

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES
June 2, 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*
Dawn Paxson, *Emerson/Willard*
Terry Pastika, *Jefferson (Alt)*
Shauna Rabinowitz, *Jefferson*
Danielle Perez, *John Muir (co-Chair)*
Lea Baechler-Brabo, *Oxford*
Mimi Leinbach, *Washington*

Marian Bradley-Kohr, *King (Alt)*
Bruce Simon, *King (co-Chair)*
Elisabeth Hensley, *King*
Catherine Lazio, *Berkeley High*
Christine Staples, *Berkeley High (Alt)*
Louise Harm, *Independent Study*
Laura Babitt, *Rosa Parks*

P&O Committee Members Absent:

Moshe Cohen, *Pre-K/Malcolm X (Alt)*
Bill Fleig, *Cragmont*
Martin de Mucha Flores, *Cragmont (Alt)*
Shilen Patel, *Cragmont (Alt)*
Octavio Munist, *LeConte (Alt)*
Molly Jo Alaimo, *Oxford (Alt)*
Patrick Hamill, *Thousand Oaks*
Radha Seshagiri, *Thousand Oaks (Alt)*
Juliet Bashore, *Longfellow*
Jenny Orland, *Longfellow*

Alma Prins, *Longfellow (Alt)*
Kim Sanders, *Longfellow (Alt)*
Catherine Huchting, *Willard*
Aaron Glimme, *Berkeley High*
Larry Gordon, *Berkeley High (Alt)*
John Lavine, *Berkeley High*
Rhonda Jefferson, *Berkeley High (Alt)*
Max Cramer, *Berkeley High Student Rep*
John Fike, *BTA/B-Tech*

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

Mark Coplan, *BUSD Public Information Officer*
Donald Evans, *BUSD Superintendent*
Jay Nitschke, *BUSD Director, Technology*
Pasquale Scuderi, *BUSD Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services*
Becca Todd, *District Library Coordinator*

Irisa Charney-Sirott, *Rosa Parks parent*
Alex Gross, *5th grade teacher, BAM*
Ellen Khalifa, *BIS parent*
Stephanie Mirza, *BIS parent*
Toni Stein, *MLK/BHS parent*

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 7:00 p.m. Co-chair Danielle Perez called the meeting to order by noting this was the final meeting for the committee for the 2014-15 school year and 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 (Rabinowitz/Staples): To approve the agenda of the June 2, 2015 P&O Committee Meeting. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

3. Chairperson's Comments

Co-Chairs Danielle Perez and Bruce Simon

Co-Chair Simon welcomed new people attending the meeting and noted that the meetings was conducted according to the Brown Act and Robert's Rules of Order.

4. BSEP Director's Comments

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Beery provided the following handouts:

- *BSEP Class Size Reduction Overview May 6, 2015 (dated 6/2/2015)*

Beery stated that this evening's P&O meeting does not include any formal plan reviews. There will be an overview of BSEP School Site Plans given by Tay. Beery also gave an appreciation of the work done by Tay and Race for the P&O Committee this year.

Beery followed up on a request from the May 12, 2015 P&O meeting regarding her presentation to the School Board on CSR and Music/VAPA programs. She showed the Board how CSR has expanded and contracted over the life of the current BSEP Measure. Information was given on this in 3-year groupings with regards to the Cost of Living Increase Adjustment/COLA revenue increases and decreases, growing enrollment, and Teacher Template costs/raises and how all of those components impact the funds available for "Page 2" for Expanded Course Offerings/ECO, Middle School Counseling and Program Support. (See handout above.) Beery added that there is a tentative agreement with the Berkeley Federation of Teachers/BFT which will impact BSEP resources. She noted that BUSD Fiscal Services was in the process of loading the new budget, and it was not yet ready to be presented at tonight's meeting. There will be a review of the CSR budget early next fall.

5. Approval of P&O Minutes of May 12, 2015

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

MOTION CARRIED (Harm/Rabinowitz): To approve the meeting minutes of the May 12, 2015 P&O Committee Meeting. **The motion was approved with a showing of 10 hands, with 0 objections, and 2 abstentions.**

6. Public Comment

Toni Stein, MLK/BHS parent, stated that during the BHS site plan review, the item at the bottom of the list was felt to be important enough to be moved to the top of the list. She hoped that during the review, the Committee members could note that.

