

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

June 7, 2016

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

P&O Committee Members Present:

Bridget Bernhard, *Arts Magnet (Alt)*
Eric van Dusen, *Cragmont (Co)*
Dawn Paxson, *Emerson*
Shauna Rabinowitz, *Jefferson*
Danielle Perez, *John Muir (Co-Chair)*
Aaron Schiller, *Thousand Oaks (Co)*

Elisabeth Hensley, *King*
Bruce Simon, *King (co-Chair)*
Josh Irwin, *King (Alt)*
Aaron Glimme, *Berkeley High*
Christine Staples, *Berkeley High*
Louise Harm, *Independent Study*

P&O Committee Members Absent*:

Victoria Hritonenko, *Pre-K*
Robert Collier, *LeConte (Co)*
Deborah Simon-Weisberg, *LeConte (Co)*
Lily Howell, *Malcolm X*
Jontanika Battle, *Malcolm X (Alt)*
John Eknoian, *Oxford*
Molly Jo Alaimo, *Oxford (Alt)*
Laura Babitt, *Rosa Parks*
Monica Booth, *Rosa Parks (Alt)*
Weldon Bradstreet, *Rosa Parks (Alt)*

Catherine Huchting, *Willard*
Christine Meuris, *Willard*
John Lavine, *Berkeley High*
Catherine Lazio, *Berkeley High*
Milan Drake, *BHS (Alt)*
Floyd Finney, *BHS (Alt)*
Alecia Harger, *BHS (Alt)*
Brianna Rogers, *BHS (Alt)*
Ramal Lamar, *BTA*

**Alternates and co-reps are not marked absent if another rep is present. Currently, there is not representation from Washington Elementary and Longfellow Middle Schools.*

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

Donald Evans, *Superintendent*
Pete Gidlund, *District VAPA Supervisor*
Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*
Pat Saddler, *Director of Special Programs and Projects*

BSEP Staff:

Natasha Beery, *Director, BSEP and Community Relations*
Valerie Tay, *BSEP Program Specialist*
Linda Race, *BSEP Staff Support*

1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports

At 7:17 p.m. Co-chair Danielle Perez called the meeting to order by welcoming attendees and asking them to introduce themselves. They were asked to give brief site reports.

2. Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda

It was determined later in the meeting that 11 voting members were required for a quorum. The 11-member quorum was met. 12 P&O members were present at the meeting. The agenda was also moved forward.

3. Chairperson's Comments

Co-Chairs Danielle Perez and Bruce Simon

Perez and Simon gave an appreciation to the P&O members for attending the meetings this year. This meeting was the last of the year.

4. BSEP Directors Comments (previously item 4 on the Agenda)

Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations

Beery mentioned that she gave a BSEP Measure presentation at Willard the previous evening and will hold more information talks for schools and PTAs as requested.

Beery also noted that a BSEP Measure Campaign Kick-off was held and reported that it was well-attended.

5. Superintendent's Comments

Superintendent Evans stated that the District was near the end of negotiations with the classified union BCCE. The classification study will have an impact on BSEP as well as the General Fund. He will not have a report until the P&O reconvenes in the fall.

6. Approval of Minutes April 26, 2015

Approval of the minutes occurred later in the meeting. There was a brief review allowed for the May 24, 2015 P&O Committee Meeting minutes.

MOTION CARRIED (Hensley/Glimme): To approve the meeting minutes of the May 24, 2015 P&O Committee Meeting as written. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

7. Public Comment

No public comments were made.

8. District Vision – LCAP, BSEP and Educational Priorities

Donald Evans, Superintendent, Pat Saddler, Director of Special Programs and Projects and Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations

Evans, Saddler and Beery provided the following handouts:

- *LCAP and BSEP Working Together Toward Priority Goals and Draft P2 ADA LCAP Budget Version 14: 6/7/2016*
- *BSEP and Student Support*
- *Single Plan for Student Achievement, Emerson School 2016-2017 PowerPoint slide document dated 5/4/16*

Evans stated that the strategic plan had not been updated since the last well-developed comprehensive plan in 2013. The District did adopt the 2020 Vision, which then rolled into the LCAP goals. The three goals are to:

- Provide a high quality classroom curriculum that promotes college and career readiness with academic interventions to eliminate barriers to success.
- End the racial predictability of academic achievement by ensuring that all systems are culturally and linguistically responsive to the needs of our students.
- To ensure all school sites have safe, welcoming, and inclusive climates for all students and their families so that all students are ready to learn.

