

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES
March 21, 2017

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

P&O Committee Members Present:

Terry Pastika, <i>Jefferson</i>	Shauna Rabinowitz, <i>King</i>
Danielle Perez, <i>John Muir (co-Chair)</i>	Laura Cho, <i>Willard</i>
Byron Pakter, <i>LeConte</i>	Catherine Huchting, <i>Willard</i>
Weldon Bradstreet, <i>Rosa Parks</i>	Aaron Glimme, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Aaron Schiller, <i>Thousand Oaks (Co)</i>	Josh Irwin, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Bethany Schoenfeld, <i>Longfellow</i>	Christina Balch, <i>Independent Study</i>

P&O Committee Members Absent*:

Bridget Bernhard, <i>Arts Magnet (Alt)</i>	John Eknoian, <i>Oxford</i>
Martin De Mucha Flores, <i>Cragmont (Co)</i>	Carla Bryant, <i>Oxford (Alt)</i>
Eric van Dusen, <i>Cragmont (Co)</i>	Stephanie Upp, <i>Washington</i>
Victoria Hritonenko, <i>Cragmont (Co)</i>	Josh Chisom, <i>Washington (Alt)</i>
Dawn Paxson, <i>Emerson</i>	Bruce Simon, <i>King (co-Chair)</i>
Alex Makler, <i>Malcolm X</i>	Jose Luis Bedolla, <i>Berkeley High</i>

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

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

Javetta Cleveland, *Deputy Superintendent*
Donald Evans, Ed.D, *Superintendent*
Beatriz Leyva-Cutler, *School Board*
Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*
Mary Ann Scheuer, *TSA/Elementary Teacher Librarian*
Pasquale Scuderi, *Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services*

BSEP Staff:

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

BSEP Staff:

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

1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports

At 7:18 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.

- Rabinowitz (King) asked if it was possible to set up a text poll at their open house, whether it was expensive, and could it be included in the Family Engagement budget. This will be discussed with Beery outside the meeting.
- Cho (Willard) stated that they were working on allocating their funds. She stated that some of the math and science teachers asked if they could get more money for technology.

2. Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda

Co-chair Perez noted there were not enough voting members to establish a quorum so she suggested moving forward until the quorum was met.

The quorum was established at 8:35pm with 12 voting members present. 12 voting members were required for a quorum. Motions to approve the agenda and the P&O meeting minutes of 3-7-17 occurred after 8:35pm.

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Huchting): To approve the agenda of the March 21, 2017 P&O Committee Meeting. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

3. Chairperson's Comments

Co-Chair Danielle Perez

Perez reminded members to take turns while talking, and requested members to state names before making a motion or a second.

4. BSEP Director's Comments

Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations

Beery apologized for not being able to get many of the meeting documents to the members in advance of the night's meeting given the need for revisions. She added that she hoped the Planning & Oversight pace and process would be helped by the structure of having introductions to each of the programs at earlier meetings, followed by later meetings with the first and second views of the narratives and budgets. She recognized that it was a lot of information and thanked the committee members for trying to keep up with all of it.

Beery noted that along with her BSEP duties, she is also the Director of Community Relations, and as such attended a meeting at the Mayor's office consisting of community members and organizations, the police chief and others to review continued concerns about the effect of the current federal administration's policies on our immigrant families. Beery stated that there are two task groups, the Sanctuary Group and the Response Plan Group, the latter of which she would attend. She would be discussing how all BUSD families and immigrant families should be thinking about care-giving plans and making sure they have all their information up-to-date so the District knows where to find family members and their children. It was unfortunate that those procedures needed to be tightened up to make sure Berkeley students are well cared for and families would not have to worry about one more thing.

5. Superintendent's Report

Donald Evans, Ed.D.

Evans noted that it was a busy time of the year for the District, and the P&O Committee would be hearing the Second Interim Report and its impacts on the district.

Teachers would be presenting Next Generation Science Standards and an update on Common Core mathematics at the Wednesday, March 22, 2017 School Board meeting. There will be a first reading for staffing budget priorities, and Evans noted there would be cuts with more to be made. He noted that many school districts would be making cuts as a result of the Governor's budget. Also on the agenda would be a discussion of possible financing for teacher/employee housing.

6. Approval of Minutes March 7, 2016

There was a brief review allowed for the March 7, 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.) A typo for Beatrice Leyva-Cutler name on the attendance list was noted for correction: Leyva-Butler should be Leyva-Cutler.