7. Overview of BSEP School Site Plans for FY15

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director/Valerie Tay, BSEP Program Specialist*

Beery and Tay provided the following handouts:

- *Memo To: The BSEP Planning & Oversight Committee, From: Natasha Beery, Director of BSEP and Community Relations and Pat Saddler, Director of Programs & Special Projects, Dated: June 24, 2015, Subject: 2015-2016 Single Plans for Student Achievement*
- *Budget Summaries 2015-16* (Comprehensive Site Plan Budgets for all schools)

Beery stated that Tay had been working on the School Site Plans and would be leading the discussion. Tay provided handouts and noted that the Budget Summaries for 2015-16 included the use of PTA funds as well as other funding sources. Tay noted there was some confusion and uncertainty around LCAP funding last year, and going into its second year of LCAP, the District's plan was largely in place such that the SGCs had an easier time of deciding where they wanted to put their resources. Tay noted that there was a range of different funding models, with some SGCs using their BSEP funds for enrichment FTE while other sites used PTA funds for contracts for programs such as movement, art, and outdoor field trips. She stated that all of the elementary schools used site money to round out their Literacy Coach FTE and most augmented the LCAP FTEs for RtI and EL provided by the district. Tay added that sites with very active PTAs made a concerted effort to include their PTA budgets in their overall site plans.

Questions and responses:

- Beery requested that Toni Stein clarify her concerns about the WASC bullet points that were at the bottom of the BHS Site Plan to her later. (Stein's comment was noted in Item 6. Public Comment above.)
- Tay confirmed that the budget template was the starting point for the principals in their budget meetings and planning. By the time BSEP staff receives the final site plans (in their specific budget software—"Doc Tracking"), the numbers may have changed based upon SGC discussions and revisions to their action plans. The template has become a useful tool for the principals and budget analysts to communicate. These summaries will be attached to all the site plans.
- In response to a question from Babitt, Beery and Scuderi confirmed that the "flight from middle school" with a return to BUSD for high school was not a current enrollment pattern trend. Scuderi stated that Willard Middle School had about 100

more students than it did 3 or 4 years ago, but he would have to confirm those numbers. Beery stated that BUSD was seeing growth in enrollment across the board.

- Lazio asked if the Literacy Coaches were serving the same population and was there a difference between the resources for them, because the combined amount of site money looks to add up to about \$150K. She noted that it had not always been this way and thought they had been absorbed by BSEP during the time of restricted funding during 2008-2010. She also asked that with the increase in LCAP funding (noting \$750K), whether it was the district's intention to absorb these Literacy Coaches? Scuderi responded that there is a discussion now about "Page 2" funding forcing this issue and having to address offloading/transferring expenses for that portion of "Page 2" at least for next year as they look for more solid funding. Lazio, as a representative to the Superintendent's Budget Advisory Committee/SBAC, stated that they are rejecting increases for 2016-17 and of the extra \$750K LCAP money that could be allocated, only \$20K goes to more Literacy Coaching. The following year, there is nothing, and this year there was only \$10K. LCAP has only picked up \$218K of the Literacy Coaches (according to a document from the SBAC). Lazio added that at BHS, it was difficult to know what was going on with the LCAP and how to advocate for some of the positions BHS felt LCAP would be well-suited to support. In terms of the process, the interest and the amount of man-hours that have gone into LCAP, there needs to be a reminder that BSEP has been funding these very same objectives and initiatives for years. School sites all agree that they are important, but because funding has been institutionalized, it limits the choices that you have on those oversight committees when you have to choose and fund the existing positions that are necessary. How would SGCs go about interfacing better with LCAP? Scuderi noted that Ed Services team proposes to find a way to integrate discussions about all of these major budgets areas. This year they talked about Common Core and LCAP a lot and had multiple conversations about BSEP. Those things don't happen in a way that you can look at those resources together. Scuderi was not sure how to get that information to SGCs for decision-making and advocacy purposes earlier than they are now, because they are still figuring out how to integrate the discussion around all three of these funding resources and the Mandated Cost Reimbursement (which the Governor recommended using for Common Core). They have not done the mapping yet for looking at the funding sources holistically to see how they are being applied to certain specific goals and objectives. He added that there were some logistics with LCAP funding, and he is looking for other funding to offset costs for something like Literacy Coaching with General Funds/Mandated Cost Reimbursements for at least the next 5 or 6 years or over an extended period of time.
- Harm noted that last year when they determined their SGC budget, they had a conversation about what they wanted their numbers to be, because what they are dealing with in Independent Study is different from all other sites. She stated they are not getting other resources from PTA, LCAP or Title 1. This year, they didn't have a conversation at the SGC level about how much they wanted to allocate to the different things. Should they not have done that? Is the current summary what their budget is for this year? She is still hazy about this. It would be nice to get LCAP support at

