for the BREA staff to present it. Occasionally, D’Angelo will present when asked. She noted that since they are funded out of BSEP, it is their job to answer those questions. There are a lot of things on the TSAs’ plates, and they will get answers back to people in time. She added that this year, they learned more about the survey that she will share next fall and that she would have another survey committee. Paxson noted that as much as they try to get out of the Parent Survey, there is limited information vs. that information. D’Angelo agreed. D’Angelo confirmed that in order to include IAs and itinerant staff in PD, at the beginning of the year, she asks the principals for a list of any new staff. If they are not Power School and not scheduled into a classroom, they have to enter them in by hand. The IAs are automatically in Illuminate and have a

password if they have a classroom. They are counted as a teacher of the class but if they are able to get the list, they will know what classrooms they have access to and then give those IAs access to that. A great idea would be for D'Angelo or her staff to give Illuminate training for IAs on those staff development days. They are invited to all trainings.

- Alaimo noted that in terms of data, she cautioned that parents and students not look at Illuminate as the only source of data and to keep communications open and know that teachers are also using formative assessments throughout the year. It is extremely powerful for the teachers as they move into the Common Core and as long as assessments are aligned to the curriculum and the programs they are using. She asked if D'Angelo could talk about the math assessments/alignment because they were just told by their math leads that they will be sticking with The Story of Units and the pacing guide, which is fast. D'Angelo stated her department was on the technical side, noting that she was on the instructional team and part of educational services. Her team works in partnership with TSAs and teacher leaders. In the case of mathematics, there are teams of teachers writing the assessments, and it is coming from The Story of Units and the pacing guide. BREA's job is really to assure that they are valid, reliable and that there are not too many questions on one piece. Commenting on multiple measures, she agreed with Alaimo, and said that Illuminate was just a vessel for teachers to create their own formative assessments and reports, and their goal was to show the teachers how to do that to see a bigger picture of what their students are doing. She added that she cannot see every item that a teacher has put into Illuminate. It is not a report card on the school, rather it is a tool for teachers to inform their own practice and instruction electronically. Scuderi added that in order not to drop a summative assessment on the teachers, instead it be teacher-created, imbedded in the curriculum and what emerged was reportable cumulative data. The creation of the assessments of The Story of Units and of Modules to make sure what they're assessing is what is being taught. And that there would be some additions to three units that would have cumulative data, a sample pull-out, so that the majority of the assessing that would be done would be embedded in what is being taught. D'Angelo stated that she sat down with the middle school math PD TSA, Rebecca Burke, to make questions possible for them to do. The teachers drive what it looks like. D'Angelo as a psychometrician was to help evaluate not only is the assessment informing instruction but that it is viable and reliable. They are still up in the air for the interim assessments provided by the state with regards to their viability and reliability.
- Staples wondered if there was any consideration of moving away from PowerSchool to Illuminate or if the two would go hand-in-hand or do people have to enter into both separately. D'Angelo stated that if data goes into Power school, every night it updates into Illuminate. That part is automatic. Nitschke stated that the second part of Staples' question would happen sometime in the future. Glimme added that when a teacher gives an assessment in Illuminate, it does not automatically populate the teacher portal in Power School. Many teachers give and grade their assessments in Illuminate, but there is work involved at the teacher end to move data from Illuminate to where parents can see it. It is not an automatic process. It is not terribly complex if you are somewhat technologically savvy; there are several button pushes

to take and export data from Illuminate and into Power School. D'Angelo stated that there was a parent portal in Illuminate, but they don't have the staff to roll that out, and it would be very confusing to parents to have two logins. They are looking at doing something for elementary school because they are not able to see it in Power School.

Glimme moved that item 10 of the agenda: *Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Funds in FY 2015-16: Class Size Reduction Fund* be moved forward for consideration. MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Huchting). The motion was unanimously approved.

8. Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Funds in FY 2015-16: Class Size Reduction Fund

Pasquale Scuderi, *Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services*

The following handouts were provided:

- *Memo to BSEP Planning & Oversight Committee, From Donald Evans, Ed.D., Superintendent, and Pasquale Scuderi, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services, dated April 28, 2015 for Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Class Size Reduction Funds in FY 2015-16*
- *BSEP CSR Multi Year Projections Based on CSR Recommendations for FY 2014-15 V2015-04-10*

Scuderi noted as was mentioned last meeting, ECO, Counseling Services and Program Support, which are funded by the CSR budget once class size ratios have been met, are called into question now because of the substantial shortfall projected for this budget by the end of the measure if reductions are not made. He noted that two options were discussed last meeting, one that involved significant cuts across ECO, Counseling and Program Support, and Option 2 which was a proposal where \$330K in one time monies that are a combination of EIA Replacement Funds and surpluses in the Education Services budget, in addition to a relatively small cut in ECO allocation at BHS, would be used to cover \$400K for next year. Option 2 would essentially buy a year, knowing that there would be cuts or alternative funding sources for items on "Page 2" in the final year of the Measure. Scuderi's thinks there are some significant budget events coming up, including the May Revise and the finalization of the budget by the Governor, which could possibly include some explicit funding for Common Core. It is possible that we could at that point propose to move some of the literacy coach costs on "Page 2" of the BSEP budget to a new resource like that. Additionally, in January of 2016 when the new state budget comes out, we may be seeing some Common Core funding, some additional mandated cost reimbursements, and the possibility for Adult School reinvestments that would bring more money into the district. Option 2 was a way of avoiding some difficult cuts that impact sites and staff for a year, while we see if there is another way to cover these costs in the final year of the Measure. He noted that on page 4, "Option 1" lists cuts that would have an impact on multiple sites. The question was posed as to the role of the P&O when other funding sources would be involved, as that recommendation would require board action. Even if the P&O committee recommended Option 1, it would require board action. In looking at "Page 2" and having to make difficult cuts and talking to staff, clearly no one at the school sites are in favor of all of these cuts, Scuderi listed the outline of cuts/reductions for schools under Option 1 such as

reducing TWI combo class supports, reducing ECO staff at BHS, as well as Middle School counseling staff. RtI² would not be able to be reduced because of the contractual issues with Special Ed. Reductions would also include literacy coaching, which would affect all school sites, PD, and other commitments in the LCAP plan.

Scuderi seeks support for Option 2, which he thinks would buy some time for “Page 2.” He also noted Daniels’ concerns. Scuderi’s concerns were for preserving what has been built in the last two years of the Measure. He asked the committee to lend their support for Option 2 to cover these programs and see what happens in the significant budget events he mentioned. He noted that this pushes difficult decisions out a year. Huchting stated that we were all hoping the Measure will be renewed and from her perspective, it would have been great to see a 3-year plan with some assumptions built into it that would have or assume some of the same numbers to see how/where we would cut using Option 1 or Option 2 and rolling it out a little bit further so we could see the total ramifications of it beyond this year. Scuderi thought it would be hard to contemplate what that would be. If no additional funding or place for transferring costs came up through Common Core or LCAP in the next year, we would probably be in the same exact place without the one-time money to cover it. Do we cut this year and then know we are probably going to have to cut in the subsequent year or do we buy a year and see if there are some creative, productive ways to get past this until the Measure is renewed? Beery stated that the problem with the multi-year projections is that there are so many moving parts, and many of them are unpredictable parts. They are things like Indirect Costs, COLA, cost of staff. You can do these things, but just like our demographic projections, they only have so much value. As has been seen, when you compare something from last year’s plan to this year’s plan, so much changes. Beery noted that you don’t know from year to year what options are coming from the state. The best that we have been able to do is a basic multi-year projection that lays out enough so you can see what those suppositions are and how they might change. Examples given: The COLA projection for 2015-16 was 0.022% and it turned out to be 0.0186%. We will find out soon what it will be for next year. The staff increase for teachers is just a model based on the step increase of 1%, with unknown additional increases. The Indirect Costs is a number that comes from the state, and we only know that one year in advance. That can go up and down. We know what this year’s Indirect Costs are, but we don’t know what 2016-17 will be. We don’t know what enrollment will be in 2016-17.