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Schoenfeld): To approve the meeting minutes of the March 7, 2017 P&O Committee Meeting with the above mentioned correction. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

7. Public Comment

Balch stated that she asked her Independent Study/IS administrator how they could get information from the district survey and was unable to get an answer. She noted that IS was a part of Berkeley High School/BHS, and they don't know who of their population, responded to that survey because they don't get that information. Beery responded that Debbi D'Angelo, Director of Evaluation and Assessment, could help with that, but was not able to attend the meeting tonight and added that D'Angelo could be reached during her office hours daily from 4-6pm or by email to answer questions. (Berkeley Research, Evaluation & Assessment/BREA: <http://www.berkeleyschools.net/departments/bea-berkeley-evaluation-assessment/>) Beery confirmed that Balch could work with D'Angelo about maintaining confidentiality with the IS site survey.

Perez added that during a conversation with another SGC person, there was some confusion about who could look at surveys. She felt that needed clarification. Beery responded that there had been issues with that before, especially around open-ended questions that pertained to individuals. D'Angelo worked to provide the information needed while maintaining confidentiality. Perez asked about SGCs sharing survey responses with the school, and Beery stated that D'Angelo would help evaluate questions/answers that would be appropriate to share.

Huchting asked for clarification about surveys, were they the same or different? Beery responded that there was a core district survey that had the same questions.

Glimme added, in reference to Balch's concerns above, that BHS does not do a site survey. The high school had stopped doing the survey many years ago because the results were not helpful. The BHS SGC takes proposals from teachers/students/others for the distribution of their site funds.

Schoenfeld asked if other schools have teachers take a survey that was more internal regarding school climate and administration. How do teachers provide that information?

Glimme and Evans noted that BHS teachers take a survey for the union that gives the District information on how things are done. It was confirmed that the BUSD teachers do take a union survey.

Huchting asked if it was possible to find out the total number of surveys turned in and if the information was meaningful. Beery said that was a question for D'Angelo to answer.

NOTE: At this point in the meeting, Co-chair Perez asked for the quorum to be established and agenda and previous minutes to be approved. See items **2. Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda** and **6. Approval of Minutes March 7, 2016** above.

8. State and District Budget Overview

Javetta Cleveland, Deputy Superintendent

Cleveland provided the following handouts:

- *Berkeley Unified School District: FY 2016-17 Second Interim Budget (Slide Presentation-18 slides)*
- *Budget Priorities for 2017-2018 Budget*

Deputy Superintendent Cleveland began her presentation with the Second Interim Budget slide presentation as noted above. She noted that she was keeping an eye on a positive financial statement and balanced budget. She confirmed that a lot of districts were making significant reductions and though BUSD did not need to make significant reductions, some did need to be made. Cleveland stated that was a tribute to BSEP and the P&O Committee working well with the teachers union, Board, and the Superintendent's Budget Advisory Committee/SBAC, that the District was able to keep a balanced budget. She stated that last year the District had a AA+ credit rating from Standard & Poors and a AAA rating from Fitch. This year they had a AA+ credit rating from Standard & Poors but did not seek a rating from Fitch.

Unfortunately, the Governor's Proposed Budget for 2017-18 reduced the amount of revenue to all school districts quite substantially. That was one of the reasons they were looking at making reductions to the budget. Earlier, smaller reductions will assist with the multi-year projections. If no cuts are made early on, drastic cuts would have to be made later. She noted that the presentation would show positive revenues for 2016-17 with a positive ending fund balance and a structural deficit beginning in 2017-18. Cleveland confirmed this was due to three major factors:

1. **State revenues decreased. One time funding (Mandated Cost Reimbursement/MCR) from the state/Governor's Budget was reduced by \$214K or \$1.9M when it was projected to be over \$2M. In 2015-16, the District received \$5M in MCR. The District will receive \$400K in 2017-18.**
2. **Pension costs increased by \$1.1M for the last three years and continue at that pace.** The increases are cumulative. Every year until 2019-20, the pension cost will be increasing by 1.85% for California State Teacher Retirement System/CALSTRS as well as Public Employees Retirement System/PERS. Cleveland noted that the District has to cover those costs despite decreased revenues.
3. **Enrollment declined by 127 total students district-wide.** Cleveland noted this occurred at the high school and kindergarten levels. They will try to increase enrollment by 60 students for 2017-18. She noted that when enrollment declines, so does funding as supported by Average Daily Attendance/ADA. ADA adjusts for the following year and will impact district funding if the enrollment is not adjusted upward. The 2017-18 budget will be based on 2016-17 ADA unless enrollment increases. It will not reach budget adjustments based on enrollment from 2015-16

levels.

4. **Noted additional costs:** The District had to increase the contribution to Special Education for a **total of \$274K**. This was for agency support services as well as a Board-approved one-time expenditure of \$100K for assessments for Special Ed students.

The second interim budget was noted as the third budget of the year and could be viewed as a budget amendment for the adopted budget:

1. The budget was adopted on July 1, 2016
2. The first interim budget includes transaction/adjustments through October 31st
3. The second interim budget includes transaction/adjustments through January 31st.