IS, but she does not know what that would look like. Tay responded that IS was the only budget in draft form right now, and it hasn't been approved by the IS SGC yet. Harm stated that she felt that the way it was presented was "this is what our budget is." Tay stated that she thought the process had been delayed at IS, and that this document only represented the first step. After the budget analyst and principal put together a preliminary budget, the principal takes it back to the SGC for discussion and vote.

- Staples echoed Lazio in that she thought there were a lot of things that LCAP could be funding (Literacy coaches, EL coaches) that BSEP had been funding during the rough times. It would be lovely for BSEP to be able to expand on its other missions when there is additional money coming in from other sources.
- Marchesini asked if the committee takes into account how much the different PTAs make and noted that some PTAs make more than others. Beery confirmed that the PTA money does not come into play as the BSEP site allocations are made. Marchesini noted that seemed sad, as some schools are so small. Beery stated that the way the allocation is made is on a per pupil basis, per the measure, and not looking at other available sources. The PTA Council recognizes that there is huge variation across the district and there had been discussion around that. Beery noted that some districts, such as Albany, pool their PTA funds. Sharing funds was once discussed here, and it might come up again. It would have to be approved by the PTA Council. Simon stated that not all the numbers shown may be accurate. Nitschke added that this was just the budget that runs through the district and the checks that pay for staff may not reflect what the total overall revenue is. Baechler-Brabo said that the PTA at her school works with the SGC on funding certain things that make it onto the Site Plans, but there are some things that aren't necessarily listed. Site Plans are not representative of the total budget each school has. Tay stated that there has not been a uniform way to get the total school budgets, which offers some challenges, but they are more complete than they have been in the past. Beery described a few things on the Budget Summary spreadsheet: OBJ means Object Code, DDF means District Defined Field, BSEP Site Funds Resource 0852 etc., and all numbers are used for internal accounting to indicate where the funds come from and what they are specifically used for.
- Babitt stated that she noticed that the District does not do Cost Benefit Analyses; for example, there was no discussion around getting different scenarios for providing a literacy program besides having Literacy Coaches. She felt this was expensive and could the goals be met in less expensive ways? Lazio noted that the Vice Principal positions at King also serve as counseling positions. Although there is nothing in the Measure that says we can't fund Vice Principals, she felt there should be, because there is a perceived conflict of interest there. As a parent she respected the site's decision, but as a taxpayer she thought it raised some questions in terms of spending site money for administrators. She noted that it was a big chunk of money: \$103,750 and about as expensive as counseling services. The money was ancillary or extra money for some of us and noted that we needed to be responsible, careful and to have a discussion about whether this was the best use of these resources. Simon re-

