

**BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES**  
**November 1, 2016**

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

**P&O Committee Members Present:**

Victoria Hritonenko, *Cragmont*  
Dawn Paxson, *Emerson*  
Danielle Perez, *John Muir (co-Chair)*  
John Eknoian, *Oxford*  
Weldon Bradstreet, *Rosa Parks*  
Aaron Schiller, *Thousand Oaks (Co)*  
Josh Chishom, *Washington*

Josh Irwin, *King (Co)*  
Bruce Simon, *King (co-Chair)*  
Catherine Huchting, *Willard*  
Aaron Glimme, *Berkeley High*  
Jose Luis Bedolla, *Berkeley High*  
Christine Balch, *Independent Study*

**P&O Committee Members Absent\*:**

Madhu Marchesini, *Arts Magnet*  
Bridget Berhard, *Arts Magnet (Alt)*  
Terry Pastika, *Jefferson*  
Byron Pakter, *LeConte*

Lily Howell, *Malcolm X*  
Ramona Coates, *Longfellow*  
Hasmig Minassian, *Berkeley High*  
Ramal Lamar, *BTA*

*\*Alternates and co-reps are not marked absent if another rep is present.*

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

Judy Appel, *School Board*  
Charles Burress, *Public Information Officer*  
Donald Evans, *Superintendent*  
Liz Karam, *BSEP Sr. Budget Analyst*  
Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*  
Pasquale Scuderi, *Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services*  
Pearl Lee, Shien Sam, Megan Myers, Jennifer Reiff, *Students from UC Berkeley*

**BSEP Staff:**

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

**Note: An Orientation to the P&O Essentials for New Members at 6:40p.m. was led by Natasha Beery, BSEP Director, and Liz Karam, BSEP Sr. Budget Analyst.**

Beery and Karam gave a slide presentation to explain BSEP Programs to the new BSEP P&O members.

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*

### **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.

### **2. Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda**

**The quorum was approved with 13 voting members present.**

**MOTION CARRIED (Irwin/Eknoian):** To approve the agenda of the November 1, 2016 P&O Committee Meeting. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

### **3. Chairperson's Comments**

*Co-Chairs Danielle Perez and Bruce Simon*

Perez explained approval of meeting minutes and reminded attendees about contributing to the fund for meeting snacks. Simon stated that meetings are conducted according to Roberts Rules of Order and anyone in need of more information regarding them should contact [bsep@berkeley.net](mailto:bsep@berkeley.net). He also encouraged new attendees to ask if they had any questions or wanted to know about acronyms that are often used.

### **4. BSEP Directors Comments**

*Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations*

Beery provided the following handout:

Beery welcomed returning and new P&O Committee members, including previous long-time member, John Lavine, who had stopped by to recycle his old BSEP binders. Beery thought this year would be especially interesting to the committee because of the transition from the old measure to implementation of the new BSEP Measure.

### **5. Approval of Minutes June 7, 2016**

There was a brief review allowed for the June 7, 2016 P&O Committee Meeting minutes.

**MOTION CARRIED (Paxson/Huchting):** To approve the meeting minutes of the June 7, 2016 P&O Committee Meeting as written. **The motion was approved with one abstention.**

## Public Comment

Appel thanked the committee members for serving this year, noting they would be responsible for ushering in the new Measure and the funding that would come with it.

### 6. Class Size Report for 2016-17

*Pasquale Scuderi, Asst. Superintendent for Ed. Services*

Scuderi provided the following handouts:

- Berkeley USD Elementary Class Size Averages, (K-5)*
- Berkeley Unified School District Berkeley High School Overall Average by Department-October 7, 2016, Berkeley Unified School District Berkeley High School Overall Average by Small Learning Community-October 7, 2016, Berkeley Unified School District Willard Class Size Average by Subject-September 27, 2016, Berkeley Unified School District Longfellow Class Size Average by Subject-September 27, 2016, Berkeley Unified School District Willard Class Size Average by Subject-September 27, 2016, Berkeley Unified School District King Middle School Class Size Average-September 27, 2016, Berkeley Unified School District Middle School Class Size Average by Subject-September 27, 2016 (Single packet)*

Scuderi stated that he was required to report to the committee on whether the District was meeting district-wide class size averages goals: K-3 of 20, 4-5 of 26, and 6-12 of 28. The goal was being met, although there were some classes slightly larger in 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> grades. This may be due to enrollment growth at those ages. The K numbers were significantly lower this year, and the goals were being met for 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades.