Cleveland stated the District had a positive certification for the budget through the county and the state. This meant we are meeting our current year obligations and on target for the two subsequent years.

Our projected undesignated fund balance for the end of 2016-17 was \$5.5M, down from \$9.6M for the end of 2015-16. There were \$1.1M designated funds in our reserve committed to the following:

- \$400K for BSEP for the last year of the measure, which may not be used
- The District put away \$2M for the last year of Measure A and is projected to use \$1.6M of that for Class Size Reduction/CSR, increased salary costs and Program Support on “Page 2” for the 2016-17 Teacher Transfer

The total ending fund balance for 2016-17 was \$6.6M and the change in fund balance since the First Interim was increased by \$600K. Cleveland thought things looked good for 2016-17.

There was a net savings from LCAP unexpended funds, which was pulled and kept for targeted students, four unfilled 1.0 FTE positions due to the drop in enrollment, and decreased health costs due to vacancies. Cleveland noted that she also looks for any extra funds that could be pulled for savings. The total savings was \$1M.

Cleveland explained the change in fund balance (equivalent to profit or loss) on the multi-year projection slide. She noted that the drop in fund balance from \$9.6M to \$5.5M was due to deficit spending for BSEP in the last year of Measure A, a 3% salary bonus, and a one-time Common Core/CC expenditure that was part of the budget. She noted a projected negative fund balance in 2017-18 of \$125K and 2018-19 of \$1.1M. Cleveland added that the one-time funds of approximately \$6.4M could be taken out of the budget to see if there was really a structural deficit, and that was explained in detail in the slide presentation. She noted that when that was done, there was a \$568K operating deficit in 2017-18 and in 2018-19 an operating deficit of \$1.1M. There was not a deficit for 2016-17. Ending fund balances were noted on slide 18 with \$5.4M 2018-19 going forward.

Cleveland reviewed the 2017-18 Budget Priorities with the committee members. These were going to be presented to the Board for discussion. She emphasized that costs needed to be monitored and prioritized.

Questions and Responses:

- There was a question about the Special Ed assessments, and Cleveland stated that was something that addressed Special Ed student needs. Further clarification was given by Scuderi that it could be tools and assessments for reading or math for those students. Scuderi was asked to get the number of Special Ed students for the Committee.
- Cleveland confirmed the 3% one-time bonuses were part of the negotiated salary increase. That was in addition to an ongoing 2% salary increase.
- Huchting asked if the Cleveland could project out the possible structural deficit for

the length of Measure E1. Cleveland stated that it was difficult to predict but for 2019-20, it gets a little more balanced. That does not include any negotiated salary increases for the subsequent years. Cleveland repeated that the teacher pension will continue to increase by 1.85%/year or about \$1.1M/year for certificated teacher salaries until 2019-20. It was confirmed that the pension was incorporated into the average teacher cost for the teacher transfer funded by BSEP.

- Cleveland confirmed that the 60 additional student enrollment numbers would come from what they have already received in the admissions office, so there will be some growth. She noted that there was a large 8th grade cohort moving to the 9th grade. Some new students would be inter-district transfers. It was noted that there was a large graduating 5th grade cohort that would be part of the 60 additional students and impacting the middle school level enrollment.
- ROP was defined as Regional Occupational Programs that provided Career Technical Education/CTE, Fire Science or Biotech classes.
(<http://bhs.berkeleyschools.net/departments-2/career-technical-education-cterop/>)
- Cleveland confirmed that the Technology needs line item was \$131K for 2017-18 and 2018-19.
- Scuderi confirmed that the Achieving Proportionality with RtI² Staffing K-8 line item budget was To Be Determined/TBD and a decision that would depend on revenues. LCAP may address this priority, and he noted that funds for RtI² come from BSEP and LCAP. Cleveland stated that they were still looking for funding as well as making reductions. It was easier to fund one-time costs opposed to ongoing costs. She added that the BHS redesign would be an ongoing cost at \$550K/year and funding sources need to be found for that as well. The District needs another School Nurse so they are looking for sources of funding for that.
- Cleveland confirmed the state-mandated 3% reserve was held in a special reserve and estimated that to be over \$3M.
- Cleveland stated that the District would not have to make drastic cuts like neighboring schools districts. She had a preliminary target of reducing the budget by \$750K for 2018-19 to keep the budget balanced. She added that she could not predict other reductions from the state and federal governments or impacts from a recession, but she would be monitoring those things.
- Evans added that the BHS Redesign that would have an impact on the budget, and cuts would have to be made during its implementation.
- Pastika asked if the Budget Priorities items were already accounted for financially or items that the District wants to do but unsure what “bucket of money” it was coming from. Cleveland stated that these items were critical items that the District needs in order to operate. There were recommendations for things like food service, where we have vacancies, which is often because we don’t offer enough hours for those employees. That restructuring included \$50K for increasing hours and providing health benefits so we can attract more applicants and retain them. She noted they were losing revenue and the support for ROP programs. The non-salaried and BTA reductions offset the items that were proposed in column 1. These don’t add to the budget because of the reductions, but there was a structural deficit that still needed to be dealt with on top of that. The one-time budget items will be funded from the \$6M reserve, which will decrease that reserve to about \$2.8M at the end of 2018-19. It was not a dire situation, but it was something that needed to be monitored. She added that the BHS Redesign budgeted at \$550K/year would advance the fully expended reserves at the end of 2018-19 or 2019-20.