sponded that it was the responsibility of the SGCs every year to collect information about how to best use the funds to serve the needs of the students at those schools. He noted that the Literacy Coaches have in effect become a mandated cost over the past couple of years because the District has required that the schools pick up a portion of the cost. All of the other expenses listed under the Budget Item column were under the discretion of the site administrator and the School Governance Council. Although he had been very vocal at his SGCs over the years about the difficulty of using the data that they are provided to make those decisions, it was the responsibility of the SGS to make those decisions. Gross added that as a teacher herself, she thought the Literacy Coaches played a different role than any contracted employee could play, unless the contracted employee could be guaranteed a contract year after year, because they build relationships with students over an extended period of time. They know the students as readers over a long period much better than she did and stated that had a lot of value. She felt it was hard to envision a contract worker playing exactly the same role. Babitt added that she felt that there was not much comparative analysis, it has always been Route A or Route B and it seemed that we always looked at what was put in front of us as to what gets approved. She felt that from the District level on down, we should look outside of the box as to how to stretch the dollars. Hensley stated that she would love to see the P&O and the SGCs speak to what would be the alternative vision for the dollars. What do WE think they should be doing, doing differently, and what outcomes are we expecting from that. She felt we did not get to that enough and that has to be heard in order for people to know there is another "box." Paxson noted that at Willard, even though they hadn't come up with the answers, those were the questions they had been asking. She was grateful they had been asking those questions, because there are not a lot of dollars available and for the past few years, a huge portion went to Cooking and Gardening as a site decision. They thought about what they needed, what they wanted, what they had, and got creative. She noted that it was a hard conversation to have but it helped clarify what the principal wanted to see and it went beyond their identity as a school to what the kids really needed. Paxson added that there were things the principal and the teachers wanted to see to support the students. She felt they were able to make huge changes in the last three years with the same dollars, and it was a big turnaround. Lazio said the BSEP Committee was presenting a multi-year history for people to see how the money has historically been spent. That, in conjunction with the questions the committee members could feel free to ask may serve as an entre to sites where that may not be happening and to use it as a tool. Beery stated there is a matrix/rubric used at Berkeley High for evaluating proposals and wondered if those questions could be pulled out of the matrix as a tool that could be used at other sites. She stated that was used to ensure that whatever was being looked at aligned with what the goals were for that school. Lazio affirmed that the rubric could be used as a basis for questions at a starting point. She added that other school sites may have suggestions for the way they open their conversation, and the fact that there were teachers and administrators at the table may be intimidating for a parent. Sometimes

it takes years to understand what you are looking at, and some sort of tool would be useful.

- Hensley added that it might be useful for the SGCs, and for cross-sharing, to write up a short budget narrative or summary stating what they would be doing for the year and why, changes that were made, and what they were trying to get at, an abstract submitted with the plan. Baechler-Brabo noted that it would be a way to communicate with your own community, because she felt the schools never really get a sense of what is in the site plan; it is hard to dissect. Pastika added that the same kind of thing was happening at Jefferson, and it might help to jump-start the conversation at the orientation at the beginning of the year. It could be a topic at one of the break-out sessions, because it could provide a forum for those who are interested to report back to their SGCs, and it could provide a natural avenue to bring up all these things we are talking about and a way that may be less intimidating to parents who are feeling they can't bring up this information because the RTI person is at the table for example. It's an opportunity to present the conversation in a safe way at the orientation and describe it as a deliberative dialogue session simply titled as "How to Have a Meaningful SGC."
- Babitt stated that the LCAP plan (Supplemental and Base funding) was the overall vision and goal of the district. Strategically, the District is supposed to be lining up with those goals and measures in the LCAP plan. If Literacy Coaches are deemed to be the best method and practice, and it lines up with the goals, then that is fine, as long as it is established that way, and we have the conversation. When we talk about a Cost Benefit Analysis/CBA, what is the best practice to get to this goal? Our site plans and BSEP plans are supposed to line up with the district goals. She was wondering overall if we took the time to link this back to the overall strategic goals, does it address the issue, for example at BHS, that things are supposed to line up with WASC/Western Association of Schools and Colleges (accreditation) goals. Are we doing that at each site to get to those goals and objectives and how we do that includes the establishment of best practices and of CBA, that could be rolled out at every school with the help of the SGCs. Howell said that spoke to increasing communication across SGCs and in looking at this budget at the end of the year she noted that there were things that other sites did that were very clever or a smart way to do something/fund particular programs. Howell wondered if there was a way to find out more information before sites submitted their budgets and get support and feedback across SGCs about how they are tackling very similar goals. Beery stated that was written into the bylaws of the P&O. One of the purposes of the P&O is to provide that bridge, that forum for those discussions to happen. We could increase those opportunities. (See BSEP Bylaws, Sections II and III in the BSEP P&O binders or http://berkeleyschools.net/uploads/bsep/P-O_Bylaws_adopted_4-23-08v3.pdf online.)
- Various committee members gave an appreciation for the budget summary document.

