

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 28, 2017

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

P&O Committee Members Present:

Bridget Bernhard, *Arts Magnet (Alt)*
Dawn Paxson, *Emerson*
Terry Pastika, *Jefferson*
Danielle Perez, *John Muir (co-Chair)*
Alex Makler, *Malcolm X*
Carla Bryant, *Oxford (Alt)*
Weldon Bradstreet, *Rosa Parks*
Aaron Schiller, *Thousand Oaks (Co)*

Stephanie Upp, *Washington*
Bruce Simon, *King (co-Chair)*
Bethany Schoenfeld, *Longfellow*
Laura Cho, *Willard*
Jose Luis Bedolla, *Berkeley High*
Aaron Glimme, *Berkeley High*
Christina Balch, *Independent Study*

P&O Committee Members Absent*:

Rashay Lankford, *Pre-K*
Martin De Mucha Flores, *Cragmont (Co)*
Eric van Dusen, *Cragmont (Co)*
Victoria Hritonenko, *Cragmont (Co)*
Byron Pakter, *LeConte*

Silvia Torres, *LeConte (Alt)*
Shauna Rabinowitz, *King*
Catherine Huchting, *Willard*
Josh Irwin, *Berkeley High*

**Alternates and co-reps are not marked absent if another rep is present. Currently there is not representation from BTA.*

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

Cathy Campbell, *Berkeley Federation of Teachers*
Donald Evans, Ed.D, *Superintendent*
Mary Ann Scheuer, *TSA/Elementary Teacher Librarian*
Pasquale Scuderi, *Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services*
Michelle Sinclair, *Coordinator of Professional Development*

BSEP Staff:

Natasha Beery, *Director, BSEP and Community Relations*
Linda Race, *BSEP Staff Support*

1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports

At 7:15 p.m. Co-chair Perez called the meeting to order by welcoming attendees and asking them to introduce themselves. SGC site reports were given as part of the introductions.

2. Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda

The quorum was approved with 15 voting members present. 12 voting members were required for a quorum.

MOTION CARRIED (Paxson/Glimme): To approve the agenda of the February 28, 2017 P&O Committee Meeting. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

3. Chairperson's Comments

Co-Chairs Danielle Perez and Bruce Simon

There was a reminder to contribute to the snack fund.

Simon commented that if new members wanted to know more information, the meaning of acronyms, how the P&O works/what P&O responsibilities are, they should refer questions to him, Beery or reply to Perez's email to new members. An acronym sheet was also available on the sign-in table at every meeting.

Beery added that new members were typically given a mini-orientation in November, and she passed out to new members an orientation handout packet (digital copy available-) from it. Perez stated that in addition to coming early to get answers to their P&O questions, they could stay after to do the same.

4. BSEP Director's Comments

Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations

Beery provided the following handout at the sign-in table:

• *Resolution 16-050 Before the Board of Education of the Berkeley Unified School District, Resolution of the Board of Education of the Berkeley Unified School District of the County of Alameda, State of California, Calling an Election for Approval of an Education Parcel Tax, Establishing Specifications of the Election Order, and Requesting Consolidation with Other Elections Occurring on November 8, 2016 (Measure E1 language)*

Beery provided the Measure E1 handout as listed above.

She noted that the principals would be getting their allocations on March 1st, showing that most schools would be getting a little more in BSEP site funds than they did last year.

Beery noted that she would be less available for immediate communications due to her daytime jury duty service. If members cannot reach her directly please contact Valerie Tay, BSEP Program Specialist at valerietay@berkeley.net.

She added that the Communications and Community Relations team was also very busy responding to what was coming down from the federal level, regarding immigrant students and families and transgender students.

5. Superintendent's Report

Donald Evans, Ed.D.

Evans noted that at the next School Board meeting to be held Wednesday, March 8, 2017, the items to be discussed are the Second Interim report, budget projections, and afterschool programs. School Board meetings are held twice a month and are listed at <http://www.berkeleyschools.net/schoolboard/board-meeting-information>.

