

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES
March 7, 2017

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

P&O Committee Members Present:

Bridget Bernhard, <i>Arts Magnet (Alt)</i>	Aaron Schiller, <i>Thousand Oaks (Co)</i>
Terry Pastika, <i>Jefferson</i>	Stephanie Upp, <i>Washington</i>
Danielle Perez, <i>John Muir (co-Chair)</i>	Bethany Schoenfeld, <i>Longfellow</i>
Byron Pakter, <i>LeConte</i>	Shauna Rabinowitz, <i>King (Co)</i>
Alex Makler, <i>Malcolm X</i>	Catherine Huchting, <i>Willard</i>
John Eknoian, <i>Oxford (Alt)</i>	Aaron Glimme, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Weldon Bradstreet, <i>Rosa Parks</i>	

P&O Committee Members Absent*:

Rashay Lankford, <i>Pre-K</i>	Dawn Paxson, <i>Emerson</i>
Martin De Mucha Flores, <i>Cragmont (Co)</i>	Jose Luis Bedolla, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Eric van Dusen, <i>Cragmont (Co)</i>	Josh Irwin, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Victoria Hritonenko, <i>Cragmont (Co)</i>	Christina Balch, <i>Independent Studies</i>

**Alternates and co-reps are not marked absent if another rep is present. Currently there is not representation from BTA. With this third absence, there is no representation from Pre-K.*

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

Judy Appel, *School Board*
Cathy Campbell, *Berkeley Federation of Teachers*
Donald Evans, Ed.D, *Superintendent*
Beatriz Leyva-Cutler, *School Board*
Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*
Pat Saddler, *Director Special Projects and Programs*
Pasquale Scuderi, *Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services*
Becca Todd, *District Library Coordinator*

BSEP Staff:

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

1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports

At 7:17 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. Co-chair Simon was unable to attend this meeting due to illness.

2. Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda

The quorum was approved with 13 voting members present. 12 voting members were required for a quorum.

MOTION CARRIED (Schoenfeld/Bradstreet): To approve the agenda of the March 3, 2017 P&O Committee Meeting. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

3. Chairperson's Comments

Co-Chairs Danielle Perez

There was a reminder to contribute to the snack fund.

4. BSEP Director's Comments

Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations

Beery provided the following handout:

- *P&O Member Availability and Interest*

Beery stated that she attended a conference of the California School Public Relations Association last week. One of the workshops, called "Beyond Bienvenidos and Buenos Dias," encouraged reaching out to people (parents/families) instead of waiting for them to reach out, and to use others in their community to help with outreach.

Beery handed out the *P&O Member Availability and Interest survey*. She said she makes an effort not to have back-to-back meetings, but in the process of putting together the Teacher Template, Superintendent Scuderi had the additional responsibility of presenting how the transition from Measure A to Measure E1 would happen. In looking ahead at the schedule for the remainder of the year, Beery will send out the *P&O Member Availability and Interest survey* within the next few days. She wanted to know if the April 11, 2017 meeting would be an issue for the members, as it falls right after Spring Break. Beery also wanted to know if members were interested in participating on subcommittees and would inform them if and when meetings would be scheduled.

5. Superintendent's Report

Donald Evans, Ed.D.

Evans noted that the discussions at tomorrow night's School Board meeting, Wednesday, March 8, 2017, would be around the Second Interim report, enrollment projections, budget impacts, 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 28, 2016

There was a brief review allowed for the February 28, 2017 P&O Committee Meeting minutes. (Members do not have to be present at the meeting to vote to approve the minutes. Everyone has a chance to review the minutes, make necessary changes and if the minutes were correct enough to be entered into the public record, members could vote to approve the minutes.)

MOTION CARRIED (BradstreetEknoian): To approve the meeting minutes of the February 28, 2017 P&O Committee Meeting. **The motion was approved by 12 members, with 1 member abstaining.**

7. Public Comment

Eknoian noted that a couple of meetings back he had asked about Rtl² funds, how many

students were being served, how many students were of color, and how do the District measures progress to get a per unit cost? He wondered if any of those numbers were available. Scuderi thought he could get the total number of kids who were regularly coming through the coordination of services teams. Scuderi suggested to look at the high needs students who came through the coordination of services teams and look at composite inputs and outputs. He noted the District did not have that information and would have to build it. Glimme said a question is how to define being served by RtI², because RtI² is not a program of services, but monitoring students to try and help funnel into certain services. He gave an example of students in a fifth grade class not meeting reading targets. Through the RtI² process, the RtI² Coordinator may enroll half the 5th grade class for the next three weeks into an afterschool class. Should all those kids be counted or not? Eknoian stated he would like numbers to point to as a place to start. Pastika noted this might be discussed in the LCAP presentation.