Baechler-Brabo asked if the committee approves Option 2, will Scuderi only send that option to the Board, or are we saying we are not going to decide one way or the other and let the Board decide? Scuderi responded that he hoped that the committee would weigh in and support one of the options. He noted his preference but that does not obligate the committee to that. Scuderi and Beery confirmed that whatever option the committee goes with, the CSR budget document would be revised to reflect the decision of the P&O Committee.

Hensley asked if we should choose to adopt Option 2, what is the function of Option 1 at this point? Beery responded that the P&O minutes would reflect that they examined Option 1, and they could provide through minutes or a statement to the Board the concerns. If you say that Option 2 is what you want and have really reflected on Option 1, then it would be helpful for the Board to hear why you did not support Option 1. This would go to the Board on May 6th. If the committee wanted to make a statement, that would have to be drafted before next Tuesday’s P&O meeting. Beery mentioned historical documents that accompanied previous CSR budget that stated the P&O’s concerns, including their

interpretation that the measure prioritizes ECO first, MS Counseling, and then Program Support.

Simon noted that going forward with Option 2 is based on a lot of suppositions and a lot of hope. If those don't come to pass, then we are going to try and pass a Measure after making more significant cuts over the next 2 years. Baechler-Brabo noted if we chose the short term, one year, to buy us some time, it doesn't necessarily mean that we will be cutting services to students. Simon stated that if we choose Option 2 and there are no guarantees for additional monies next year and we try to maintain the same level, and there's no guarantee that we will be able to maintain them, if we do have to make cuts next year, it will be worse.

Glimme stated that based on his understanding and reading about what is going on in terms of the budget for California and the Governor, Option 2 is not as risky as it may, at first blush, appear. In previous years, five or six years ago, we made cuts early and that served us very well because the budget situation was actually worse than we had thought it was going to be. His concern was that we were in a situation where the budget situation is going to be better than we think it will be and making cuts early may make us undergo pain that we don't have to go through. Glimme added that a proposed loss of 2.4FTE at BHS would be a very significant cut, resulting in classes that won't be able to be offered. That is on the order of twelve extra sections of classes that we're not going to be able to do if that cut has to go through. Glimme noted that it may be worth it to run a cost benefit analysis and the risk to other programs and how much money is it likely the state will bring in. He added that it was not an unwarranted risk to choose Option 2 when Option 1 seems to be a lot of immediate pain. He added that before the current Measure, a Bridge Measure was passed in the middle of horrendous cuts, and he was not at all sure that saying that we have to make cuts drives us to the point where people won't vote for it. It very well could be that we're making cuts because we don't have enough money, the community could respond in the way they have in the past: If you have to cut all these things, maybe you need more money. That is what has happened in the past. It is a different budget, tax, political climate, etc., but it seems that it is not a foregone conclusion that making cuts leaves people thinking that we are spending their money willy-nilly and won't vote for taxes. Scuderi said that with that risk, he named funds that might come available and what was originally put forward in the budget priorities document that went to the Board was an option wherein there was a portion of the GF, not this one-time money that might be called on to create a subsidy that could be looked at again when we look at some one-time expenditures being proposed in the GF, for example the Cooking and Gardening.

Campbell stated that for the BFT's part, they are supporting Scuderi's recommendation, and it may reassure people that from her point of view, this budget would have to be looked at in the fall and not the spring because it is the last year and we would have a little more time under our belt, and you really have to do that in the last year as you prepare for the new Measure. You have to make sure you are thinking carefully about this fund early. She also noted whether this committee becomes constrained by labor law with regards to layoffs. She noted that she thought there were parts of this that could not be done and if it is looked at in the fall, there would be more information about what happened in the adopted budget. She noted that there were at least four other significant budgets: the Mandated Block Grant/CC, the LCAP budget, and the GF that could be used to help us get through the last year of the Measure and keep this whole, and barring unforeseen circumstances, that will be the goal. From everything the LAO/Legislative Analyst's Office tells us is that California is looking

at an improving economy over the next 5 years. This reserve cap gets triggered by a recession, and they don't foresee this happening for 5 years at least. We have some information that makes us sanguine about keeping this fund whole.