6. Approval of Minutes February 7, 2016

There was a brief review allowed for the February 7, 2017 P&O Committee Meeting minutes. Perez noted that members did not have to be present at the meeting to approve the minutes. She added that everyone has a chance to review the minutes, make necessary changes and if the minutes are correct enough to be entered into the public record, they could vote to approve the minutes.

Makler noted that he had not received the necessary materials because of an incorrect email address. He submitted a correction, and Beery noted that information or corrections can also be sent to bsep@berkeley.net.

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Bradstreet): To approve the meeting minutes of the February 7, 2017 P&O Committee Meeting. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

7. Public Comment

Paxson commented on the District's Preschool Special Education program. She noted that she was aware that the Preschool Special Ed classrooms were full and that some kids were not currently getting those services.

8. Superintendent's Budget Advisory Committee (SBAC) Rep

Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations

Perez noted that at the last P&O meeting, Martin De Mucha Flores volunteered to be an SBAC representative, and that it is usually better to have at least two representatives and an alternate. She asked if anyone else was interested in going to the SBAC meetings.

Simon stated that the SBAC came about a couple of years ago during times of financial challenges in the District. The SBAC is comprised of union, P&O, PAC, PTA, and BHS Development Group members as well as a few other individuals appointed by the Superintendent. Factors that will have an impact on the budget will be increases in enrollment, increases in teacher/other employee benefits, projected declines in the state budget, and lower adjustments in the District budget over the next two years. He stated this was an opportunity to sit with a group of people to have substantial discussions about where those budget cuts should come from. Simon added that he attended his first SBAC meeting prior to the P&O meeting and found it very interesting. He noted the upcoming SBAC meeting schedule and that March 14, 2017 was the next meeting. He stated that Deputy Superintendent Cleveland wanted SBAC reps to commit for a couple of years because the decisions were complex and continuity would help with the learning curve. Simon stated that he volunteered for this evening's SBAC and could stay on, but would like to have another person as a permanent rep or alternate.

Paxson said that if anyone was interested in being an SBAC rep, she would strongly recommend it. She thought it was a great way to get a whole understanding of the District budget. She had attended SBAC meetings periodically as a guest and encouraged people to keep that in mind as an option.

Evans said that the SBAC reps also make recommendations for him to take to the Board. Perez confirmed that the SBAC reps would give an update to the P&O about the SBAC meetings.

Stephanie Upp volunteered to be a rep or an alternate.

MOTION CARRIED (Perez/Glimme): To approve the nomination of Stephanie Upp as a P&O Committee co-rep to the SBAC. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

9. Measure E1 and Class Size Funds & "Teacher Template"

Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations

Pauline Follansbee, Director of Fiscal Services (unable to attend the meeting)

Beery provided the following handouts:

- *Teacher Template: Background by Pauline Follansbee, Director of Fiscal Services*
- *Berkeley Unified School District Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document, Example for Measure A to Measure E Transition (1page-yellow and gray bars)*
- *Berkeley Unified School District Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document, Example for Measure A to Measure E Transition (2 pages-yellow and blue bars)*

Beery stated that she would be standing in for Follansbee to present the Teacher Template information. The Teacher Template was used to determine how much money it would take to meet the largest segment of the BSEP budget, which was Class Size Reduction. BSEP CSR pays for teachers, substitute teachers and classrooms. The Teacher Template is the way they

calculate how they staff classrooms, how many teachers BSEP needs to pay for in addition to what the General Fund/GF pays for to attain the class sizes averages.

Beery referred to the *Berkeley Unified School District Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document, Example for Measure A to Measure E Transition (1 page-yellow and gray bars)* which focused on the elementary schools. She noted that Staffing Enrollment by Grade referred to the current school year (the last year of Measure A) and the yellow highlights represent areas of transition to the new Measure E1.