Perez noted that the Committee needed to be careful about turning Public Comment into a discussion. If there were questions about the function of RtI², Perez suggested that the members return to that during the course of the meeting.

8. What do LCAP Supplemental Funds do for our Students?

Pat Saddler, Director of Special Projects and Programs

Saddler provided the following handouts:

- *(What LCAP Funds Do For Our Students) LCAP Goals and budget (7 pages)*
- *Budget Development Calendar for 2017-18 (2 pages)*

Beery introduced Saddler to the P&O Committee. She noted that the LCAP information to be shared was not the responsibility of this committee but added to the understanding of the larger picture, especially where LCAP and BSEP intersected.

Saddler thanked the Committee and stated that she would be sharing a brief overview with regards to LCAP. She stated that there would be an LCAP Joint Stakeholders meeting on March 16, 2017 at Longfellow Middle School Library to share mid-year data. Saddler invited the members of the Committee to attend and said that RtI² data would be part of the presentation.

She passed out the handout *What LCAP Funds Do For Our Students*, the document that describes the programs in more detail (see above) and requested that members look at it after her presentation. She gave a slide presentation and explained what the Local Control and Accountability Plan/LCAP provided for under the Local Control Funding Formula/LCFF. It is targeted to a specific population of students (English Learners/EL, Free and Reduced Lunch eligible, and Foster Youth. The students can be all three but they are only counted one time and are therefore called “unduplicated” students.) Additional funding is provided for because historically in California and across the nation, they have been underserved. Since funding is provided for these students, the District is required to do an LCAP plan. The LCAP uses California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System/CALPADS data (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sp/cl/>). Collection occurs on October 1 every year and provides total enrollment and the number of “unduplicated” students for each school. Saddler noted that she pulled out EL student numbers from the data because that was a special population group for BUSD. In 2015-16, there was a total of 9783 students. Of that number, 3777 were “unduplicated” students and 1042 were EL students.

LCAP was divided into three goals:

1. GOAL 1 – Classroom Instruction and Enrichment (approx. \$2M portion of LCAP)

Enrichment includes:

- RtI² K-8 – Enrollment determines the amount of RtI² service each school site receives through LCAP funding. It could be as small as .4FTE or as large as 1.0FTE depending on the number of students. (A formula was used to determine FTE.)
 - One elementary Math Coach
 - One part-time Middle School Math Coach
 - A Math Teacher Leader at all schools that meets on a regular basis with the Math Coach
 - LCAP pays for .2FTE of the Literacy Coaches at the K-5 schools
 - Advancement Via Individual Determination/AVID College Prep program – starting in grade 7 and going through grade 12
 - Middle School Bridge Program – Transitional program used to identify students who need support, peer or adult guidance through middle school. This program meets two to three times/week after school.
 - High School Bridge Program – Meets after school daily for identified students in that program.
 - Super Science Saturday – A program for identified students needing support in math. The first Super Science Saturday was held and well-attended. It is provided at three schools in BUSD but available to all students in K-5 schools.
 - A new program being provided this year is Ramp Up, a literacy pre-teaching Summer Academy for grades 1-3. This is for students going into grades 2 and 3 who were identified as almost reading at grade level. Also offered are Saturday sessions twice/month where they pre-teach what the students will be exposed to during the month of instruction. They work closely with the Lead Lit Coach.
 - Money has been allocated for schools to provide academic intervention after school. The allocated money was divided by the number of “unduplicated” students at the school and then provided to the principals to design an after school intervention. They are using the 6-week data cycle and assessments for math and language arts to determine which students needed to be in the second or third data cycle of after school intervention. They are currently in the third cycle. Saddler noted that they just looked at the data to date, and some of the schools have not accessed the funding while some of the schools had almost spent all of their money. Scuderi and Maggie Riddle, Director of Schools, will be meeting with principals to find out what challenges they may have had and if they had not accessed their funding, what might be a next step. Saddler confirmed that \$142K was allocated for this K-8 program.
2. **GOAL 2 – Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Systems which ensures that the District diversifies their workforce (approx. \$1.14M portion of LCAP)**
- This includes:
- A consultant to help recruit and retain teachers of color.
 - One .5FTE Teacher on Special Assignment/TSA who collects information from staff/parents, reviews curriculum, works with the Library Coordinator/reviews books to make sure students “see themselves.” The TSA will be presenting her research on April 15, 2017 to the Anti-Racism Taskforce and also at a future School Board meeting.
 - There are English Language Development/ELD Coaches at all schools, including the high school. The number of ELs determines the amount of ELD Coach FTEs with a minimum of .4 FTE (2 days) and the largest at 1.0FTE. The high school has a little more than 1.0FTE. There is a part-time ELD Coach that supports the site coaches in meetings and meets with District English Learner Advisory Committee/DELAC parents.
 - For the past two years, the District has provided training for principals and site