Middle School averages are meeting the BSEP goal with 25:1 in 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade Math and 26.7 in 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade English.

Scuderi went on to explain the class sizes at BHS, noting that districts are permitted to staff PE a little higher. For *Berkeley High School Overall Average by Small Learning Community*, the acronyms and number of sections across the bottom were confirmed as follows: AC (101) Academic Choice, BIHS (118) Berkeley International High School, CAS (34) Communication Arts and Sciences, AMPS (32) Academy of Medicine and Public Service, AHA (35) Arts and Humanities Academy, AfAm (9) African American Studies, ELL (18) English Language Learners, BTA Berkeley Technology Academy (separate campus). The averages at the top of each graph line are an indication of how class size plays out in learning communities and can vary between sections in the communities. Glimme noted that the average shown for AfAm of 32.2 includes the dance classes which are large and well-attended and skew the average. Scuderi will provide a number without the dance classes included. The Independent Studies numbers are not included in the graph, as class size goals do not apply to the small group numbers at IS.

Scuderi agreed that the “7/8” combined designation was not a good way to indicate the class size average by subject. Each 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade had the same class size number. 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade math, previously funded by BSEP class size reduction, will no longer be funded by “Page 2” BSEP resources. Scuderi noted that Common Core/Mandated Cost Reimbursement funding would provide for the development of new math programs for 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grades. He confirmed that the Common Core/Mandated Cost Reimbursement

funding also was also being allocated to science literacy and math PD/professional development, although to a lesser extent than the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade math programs. Scuderi confirmed the class size for middle school was 28:1 (6-12).

Beery confirmed that the class size report is given to the P&O Committee and the School Board had already seen it (October 19, 2016).

## **8. Preliminary SGC Elections and Orientation Report**

*Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations*

Beery provided the following handouts:

- *2016-17 School Committee Member Survey Responses, As of November 1, 2016*

Beery stated that the BSEP office must report annually to the School Board on the conduct of the School Governance Council/SGC elections. She said she was still gathering data for the report due in December. The handout *2016-17 Committee Member Survey Responses, As of November 1, 2016* gives a snapshot of the elections based upon roughly half of the elected SGC members responding. The survey gathers data on how the elections went, what forms of outreach were done and what was successful or not successful in terms of the outreach. Beery noted that there was much variation from site to site as they tailored their methods to their community. At the same time, there are issues around the way the elections are conducted so they are both compliant with the State Ed code and also effective in reaching out to the community to enable new representation.

Beery has asked to bring the SGC and P&O Bylaws before the School Board Policy Committee this year to align them with the new Measure.

A demographic report was also required, and Beery pointed out the race/ethnicity part of the handout. The information was gathered according to federally mandated categories and self-reported ethnicities in order to align with the student population reports.

Beery had also asked for input on what interests and skills committee members could bring to the table and what topics they would like to see for future workshops. This year the SGC Orientation was held with time set aside for each SGC to meet separately to kick-off the year. Meetings have to comply with the Brown Act in providing public notice, so either action was not taken, or it was reaffirmed at a subsequent meeting. She stated that not all the topics could be done for the December 1 training, and another workshop would be set up for later in the year.

Beery added there was interest in having the P&O Committee meet with the LCAP Committee Parent Advisory Council/PAC. Part of the discussion for the meeting would be focused on how funding might or might not dovetail between the two resources.

Beery confirmed that any changes for SGC representatives to the P&O Committee could be emailed to [bsep@berkeley.net](mailto:bsep@berkeley.net). Beery or Valerie Tay, BSEP Program Specialist, would handle any information or questions received.

Simon stated that he thought the arrangement of having the first SGC meeting after the Orientation worked well. Balch reported there was no SGC election for Independent Study/IS. Beery stated that a site may choose its representatives as is usual for their site, either by vote or by consensus. Beery and Balch could discuss this to make sure there was an opportunity for anyone that was interested to participate.

## 9. Preview of 2016-17 P&O Calendar; Roles and Decisions

Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations

Beery provided the following handouts:

- BSEP Planning & Oversight Committee Calendar 2016-2017, Version 11/14/16, Shared on Google Drive*
- BSEP P&O Timeline (Graph Chart)*

Beery passed around the handouts. She noted that there was a cycle of planning and reporting and on the Calendar, events in black font denote P&O meetings for the members to attend. After November 1, the P&O will not meet again until December 13<sup>th</sup>.