For instance, under Measure A, if Grade 3 has an enrollment of 768 students, it would receive 22.59 FTE for 34:1 from the GF base funding and then the calculation would be made for the BSEP contribution for 15.81 FTE to get the class size down to 20:1. She noted the smaller numbers below the FTE calculations were to allow for contractual prep-time release teachers.

Questions and responses:

- Beery confirmed that new kids come in at the Kindergarten level as well as into other grades from Berkeley residents whose children had been enrolled out of District (parochial or independent schools).
- The District has a process for re-enrollment at the middle school and high school levels for continuing students. Inter-district permits are an option if there is room.
- Simon added that information from the SBAC meeting was that attendance dropped about 150 students from last year to this year and noted that sometimes there were “bubbles” of kids moving in and out of the District.
- Beery confirmed that LCAP supplemental funding does not have anything to do with class size, but the LCAP base fund contributes to the GF base funding and BSEP provides the funding for reducing class sizes from the GF contribution.
- Beery confirmed that the GF (money from the state) pays for 34:1. Glimme stated that that number has fluctuated over time depending on what money is coming from the state. The number has been as high as 38:1 and he had not seen it lower than 34:1. He noted that number was an arbitrary number from the District that could be changed. Glimme added there was a mandate from the state regarding class size but it was higher than 34:1.
- Simon stated that the class size reduction number was what was written in the BSEP measure about what class size averages were the target. It has shifted over the years depending on a lot of things.

Beery passed out the *Berkeley Unified School District Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document, Example for Measure A to Measure E Transition (2 pages-yellow and blue bars)*. She noted this represented the FY 2016-17. The items highlighted in yellow would be immediately or over time adjusted with Measure E1. One of the changes in E1 was that the class size in Elementary schools would need adjusting. She noted that the inherited CSR for K-3/20:1 and grades 4-5/26:1 created various challenges for sites. Under Measure E1, the District will be re-balancing class sizes for an elementary school-wide average of 23:1 to be done by grade over time. Beery noted the 1986 BSEP Measure allowed for an elementary class size goal of 25 or 26:1. It became 20:1 for K-3 in the early ‘90s when there was a special fund set up by the state to reward districts that could do that. That fund has since changed its goals to 24:1. We are now attempting to beat the state goal by maintaining 23:1 and expand that beyond K-3 to K-5. BSEP Middle school and high school class size goals did not change, at 28:1.

Beery noted that on the back of the *Berkeley Unified School District Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document, Example for Measure A to Measure E Transition (2 pages-yellow and blue bars)* was the Grand Total of \$14,611,300 in BSEP funds to be transferred to the GF

for CSR teachers. What is left over after meeting class size goals constitutes what is often called “Page 2” of the CSR budget, which under Measure A was Middle School Counseling, Expanded Course Offerings/ECO (more teachers before and after the school day for middle school and high school), and Program Support. Highlighted in yellow is the new Measure E1 “Page 2” that would include ECO, Professional Development, Program Evaluation, and Classroom Support. All of these items fall under the general concept of “Support for Teaching.”

Note: “FTE Ave Compensation” is the calculated Average compensation and includes wages, benefits and pension contributions. Direct Support was a direct cost for more classrooms and services for smaller classes.

Questions and responses:

- In response to a question about pension funding, Beery confirmed the state was making incremental progress toward funding that. Contributions are made by the District, and Glimme noted there was a California State retirement system set by the state, a California State Teachers’ Retirement System/CalSTRS (certificated staff), and California Public Employee Retirement System/CalPERS. Costs to districts and employees have been going up. Campbell added that the employer’s contribution was going up 8.25% of every dollar of payroll to 19% over a 6-year period. It is having a very significant impact across the state. It is a mandated cost and impacts every other part of the budget including compensation. The rate for newer employee contributions has been raised, so they will be paying more starting next year. All employees have been paying more in the last two years.
- Beery responded to how and when the “Page 2”/discretionary money will be spent by stating that there was a sequence to presenting all the BSEP preliminary budgets between now and April. The CSR budget is the largest budget and is presented first. Ordinarily the proposal for “Page 2” was presented as part of the CSR budget. Since there will be a transition from Measure A to E1, the sequence may change. The Teacher Template will be discussed at the next P&O meeting, and there may an initial budget for those secondary purposes. Pastika asked what the flow of communications is for what site discretionary monies and District monies are spent on the same categories, using the example of RtI². The SGCs would like to know if they didn’t need to put money there because they would know money was coming from the District. Beery stated that for the next meeting, the plan was to discuss Support for Students, which included RtI² and Lit Coaches. Pastika added that SGC site funds were being dedicated to LCAP goals. Beery noted that Pat Saddler, Director of Special Projects and Programs will be attending the next meeting to give an overview of where things are headed with the LCAP Supplemental Funds.