8. Roundtable – Effective & Inclusive SGCs

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director*

Beery provided the following handout:

- *Best Practices for School Site Committees* (6 pages)

Beery noted that some ideas about the SGC process were already being shared (see previous item above). She noted that given where we were with recent changes and grappling with LCAP, we should use the P&O Committee as a forum to reflect about going forward in October and planning the orientation next year. One of the functions of the BSEP office is to help support recruitment, elections, election reporting, supporting the management of the SGC meetings, give templates, take minutes throughout the year. We often hear from the SGCs when there is a challenge or something that the BSEP office is asked to weigh in on. Beery has been tracked all of these instances and sent out a memo after the elections and more recently noted to the BUSD School Board Policy Subcommittee that there were things that the SGCs needed clarification on or wanted to change. The Board Policy Subcommittee was willing to look at any possible changes that might need to happen around the bylaws, maybe in August. A lot of what is being talked about is more about process and not necessarily about bylaws.

Beery wanted to review the *Best Practices for School Site Committees* that was handed out at orientations and built on over the years based on conversations like these. She intends to follow up on a BHS request for a survey on their thoughts.

- Recruitment: Beery wanted to hear thoughts on timing, method of candidate recruitment, making sure there is a diverse and representative group of people, a balance of new and historic voices, once the candidates are selected how they are presented to the rest of the site's community, and how elections are conducted.
- Simon shared two practices that King Middle School used that were effective in recruitment. They have an event on Saturday for the incoming 6th grade and an SGC member is sent to that event to recruit incoming parents. Both he and Hensley both spoke at the Back-to-School Night and had nomination forms available for people to nominate themselves or others on the spot. Hensley added that it was important to go to the event for incoming 6th graders because you only have those families at the school for a few years. She felt that it was important to plant the seed for engaging in this kind of work early. Perez noted that John Muir Elementary holds summer playdates for incoming kindergarteners, and they plan to send an SGC representative to have informal conversations with parents. Charney-Sirott, Rosa Parks parent, noted that they had a success and a challenge that she wanted to get the group's input on. Rosa Parks uses a lot of direct outreach to special interest parent groups (ELAC, ADAC, Parents of students with special needs) and got a lot more people running. The problems came from the voting piece, as the same population that typically votes continued to vote, and if the people running are not "known", the same people get elected each year. She noted that they had more votes this year but the newer people that ran did not get elected. Charney-Sirott said that although everyone could be included, it was a big commitment to make the evening meetings. Even if child-care was provided, there was less commitment from alternates. She stated that even though they recruited people, they became alternates and they couldn't sustain their participation in the SGC. She felt that they needed more support for the election

piece and wondered if there could be 2-3 at-large seats and some for special committees like ELAC, ADAC, etc. so that those committees could run their own mini-election for special committee seats. They are trying to think outside the box to get the voices of all the parents. Beery said it was unfortunate that the State-written rules for the SGCs are that you cannot reserve seats for particular groups. She added that they do something similarly Berkeley High for the different small schools but not particular groups. They tried having non-voting members, but that was like being an alternate. Baechler-Brabo noted that she had been a part of these groups for many years and realized that she didn't have to vote in order to participate in the conversation. She stated that she often became the alternate so that someone new could participate. It was also nice to have people who had experience participate to have conversations that you want to get at, how you can question, how you can be a parent at the table and not feel intimidated. Sometimes they didn't even share the voting numbers so that new people could participate and the older members could be the alternates. Simon said they tried something similar this year. They had nominees on the ballot, and all the nominees were invited to the first SGC meeting, and the results were not announced prior to that meeting. Hensley stated that all the people who ran were considered on the committee. Simon said that you rarely take a vote because the votes are usually unanimous. They downplayed the voting aspect of the role and encouraged everyone to participate in the conversation. He said that when a vote was necessary and certain people had to vote, it was done very informally. Their committee grew over the course of this year. Hensley agreed with Simon and said that the critical aspect was the contribution to the discussion. She felt it worked better. Paxson said what worked well at Emerson was holding the voting at the Open House because it was the event with the most attendance. They did a good job of recruiting a wide range of members, and there was a slate that included everyone. Paxson stated that all kinds of people were on the committee, and they stayed. Howell noted that how the meetings are run, the temperament of the meeting, the inclusivity of the meeting (or not) helps the alternates as well as all the members stay. She noted that she was a Pre-K alternate for 3 years and the meetings were run in an inclusive way. She felt very invested in attending the meetings and felt like an important member at the table whose opinions were taken into account. Though this is an intangible, how the meetings are run can keep members coming back.