Committee work will ramp up in December and January for the presentation of reports for the past year and for the selection of Chairs for the coming year. Members will also be asked to consider volunteering to represent the P&O on committees such as the Superintendent's Budget Advisory Committee/SBAC (school and district budget considerations) as well as P&O subcommittees.

Beginning in February, there will be presentations for the new budgets for each BSEP program. Sometimes the committee will meet twice a month.

## 10. Measure E1: After November 8<sup>th</sup>, What Next?

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Beery provided the following handouts:

- Comparison Chart for Measure A of 2006 and Measure AA+ of 2016 (Replace AA+ with E1)*
- Bay Area Average School Sizes and Average Class Sizes Compared to BSEP Measure E1 Class Size Goals*

Beery gave a slide presentation for the *Comparison Chart for Measure A of 2006 and Measure E1 of 2016 (Preliminarily Titled Measure AA+ of 2016)*, or how we get from Measure A to Measure E1. Beery stated that Berkeley's special tax measures are unusual in the degree of specificity, compared with other districts with special taxes, which tend to be vague. However, even though percentages and dollars are relatively set, and the purposes are named, there is room for interpretation by the program manager. The managers come to the P&O committee to present their program ideas.

The handout shows the fiscal ramifications of the structural change from Measure A to E1. In the sunset years of Measure A, a number of the programs were deficit spending to an unsustainable amount. They were drawing on their reserves so that the programs could be carried out, but this could not continue indefinitely. Factors for increased costs to BSEP include: mandated costs for retirement and the long-delayed increases in staff wages since the recession, which hit BSEP funds tied to the low COLA (Cost of Living Adjustment).

Beery noted that the District made it to the end of the Measure while keeping major programs in place, which was something to be proud of. The School Board decided to allocate funds from the General Fund/GF so that BSEP programs would not have to suffer drastic cuts. The new measure creates an eight-year forecast and plan. She stated that residential properties were currently paying about 29 cents per square foot while commercial properties were currently paying closer to 43 cents per square foot. Under the

ruling for special taxes, residential and commercial properties will be paying the same rate or 37 cents per square foot. That revenue makes up for the tax ruling and catches us up with prior costs. She also noted there is an adjustment to Class Size Reduction/CSR (far right columns) from 20 for K-3, 26 for 4-5, and 28 for 6-12 under Measure A to an average at the elementary level of 23:1 (balanced class size across the district).

There were changes made to the structure of Measure E1 as shown in *High Quality Instruction*. Beery explained that the BSEP Measure plan includes *Page 1: Class Size Reduction* goals that budgets the required teaching staff and classrooms. After CSR is met, the funds remaining would be applied to programs under *Page 2: Support for Teaching*. Under the old measure *Page 2: Program Support* did not necessarily connect with CSR. In the new measure, *Middle School/MS Counseling* was moved to the *Effective Student Support* block and a new category for *Classroom Supports/Reserve* was made under *Page Two: Support for Teaching* to provide for flexibility and other kinds of supports in the classroom. The dollar amounts shown on the E1 side reflects preliminary/possible budget allocations based on current costs. It also indicates what might be sustainable as we go into the new measure.

**Questions/Responses:**

- It was noted that TWI was supported for 2016-17 but not shown in 2017-18. Beery stated that TWI was being phased in to one school. Scuderi confirmed that the need for 5<sup>th</sup> grade at the schools transitioning out of TWI would be provided and that same level of support would not be needed the next year.

Under Measure A, *Programs to Enhance Student Learning* were running into an unsustainable deficit if spending continued at the same level. With the new measure and slightly higher revenues, it is expected those programs will be in the black. There were adjustments to all of the programs to make them sustainable. Beery noted that Technology was moved into the grouping with Libraries as they had developed a collaboration for programs such as DigiTech. She added that it made sense to move and combine programs such as Parent Outreach and Middle School Counseling into another category, *Effective Student Support*. Beery pointed out that the programs in the purple block of Measure A have been moved to more appropriate categories under the new measure, which allowed for the new *Effective Student Support* category. Things that were funded under *Page 2* of the old measure are now together there as well. She added that the new measure included a 10% funding flexibility option that could be shifted between resources within *Essentials for Excellence* and *Effective Student Support*, wherever the need was greatest. Appel stated that 2017-18 program budget projection was for that year only. It was expected that the move toward balanced class size would happen over the eight-year course of the new measure.