10. FY 17-18 Plan: CSR and Support for Teaching

Pasquale Scuderi, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services

Scuderi provided the following handouts:

- *Class Size Reduction and Support for Teaching (BSEP Measure E1, Resource 0841), Plan Overview: FY 2016-17*
- *Core Professional Learning Targets, BUSD Educational Services Division (3-pages) with attachments: A New Vision for Science Education and Common Core and NGSS 15-16 Through 19-20*

Scuderi passed out the above handouts. The *Class Size Reduction and Support for Teaching (BSEP Measure E1, Resource 0841), Plan Overview: FY 2016-17* will give a narrative of the goals and aims of CSR. He stated that their Department supports teachers in

creating the educational experiences for kids that would lead to great outcomes. Scuderi pointed to Expanded Course Offerings/ECO (page 2), which was primarily at the secondary school level to provide funds for science labs, yearbook and music classes and other additional experiences for students. He did not anticipate a significant shift in ECO, but noted as they moved forward with both Student Support and other areas in Measure E1, whether there were ways to support the redesign of the 9th grade at BHS. That was a major structural shift that was being proposed to take place in the 2018-19 school year. They made a preliminary presentation, and the Board will have to approve it in June in order for that to happen. They will be looking for ways, in accordance with the Measure, to direct some supports to that effort. It looks like there will be \$500K-600K to fund it in its current form.

Scuderi moved on to Professional Development and introduced Michelle Sinclair, Coordinator of Professional Development. He referred to the handout *Core Professional Learning Targets, BUSD Educational Services Division (3-pages) with attachments: A New Vision for Science Education and Common Core and NGSS 15-16 Through 19-20* as a document that would give an idea of all the areas where they were trying to build capacity with teachers. He noted that over time, he hoped to broaden the goals into all areas they were working in. Scuderi added that the list, although numbered, was not hierarchical or did not indicate what was more important. The document also listed things that still needed some development. He added that the last page of the handout provided a two-year look at what GF monies were designated and spent to support the implementation of the Common Core/CC, Next Generation Science Standards/NGSS and some Instructional Technology efforts. He was currently developing a three to five year framework with that money and felt that not as much BSEP money would be required for those areas. The P&O member and others have asked for an idea of what other funds were provided for professional learning and support for teachers, to get a more global look at our investment. Scuderi noted that there were high expectations put on educators, classroom teachers and principals to provide support to students.

Scuderi stated that he could provide more details on Common Core and will return with a more specific budget. It will contain CC information and expenditures in Professional Development, which he didn't anticipate would change dramatically. The Coordinator was partly funded out of Professional Learning and money for Culturally Responsive workshops. The K-5 Lead Lit Coach and Lit Coaches are partly funded by CSR Student Support.