- Lazio stated that one of the pleasures of the BHS BSEP committee is the students. Students could be invited to participate at key meetings, etc. (5th grade at elementary, 8th grade at middle school). She noted that the conversation could get real in a hurry, and parents could be enlightened by a student's perspective. Hensley stated that the principal at King invited a group of 8th graders to participate this year, and they were at almost every meeting. She noted they provided a reality check on a lot of things. Hensley stated that they were very engaged in the survey process this year. Harm would like to support the IS parents and was curious about what people were experiencing with SGCs that were not necessarily working well. How do parents hold challenging conversations with administrators on such SGCs. Paxson related this to middle school and how challenging it could be, especially around the Cooking and Gar-

dening program. It was tough and required a lot of outside conversation. What was challenging this year at Willard was having parents ask how things work and getting different levels of feedback from the teachers, administrators and the district. The parents care about programs and want them to work out. In middle school, she went to the principal to talk with them about things that were coming up.

- Stein noted that she had been on various committees and experienced dysfunction everywhere and noticed that competing for money caused contention. She added that people do want to share and care about each other and our differences. She felt that we should push for the growth of the district website to include space for each group to disclose their opinions and people can get involved in the discussions for things to grow and develop much better.
- Beery asked, in terms of bylaws, if anyone experienced the inability to move forward because there was not enough people there or if there were people that made it difficult to move forward? Did that ever become an issue? It should be a safe place for people to share. Were there tools you felt that you should have had?
- One parent noted that she was part of an SGC last year and her personal experience was very frustrating. Where does a parent go when you had a ceiling, whether it was from an administrator or a committee member, that you could not go past? She felt that she and other parents did not know what their options were, and it felt disempowering to be in that situation and see holes between the teachers', district's, and administrators' points of view. As a parent, she saw a lot of problems and decided to step down from her SGC because she felt it wasn't worth her time because it wasn't productive. She asked for advice on that. She also noted they had problems establishing a quorum because they were not scheduling the meeting at times when people could be there. She wondered if there was any advice for small programs that needed more members or parents that do not have a positive environment. Beery stated that she and Tay had talked about whether there are times that it would be helpful for Beery, Tay or another SGC member with experience from another school that could be a third party to come in to facilitate, provide another perspective or coach. She was asked by the interim principal at BHS to come to every meeting to provide support to the group and the new principal. That seemed to help. Are there situations where that or something like that would be helpful? It was noted that it would be helpful especially when there is a new principal, because it is different to be a parent with a new principal.
- Another issue that was brought up was the knowledge gap between the school staff and the parents. Thinking outside of the box is wonderful, but not everybody knows what's outside the box, or what's in the box. The principal has a lot of power in the SGC; whether he/she wants it or not. Being on an SGC where they are expected to rubber stamp a budget is a difficult situation as a parent, or even a parent with a lot of knowledge, to confront it without fear. To have someone to call to get some advice would be helpful.
- It was noted that more opportunities were needed for cross-pollination and sharing of information as parents or community representatives. Could there be an online place for SGC members from different schools to post or get feedback about programs?

Could it be a Google group? Beery responded that there are both positive and problematic issues surrounding what can be done online. Some communities do use Google docs, but there could be some slippage into Brown Act conflicts where it may be perceived that decision-making discussions were taking place that members of the public wouldn't have access to. There would have to be a moderator. She added that if there is interest, the Communications team could discuss it and come up with some suggestions.