Beery stated that we were not totally in the black in the new measure forecast, with the current cost of programs under Student Support being a bit more than was sustainable right now. Family Engagement was being co-funded through BSEP funds and Local Control and Accountability Plan/LCAP. There were shifts in the funding from surplus to an inability to maintain that program with BSEP funds only. That program will need some adjustments.

The gray block indicates the 2% of the BSEP budget that will be retained from the old measure to the new measure that provides funding for the BSEP office, Public Information, Communications, and Translation services.

Questions/Responses:

- LCAP funding for Family Engagement will be on the agenda for the P&O to discuss at the appropriate time.
- Would *Effective Student Support* include a program like Restorative Justice? Beery stated the time to bring forward questions about Restorative Justice would be when *Effective Student Support* would be on the agenda, calendared for March 7, 2017.
- Beery confirmed that moving money from one resource to another was permitted – up to 10% can be moved from any resource in *Essentials for Excellence* and *Effective Student Support* to any other resource within each of those programs, once E1 has passed.
- Measure E1 will be added to the BSEP binders and sent out by email. Measure E1 would be voted on in November and not implemented until July 2017.
- Beery went over the changes from Measure A to Measure E1:
  - The shortening of the term of the measure from ten years to eight years. The last two years of the 10-year measure were the most challenging in meeting financial goals and eight years was a better planning framework. It also aligned with the general election which could increase voter turnout and interest.
  - The rate was adjusted based on the court case *Borikas vs. Alameda USD*, which required that commercial properties be taxed at the same rate as residential properties.
  - There was a change from using the state's Cost of Living Adjustment to the Bay Area Consumer Price Index. The advantage to that was that there would be figures for the CPI in December that would be solid by January or February, as opposed to getting the Governor's Budget in January and then the revision in May (when it would be too late for budget planning).
  - CSR would be changed to a balanced approach.
  - The BSEP program structure was changed slightly to provide a good balance between a clear purpose and the flexibility to adapt.

Beery passed around the handout *Bay Area Average School Sizes and Average Class Sizes Compared to BSEP Measure E1 Class Size Goals* and stated that it would be a gradual transition and take 6 years to achieve balanced class sizes. She noted that next year's kindergarteners would be in balanced schools as 5<sup>th</sup> graders. Referring to the handout, Beery stated that Berkeley was trying to have smaller class sizes overall and also, for the most part, we have smaller schools than many of the surrounding school districts. It is more challenging to run a smaller school because it costs more and there are fewer options as to how many classes could be run. In addition to having small schools, people in Berkeley really cherish small class sizes. She noted that the K/1 class size would be somewhere around 21-22 to allow for new kids coming in at later grades, and added that the class size averages would be school-wide. Beery pointed out the *Implementation in Measure E1* on the handout and noted that class size averages for elementary grades would be below most schools in the region, both in terms of school size and class size. The 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grades would be significantly smaller as well, hopefully addressing the needs of kids at a transitional age prior to middle school.

Beery noted that the new measure needed to pass with a 2/3rds (66.7%) vote. She added that there was no argument filed against Measure E1, which had not been true in the past, and she was cautiously optimistic about passage.

Glimme made the recommendation to get an electronic version of the BSEP binder. Beery stated that there could be a Google Drive set up as the binder. She added that since the P&O was a Brown Act committee, there could be no deliberations or editing of a plan via email, as it would be a violation of the Act.

### **11. Statement to the Board for November 2<sup>nd</sup> and/or November 16th**

*Natasha Beery, BSEP Director, Danielle Perez, and Bruce Simon, P&O Co-Chairs*

The following handouts were provided:

- Talking Points for School Board, P&O Committee Comment – November 2*
- Talking Points for School Board, P&O Committee Comment – November 16*

Perez stated that it was common for the P&O Committee to prepare statements to be presented to the School Board by a member or members when the group would like to call something to their attention. She suggested presenting statements to the Board before and after the election for Measure E1. The P&O Steering Committee had drafted statements for the P&O Committee to review and approve. Perez also noted that a volunteer would be needed to read the statement at the Board meeting. Simon explained that every School Board meeting began with Public Comment and after that period, five minutes were set aside for a representative to speak on behalf of BUSD committee such as the P&O. The statements were vetted through the subcommittee that was comprised of Beery, Perez, Simon, Glimme, and Irwin. He added that the text focused on briefly explaining what E1 meant and noting and where it could be found on the ballot. Beery said that any individual could make a statement to the Board during Public Comment for two or three minutes, depending on the attendance that night.