Questions and responses:

- Paxson was glad to see a bullet point for General Education support for students with special needs under item 6. *Additional Areas Needing Continued Development and Capacity Building*. She was interested in seeing where that might come up in the various budgets. This was an issue for parents and the PTA. Scuderi confirmed that the Math Teacher Leaders were part of the PD budget historically but would be reconfigured under Measure E1.
- Bryant wanted to know what was coming next for Program Evaluation and what was the District evaluating? What was the end game? How did it relate to “informed decisions?” Beery responded that each specific program (PD and Evaluation) would come with its own narrative and budget goals. Scuderi added that it was a good question, specifically about what the investments would yield, for culturally responsive classrooms for instance. The hope is to see some of the negative disproportionate outcomes that have been seen in our classrooms improve, not only with academic markers, but disparities in attendance and disciplinary referrals. If we create classrooms that are more welcoming, more cognizant of what it takes to engage students, that we see improvements in behavioral and academic markers in a generalized way, our hope would be to chip away at those race-based outcomes.

- Schiller noted there was a jump in science spending and would that number stay constant, or was it an investment that would go down in later years? Scuderi noted they were implementation costs from Mandated Cost Reimbursements/MCR received from the state. Portions of the MCR were designated to support the implementation of Common Core and NGSS. He noted the District invested heavily in literacy over the past few years and was now trying to balance that out with various budgets to equalize an investment in Math. All along it was planned that the third or fourth year of Common Core support could help ramp up Science. They are going to propose an increase in the science expenditure for 2017-18 to support changes in the core sequence of science in grades 9-12, especially for the 9th grade beginning class, to align more effectively with what students are doing in their Math 1 class and add a conceptual Physics class. There will be a big bump in investment with that pilot in 2017-18. Proposed full implementation would occur in 2018-19 concurrent with the new 9th grade program. Science will be a big focus with these investments in the proposed 2017-18 budget.

Questions and responses:

- Bedolla commended Scuderi with what they are doing with not too much money, but he noted that what was spent on math and science was not nearly enough, and following Bryant's comments on the differences in outcomes, that they were bringing down the scores of the entire District. He thought that this was something that should not be addressed on the edges and stressed that more needed to be done.
- Paxson thought that there was a wider range of kids who struggled in math in comparison to language arts, not just a predictable group. She added that you see that when you sit in your SGCs in the middle schools and then going from the middle school SGCs into looking at high school. The issue with science stems from these math problems. She was excited to hear about changing curriculum and hoped it would start in middle schools. She would like to see more math support for math and science.
- Scuderi confirmed that the General Fund supported the CC and NGSS. Pastika asked when the budgets are planned and monies allocated, whether they make assumptions based on what other pots of money are contributing to the same things, e.g. Professional Learning. Was one of those pots the SGCs? Scuderi said no, but there were isolated agreements for things like Lit Coaches where the District contributes 75% funding per elementary site and the sites 20-25%. With CC, budgets have been made in tandem with what was proposed or existed previously in the BSEP contribution. For example, having key leadership positions funded by BSEP allowed more for line items for teachers. There were not a lot of materials costs in the CC budget because state lottery funds allowed for the purchase of instructional materials.
- Simon stated that he was glad to hear about equalized spending on professional development for mathematics. In terms of overall spending for things like Lit Coaches at every school and one Lit Coach for the entire district for K-5, it's nowhere near equal. He thought CC mathematics was substantively different from previous mathematics curriculum than CC literacy was from previous. Further, he felt the challenges for mathematics began in elementary school and that we needed to make an investment for those kids starting at the very beginning of their schooling, or we would continue to see problems. Scuderi responded that he agreed that developmentally the gap needed to be addressed early on. He wanted people to realize that for 9th grade, they were making unprecedented investments in teacher and curriculum development and peer support around mathematics. \$200K/year was spent over the last two years and essentially bought a collaboration period for math teachers to not only develop the new curriculum together but to be in each others classrooms supporting struggling students and watching each others practice. That was an example of a place where a respectable investment is being

made. . It also has to be understood that teachers have limits to their bandwidth in how much they can develop all at once in multiple subjects. It may require some kind of dramatic structural move in terms of what we emphasize, literacy vs. mathematics. Scuderi did not disagree that we needed to invest in math more. It was felt that literacy was the gatekeeper in multiple subjects for kids as they progressed through grades K-12. It didn't mean the math concerns weren't legitimate.