teams in Professional Learning Communities. These help participants to look at the 6-week cycle data, ask critical questions, and learn data analysis skills (student progress, lesson intentions, did students already know or not know the information).

3. GOAL 3 – Safe and Welcoming Inclusive School Climate (approx. \$1.14M portion of LCAP)

This includes:

- Each school was given \$12K to contract with outside mental or behavioral health agencies. The City of Berkeley gives the elementary schools \$5K and with the LCAP \$12K funding, the amount totals \$17K. Saddler noted that some sites provided funding for additional people to provide play therapy, anti-bullying groups and to address whatever students and families bring to the principal or the coordination of services team to get their needs met or a referral for a higher level of service as needed.
- Saddler noted that Bob Nakamoto, K-8 Coordinator of School Based Services (<http://www.berkeleyschools.net/departments/student-services/positive-behavioral-interventions-and-supports-pbis/>) works with all providers and all schools with Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports/PBIS, Toolbox, and Welcoming Schools. She noted that he was at the helm for coordinating that work as well as ongoing training for all those initiatives.
- Bay Area Peacekeepers meets with students who commit suspendable offenses in grades 4-12. They provide mentoring and group support. Saddler noted that the students love the group so much they have asked for funding for Bay Area Peacekeepers to provide support over the summer.
- BHS has two Intervention Counselors that work with a prioritized caseload of students that have been pre-identified using the data system and Academic Support Index. The counselors work with approximately 35 students on a daily basis, monitoring their grades, helping them work through crises or providing whatever support they need.
- Restorative Justice Programs: BHS has a Restorative Practices Coordinator who started mid-year last year. Saddler noted that the BHS principal cited him as an asset to the school in diffusing student conflicts, building healing circles, and providing student mediation. She noted there was a pilot Restorative Practices program at Washington Elementary and BTA led by SEEDS, a community agency (<http://www.seedsrc.org/>). New this year at each middle school is a restorative justice counselor. They are helping to build the capacity of teachers to provide restorative counseling, do the community circles, and diffuse potential situations with middle school students in their classrooms. The counselors also work with the parents, as well as in instances of student/staff conflicts.
- LCAP provides for four full-time FTE Family Engagement Staff divided between two elementary schools and BHS. BSEP and LCAP together fund the Family Engagement office.

Saddler briefed the committee on the LCAP timeline, the development of LCAP for the next three school years and noted that in about a week, they would be starting to make recommendations for the Supplemental Funding. There is a Board policy for LCAP, and Superintendent Evans will make recommendations about what current programs might be discontinued and/or new ones tried in order to close the achievement gap for the “unduplicated” students.

Questions and Responses:

- Saddler confirmed that the EL students are identified upon enrollment registration when answering questions on the home language survey. If they

answer one of four questions indicating they speak another language at home besides English, it automatically identifies them as an English Learner/EL.