Hensley stated that she heard the concern about how this can look if those funds do not show up. She noted that Option 1 caused her some concern because someone could look at this and say that we were supposed to prioritize ECOs and Middle School Counseling over Program Support. It's not really happening in Option 1; it has some problems.

Paxson said that this was a big and different kind of decision than what we've made in quite awhile. The BSEP fund is winding down and in this transitional part, for her as a parent, she needs a whole other set of information, which we're getting and is aware that there are other budgets that are interwoven with the BSEP funds that we don't go over. Relying on information shared from others, we are making an educated guess. We have to spend the money down while understanding that there may be money from the state through the fall. The transition makes her feel a little stuck and she feels that she is being asked to see into the future. She noted that it was hard to know about the other budgets and hard to grasp.

Baechler-Brabo would like to only offer Option 2 and not mention Option 1 at all. She noted that if any statement is made, to just state the things we looked at individually rather than naming the Options. She expressed her fear that the Board would pick apart the things they think we might do with the money. She noted that if the Board rejects Option 2 and it comes back to the committee, rather than putting together something else, have Option 1 on the table.

Harm, said that being new and new to the process, she was happy to endorse Option 2. She felt that she didn't understand why Daniels was not in support of Option 2. Glimme responded that it was his understanding that it was a primary concern that if we made the cut now, there would essentially be more time between "the cut" and when the voters vote on the Measure. If we push it off a year and then we do have to make the cut, it would be right before asking the voters to vote on the Measure.

Staples recalled that Daniels mentioned the phrase at the last meeting: "we would have less money next time the Measure goes forward." She stated that she thought it meant that there was a potential of less revenue coming in, that there was an underlying concern around the split roll tax. She wanted to put forth the thought of asking voters for the money we actually need.

Gordon asked why this budget has to go to the Board before the May Revise. Scuderi stated that this budget was going to the Board when there was a whole host of budgets being voted on. If we aren't going to cover this, and there is a substantial reduction of "Page 2" positions, it becomes more and more difficult for staffing purposes, e.g., principals who are trying to get sites ready. If we are not going to approve this and we can't go forward with \$340K of literacy coaches or TWI support, it becomes very difficult to push that to almost June. Beery reiterated that it is in the context of decisions being made in other priorities and noted that she would send out other documents. She noted that Daniels' concerns were not only about BSEP but the other calls upon the GF and other sources. Beery added that if the committee is saying to the Board that EIA and other funds should be used for this purpose, the committee may want to understand the big picture of other considerations in the budget and what the board was prioritizing.

Hensley noted that Daniels may be getting to a point about setting expectations about what CSR funds, can fund, and will continue to fund and not have a big gap in that. She felt it was important to maintain the level of service and programs that we had and keep people invested in them as they are, rather than chip away at them and suggest that they're not important in a way. By saying that these things can be reduced and still be fine sends a complicated message right now.

Nitschke noted that the CSR ratios of 20/26/28:1 has made it through the current Measure and we should congratulate ourselves that this Measure that we wrote in 2006 made it through 2016-17. He noted that was an amazing thing. Nitschke acknowledged Glimme's comment that class sizes in middle school were in the 30's, and Glimme commented he once had classes of 42. Nitschke added that when we had the need in the district, the bridge measure passed, with 75% of the voters voted yes on the Measure. The funding cuts/reallocations being discussed for this budget are relatively speaking small, and it didn't make sense to consider Option 1 given the impact on program.