- Cho asked what prompted the BHS Redesign. Scuderi stated that they had a team analyze the way the most effective high schools were structured, particularly at the entry point of 9th grade. The District was not in line with that research in terms of the level of personalization offered and coherence and calibration around curriculum. There was a long-standing concern about the way students were assigned to different schools and the structures we were setting up in terms of how teaching and learning happened in 9th grade. There seemed to be a need to do something structurally different. Our program was segregating kids a little too diffuse in terms of what was being taught. The system was proving to be inherently inequitable in terms of the choices that kids make and receive in the 9th grade student assignment process.
- Leyva-Cutler, in reference to ADA, added that every SGC should monitor the attendance of students in our schools.. She encouraged members to ask for the attendance numbers at their schools and ask what could be done to ensure students are attending.
- Irwin asked about the school bus line item. He noted that buses were so expensive, it was prohibitive for classes to go on field trips. Irwin wondered if the money could go to retrofitting the old buses with seat belts. He noted buying two new buses does not necessarily make them more available or at a cheaper rate for the schools to use. He wanted more information. Cleveland responded that the District had not purchased buses in 8-10 years and noted the maintenance costs for buses was very high. She added that there were 35 buses in the fleet, and the cost was a one-time cost. Cleveland confirmed they had their own budget within the transportation budget. The purchase of the buses will reduce maintenance costs further and Transportation will give that money back to the General Fund/GF. Cleveland will look into field trip costs and noted that when the maintenance costs go down, the field trip costs should also go down. There was also a schedule in 2018-19 to replace five buses and hold after that to see what was happening with the budget.
- Pakter noted that the Common Core budget was the largest item compared to everything else. If something could be done to reduce that budget by possibly 5%, it could help with the deficit. Cleveland noted that budget had been cut several times but it was one-time money, and she thought they should be looking critically at the ongoing costs.

Cleveland noted that the budget priorities Superintendent Evans mentioned were not a part of the presentation she gave. Beery noted that budget priorities would be sent out to committee members. Cleveland stated there would be some reductions in the budget priorities, and noted costs at the central office and school sites and any increased costs would be kept to a minimum.

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 presentation and handouts:

- *Berkeley Unified School District, FY 2017-18 Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document (2 pages)*
- *FY 2017-18 Teacher Transfer, Summary of Proposals, March 21, 2017 (Chart)*
- *Support for Teaching: Professional Development Plan Overview: FY 2017-18 (4 pages)*
- *Support for Teaching: Program Evaluation, Plan Overview: FY 2017-18 (5 pages)*
- *Berkeley Unified School District Memo, To: Donald Evans, Ed.D., Superintendent, From: Pasquale Scuderi, Asst. Superintendent for Educational Services, Date: March*

22, 2017, Subject: Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Class Size Reduction Funds in FY 2017-18 (4 pages with handwritten corrections on page 5, note page 4 missing)

Scuderi pointed to the major differences between the last presentation and the current document for the teacher transfer.

- On page 2, Discretionary, he noted that the line items were programs they would be able to do once CSR was met.
- There was an attached budget for Professional Development.
- There was an attached budget for Program Evaluation.
- Bilingual Maintenance Program @ Thousand Oaks/TO: Last meeting it was thought they would need a 3.0FTE investment to sustain that program but looking at enrollment, they are proposing 1.0FTE with the hope that part of the increased district enrollment numbers will include students for that program that would round it up to 3.0FTE. They will not know for certain until they see the actual enrollment numbers. They will be making a recommendation to the Board in June about what can be done for that program for the 2018-19 school year. This was the most significant change from the last presentation.
- Classroom Support BTECH (BTA): Scuderi stated BTA had been overstaffed for a long time as explained at the last meeting. The enrollment was more like 60-90 students as opposed to the 150 that it had been staffed for. The new principal will be trying to make an effort to keep and draw kids to that campus as a genuine alternative and not just a place where you end up. They are proposing a gradual reduction to staffing with an enrollment goal of 90 kids. This would mean a decrease in FTE from 10 to 8 FTE. BSEP would pay for an additional 2.93 FTE to bring BTA to 8.0 FTE.
- Beery passed out the handout *FY 2017-18 Teacher Transfer, Summary of Proposals, March 21, 2017 (Chart)* noting that it would help describe the bottom line for the teacher template seen last meeting and this meeting as it related to TO and BTA