- Glimme noted that Jefferson Elementary uses the intervention coordinator to monitor all the students in the school, keeping track and identifying them through those six-week cycles. He felt it worked well in that setting and made a difference for kids who needed support.
- Saddler added that they do a monthly update for LCAP services and share that with the Board. For the month of February, there were 159 students that were new to the reading intervention cycle done by the RtI² teachers: 70% of those were “unduplicated” students and received direct services, 22% of them received in-classroom instruction/small group interventions by the RtI² teacher and 71% of them received Leveled Literacy Intervention/LLI group. This data was for “unduplicated” students only. No other demographic data was given. Scuderi stated if you look at the gaps and who was not achieving at the levels that they wanted to see, more often than not, the groups being served and getting the bulk of the services by the RtI² coordination of services teams were low income, African America, Latino, and EL.
- Saddler stated they do have data from the last school year for LCAP services broken down by ethnic groups, Special Ed/non-Special Ed, ELL. She said she could share the information with Beery who could then share it with the Committee.
- Saddler addressed Eknoian’s question about getting an identified source of funding for African-American students saying that everything she shared about LCAP funding addresses African-American students. In response to Eknoian pointing out that the bulk of the money in Goal 2 went to ELD students, Saddler noted that was another identified key subgroup within LCAP. Scuderi noted that they were trying to be as equitable as possible and noted that they were seeing an increase of 15% in third grade reading last year (2015-16) for African American students. That is not closing the gap but it was certainly progress. They were also showing an increase of 15% for the ELA subgroup as well.
- Appel stated that it was important for parents to know that the resources were intentionally targeted and students were being identified for services. She felt they needed to see the data and that things were happening that did not happen before.
- Saddler confirmed that the 2016-17 LCAP data would come out in June. She noted that they were currently looking at mid-year data.
- Pastika asked for some clarity around why undesignated site funds were being directed and spent for LCAP goals. Appel responded that the LCAP was not the District’s entire strategic plan but it was one of the ways they were prioritizing the use of funds. She noted there were goals which had the strong support of the Board and policymakers, to close the achievement gap, and provide academic supports for all students. Evans added that what schools have done was to provide additional resources and support to those goals. Pastika noted that she would like to have more conversation and clarity around her question.
- Pakter was curious about partial budgets for programs and noted that Super Science was half the budget of AVID. Saddler responded that Super Science was a smaller pilot project that happened for six to eight Saturdays, as

opposed to AVID which was a daily instructional program at all three middle schools and the high school. AVID was an elective course for students and required ongoing training and contact with AVID. The District contracted with local science organizations like Lawrence Hall of Science and Sarah's Science. Saddler added that when Goal 1 was talked about as part of the strategic plan, it was not just in-class instruction/interventions, but included enrichment. Super Science Saturday was considered enrichment with an academic focus.

- In response to Huchting, Saddler confirmed that LCAP does not cover summer school. The District uses a variety of funding sources for that. She added that summer school was offered for middle school in a small pilot program for ELs, Bridge, and AVID that was not credit recovery. They also offer a math and an EL class, not mandatory, and with a small pot of funding. The high school summer program was mandatory especially for students who were graduating. There was also a small program at the elementary level that was partnered with their BEARS (afterschool academic support) program. Huchting noted her concerns that middle schoolers would be lost by the time they got to high school, and Saddler noted that in her professional experience summer school would not change that for them. She felt they needed to have ongoing interventions and that was why they offered schools money for after school intervention programs. Intervention had to occur immediately, and summer school would not help change that outcome. The District is working on building a middle school summer school pilot with math, ELA, and an ELD component as well. She has also encouraged the principals to set up ongoing interventions in math. The District does not get as much Title 1 funding as it used to, which had funded middle school summer school in the past. She noted that the District's poverty index had declined significantly and so had its Title 1 funding. Several schools would no longer receive that funding in the future and that would change their site plan requirements as well.
- The LCAP plan has to be approved by the county and then by the state.
- Pastika asked how the District was looking at using the data to assess if all the investment in Professional Development was achieving outcomes as described in the LCAP plan. Scuderi said two of the measures they were most proud of were the increases in literacy for African-American students and at the high school, over time, dramatic reductions in suspensions. He said success for all students meant success that looks very different in a lot of ways. They used an aggregate index of how students were showing up in school with behavioral and socio-emotional experience. The performance that they lean on were the various assessments and refining those points and looking at fewer points in a lot more depth. There was a plan to adopt curriculum at the middle schools with English Language Arts next year and assessments would be built or come with that curriculum. A multiple measure index would always be used. He noted that the six-week data cycle was the single legitimate and valid way to use data in the education set. The classroom teacher was able to do a far more effective job responding to real-time data to serve a kid in a profound way. Another shortcoming of the system was that when we look at the big-ticket annual measures or local measures, we don't articulate the growth students have made. Saddler noted

that was hard to tease out despite marking every kid for every service they receive. Evans added that building the capacity of teachers comes from providing Professional Development.

