

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

May 5, 2015

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

P&O Committee Members Present:

Lily Howell, *Pre-K (Alt)/Malcolm X*
Madhu Marchesini, *Arts Magnet*
Bill Fleig, *Cragmont*
Dawn Paxson, *Emerson/Willard*
Danielle Perez, *John Muir (co-Chair)*
Lea Baechler-Brabo, *Oxford*
Patrick Hamill, *Thousand Oaks*
Bruce Simon, *King (co-Chair)*

Catherine Huchting, *Willard*
Aaron Glimme, *Berkeley High*
Larry Gordon, *Berkeley High (Alt)*
John Lavine, *Berkeley High*
Catherine Lazio, *Berkeley High*
Christine Staples, *Berkeley High (Alt)*
Louise Harm, *Independent Study*

P&O Committee Members Absent:

Moshe Cohen, *Pre-K/Malcolm X (Alt)*
Martin de Mucha Flores, *Cragmont (Alt)*
Shilen Patel, *Cragmont (Alt)*
Terry Pastika, *Jefferson (Alt)*
Shauna Rabinowitz, *Jefferson*
Ananda Esteva, *LeConte (Alt)*
Octavio Munist, *LeConte (Alt)*
Yusef Auletta, *LeConte*
Alma Prins, *Longfellow (Alt)*
Molly Jo Alaimo, *Oxford (Alt)*
Laura Babitt, *Rosa Parks*

Radha Seshagiri, *Thousand Oaks (Alt)*
Mimi Leinbach, *Washington*
Elisabeth Hensley, *King*
Marian Bradley-Kohr, *King (Alt)*
Juliet Bashore, *Longfellow*
Jenny Orland, *Longfellow*
Kim Sanders, *Longfellow (Alt)*
Rhonda Jefferson, *Berkeley High (Alt)*
Max Cramer, *Berkeley High Student Rep*
John Fike, *BTA/B-Tech*

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

Ann Marie Callegari, *FEE Site Coordinator, Emerson/BAM*
Charity DaMarto, *Supervisor, Family Engagement & Equity*
Donald Evans, *BUSD Superintendent*
Jay Nitschke, *BUSD Director, Technology*
Laura Rivas, *FEE Site Coordinator, LeConte/Thousand Oaks*
Pasquale Scuderi, *BUSD Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services*
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 7:20 p.m. Co-chair Bruce Simon 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 13 voting members initially present, 14 total voting members, and 1 BHS alternate present later in the meeting. 13 voting members are required for a quorum.

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Lavine): To approve the agenda of the May 5, 2015 P&O Committee Meeting. Simon asked for **Agenda Item 3. Public Comment** moved to be heard after **Agenda Item 6. Approval of P&O Minutes of April 28, 2015**. **The motion to approve the agenda as amended passed unanimously.**

3. Chairperson's Comments

Co-Chairs Danielle Perez and Bruce Simon

Co-Chair Perez stated that if any of the committee members had questions that needed to be answered or clarified about BSEP, Perez, Simon and Beery would be at the meetings early and stay late to answer any questions that come up.

4. BSEP Director's Comments

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Beery thanked the committee as well as Tay and Race for their work on documents for the committee and Liz Karam for her work on the budgets behind the scenes.

Beery noted that she will be giving a "BSEP 101" talk to the BUSD management team next week about what BSEP is, why it matters and what it means to be moving into the next Measure. She explained that the management team consists of directors, principals, supervisors of various departments, classified and certificated.

5. Approval of P&O Minutes of April 28, 2015

Since the minutes were extensive, there was a brief review period allowed for the minutes.

MOTION CARRIED (Paxson/Harm): To approve the meeting minutes of the April 28, 2015 P&O Committee Meeting. **The motion was approved with a showing of 11 hands, with 0 objections, and 3 abstentions.**

6. Public Comment

Todd spoke to clarify the amendment made to the Library proposal presented to the Board for FY 2015-16. To highlight the short-term nature of the proposed TSA/Elementary Teacher Librarian position, Todd provided the handout *Amended Excerpt: Budget Recommendations for Libraries FY 2015-16* for review and noted the bolded area on the front side of the hand out "We enter the 2015-16 school year..." and "Elementary – We are proposing to increase..." that were the alterations to her budget narrative. The committee reviewed this and Todd asked for any comments or questions, as this was the version that went forward in the Board packet for their 4/6/15 meeting. Paxson said she thought it covered their concerns and was very clear. Lazio disagreed and noted that she had a concern about deficit spending.

Todd noted that the position was temporary and short-term for two years; the funding is sufficient for that; and the position was critical at this juncture because of the need for digital literacy support for students and staff. She stated that all budgets were up for review and renewal every year and it was not proposed that the position was to be added “forever.” Todd clarified that this would not be a cut at the end of the Measure because the position was only to be funded for two years, and it was clarified that the position was for a TSA/Teacher on Special Assignment.