- Makler asked what's the "extent of the universe?" Scuderi responded that CC was the lion's share of the budget, and a missing piece was the expenditures from the LCAP supplemental budget, which largely funds Math Coaches or the high school Math Design Collaborative (designated coaching). LCAP provides block grants to augment what was being done in Professional Learning.
- Makler also asked, apples to oranges, are the programs fundamentally different or are these different categories? He also asked if the Middle School math class size reduction was equivalent to a Lead Literacy Coach? Scuderi stated they were fundamentally different. The investment in smaller class sizes for math is being continued to help struggling students. At the end of the last measure, that was happening concurrent with the development of this budget, and the decision was made to carry it through. That was different than some of the other line items for teacher collaboration, external consultants and costs for teacher time during and after the work day, which were rolled into the costs.
- In response to Bryant's comment about not being able to see the bigger picture around funding and context/content, Scuderi said that the BSEP and CC budgets constitute about 90% of the funding, with smaller contributions coming from LCAP. It was an overview and he could return and show how all the pieces were connected together.
- Cathy Campbell, BFT, commented that the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program was required by law and funded by one of the smaller funds in the GF.
- A suggestion was made to have a document that listed the topic on one side and the funding (BSEP, LCAP, Block Grant) next to it.
- Bedolla asked how PD compares with other cities around here? Do we do more or less, where do we fit? Sinclair responded that we were pretty equivalent, and maybe we do a little bit more. She noted that other districts call to ask about PD programs because they are just beginning to think about it. We've been doing things like the Teacher's College Reading and Writing Project for six years and math for three. We are a little bit ahead of the game but limited by the amount of days we can pull teachers out for PD days, and that was always an issue. Bedolla noted that it was hard to judge things because he had no data to compare and stated that it would be useful to see more data. It would be interesting to see and compare whether other programs were doing better with minorities, comparing spending levels and how we stack up. Sinclair commented on how much of the PD that was being done is done in other districts in much the same way.

Glimme noted that care needed to be taken around analyzing data with data from other Districts. He added that it would take a tremendous amount of staff time to analyze other district budgets and to figure out how they're spending money. We could look at higher level/state level results. Glimme emphasized that this Committee was to analyze how Measure money is being spent, that this purpose and function was written into the statute. He thought it was good to see how money was being spent in the context of what was being done in the broader District, but this committee's charge is more narrow. If we broaden out too much, then we are not doing the task outlined in the statute. Perez noted that the SBAC was where the budget for the entire District was taken on, whereas the P&O was specifically to review the tax money. Bryant thought investment meant "value added" and asked how we would measure that. Glimme responded that would be difficult to measure. He read from the *Berkeley Public Schools Educational Excellence Act of*

2006, Measure A, Section 5. Accountability Provisions, Part B Participation in Planning and Oversight of Special Tax Funds, item i. District-wide Committee (page BSM7 of Overview and Bylaws Section):

“A District-wide Planning and Oversight Committee, composed of parents/guardians, staff members, students, residents, or community members representing all school sites, shall be established to be advisory to the District, and, in accordance with bylaws adopted by the Board of Education, shall:

- Present recommendations to the Board of Education about the annual expenditure plans for the revenue generated by this Measure;
- Provide communication among school sites to enhance their effective use of the revenues provided by this Measure; and,
- Review District compliance with the terms of this Measure”