9. Recommendation for BSEP Funds in FY 2017-18: CSR and Support for Teaching

Pasquale Scuderi, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services

Scuderi provided the following handouts:

- *High Quality Instruction, Class Size Reduction and Support for Teaching, Plan Overview: FY 2017-18 (4 pages)*
- *FY 2017-18 Class Size Reduction and Support for Teaching v 01.07.17*
- *Berkeley Unified School District Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document, FY 2017-18 TT TO Rounded Down for Three Classrooms 17-18 Enrollment – BTECH staffed at 5 on page 1 (2 pages)*
- *DRAFT – Working Document (Ed Services General Budget and Goal Alignment.xlsx) (4 pages)*
- *Support for Teaching: Professional Development, Plan Overview: FY 2017-18 (4 pages)*
- *Support for Teaching: Program Evaluation, Plan Overview: FY 2017-18 (5 pages)*

Beery stated that one of the P&O's big tasks was to review the CSR. This was the first reading for the Teacher Template and the second component, Support for Teaching, which includes Professional Development, Program Evaluation, Expanded Course Offerings/ECO, and Classroom Support.

Scuderi handed out the narrative *High Quality Instruction, Class Size Reduction and Support for Teaching, Plan Overview: FY 2017-18 (4 pages)* and two charts: *FY 2017-18 Class Size Reduction and Support for Teaching v 01.07.17* and *Berkeley Unified School District Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document, FY 2017-18 TT TO Rounded Down for Three Classrooms 17-18 Enrollment – BTECH staffed at 5 on page 1 (2 pages)*. Scuderi noted that this information was for CSR, which was 66% of the BSEP budget to meet class size goals as stated in the measure, with remaining revenue after goals were met to be used for the reorganized supports, formerly referred to as "Page 2."

The *FY 2017-18 Class Size Reduction and Support for Teaching v 01.07.17* compared last year versus this year to give the overall teacher transfer. The teacher transfer is the amount of money that BSEP adds to the General Fund/GF to meet the class size targets. Scuderi noted the amount of \$2,428,253 under the FY 2016-17 for MS Counseling, Program Support and ECO was formerly known as "Page 2." Now those funds provide Support for Teaching, which includes PD, Evaluation and ECO. He noted the "0841 Class Size Reduction Total" – Variance was (\$348,588). He then referred to the *Berkeley Unified School District Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document, FY 2017-18 TT TO Rounded Down for Three Classrooms 17-18 Enrollment – BTECH staffed at 5 on page 1 (2 pages)* using K enrollment of 680. The GF would contribute 20 teachers based on 34:1 and in the next column (note typo, should read "Meas. E1 CSR FTE") BSEP to contribute 10.36 teachers to achieve a class size of 22.4:1. The last column (note typo, should read "Meas. E1 Necessary FTE") shows the rounding contribution by BSEP to a whole FTE. He reviewed Grade 2 staffing calculations which were the same as K but also has another allocation for "Release Time and adjustment" of 0.84, 0.59 and 0.42 to add FTE for release time periods that teachers at that level are entitled to.

Questions and Responses:

- Teachers in grades 1-3 get release time/prep time as one period per week.

- Beery responded to a question on the -1.30 necessary FTE for Grade 3 stating that she would have to look to enrollment projections for each site but sometimes the numbers go that way based on actual classes.
- Release time teachers are not subs, but teachers for music, science or enrichment.
- Scuderi noted that average class size would continue 28:1 in middle school and high school. Class size balancing goals would progress within six years to achieve 23:1 in the elementary grades, balancing class size with site averages.
- Total number of teachers provided by the GF was noted at 307.50 FTE. **BSEP's contribution was 127.11FTE with Necessary FTE of 2.03 for a total of 129.14FTE.** The grand total of teachers was 436.61 FTE.

Scuderi explained the next line "BSEP Measure A (typo, should be E1) Projected Expense for CSR." "Sub Ave Compensation" was predicted substitute teacher costs at \$573,200. "Direct Support" is the facilities and other costs associated with supporting the additional classes. **The "Transfer from BSEP to GF for CSR" total contribution will be \$13,835,200.**

Scuderi explained that the "Discretionary" portion of the planning document outlined the additional programmatic options after CSR goals were met. For example, ECO includes additional classes in music, dance, and art, at the middle schools, and science labs, music, theater, school newspaper and academic support at the high school.