- It was noted by Babitt that it sounded like having Beery facilitate was a bonus. She also noted that since the district is mandating some expenditures, maybe they should go to the schools and say why they have mandated certain approaches. It should be that whoever came up with the approach be able to explain why they want to push an approach they used at one school to other schools. She felt that people were reasonable and will come together around a best practice.
- Howell noted that the PTA brings up a challenge and supplements the school with money with goals they want to pay for. She felt that the PTA at her school decided how they wanted to spend the money and wanted the school budget to be pieced around the PTA budget. She thought that strengthening the relationships and understanding between the PTAs and the SGCs needs to be worked on more. Rubber-stamping budgets doesn't allow for parents to have a voice or say how a budget is created. Rabinowitz asked how the survey process works with a rubber-stamp budget. She thought the SGCs suffered a bit and lost a lot due to the District's survey timeline and process this year. Will the district share data from the surveys? There was a discussion around what SGCs sent out a supplemental survey, and it was noted that timing made it difficult to develop a budget from the information, especially this year. It was noted that by the time they got data, it was hard to incorporate that into the budget. It was felt that budgets were being developed with old data, and things don't really change or shift. Are SGCs changing what they are doing or is it staying the same? Rabinowitz stated that things at her school pretty much stayed the same, but now that there is new leadership, there may be a shift. Budgets are presented, and there are no conversations about alternate suggestions or points of view. It was noted that there was some envy in looking at other school budgets and seeing the way they prioritized how they wanted to spend their money. How are their priorities so different and their analysis of what needed to happen at their school so different from theirs that they are able to come up with different programs, e.g. the arts that are not done at their school. If the district is dictating a lot of what is supposed to be done, why are there different budget interpretations? Paxson stated that she had been on the SGC at two schools. At one school, the principal brought in district staff to explain programs, and she felt that helped tremendously. There was more cohesion amongst the district and the school staff. The other school did not do that, and she noted that there was a feeling of concern and less collaboration between district and staff. Having district staff involved helps parents understand whether programs are mandated or not.
- Pastika noted that there was an issue at Jefferson with the bylaws regarding when the alternates could vote. Alternates are only voted in for one year while the SGC mem-

bers are voted in for two years. A clarification in the bylaws would be helpful because they could not find it anywhere. Beery stated that it is not in the district bylaws and every school is doing it differently. Pastika stated that item needed to be documented and knowing where to find it would be helpful, because it took three meetings to get an answer to that question when it should have been resolved in 10 minutes. Pastika stated that having the budget template would be helpful to have at the orientation again because she tried to get a copy of another school's SGC budget just to see how they were spending their money and could not get one. She stated that it would be helpful for the best practices to have a PTA-SGC liaison. Pastika stated regarding data, parents had been asking for a teacher list of priorities with a dollar amount so that there could be a discussion based on facts rather than being afraid to hurt other people's feelings, etc.

- Lazio stated that having the budget template would be useful in planning for the next Measure. She gave the example of seeing other schools needing more counseling services.

9. BSEP Measure Planning Update & Discussion

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director*

Nitschke provided the following handouts:

- *BSEP Measure Planning and New BSEP Measure*, (2) slides on a single page dated 6/2/15

Beery and Tay presented the committee members with an appreciation for their work this year.

Beery had the committee test the cell phone poll that she used for the BUSD Management Team to raise awareness of the BSEP Measure. This poll quizzed people on the history, budget, and various programs provided by the Measure.

Beery segued into describing how interwoven BSEP was into the District in many ways by paying for 1/3rd of the classroom teachers and things like the Library. She will be reporting that in terms of the current Measure, they are in good shape going into its 9th year. It has not been without challenges, and now there is the inclusion of the LCAP into the district-wide budget with BSEP. Most of the budgets are sustainable to the end of the Measure, but all of the resources are deficit spending, drawing upon their fund balance or other sources in order to sustain what needs to happen. The District is in a period of higher enrollment growth with higher associated costs with some programs. It is also a period of lower COLA increases, which is how the tax measure grows. That has been challenging as some of our expenses are outstripping revenues.