MOTION CARRIED (Staples/Glimme): To recommend Option 2 and remove Option 1 from the budget and approve the *Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Class Size Reduction Funds in FY 2015-16 dated April 28, 2015*. **The motion was approved with a showing of 11 hands, with 2 objections, and 1 abstention.**

Discussion of the CSR statement letter from the P&O Committee to the Board:

- Recommend statement to acknowledge that we understand the risks with this approach, heard Director Daniels' concerns, and that despite uncertainty, state why we think it is important to continue planning for funding and what we see coming down the road in terms of additional funding availability, acknowledge what the risks are and the tradeoffs that we were confronting were worse, making potential cuts in important programs that are providing a lot of value to our schools
- Whether to state that the Committee has some doubts about Option 1 or pushing Option 1 because Option 2 is not strong enough. The P&O voted on Option 2, opting not to include Option 1 at an alternative, because we've made our statement for Option 2.
- Acknowledge that there are risks involved, and we understand those risks.
- Make it clear we heard and understood what Daniels had to say, had a responsible discussion about the possible risk factors, and we made a considered decision.
- It would be a good idea to explain why the Committee voted the way it did. The School Board has already heard about Option 1. The Board has the authority to cut what they want. The P&O makes recommendations. It is not unreasonable for the P&O to say that we looked at the CSR budget issues going forward, we feel that there is substantial potential of incoming revenues that would make Option 2 sustainable going forward. Those are reasonable things to say as to why we thought Option 2 was the better choice at this juncture. As a group, P&O has been very willing to support the administration to make difficult cuts in the past. That does not appear to be the situation we are in at this moment. We don't need to make a very difficult cut to keep the school district functional. We can look for

other solutions based on what appears to be an improving economic picture in our state and for our district.

- The statement should reflect the term “budget proposal,” not Option 2.
- If there is general consensus on the main points/skeleton draft, Glimme as the first draft writer can delegate the writing to a subgroup. **The draft writing group will consist of Glimme, Hensley, Paxson, Huchting, and Rabinowitz.**

9. Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Funds in FY 2015-16: Professional Development

Michelle Sinclair, *Professional Development Coordinator*

The following handouts were provided:

- *Memo to BSEP Planning & Oversight Committee, From Pasquale Scuderi, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services & Michelle Sinclair, Coordinator of Professional Development, dated April 28, 2015 for Recommendation for Expenditures in 2015-16 of Funds Allocated to Professional Development from the Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006 (BSEP Resource 0855)*

Sinclair handed out the above document as the budget proposal for next year. She started with staffing at 6.75FTE and noted some areas of increase. Funding through BSEP provides for Lit Coaches, Literacy Lead Coach, PD BHS/10 teachers at 20% PD. She is asking to increase the Instructional Technology TSA from 0.5FTE to 1.0FTE and the Professional Development Coordinator to be increased from 0.20FTE to 0.40FTE. Scuderi added that there was an effort to restructure and expand the technology department that supports the integration of instructional technology. They are also trying to develop instructional technology for students, things that they should know and be doing relative to technology/hardware and software as they move along. Scuderi cited the Long Beach Unified model of Common Core-based tech standards and the development of technology with curriculum, especially as an accelerant to curriculum/teaching.

Sinclair stated that the Coordinator of Professional Development was always a 1.0FTE with part of the position paid for by BTSA/Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment. They are looking to split the position so that more of Sinclair’s time would be devoted to PD. Scuderi added that he wanted to be clear that this change was part of envisioning an expansive annual cycle of learning opportunities for teachers. This would apply to many programs such as Common Core, Toolbox, and new curriculum. Sinclair confirmed that there would still be BTSA. Scuderi noted that one of the LCAP goals was to hire and retain teachers of color and BTSA complements that. Sinclair would still oversee and support BTSA. Glimme and Scuderi brought up the balance of pedagogy and content as an important area for PD. Sinclair stated that she thought this was being done in middle school math and noted that Common Core math was completely different. She said that the teachers worked a lot on concept development and got a lot of feedback about how helpful that has been. It was harder to do at the elementary level because the teachers teach so many subjects and there are a lot of initiatives coming in.