Those three goals encapsulate the mission and vision, which are the 4 E's of Excellence, Enrichment, Engagement, and Equity. The new Measure also takes into consideration high quality instruction, the essentials for excellence, and support for systems. The District has identified items paid out of LCAP and what BSEP contributes to help meet those goals.

Saddler reviewed and explained the *LCAP and BSEP Working Together Toward Priority Goals*. Beery passed out the *BSEP and Student Support* and reviewed that with the committee. She mentioned it included the BHS school site funding and programs. Beery noted that people want to understand how the LCAP goals and BSEP fit together. Beery added that a joint meeting with the P&O and the LCAP PAC should happen next year. Questions and responses:

- Rabinowitz attended a BHS meeting and noted that people did not know what AVID and BRIDGE were and how to be involved with them. Adding that she thought Science Saturdays were for everyone, she noted that more education and publicity needed to be done around these programs. Saddler responded that AVID was originally designed for first-generation college-bound students who were referred based upon academic promise. Over time, AVID was broadened to include interested students and “under-represented at college” students. She explained that there were several AVID models and hoped it would be offered across the District in a broader way. Students at the 8th grade level can apply through their academic counselor.
- Super Science Saturday is offered to students that struggle in Math. They are referred to the program (as a targeted student population.) This was the third year of implementation and includes all elementary schools.
- The BHS BRIDGE program is a 7th period program that offers academic support and focus on college preparedness. Saddler noted that data shows the success of the program. The Middle School BRIDGE program was developed to help accelerate African-American students. The students were pre-identified in 5th grade, but there was really no model for the program. Teachers were hired to work with students after school but noted that difficulties arose with students having other afterschool activities or parents wanting their students to be at home. With a lack of consistency in attendance, the District did not see the outcomes they were hoping to see. One site that had the same teacher for all years of the program did have more impressive GPAs and student outcome data. Other sites were more difficult to staff. A recommendation for next year is to only have a 6th grade program that will help with the transition from 5th to 6th grade. There will be other vehicles for support and monitoring of 7th and 8th graders.
- Harm mentioned that she was curious to know how to get the Independent Study (IS) students into these support programs, e.g., high school BRIDGE. Since IS are “hidden” in some ways, it takes a certain amount of advocacy to make sure its students are served. Scuderi said that the program leads work directly with the middle school counselors to identify students. Harm stated that some of their students come to IS from other middle schools, and Scuderi confirmed the difficulty of running them through BUSD screens and obtaining transcripts when they transfer in. He added that recommendations often come later. He noted that he could have the program staff reach out and that Vision 2020 looks for students receiving free & reduced lunch and first-generation college-bound. Staples stated that there were often not enough spots in the program to serve all the eligible students. Staples noted

that Rabinowitz's comment about communication needs bears more consideration/conversation.