Bryant noted that all these measures, such as CSR, should increase the likelihood that the children are academically successful. If we are doing things like adding more PD for science and math, are we being effective? If we are investing in the tools to help children become academically successful, were they working? What she was hearing was that it was difficult to measure effectiveness, to tell if something is working. She assumed if we were measuring effectiveness that we would see it. Sinclair responded that they asked themselves that question every day. They were constantly analyzing their department and budget, and thinking about whether they were spending the money in the right place and seeing improvement. She noted it was difficult to measure because it was very nuanced. – Although these students had this curriculum for how many years, was it being done to its full effect? Were the teachers doing all the components of the program and if not, did they need more PD for that? Over the past few years, they had been honing in on the components of the programs, whether the teachers were doing it fully, what they needed to do better, and whether they were seeing improvements. Scuderi added that it was very challenging to look at a set of student academic challenges and know whether it was the PD that caused the gain or loss. When Scuderi looked at data outcomes and had to dig deeper with students that were not succeeding, there were a lot of different factors that may or may not be contributing to their success or failure (economics, attendance, instruction). One of the ways to get to Bryant’s question of value added was to get tighter on a fewer set of intervals on the K-12 continuum and dive deep. What we were going to see as failure or a lack of success for kids had so many different factors that when we look at PD, what we put our resources into, we try to approach it in an aggregate way for all the possibilities, and that was not always being precise. Scuderi thought that the District could augment systems for what they are proposing at the high school and what the RtI² coordination service teams are doing at the K-5s. They were a set of professionals looking at kids and getting data and information that’s far more formative and can respond to in far more effective ways than what we do when we come back and say our math scores were X, so our math curriculum must not be working. What their Department is trying to do is create a set of investments that build capacity and competencies in teachers. Was it school climate, a lack of cultural responsiveness in the classroom? Was it the math instruction itself? Was it the lack of collaboration time for teachers? We tried to address these questions in a composite way, because it’s difficult to ascertain what all the factors are preventing kids from succeeding.

• Paxson appreciated Scuderi going over the RtI² coordination of service teams and noted that since they repeatedly deal with the students’ issues, they can understand and pinpoint different pieces. As a parent, she also appreciated getting information about the various funding pieces and other questions that needed to be asked.

- Perez thought it was good to have both sides of the discussion they just had. In looking at the bylaws, there was the wording “enhance the effective use” that was pertinent to the Committee’s charge, but it was also very clear that they needed to stick to the Measure as it was written. She stated it was a great discussion of their work.

11. Professional Development and Program Evaluation

Michelle Sinclair, Coordinator of Professional Development

Pasquale Scuderi, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services

It was noted that items 10 and 11 were covered together as noted above.

Scuderi stated that Teachers on Special Assignment/TSAs were included in the budget for Program Evaluation. TSAs were assigned to support sites and build the capacity of teachers to use our current data system, Illuminate. Illuminate allowed for the creation and storage of assessments, the development of tools, and allowed administrators to look at various markers of progress or slide. Currently that department was supporting the K-8 efforts to have 6-week data cycles to look at data, tools and outcomes and to respond to the needs of individual students. He stated that what was measured, with regards to what was just discussed, needs to be drawn down to a place where we could go into greater depth to get an understanding of what the obstacles were at various levels on the K-12 continuum. Our emerging idea was that we would be supporting kids in all subjects everyday, and our teachers would be doing that work. Scuderi added that through all the departments and budgets, they wanted to develop fail-safes for kids and determine what kinds of differentiation and support they needed. That was a philosophical shift, and they needed to address staffing needs for that.

Scuderi stated that tonight he gave the committee a collective view of goals and philosophy moving forward. They will return with a specific, detailed budget proposal. He noted he would try to honor the request to provide everything in one place so the extended universe could be seen in a user friendly way.

Simon added that the District generated tremendous amounts of data and didn’t always do as good a job of providing enough evaluation of that data. He was hoping diving deeper and narrowing focus would be a part of it. He noted there had many conversations in the committee about the data the SGCs got and how difficult it was to do anything meaningful with that data. Scuderi responded that what they would like to do systemically was to model and build a specific set of responses at fewer points along the continuum to address the needs of students, e.g., 5th to 6th grade math transition, get those right and when progress was shown, then expand to other levels. He felt they paralyzed themselves by trying to address the needs “everywhere.”

12. For the Good of the Order

For the Good of the Order is time set aside for members to bring up items not discussed or addressed during the meeting. No items were put forward.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:09 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support