Hensley noted that another thing that Long Beach Unified provides is the leveraging of community resources to support things like content expertise. She noted that she would love to see that what we are doing is helping support holistic, strategic PD and was there room for someone to see how we could better leverage community-based connections with

universities to do that and using resources to invest and expand and not just deliver small pieces.

Leinbach stated that she was going back to Lit Coaches and noted that the large elementary schools are struggling with resources when it comes to teacher coaching as well as intervention. It was something they were constantly frustrated with, and nobody is sure when the conversation was happening about why it continued to be that schools that were twice the size of another school would get the same resources in something that was so critical. Scuderi responded that it was something that was being looked at. A place that they thought they could shore up proportionality was in the proposal for the Common Core budget. A final version would be going to the Board on May 5th but it did not include additional literacy coaching resources to solve that issue. He thought additional resources would come out with RTI² coordination. That is a place that would be an add through LCAP this year that would bring some proportionality. Literacy coaching was a huge issue, and they started with a CC budget proposal that was \$1.3M, because he was asked to put together an optimal implementation plan. But that was not accepted, and he took it down to about \$750K which will go forward. The decision that he feels he has to make was does he address proportionality at the elementary schools which was an issue in the same year when they think they would be solving proportionality with RTI² while being responsive to the middle schools that say they need a literacy person to balance with an RTI². There is \$250K being looked at for middle school coaching. Scuderi noted that the allocation for the RTI² coordinators was proportional, and now staff is being added. The literacy coaches are at 1.0FTE at all of the sites, and Malcolm X is a very different scene than at Oxford or Emerson. Sinclair stated that the ELD teachers were done proportionally. Scuderi stated that the reason they were able to do the RTI² coordinators was through the specific students LCAP is to serve. He noted that one thing that came up in the discussion was since we had limited CC funds and were doing this implementation, they would focus on middle schools for a year, then we might have to defer that investment/reduce that allocation until we can do it right. But he noted that literacy was something that they needed to feed at all levels.

Sinclair noted the other PD activities. They are providing an additional cultural responsiveness training and would like to put in the Cultural Competency Academy. They reduced the secondary workshops for teachers because the AVID part of that was now funded through LCAP. The Math Consortium/Silicon Valley Math Initiative is being paid for as a one-time fee through CC, so that has been eliminated.

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

Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*

The following handouts were provided:

- *STRS Rate Increase – The Governor Gives and Takes Away*
- *Memo to BSEP Planning & Oversight Committee, From Jay Nitschke, Director of Technology, dated April 28, 2015 for Preliminary Recommendation for Expenditures in 2015-16 of Funds Allocated to Technology from the Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006 (BSEP Resource 0862)*

Nitschke handed out the STRS (Teacher Retirement) Rate Increase and explained the increases for employees and the district. He noted that for 2014-15, the cost was equal to \$2.4M and needs to come out of the district budget.

Nitschke noted that very little was changing in the Technology Budget. Some highlights are:

- Tech Teacher leaders were stipend positions at every site. That was an add from last year.
- There was a reduction in technology equipment money.
- He noted that they were spending their money down but because of equipment and supplies, there was some fungible money.

Rabinowitz expressed concern that there are teachers that use technology that is not provided by Nitschke's department. Nitschke commented that his department tries to support things as equitably as they can at the schools. He noted that the Instructional Technology Teachers work with teachers to build their level of confidence to a higher level, and the Tech Teachers will be doing that too. Common Core assumes that there were certain standards that the students would get.

Hensley stated that if they were getting a stipend to model and demonstrate, what is being done with the equipment that is being supported and given to everybody? Nitschke noted that the district standard was Chromebooks and Google docs, and every student has an account to access material with the Chromebooks. Alaimo stated that they were looking at CC/K-5 standards around speaking and listening. The Teacher Leader provided a buffer/translator that was useful in the classroom.

11. For the Good of the Order

No comments were made.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:24 p.m.

The next P&O meeting will be held May 5, 2015.

Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support