Questions and Responses:

- Huchting noted that at the last meeting, Cathy Campbell, Berkeley Federation of Teachers/BFT President, said that if the BTA and TO proposals were not approved, the money could go to a separate reserve. That was affirmed.
- Beery confirmed that the 2.93FTE for BTA would support an even lower class size beyond the 18:1 required by the measure for that school. Scuderi noted that if they were to go down to 5.0FTE, which is what is justified just by class size ratios, it would require teachers with multiple credentials in order to cover all subjects which becomes more complicated to do. Cleveland stated that there would be 8.0 FTE at BTA, and it was just a different way of accounting for it than in previous years. She noted that 5.0 FTE would be the class size goal and the 2.93 FTE would be supporting the program and therefore going from 10.0 FTE to 8.0 FTE was overall a 2.0 FTE reduction as presented in her budget.
- Huchting asked why the District didn't pay for BTA completely and wondered what the real plan was around drawing more students to BTA. She acknowledged that the site was important and relevant but wanted to get more understanding about it. Beery stated that the continuation program support was written into the Measure. Scuderi stated the strategy had been discussed over the past couple of years. The new principal would like to take advantage of some of the smaller revenue streams such as a Career Technical Education/CTE grant for alternative/continuation schools. He felt that it was worth trying to establish trying something different there, and how long

they would do that would require thinking deeply about it. The alternative would be to provide a straight continuation program which they are mandated to provide. It would be very bare bones, provided credit recovery to get a high school diploma, and out you go. There are all kinds of arguments for and against that, and it would be the cheaper way to go, but there is also an opportunity to see if through technology or a digital arts component, they might engage some kids for whom BHS did not work. He thought they would have to be conservative with the window offered to the BTA Principal. The new principal was trying to get a Career Pathways Trust 2 (for alternative schools) funding for something like a new recording studio. They may have to rethink staffing, courses and materials.

- Leyva-Cutler stated that in the past, students went to BTA for credit recovery and they did not currently have to move over from BHS for that. For students who were not doing well, this was a real safety net. In the past, they would see enrollment go up to 100 mid-year, but they were not seeing those numbers this year.
- Pakter noted that even if BTA received support at 2.93FTE, the ratio would be near 10:1. Beery confirmed this would be correct for a teacher calculation for 8.0 FTE. Scuderi noted that BTA had a very different population of students. Glimme explained that at the high school level, teachers have credentials for specific subjects, even some disciplines within that subject. It was not the same as elementary school, and high school teachers can't just teach any class. He noted that his class, though larger, was easier to run because his students had fewer needs that required support to be successful in the classroom. He added that the BTA students were our highest-risk and highest-needs students. There have been cuts, and it was reasonable to keep the program to see if we can attract students while running it to be successful at the same time. Balch confirmed the high needs of the students and that the staff worked very hard to serve them.
- Irwin referred to TO staffing, and Cleveland confirmed that of the additional 3.0 FTE that would be necessary to support a special "bilingual maintenance program", 2.0 FTE might fit into the teacher template if overall enrollment goals are met, and an additional 1.0 FTE would be provided through "Classroom Support" by BSEP. Beery added that the latest admissions projections allowed them to move 2.0 FTE from "Classroom Support" to the Teacher Template. Beery stated this was a planning document that gives us the best idea for today, but that things may change between now and June and then change again in the fall. If enrollment goals were not met, if they were unable to create those classrooms based on increased enrollment, it could drive the entire 3.0 FTE back into BSEP Classroom Support funding (rather than the Teacher Template for which the GF pays about 2/3 and BSEP about 1/3).
- Irwin asked about the long-term discussion the District was having about TWI, a successful program, a special program and said that it mattered to him if it was 3.0 FTEs or 1.0 FTE. He added that out of all the discretionary Classroom Support staffing, TO staffing was 3.0 FTE and for BHS and middle schools, it was only 7.6 FTE, and he saw inequity there. Scuderi replied that at the beginning of last year if they got low enrollment, they would backfill the class and that was a dilemma too because what was a bilingual maintenance program was merged into a quasi-TWI class but not called that. They will report to the Board what the options are because he thinks what they were doing now is unfair to staff and students while creating a multi-tiered process in trying to get folks in. Scuderi mention a few options being considered and confirmed for this year, this was the best-case scenario for how this program could be managed for the next budget year.