Lazio expressed concern over being presented with single year budgets and one resource at a time, and wanted a sense across the funds. Beery stated that Lazio was right to raise question of whether the pattern of spending and the structure of the budget is sustainable. Beery stated that in the budget summaries, all the budget managers have statements regarding the pattern of spending and sustainability through the end of the Measure. Every budget has some flexibility, and that a budgets had to planned to leave a positive balance each year.

There was a discussion regarding the budgets, budgeting for a single year, projecting budgets forward, and budget changes year to year. Glimme noted that Todd has the option to restructure her budget in order to keep the program going. Several members thought there was a clear understanding of the Library budget and the position being discussed and understood the idea of deficit spending when funds are available. It was clarified that there was no requirement for reserves at the end of the Measure. Beery stated that there were some funds from prior measures that had small amounts left in them and the money was to be used following the language of the previous Measure, and they are kept in separate funds for managing. She added that the money was to be used for the purposes of the Measure. She noted that there are things beyond our control that lead to larger fund balances, for instance, unexpected changes to staffing. As long as permanent positions are not set up that are structural and unsustainable, this was in keeping with the Measure. Beery stated that the budget managers were looking at the programs, and making sure if deficit spending was happening to assume that pattern could not continue and that the program core would be established on the revenue base.

Todd added that Library and Technology as a grouping for the next measure was evolving as an idea for the new measure, but it was premature to say she knew what was going to happen in three years.

7. CSR 2015-16 Proposal; P&O Statement to the Board

Natasha Beery, *Director of BSEP & Community Relations*

Beery provided the following handout:

• **(SINGLE PAGE) BOARD CSR FY15-16 v05_06_15 rev pg 4** from the *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)*

Beery noted that there was a typo on page 4 of the CSR Budget, which was corrected and sent to the committee members and given to the Board. (The Revenue Allocation of \$16,118,873 is correct as revised – there were no other changes.

Simon stated that the committee needed to review the Draft Statement to the Board, approve it and find someone to deliver it at the Board meeting. Glimme drafted the statement and several of the members edited it.

The committee as a whole edited and reworded the draft statement. Simon read the final statement as written below. **It was decided that Paxson and Hamill would read the statement to the Board at their meeting of May 6, 2015.**

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Fleig): To approve the P&O Statement to the Board regarding the Class Size Reduction budget. **The motion was approved with a showing of 12 hands, no objections and 2 abstentions.**

Statement Wording:

Hello Board Members,

I am addressing you tonight on behalf of the BSEP Planning and Oversight Committee to express the committee's general approval of the plan for the Class Size Reduction budget. As we approach the end of this 10-year measure, we are pleased to have been able to meet the class size goals established in the 2006 Measure, and have sufficient funds to also provide support to the district by funding Expanded Course Offerings, Middle School Counseling, and Program Support, as specified in the Measure. In the early years of the Measure, the BSEP budget was able to bolster the District's General Fund, and increase support to important district programs during a period of BSEP revenue growth based on higher COLAs of over 4%, and flatter costs when enrollment and salary increases were less than they are today. Recently, the BSEP budget has had much smaller COLAs, hovering around 1% for the last few years, and all of the various program budgets have been strained by enrollment growth and cost increases.

There are many potential ways to balance the needs of our schools with the budget issues we face. In the past, the District administration has prudently cut budgets early, when funding from the state looked uncertain and likely to decline. Those cuts, while difficult, served both the district and the people of Berkeley well, and they protected our schools from dramatic changes. Given this historical precedent, cutting programs now may look like the correct action...it worked before to minimize the possibility of major traumatic cuts, reducing through several smaller painful events, so why not repeat this "cut early" tactic?

After careful consideration and extensive deliberation, the general consensus of the P&O at this point is that we now face a different budget climate, both as a district and as a state. The current situation is one where investing some short-term General Fund and other money to buffer the BSEP priorities of Expanded Course Offerings, Middle School Counselors, and Program Support, has a very real chance of preventing cuts to these vital programs. While the BSEP has funded literacy coaches for many years, we hope the Board will continue to fund this valuable program into the future. Tax receipts that are higher than projected and additional funding for Common Core are but two examples of additional funding that make the state's budget outlook look particularly positive, and the possibility of additional funding for schools is high. By shifting funds in the way proposed, we can buy enough time to get these budgets on solid footings and maintain critical school programs. We believe the benefits of maintaining these programs outweigh the consequences of the cuts at this time. We encourage you to adopt the budgets proposed by staff and strongly endorsed by the Planning and Oversight Committee.