Beery was pleased to report to the Board that we have a P&O and SGCs that are very engaged. She noted that the P&O had a quorum every meeting this year. She will be speaking to the Board about priorities and raising BSEP awareness.

Beery stated that she will be presenting themes to the Board:

- Educational Priorities: create brief idea papers to have ready for the fall when there will be engagement with stakeholder groups;

- Fiscal Planning: Before we start launching into a wish list that BSEP might pay for, staff will see what various options might be, update costs and find possible options with legal consultation around the Measure, the impact of the Split Roll tax restructuring and what options are, models and projection for the General Fund/LCFF/Governor's Budget;
- Options for Public Process: creating town halls, seminars, workshops, voter polls, focus groups, participation to make informed decisions

Stein asked how the Soda Tax will be integrated and who will be the liaison to that group. Beery stated that there will be people that will be looking at that, but it is very new and they are just getting their first receipts. It looks like they will be doing well.

Beery presented the *BSEP Measure Planning and New BSEP Measure* overview slides, a map of how we get to November 2016. She stated the planning groups, groups that are not writing or planning the Measure per se, are work groups doing the ground work: fiscal modeling, educational priority outlines, and beginning to do some of the public process outlining. She hoped that the committee would weigh in on the public process as to what is effective in thinking about the SGCs, the PACs, the LCAP process or other processes people have been involved in. Some of the work will be done over the summer, and there will be seminars and workshops in the fall. There will be a presentation of idea papers in outline form to the Board in some of the general areas and updating them on some of the general ideas and challenges that we've seen in CSR, issues that have arisen in Libraries and using those as foundations for dialogues. We should be able to refine cost and rate structures and have them in place by November of next year so that we can plunge ahead in February or March of 2016 after discussions of best practices and priorities. It may be useful to do an initial voter poll by October because of the change in the Split Roll tax to test how the voters feel about the possibility of a tax increase and having that in hand so we can build some models. She noted finding a "thermometer" workshop exercise that groups could build budgets using costs for programs. There would be a voter poll refining things again. The group that did the polls conducted focus groups that went to every school to meet with the SGCs, various stakeholder groups and parent affinity groups. They summarized the focus groups very well, and that helped us build a poll. All that will be taken to the Board to make the decision on the proposed outline from the staff that will be holding all of this process. It has to be finalized by the Board in June, and that is when the public campaign happens. Anyone who works here cannot use staff time to work on it but can use their personal time to do so. Everybody else in the community who supports the schools and BSEP gets involved in campaigning for BSEP so that we are successful at the polls on November 8. At that point we are nearing the end of the Measure on June 2017, and we hope it passes in November of 2016 so that there is a new budget carrying us forward in June 2017. One of the unknowns, and what we will be working on is how long should the next Measure be? Things can change so much that we have to decide on a planning period that makes sense.

Lazio asked how someone can join a planning group. Beery stated that the P&O is its own group which can discuss all elements: Public Process, Educational Priorities and Fiscal Components. The other are primarily district staff providing data, incorporating

input, and feeding back to the Superintendent. The P&O subcommittees should also be meeting to discuss. All of this input comes eventually to the Board in the spring of 2016. Babitt had a BSEP awareness idea: pictures of student groups that would be graduating that year: BSEP Babies.

10. Election of Steering Committee

Co-chair Perez asked if there were 5 members of the committee who would volunteer to serve as members of the summer BSEP P&O Steering Committee, in addition to the Co-Chairs. The steering committee would be a 7-member committee. Beery confirmed that the Steering Committee's function would be to follow up on anything that needed to be discussed over the summer. No action would be taken and the Steering Committee would make a report to the full P&O Committee when it reconvenes in September of 2015.

MOTION CARRIED (Lazio/Howell): To approve the members of the **BSEP P&O Steering Committee which would include Co-chairs Perez and Simon, Shauna Rabinowitz, Laura Babitt, Christine Staples, Louise Harm, and Elisabeth Hensley. The motion was approved unanimously.**

11. For the Good of the Order

No comments were made.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:16 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support