- Saddler will send Beery information about how many students are being served by each of the programs, as well as their effectiveness, to distribute to the P&O members.
- Hensley asked what percentage of 9th graders were not coming from BUSD middle schools, and Nitschke noted that number has been declining. Scuderi noted that it was roughly 125 to 150 students in the last 5 to 7 years. Hensley added that the District loses fewer students transitioning to high school than other districts.
- Evans confirmed that statewide, many districts have adopted LCAP goals as their strategic plan, and he sees BUSD doing the same. Evans stated that they have already evaluated all of the programs for the Board. There is a Board document that could be shared with the committee. Saddler added that programs are evaluated twice a year: mid-year and then again in August or September. D'Angelo does a complete analysis of all of the LCAP-funded actions and services. That information is presented at the first or second board meeting. They are changing the middle school BRIDGE program as mentioned and Restorative Practices will have its own Restorative Justice counselor for all the middle schools.
- Saddler stated that she could be emailed with questions about LCAP.
- Simon noted that it was striking to him how site funds were being spent to provide some of these programs, such as RtI², Literacy Coaches, and behavioral and mental health support.
- Saddler asked for principals to share the key things they were investing in with the support of the SGCs and alignment to the LCAP goals. She brought as example the *Single Plan for Student Achievement, Emerson School 2016-2017 PowerPoint slide document dated 5/4/16*. The presentations varied based on the services at the schools or what principals might be moving forward. These will be attached to each site plan. She noted that last year, the principals found aligning the SGC process with the LCAP goals more challenging and year easier. Scuderi added that they were able to give principals more direction with staffing. Saddler also stated that they looking at data and moving into more accountability. Simon noted that it can be difficult to draw a direct line between something like counseling and student achievement.
- Paxson asked if there were enough funds to do the RtI² tiers and resources for the students. Saddler responded that would be part of the conversation around Special Ed and needs assessment that would happen in the fall. She felt it was important that students receive the required minutes by law and that it was not a "one size fits all." The program was evolving. Scuderi stated that it was really about getting help during classroom instruction. Next year, the District may adopt a universal reading and writing program to get some coherence and calibration across the curriculum.
- Irwin wanted to understand how much discretion principals had to allocate their LCAP funds and what was the role of the SGCs with respect to influence and oversight of these funds. Saddler said that LCAP was targeted money and the principals do not have discretion over that.

9. Consolidated School Plans for FY 2016-17

Valerie Tay, BSEP Program Specialist

Tay provided the following handouts:

- *Memo to BSEP Planning and Oversight Committee, from Natasha Beery, Director of BSEP and Community Relations and Pat Saddler, Director of Programs and special Projects, dated June 7, 2016, for the 2016-2017 Single Plans for Student Achievement*
- *BSEP Site Discretionary Fund Multi-Year Comparison*

Tay passed out the above-mentioned documents. She noted that the reserves were dwindling and a lot of the sites had to be creative about how they paid for programs they had been providing for a long time. She felt that it was helpful that LCAP was covering counseling and other services.

Questions and responses:

- Tay said that a lot of important work happens at budget meetings. The principals work with the budget analysts and receive guidance on such things as how to fund TSAs and coaches. Sites have all kinds of different models, because each wants to use their teachers to their greatest potential. The site plans have a funding summary that will be provided next year in the Site Handbooks that will show positions that are multi-funded (BSEP, LCAP, Title I). Paxson stated that the Emerson principal was good at explaining positions to their SGC that made it helpful and clear for the SGC parents. Tay added that parents' experiences vary widely depending on the site and felt that roundtables were good for helping SGC parents to feel more engaged in the process of putting their plan together. Van Dusen stated that it was good to hear Paxson's views because he felt there was a lot of human potential that was being squandered in this "moderately opaque process."
- Hensley stated that since we all have the same/shared goals, there was a lot of alignment between what the District was trying to do from a central position and what the sites were trying to focus on. She loved seeing the multi-year comparison with the different kinds of expenses. It might be helpful to see a column added on to see what was added or dropped. Tay stated that they did have these and could send them out to the Committee members. Nitschke stated that it was one of the things that they struggled with: how to bring enough information to people without overwhelming the "newbies." He thought it was important that people were attending the meetings and reading the information carefully, and he appreciated that they waded through the information and moved from "newbie" to more advanced levels.
- Paxson stated that it was helpful to understand how whole positions were funded. The PTA was the "last catch" for what sites want to do. Tay noted that the PTA funding was added to plans, but she was not sure how complete the information is.
- Hensley thought there would be some value to having the plan summaries for all the schools at the individual school's SGC meetings. A look at where funding begins could provide a foundation for further conversation. It could be a framework for understanding why things were the way they were but also to look at other options. Simon added that how the SGCs were structured was discussed in the last meeting and suggested a review of the previous meeting minutes.
- Staples thought that Hensley's comments related back to the mention of "silos" in the district and finally aligning the curriculum at each of the schools. It was wild for each school to be reinventing the wheel for SGCs and the curriculum, instead of sharing information and going for a more commonality. She noted that seeing the budgets of each school gave insight as to how they budgeted programs. Harm added