Scuderi noted that PD and Program Evaluation were on separate attachments. He added that two new programs being placed under "Discretionary" were the Bilingual Maintenance Program at Thousand Oaks/TO and Classroom Support at BTA continuation high school. These line items were attempts to manage and support programs that may be in transition. Enrollment at both programs has been challenging due to demographics and choice. The push and pull between TO in having its bilingual program and LeConte having a fully consolidated Two-Way Immersion/TWI program, coupled with the changing demographics, made it difficult to keep the numbers in that program. The numbers at BTA have been lower in recent years. The staffing allocations were taken out of the Teacher Template to be a more visible calculation. The District is making an investment in both programs concurrently with having conversations with the leadership at both of those schools as to what direction to go next. BTA serves some of the highest-risk, multiple-risk, and trauma students who have needed additional support to be successful at school. BTA offers them opportunities for accelerated credit recovery, a smaller setting and in Scuderi's opinion, a terrific new principal who is trying to build the culture at that school in a more hands-on, project-based way. The school has been significantly over-staffed in the last several years. BSEP historically staffed BTA at 150:1 kids with a 15:1 classroom ratio. The target of 150 students was not being met. It has hovered between 65 and 85 students and the ratio became 6:1 or 7:1. In talking with the principal and the Cabinet, the plan is to staff BTA closer to 90 students and give the new principal a year to try to build that program to draw students and sustain their enrollment. The district is trying to balance the needs of who that school was serving while being fiscally responsible to the community. His department proposes taking the teaching staff down to eight, with the GF and BSEP each contributing 2.5FTE each and 3FTE coming from the CSR program support. This will have to be discussed after this year as to whether the school would continue to be staffed based on enrollment, but they have not given up on the idea of providing a very strong alternative environment for kids. Beery stated that both of these were pulled out of the CSR so they could be seen as an additional investment above CSR for programs that need more support.

Scuderi stated that he had a similar explanation for the TO program that was in transition because of some difficulty with enrollment. He thought there were two options moving

forward: 1) either reconsider the program's character or 2) have an all-combo class progression with the bi-lingual cohort which would put less pressure on the school annually to enroll higher numbers and still be able to serve those kids with very specific learning needs. He and his staff would be taking recommendations to the Board in June.

Questions and Responses:

- Beery confirmed that BTA has a special formula in the Measure to be staffed at 18:1, while BHS was to be staffed at 28:1. On top of that, the District had been staffing it at the higher enrollment of 150 students until the drops of the past few years. In response to Huchting's question about BTA graduation rates, Scuderi thought it might be close to 70-75%. He noted that what was difficult about calculating BTA was that a lot of the kids that were successful at 11th grade go back to BHS. How to create a school that kids want to stay at was one of the things Principal McDonald wanted to work on. Scuderi said he saw kids at BTA early that morning engaged and working on making videos, and noted that the principal was trying to infuse some new energy into the program.
- Beery confirmed that Independent Study/IS is part of BHS. Scuderi stated the majority of the IS teachers are on temporary contracts and that a good portion of the kids take classes at Berkeley High as well.
- Beery and Scuderi confirmed that the "Indirect Costs @ 5.96%" is a calculated cost mandated by the State. Beery also noted that the costs had been going down and also confirmed that BSEP has to pay its own indirect costs.
- Beery confirmed that there is no COLA in the Measure E1 budget for the first year. The Measure E1 tax starts at 37c per square foot, and in the second year, there could be COLA increase based on the Bay Area CPI.
- Cathy Campbell, BFT President added, in reference to the BTA and TO proposals, if this committee would decide not to approve those, that money could go to a BSEP reserve. It would be available to go to those purposes or another purpose. She noted this would not be part of the 3% reserve that BSEP is required to carry. The P&O Committee had the option to consider its own reserve and if that money was not spent on certain purposes, it would be available to be used for other purposes or as carryover. Appel confirmed that a reserve was written into the Measure. Campbell noted that the reserve did not exist in the previous measure and if history were to repeat itself around compensation increases, and drought periods, she felt it was important to consider having a reserve. Beery stated that the P&O was an advisory committee and that the Board listens to the P&O.
- Beery confirmed that the CSR has a designated budget of 66% of the BSEP funds. Smaller class sizes are not a site-based decision.