- Glimme asked whether there was any information about the adjustments for 3rd grade Necessary FTE of -1.56. Nitschke responded that was to align the actual class size with the built-in 20:1 calculation.

The *Support for Teaching: Professional Development Plan Overview: FY 2017-18* and *Support for Teaching: Program Evaluation, Plan Overview: FY 2017-18* were handed out. Beery stated the Professional Development/PD budget dollars and overall strategy had not changed since it was presented two weeks ago. A couple of SMART goals were added to Program Evaluation, but the budget dollars and strategy remained the same.

Questions and Responses for PD:

- Balch inquired where Independent Studies fit into the PD Plan. Scuderi responded that it was a matter of the central office and IS administration needing to connect better, that there was nothing that would inherently prohibit IS staff from attending teacher workshops and using consultant services funded by this budget. Balch commented that IS staff was focused on the curricular area.
- How do students get into IS? Balch stated that the program could be compared to an independent learning community without a lottery. Attending IS is a student's choice, not an involuntary transfer. What does IS look like? Balch said that IS runs on a quarter system where the students take three classes at once instead of six. A lot of the students are concurrently enrolled at BHS and can also be enrolled at a community college to get high school and college credit simultaneously. Students meet in small seminars with their instructors. Teachers have more prep time and a lower student load, and teachers are also paid less because of this. Balch noted that she has about 60 students at once. She teaches seven subjects, English and Social Science. She also meets with students individually each week. Balch noted that in many IS programs one teacher would teach all their subjects in a packet program. That is not the case at this site. The IS teachers, like those at BHS, create their own curriculum and do assessments so that the IS program is the equivalent of the course load at BHS, such as Academic Choice for example. She confirmed that there was anywhere from 100 to 150 students enrolled in the program. They were currently fully enrolled with students on a wait list. There was also a K-8 program as well.
- Beery confirmed that when "other resources" was mentioned in the PD narrative, it referred to resources from places like the PTA. Pastika asked, for instance, if with the Lit Coaches, there was there any way for the SGCs to see what they get at the individual schools. Beery was not sure it showed up on the budget, but it should show up on the site plan.

Beery noted that she had hand-corrected an error discovered last minute in the copies of the *Berkeley Unified School District Memo, To: Donald Evans, Ed.D., Superintendent, From: Pasquale Scuderi, Asst. Superintendent for Educational Services, Date: March 22, 2017, Subject: Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Class Size Reduction Funds in FY 2017-18*. The committee members would find a summary for the CSR budget there. The information and handwritten numbers all relate to the Teacher Template. Corrected copies will be sent to P&O members.

Further Questions and Responses:

- Beery confirmed that the two handouts for PD and Program Evaluation provide further budget details within the CSR resource of Teacher Support.
- It was confirmed the committee members would be voting on this budget this evening.

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Schoenfeld): To approve the recommendation for BSEP Funds in FY 2017-18: CSR and Support for Teaching. **The motion was approved by 10 members, with 2 members abstaining.**

Discussion:

- Irwin asked where the extra \$200K would come from if we could not get the TO enrollment needed for the assigned FTEs, if FTEs get added to “Page 2” and where would that cut be made. Cleveland responded that most of the funding would be transferred from “Page 1, the Teacher Template” to “Page 2, Discretionary Funding” noting the balance would not be -0- because of the way the Teacher Template was calculated. There would not be much impact on the discretionary programs. Beery referred to the *Teacher Transfer* document pointing out that the difference could be \$763K vs. \$964K, noting there would still be enough to pay for everything else but there would be less in the fund balance.
- Cleveland responded to a question about whether this fund could be handled more efficiently to get out of the 3-year projected budget deficit. She noted the history of BSEP supporting the District funding for several years during the recession and the District supported BSEP programs during the last year of Measure A. Cleveland stated there were some things that could be done that would need to be discussed. It would mean putting more things on “Page 2” than there were now. Beery added that efforts, such as keeping a reserve, are being made so that BSEP will be self-sustaining. It would be beneficial to be more efficient with this budget over the next eight years of Measure E1.
- Huchting appreciated the above question and noted the importance of PD to the teachers in relationship to the goals we share. Scuderi stated the PD budget plan seen here was for a long time the lion’s share of the program. Now the Common Core (CC) money is overwhelmingly spent on teacher development, curriculum development and collaboration time. When that dips down by \$500K in 2018-19, this will again be the smaller heart and soul of how PD will be funded.

Huchting mentioned that in the past the committee inquired about what the teachers think about some of these particular programs and how they have been helped. That would determine the value and efficacy of what these programs are. Beery responded that Michelle Sinclair, Coordinator of Professional Development, had stated previously that the PD department assesses how useful each of these approaches were to the teachers. Glimme stated that teachers fill out surveys after every PD meeting providing feedback about how teachers felt about that support and the union survey also touches on things like that. On a broader scale, the way we affect students in this District is through teachers doing things so kids could learn. If teachers are to do that job better and more effectively, the District must help, teach, and provide the tools to do that. PD was the best, most valuable way to that.