Thank you!

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

Pasquale Scuderi, *Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services*

It was noted that Michelle Sinclair, *BUSD Professional Development Coordinator*, was not able to attend the P&O meeting and Beery added that there were no changes made between the first presentation and this current budget. The only questions received were implementation questions which do not affect the budget.

In response to a question about allocation of literacy coaches to sites, Scuderi stated that the funding that comes from LCAP is connected to the “unduplicated” students and that staff was having discussions and looking at adjusting the proportionality model with Literacy Coaching. There is an imbalance for the size of the school, but they are trying to use the reading assessments/class profiles to determine struggling readers and how that might factor in determining Literacy Coaching resources. It may be a few months for them to pull all the factors together. Beery explained that “unduplicated” means students from the LCAP groups that are counted in the calculation of state supplemental funds (English Learners, Low Income/Free & Reduced Lunch and Foster Youth). A student could fall into more than one category but cannot be counted more than once, hence the term “unduplicated count”. Scuderi confirmed that if the team agrees, a base line of one Literacy Coach at each site could provide minimum level of coaching and service they want to see in classrooms. To service students at larger sites, there needs to be more of an allocation and he suggests that there be an assessment-based way of finding out where the needs are at each site, rather than just increasing staffing; for instance, using 2 or 3 metrics in tandem to see if there are more students with severe reading needs to prioritize even though that site might be smaller.

Harm asked based on how the district balances schools, what does it mean if there is a great discrepancy from one site to another in the district. Scuderi stated that the indicators that used to create diverse school populations are not always a guarantee that we are going to balance numbers of students who are struggling academically. Glimme further clarified that the lottery placement is not based on the actual student’s characteristics but on the home address.

MOTION CARRIED (Hamill/Glimme): To approve the *Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Professional Development Funds in FY 2015-16 dated April 28, 2015*. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

9. Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Funds in FY 2015-16: Program Evaluation
Pasquale Scuderi, *Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services* for Debbi D’Angelo, *Director, Berkeley Research, Evaluation & Assessment*

It was noted that Debbi D’Angelo, *Director, Berkeley Research, Evaluation & Assessment*, was not able to attend the P&O meeting. Beery noted that she did not receive any questions between the Program Evaluation presentation and this meeting. There were no changes made between the first presentation and this current budget.

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Hamill): To approve the *Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Program Evaluation in FY 2015-16 dated April 28, 2015 as presented*. **The motion was approved with a showing of 13 hands, no objections and 1 abstention.**

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

Charity DaMarto, *Supervisor, Family Equity and Engagement*

The following handouts were provided:

- *Memo to Donald Evans, Superintendent, From Charity DaMartto, Supervisor, Family Equity and Engagement and Patricia Saddler, Director of Special Programs and Projects, dated May 5, 2015 for Recommendation for Expenditures in 2015-16 of Funds Allocated to Parent Outreach from the Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006 (BSEP Resource 0857)*

DaMartto introduced two of her staff: Ann Marie Callegari, *OFEE Site Coordinator, Emerson/BAM* and Laura Rivas, *OFEE Site Coordinator, LeConte/Thousand Oaks*. DaMartto stated that the department had many accomplishments this year that were included on page 2 of her handout, which included collaborative efforts that have led to a bigger impact than case management. DaMartto presented the portion of the OPEE budget funded by BSEP.

Questions/Responses:

- Family Event Support is not provided at every site for every event. That item is for OFEE events that her staff coordinates.
- Lazio stated that the BHS BSEP Committee funds the balance of the Parent Liaison position at BHS, and that the person has to go through an annual process of evaluation and faces uncertainty as to whether the position will be funded by the school site or not. She wondered if the position should be included in the OFEE budget. DaMartto stated that they were not supposed to add any more BHS funds into the OFEE until the third year of LCAP, but currently they pay the one full time and part of another.
- Simon asked DaMartto to share where the site coordinators will be with LCAP funding. DaMartto responded that they are still looking at this, but that there had been a plan to provide one Site Coordinator for all middle schools, although this is still undetermined. Beery added that BSEP, which is a yearly plan, had to fit into the LCAP plan, which is a 3-year plan/trajectory. In modeling, one of the things looked at was what the BSEP revenue might be over a 3-year period and holding it relatively steady and providing increased funding from LCAP if that should materialize.
- Hamill asked what kind of metrics were being used to determine if OFEE was effective, and DaMartto responded that it was difficult to say what to use. They are using SGC surveys and their own detailed logs. She noted that they projected a 5% increase in use, but it actually doubled. They are focusing on attendance. DaMartto added that the parents that they do outreach to are not families that fill out the surveys, or are on committees etc. She noted that they may have to add something like focus groups for data.
- Howell stated that there were some measures that could be quantified and wants more from tracking families that OFEE works with over time, tracking achievement, chronic absenteeism, goals and objectives, outcomes. DaMartto stated that they do track data. She noted that some of the families they spend the most time with are transitional; they may spend a lot of time with them but then they are gone. Rivas noted that she also wondered how she would show how what they were doing was making a difference, that a database that allows them to enter the date and the reason for contact would be needed. She uses Illuminate, which shows the 10-12 times she has had to contact one family and all of the reasons, but there are 5 options in Illuminate. Most of the families she works with