Perez called for recommendations on how to make the drafts more effective or places where shifts in tone might be needed.

- Hritonenko stated that the November 16 draft was more concise and the November 2 draft could be shortened, but felt they looked great. Simon stated the drafts were less than the five minutes allowed.
- Huchting asked what the tone and intention was. Simon stated that the primary audience was the Board, even though there would also be a live and TV audience. Beery stated there could be other media, such as newspapers, represented at the meeting. The intention would be speaking to the public at a school board meeting about a school district topic. Huchting felt the wording sounded chatty and thought while it should certainly be friendly, less chatty would be better. She thought the tone should reflect a sense of how serious the issue was.
- Eknoian thought that whoever reads it should practice the statement to get a cadence going with it.
- Appel agreed about being more formal and added she would not say something like “Buried deep in the ballot...” but to emphasize the positive and the importance of voting and voting the whole ballot.
- Paxson said she felt Eknoian’s suggestion was true because of her experience. She added that it was interesting to be a part of a group presenting before the Board.
- Bedolla added that he would like to see more data interwoven into the statement to tell the story. He felt that in addition to expressing opinions, it was important to

provide facts and context, making more concrete what has been and what might be, all to highlight the importance of the new measure. He also emphasized positivity.

- Eknoian suggested holding up the ballot and pointing to where E1 was would be an alternative to saying “Buried deep in the ballot...”

- Huchting pointed to Paragraph 3, “It is a grim certainty that our district would look very different...” She felt the important point was “pays for one third of our classroom teachers...” and could there be a class size given if the measure didn’t pass. Beery and Simon said that state mandated class size would have to be met by cutting programs. Huchting thought something to add to that paragraph would be helpful. Beery thought an actual statistics would be difficult to add there. Eknoian thought including numbers would be helpful as long as it was not overwhelming. He stated that a neighbor was amazed to hear the district budget was \$125M and that BSEP paid for roughly \$25M of that. Eknoian also emphasized that BSEP paid for 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the teachers and programs such as Music and Libraries.

- Irwin thought class size average numbers with and without the benefit of the measure would be useful. He wasn’t sure using the money figures would be useful. He suggested eliminating the first paragraph 1, “We are separated by just 6 days...” and instead of “Buried deep in the ballot...” we could say “On page 5, is our important tax measure for Berkeley public schools.” There was agreement on that change.

- Paxson wanted to underscore the meaning of 1 in 3 teachers for elementary schools. If the measure does not pass many classroom teachers would disappear.

- Bedolla stated that something he was always impressed with was when someone appealed to your brain and heart at the same time and because music was our best ambassador in this respect, suggested emphasizing the free music instruction.

Perez wondered about paragraph 3 “These funds help maintain our school district as one of the best in the Bay Area...” Beery stated that it could be added that the District has been named one of the top districts in the state for music education several years running. Irwin suggested taking “These funds help maintain our school district as one of the best in the Bay Area...” to start a new paragraph and add, for example, the information about the music program and libraries.

- Huchting suggested that Paragraph 4, be revised at “...programs to which our community has become accustomed.” to something like “...programs to which our ~~community has become accustomed~~ students deserve.”

**MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Chishom):** To approve the Talking Points for School Board, P&O Committee Comment – November 2 with changes and modifications as discussed and deemed appropriate. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

**Volunteers to read statement to the Board: Danielle Perez, Bruce Simon, John Eknoian.**

Perez asked the committee members to make recommendations for *Talking Points for School Board, P&O Committee Comment – November 16.*

- Eknoian suggested changing “Countless...” in Paragraph 4 to a more concrete number.
- Hritonenko stated that she loved the statement because it was nice and short. She suggested changing the sentence in Paragraph 3, “And while the vote was split in many areas of the ballot...” should be deleted. Just focus on “...~~the~~The new BSEP Measure 2016...”

**MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Hritonenko):** To approve the Talking Points for School Board, P&O Committee Comment – November 16, with the caveat that it passes in the election, with changes as suggested. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

### **12. For the Good of the Order**

Perez explained that **For the Good of the Order** is time set aside for members to bring up items not discussed or addressed during the meeting . No comments were made.

### **13. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 8:58 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support*