Scuderi added that what you see in the PD budget was a lot of the coordinative responsibilities and staff who were designing and carrying out PD every day. That may have to change as CC money goes away and the District has to do more to

deal with the hourly teacher costs or substitute costs for teachers to attend a PD session on top of the PD coordination.

Scheuer stated that the PD given by BUSD staff was customized and focused on exactly what our teachers needed. Follow-up support is provided in the classroom and that combination makes it particularly effective as opposed to just consultants coming from the outside.

- Scuderi confirmed that Beginning Teachers Support and Assessment/BTSA was currently funded through an Educators Effectiveness Block Grant for this year and next year. If you look in the multi-year projections it will return to the GF in 2019-20. The cost was approximately \$250-275K/year for about 30-35 beginning teachers over a 5-year period. The District was required to offer the program. It was not part of the BSEP or CSR budget.

10. Recommendation for BSEP Funds in FY 2017-18: Student Support Funds – Middle School Counseling, Family Engagement, & Student Achievement Strategies

Pasquale Scuderi, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services

Scuderi provided the following handouts:

- Berkeley Unified School District Memo, *To BSEP Planning and Oversight Committee, From: Pasquale Scuderi, Asst. Superintendent for Educational Services, Date: March 21, 2017, Subject: Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Effective Student Support Funds for FY 2017-18 (3 pages)*
- *Approximate RTI Service Scope for SY 2016-2017 as of 3/19/17 (1 page document with pyramid graph)*
- *Effective Student Support: Family Engagement Plan Overview: FY 2017-18 (3 pages)*
- *DRAFT, BSEP/Measure E1 of 2016, FY 2017/18 Revenue Projection, Revised 3/20/17*

Scuderi explained the *Effective Student Support Funds for 2017-18* and noted that the main allocations supported the Office of Family Engagement and Equity, Middle School Counselors and Academic Strategies, which included allocations for the district-wide RtI² program at K-5 and the middle schools, as well as a portion of the Literacy Coaches.

In addition to the memo, Scuderi provided a handout for the *Approximate RtI Service Scope for SY 2016-2017 as of 3/19/17* in response to questions about the students being served by the RtI² program. The purpose was to give a snapshot at this point in the year by asking the RtI² coordinators to look at their data in Illuminate to find the number of students being served and the approximate percentage of the student body they represented (graph). He noted the triangular diagram and stated that with good, differentiated instruction, 80 % of the students should be able to be served. Another 15%–20% of students would need a targeted, intensive, small group with consistent follow-up level of instruction to be successful. At the very top, there would be 5% of students that would need intensive services that ranged from Special Education services to other program changes. There were schools that had higher or lower ranges in Tier 2, and his department is working with those schools to understand their Tier 2 needs and use of services and evaluating why there were too many or too few students coming through. The data was a work in progress.

Referring to the Memo, *To BSEP Planning and Oversight Committee, From: Pasquale Scuderi, Asst. Superintendent for Educational Services, Date: March 21, 2017, Subject: Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Effective Student Support Funds for FY 2017-18*, Scuderi pointed to Counseling and Behavioral Health (page 2) as a title because in the future if they wanted to add something to that program that was more specific, they could do that. What was being proposed was keeping the current level of staffing with middle school

counselors. LCAP provided an additional intervention counselor at each of the middle schools to work with a specific caseload of kids and tasked with broadening an awareness of how use restorative practices and alternative means of correction for behavior issues.

Scuderi moved on to Achievement Strategies and briefly mentioned RtI², noting past spirited discussions around RtI². He noted that Literacy Coaches were also funded by LCAP to bring 1.0FTE/site baseline at K-5. Middle school coaches were currently being funded out of CC. The “Be A Scientist” program was being joint-funded by BSEP and LCAP. This was a way to add to afterschool and Saturday activities. He noted that the Superintendent started the Science Saturday program in partnership with Lawrence Hall of Science to provide hands-on experiences for students in and out of the classroom.