Scuderi stated that the *DRAFT – Working Document (Ed Services General Budget and Goal Alignment) (4 pages)* responded to a number of requests last year and last week from people who wanted to see a snapshot of what Educational Services spends. It was not an exhaustive list from the district budget but contained Common Core information, how BSEP funds reach kids, LCAP supplemental funds, and some of the block grants. This was developed to give some sense of how all the pieces work together.

Scuderi presented *Support for Teaching: Professional Development, Plan Overview: FY 2017-18 (4 pages)* noting this was the budget that built the PD model and allocations. He highlighted the "2017-18 Goals" and Beery added that those were not the only PD goals. Last year she asked all budget managers to include in their documents at least a couple of SMART goals (Specific, Measurable, Actionable, Realistic and Timed). Metrics were built into the LCAP but not necessarily BSEP. The listed goals were a couple of those Michelle Sinclair,

PD Coordinator, thought were important and could report back on them on.

Scuderi noted the document detailed the PD expenses for the total expense of \$854K shown previously on the second page of the Teacher Template. He outlined the staffing and other expenditures. Beery noted that if there were funds left over from Measure A, they would be expended under the rules of Measure A and since the purposes for both measures were the same, the transition would be seamless.

Questions and Responses:

- In response to Eknoian's question about cultural competency, Scuderi stated that it was about raising awareness for the teaching force that was still overwhelmingly white. It was about how the classroom was to be an inclusive place where all kids feel comfortable being engaged, and explicitly asking teachers to make sure the curriculum lessons, images etc. were being portrayed for the kids in the class. That also included sensibilities around identity and race assumptions.
- Pastika asked for clarification on the 2.75FTE Elementary Literacy Coaches. Beery confirmed that on the second page, the Lit Coaches are funded from a combination of sources. Scuderi confirmed that the Site Funds provided about 20% to fully fund the site-based Lit Coaches to 1.0FTE. He also noted that many sites have opted to provide additional funding.
- Glimme asked for the formatting for columnar documents such as Teacher Template to show headings on all pages. Dates for documents should be added as well.
- Pastika stated that since we get so much information to look at for the first time at these meetings, her understanding was that with the documents they were seeing tonight, after digesting what was there, they would get a second opportunity to see a revised version. Beery confirmed this.
- Beery confirmed the next meeting would be March 21, 2017.
- Campbell wondered if there would be more goals under PD, and Beery confirmed the revised version could have more goals, but the SMART goals were meant to be a subset of measurable goals and are not the only program objectives. Sinclair was comfortable with elucidating the two SMART goals, and she will add another one or two.
- Scuderi noted the District is bringing in the people who have been training equity strategies and hoping to get them in for classroom applications as well.
- Scuderi noted that the Program Evaluation narrative mostly outlines staffing and that the program has not changed that much. He said the work ahead would be to streamline and focus the mission. The majority of the recommendations in the narrative relates to staff such as TSAs to help with everything from creating and processing assessments, people who respond directly to principals when they want particular data sets pulled out to bring to their SGCs, and operational support for logistics on state tests as well as local assessments. The allocations are broken up a little bit by grade level, with the high school and middle schools having a data support person. He noted that person is shown as a 0.4FTE but also supported with site funds to 0.8FTE. There is an Evaluation and Assessment Analyst (classified staff) who does a lot of the polishing, turn around and delivery of data.
- Scuderi noted that there are plans to transition from Power School, the current student database, to the Illuminate data system. Illuminate would handle student ID and attendance as well as classroom and assessment data. They were setting aside money for teachers to ramp up for that.

Beery stated that what was just presented is a very complicated budget. The Committee would have time to mull over the information and prepare questions for the next meeting.

Noting that the process began at the last meeting with talking in general about how this budget worked, she said the same would happen for Effective Student Support Funds that Scuderi would be presenting next.

At this time Co-Chair Perez asked for a motion to extend the meeting so they could hear the next presentation. A motion was made to extend the meeting to 9:45pm.

MOTION CARRIED (Pakter/Eknoian): To extend the P&O meeting to 9:45pm. **The motion was approved by 8 members, with 2 members abstaining.**

10. Student Support Funds in BSEP Measure E1: Middles School Counseling, Family Engagement and Student Achievement Strategies

Pasquale Scuderi, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services

Scuderi provided the following handouts:

- *Effective Student Support, Counseling and Behavioral Health, Family Engagement and Access, Student Achievement Strategies, Plan Overview: FY 2017-18*

Scuderi explained the content of the narrative noted above. This budget included RtI² that helped to round out the Special Education staffing, and Literacy Coaches. He added that some of this information could be found on page 3 of the *DRAFT* document.