that last year it was good to look at the site plans with the PTA budgets and whatever they can raise, which starts to show a very different picture about particular elementary schools in the district. She felt it would be valuable to have an equitable conversation at the beginning of next year about where money was coming from to inform parents that are sitting on these committees. Rabinowitz disagreed that the document showed the complete picture with the partial FTEs as listed. She thought it would be good to know more about how positions were funded. Rabinowitz also added that it would be good to have the binders before the big SGC meeting.

- Rabinowitz thought that in regards to the surveys, each school had been addressing their individual needs. With the new District survey, she felt that there was more rubberstamping as the district survey doesn't relate to the expenditures. Why would anyone want to be on these committees anymore if people aren't necessarily involved in making decisions? Glimme's response was that there was a big difference between making sure funds were spent in accordance with the measure and deciding how the funds are spent. He noted that a big part of the job was oversight.
- It was noted that the name School Governance Council was misleading. Irwin also noted that the cohort/Vice-Principal model at King was entrenched and used about \$115K out of \$240K of BSEP funds. He felt that the funding at his school site was interlocking and might not be able to be changed. He also agreed with Rabinowitz that the discretion should reflect the school. He did not feel what was done at the sites was really "governance." Perez also agreed that the messaging and recruitment for parents may need to be looked at, to reflect that how the money would be spent was not actually what happened. Changing the SGC name back to School Site Council could clear things up. Beery stated that there was a variation of that at BHS where there was a "BSEP Committee" and a separate Site Council (which has struggled for years with its purpose). It was noted that because of the existence of the SGCs and the P&O, budget managers know they have to be accountable.
- Simon noted that not all expenditures are the same, and they become institutionalized over time. He has seen funding shifts, and if the SGCs wanted to take that on, it would take a lot of evidence gathering and a lot of talking to the teachers and the families as well as a lot of convincing.
- Gidlund added that he had concerns about discretionary site funds, specifically that SGCs and school site planning conflicts with the District HR timeline for the year. In February, managers have a deadline to tell employees about FTE change, but then changes in site-funded FTE may arise in April/May during the site plan process. Because his plan and budget has already been approved by the P&O Committee, he must then scramble for ways to keep an employee "whole." Glimme noted this was not the first time this issue has come up at P&O meetings. There needs to be clarity around the timeline changes that needs to be in place. There was very little clarity about this.
- Gidlund had concerns about high school BSEP discretionary funds being known as "grants." This adds to the confusion with respect to identifying/messaging/imaging BSEP. Teachers write a proposal and are "granted" money. Glimme noted that the BHS BSEP Committee "funded" proposals. Harm stated that IS also gets messages that use the word "grant."

10. Roundtable: Best Practices for Site Funds and Committees

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Noting that the site plan review had already rolled into this discussion, Beery added that the Board approved the new measure and resolution to put it on the ballot. The next step is for it to go to the Alameda County Office of Education for sign off. From there, it will go to the Alameda County Registrar of Voters where it will live until August. Arguments for and against the measure will be made by August 12th. The campaign will handle the rebuttal. In terms of P&O, it will be looking at the reports for the 2015-16 year and be getting ready for the next year around the time the new measure goes for a vote.

11. Election of Steering Committee

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

The following people volunteered to be on the Steering Committee over the summer: Perez, Simon, Glimme, Rabinowitz and Irwin.

MOTION CARRIED (Harm/Paxson) To approve the above-mentioned volunteers to constitute a Steering Committee. **The motion was unanimously approved.**

12. For the Good of the Order and Celebration of the Year

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Beery provided the following handouts:

- *BSEP Gratitude to the P&O Class of 2015-16, with BSEP anthem*

Beery acknowledged and thanked the committee and staff for their work on the committee this year.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:12 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support