- have attendance, behavior and academic reasons that often overlap. Aside from the Illuminate logs, she and her colleagues use Google docs on which she shares some of the information with her principals. A lot of the work involves follow-ups, like SST/Student Study Team meetings that they attend with the family. Sometimes the follow-ups get lost between the teacher, the principal and other support staff. She often brings everyone into a communications via email, 2/3/4 way. Rivas stated that she felt they needed a better system. Howell stated that she knew that First Five had a database for tracking. DaMarto said that they were researching better ways to talk to Evaluation about what is on the surveys, etc. Hamill noted that through the surveys, school climate would be addressed and the district would track data in terms of effectiveness and achievement. He added that if we provide assistance to those who need it the most, that is where we would see the most movement. He noted that over time they would be able to tell if this was effective.
- Evans stated that moving forward, academics would be critical, such how the Lit Coaches impact student achievement. DaMarto stated that some of the families in the district do not have housing or places for the kids to do homework, and many are going to food banks every week. She felt the need to be careful how we evaluate something that is so important but might not show significant jumps in traditional tracking. She felt that her staff members were often the only face families felt comfortable with, and that might not be quantifiable by academic success or attendance. She described the severe problems that some families were experiencing and the work they do may not show up in academics for five years because of what they are struggling with. Callegari stated that they also have to broker relationships with parents and staff, between parents and administrators and noted that there are parents of gifted students that are scared to talk to staff and they have to go in with them because they don't have that comfort level. Howell suggested looking at Alameda County Behavioral Healthcare systems and their family partner system for quantifiable measures. DaMarto added that they are also working with Children's Hospital.

11. Recommendation for BSEP Funds in FY 2015-16: Public Information, Communications, Translation

Natasha Beery, *Director of BSEP & Community Relations*

The following handouts were provided:

- *Memo to BSEP Planning & Oversight Committee, From Donald Evans, Superintendent & Natasha Beery, Director of BSEP & Community Relations, dated May 5, 2015 for Recommendation for Expenditures in 2015-16 of Funds Allocated to Public Information, Communications, Translation and Support of the Planning and Oversight Committee from the Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of 2006 (BSEP Resource 0854)*

Beery stated that this budget would not look much different from previous budgets. She noted that this was the "2%" budget because 2% of the BSEP budget was allocated for providing support for public information & translation, BSEP support, the BSEP Office/Communications & Translation. She noted that the Communications Team was meeting regularly and that Superintendent Evans was on the Team. She stated that there has

been more of a focus on being an internal resource for communications. The various departments are connecting to the various aspects, strategies and channels of communications. They are also helping people to understand and use things like Google docs. Beery noted that when she began as director, translation services were requested through the mail, and now they have moved to using a Google form which can be documented and tracked. She added that she proposed to increase the budget for the use of the Language Line for interpretation. The hourly staff budget was increased to allow for meeting support and translation and interpretation. Beery noted that the BSEP Program Specialist, Tay, would be focusing more on support for the principals and the SGCs. The budget for BSEP staff was remaining the same. Contracted Services will be decreasing because graphic design needs are not anticipated to be as great as prior year.

Lazio appreciated the work of this department and the *A+ News*. She wondered if helping the principals with budgets would also help committee members as well. Lazio also noted that it was helpful to have histories of previous years funding. It helped the conversation to see where they have been and where they are going. Lazio noted there were inherited formats that were sometimes not enough and sometimes too much. Beery agreed and noted that her department was trying to meet the needs of the Fiscal Department's reporting and monitoring requirements, while at the same time amplifying and simplifying what could be useful for the SGC. She would welcome format suggestions and ideas for what the SGCs could use. Lazio suggested that it would be useful to have last year's budget next to the proposed budget. Beery stated that she had thought of that, but the reason(s) for the differences between yearly budgets would be missing. She thought if there was a budget summary at the end, that would be useful.

Fleig suggested that a training for new principals would be useful and benefit the SGCs as well. Beery stated that they could be there to provide a link when a principal leaves and new principal comes in.

12. For the Good of the Order

No comments were made.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:22 p.m.

The next P&O meeting will be held May 12, 2015.

Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support