Questions and Responses:

- In response to Eknoian's question about the \$925K Response to Intervention at the bottom of page 3 of the *DRAFT* document, Scuderi stated that was the LCAP funding that went to the sites for the coordinator positions. BSEP provides another \$550K for RtI² (shown in the K-5/6-8 RtI/MM teachers/BSEP columns above and to the right of the \$925K LCAP funding) for an approximate total of \$1.5M.
- Pastika asked how it is determined how many RtI² and Literacy positions or a portion of a position go to each school. Scuderi confirmed that there is a target of 1.0FTE Lit Coach for each site. There are identified Special Ed staff (mild/moderate, moderate/severe) for all of the sites so the money rounds those positions out. Within the LCAP allocations, they look at the total population and the concentration of "unduplicated" students. Pastika's understanding was that these positions were standard, then LCAP layered on top of that, and then the individual site plans were another layer (of funding).
- Makler noted that there is an allocation per site, but since the populations vary from site to site, what drives the number? Scuderi stated that as much as the District would like to have a clean formula, it is difficult given the disparity in school size or the number of "unduplicated" kids. If you make staffing commitments based on "unduplicated" kids, that is doing so based on a transient population, so when the District assigns FTEs to a site, the principals do their best to integrate those allocations. Instead of a hard and fast formula, much of the focus has been to provide and coordinate all the student support services that come out of LCAP which includes RtI², Lit Coaches, and EL support. Within the EL support for instance, the allocation has been done based on the proportion number of ELLs, but adjustments have been made, some based on school size, some based on "unduplicated" students. The District added a 0.4FTE at Malcolm X at the end of last year based on their atypical school size as an elementary rather than just saying that the LCAP money follows "unduplicated" students. There was some criticism about that, but Scuderi felt it was the right move.
- Schoenfeld asked if some schools didn't get Family Engagement services because more was put into counseling? Scuderi stated they didn't push Family Engagement

into middle schools because of the investment in counseling and because last year LCAP put \$300K into a Restorative Practices Counselor at each of the middle schools. That person was there to build capacity for staff for dealing with alternative forms of consequences and behavior management but also to case-manage 30 to 40 of the most challenged kids. That was a choice that was made for the middle schools, and there are frequent questions about whether or not Family Engagement should be expanded. Schoenfeld noted that it seemed to her that Family Engagement bridges school and home, reaches out to parents to be drawn into the school. It seems that it would be helpful for a TWI school. He felt they would have to revisit adding an extra counselor with a specific and designated purpose.

- Huchting noted that Willard had spent money from their BSEP fund for a counselor to support the middle school population because their SGC saw that need and made that choice.
- Beery confirmed that this was a first look at the program, and there will be a budget given at the next meeting.
- Going back to Pastika's comments about LCAP and site plans, Schoenfeld stated that the three goals for LCAP are the template for the site plans as the goals of the District. Can we do something besides that? It seems like it was supporting LCAP and giving more money to those goals, then if you serve those students, it benefits everybody. Beery stated that each site plan was going to be tailored by the site and encompass a lot of things that may or may not be directed to the "unduplicated" students. LCAP Goal 1 used to say "High Quality Classroom Teaching" and it became "Academics and Enrichment." When LCAP first appeared on the scene, the LCAP goals became the strategic plan as a default, but there's room for each site to make individual choices. Scuderi said the goals were broad strategic categories rather than prescriptive mandates.
- Pakter asked if Committee member input was expected as they looked at the previews? He thought that would be done before a budget was presented. He would like to see more done for counseling and behavioral health for families instead of putting energy into RtI². Beery stated that it would be more helpful for a preliminary budget, as money would have to be taken from x to put toward y . It was hard to do in a vacuum. Glimme added that the subcommittees were the place to do that with the person that develops the budget. The P&O Committee does not develop the budgets.
- Beery, referring to the *P&O Member Availability and Interest* wanted to know who could attend the March 21st and April 11th meetings. Makler, Upp and Schoenfeld could not attend the March 21st meeting.
- Eknoian stated that looking at the size of the RtI² budget, noting that was his axe to grind, the question was how to get money to one group that was performing so poorly and yet has no identified pot of money associated with it.

11. 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.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:40 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support