Questions and Responses:

- Was RtI² language arts or also math? Scuderi stated that RtI² was a process more than a program. It was consistently monitoring students with the 6-week data cycles implemented at the K-5 sites and included language arts and math performance.
- Schoenfeld said that at their SGC meetings they ask the teachers what they wanted, and the math teachers responded that they would really like to do intervention classes, one each for 6 and 7th grade and two for 8th grade. Where would that money come from? She noted that the data from Longfellow showed that 58.6% students received free and reduced lunch and that percentage was 26% at King. She talked to Ty Alper, School Board President, and he told her those numbers were right. It was noted those numbers may not be correct, adding that when there was a different makeup for student population that affected everything including student needs and the ability to fundraise. She noted the difference between equal and equitable as related to students with needs. Scuderi stated that it may be helpful to know that in the LCAP proposal that was going for its first presentation to the Board, there was a line item added for Middle School Math Intervention in response to that concern. They are currently funding a 1.0FTE for those math intervention classes with two each to King and Longfellow and one to Willard. King would be getting a 0.4FTE for school size, Longfellow would be getting a 0.4FTE for unduplicated students, and Willard would be getting transitional support. There would be flexibility in offering two math intervention classes at each of those school sites for next year. He added that the school principals will be responsible for placing the math intervention classes where they are needed most because the District cannot afford to provide that for each grade.
- Schoenfeld expressed her concern that the middle schools were getting more segregated based on seeing the data for students receiving free and reduced lunch. Scuderi confirmed that they were spending about \$5M/year from LCAP. Huchting estimated \$2.1M from BSEP and \$5M from LCAP would total \$7.1M and wondered how many students were being supported. She also wondered how effective the supports were.
- Scuderi confirmed that middle schools do not have lower class sizes for math. At one time, there was a program support line item for middle school CSR and they knew that would go away as Measure A ended. There was an allocation this year to open a few more math classes to keep the class sizes down but for next year there will not be a specific line item to reduce middle school math class sizes.
- Irwin asked about advanced learner classes, and Scuderi confirmed that was part of a GATE program in the GF. If appropriate, could it be included as part of RtI²? Scuderi stated that could be suggested.
- Pastika responded to Huchting’s reference to RtI² by noting Discretionary Site Funds

that could be used for that. Pastika asked if Program Evaluation would be evaluating the efficacy of the RtI² program. Scuderi confirmed that Program Evaluation pulls that information together as part of their work.

NOTE: At 9:29pm Co-Chair Perez asked for a motion to extend the meeting so that more could be heard about Student Support since a vote on this budget would take place at the next meeting. A motion was made to extend the meeting by 15 minutes (to 9:45pm).

MOTION CARRIED (Bradstreet/Irwin): To extend the P&O meeting by 15 minutes. **9 members approved the motion, with 2 members opposing and 1 member abstaining.**

Beery stated that further details would be given for the Family Engagement budget when Anne Callegari, Supervisor of the Office of Family Engagement and Equity/OFEE attends the next P&O meeting. Beery handed out the *Effective Student Support: Family Engagement Plan Overview: FY 2017-18* for the committee's review. She stated that the department was currently structured such that its expenses exceed revenues. It was known that there was a significant fund balance in the prior measure to draw upon due to staffing changes. It was known that unless additional revenue sources are found, there would need to be some cuts made. Callegari was already making cuts to discretionary expenditures for conferences and consultants, but they are currently in deficit-spending mode.

Questions and Responses:

- Huchting referred to the CSR document and asked where the General Fund Class Size FTE of 34:1 or 36:1 came from and was there any opportunity to rethink that. Glimme said that the GF was already in a deficit and it would be difficult to ask them to do more.
- Beery confirmed that the budget for OFEE did not include making reductions to staffing. If Callegari was able to keep the additional expenditures where they are, the staffing could possibly stay at the same structure for another year or two.

Beery handed out *DRAFT, BSEP/Measure E1 of 2016, FY 2017/18 Revenue Projection, Revised 3/20/17* and stated that the committee saw the first version of this in early February 2017. The allocations for all the resources were shown on this document. There was a mistake noted on the previous Student Support box (gold rectangle) that was corrected in the Revised 3/20/17 document for Middle School Counseling and Student Academic Strategies.

Beery stated that at the next meeting, the P&O members would be getting a second look at Family Engagement, Middle School Counseling and Student Academic Strategies. There would also be a first look at Libraries, Music and Technology.

Questions and Responses:

- Glimme noted that *Effective Student Support: Family Engagement Plan Overview: FY 2017-18* under Berkeley High School on page 2, BSEP actually pays for more than “.27FTE,” noting it was double that and Beery stated that was correct at .53FTE.
- Irwin asked what the long-term plan was for OFEE since this budget was running a deficit. Beery said there had been a theory that LCAP would pick up more of that and that hasn't happened yet. Otherwise it would require internal restructuring or taking money from another resource within the BSEP structure, which was written into Measure E1 and would decrease the other resource's budget.
- Middle School Counseling was confirmed as not encompassing the Vice Principals.
- Beery confirmed that BUSD would not get revenues from the new buildings being built in the City of Berkeley until they are included on the tax rolls. They cannot be included in budget projections until then. Over time the district might realize revenues of a couple of hundred thousand but it will not be a significant amount.

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 9:38 p.m.
Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support