

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

April 25, 2017

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

P&O Committee Members Present:

Rashay Lankford, *Pre-K*
Martin De Mucha Flores, *Cragmont (Co)*
Danielle Perez, *John Muir (Co-chair)*
Denise Dafflon, *LeConte (Sub)*
Grace Kong, *LeConte (Sub)*
Alex Makler, *Malcolm X*
Carla Bryant, *Oxford (Alt)*
John Eknoian, *Oxford*

Weldon Bradstreet, *Rosa Parks*
Aaron Schiller, *Thousand Oaks*
Stephanie Upp, *Washington*
Bruce Simon, *King (Co-chair)*
Bethany Schoenfeld, *Longfellow*
Catherine Huchting, *Willard*
Jose Luis Bedolla, *Berkeley High*
Aaron Glimme, *Berkeley High*

P&O Committee Members Absent*:

Bridget Bernhard, *Arts Magnet (Alt)*
Dawn Paxson, *Emerson*
Terry Pastika, *Jefferson*
Shauna Rabinowitz, *King*

Laura Cho, *Willard*
Josh Irwin, *Berkeley High*
Christina Balch, *Independent Study*

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

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

Donald Evans, *Superintendent*
Peter Gidlund, *VAPA Supervisor*
Olivia Lam, *LeConte Parent*
Beatriz Leyva-Cutler, *School Board*
Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*
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 7:20 p.m. Co-chair Simon called the meeting to order by welcoming attendees and asking them to introduce themselves. SGC site reports were given as part of the introductions.

Of note:

- Simon (King) noted that there was significant concern at King Middle School over the possibility of losing Title I funds, which would be a hit to the overall school budget. Title I funding is based on the number of students who qualify for Free & Reduced Lunch. It is becoming increasingly difficult to get families to submit the paperwork so the school could qualify for those funds. He added that they were “grandfathered” in for this year but may lose Title I funding next year.
- Makler (Malcolm X) noted their principal presented the California School Dashboard (<https://www.caschooldashboard.org/#/Home>). He was impressed by the

improvement in math scores and reading proficiency demonstrated, and suggested that someone write an editorial or op-ed piece for Berkeleyside to talk about the progress schools continue to make.

- Eknoian (Oxford) stated that 80-85% of the monies the SGC was spending was directed toward personnel.
- Nitschke invited the Committee members to the Technology Subcommittee meeting convening Thursday evening, April 27, 2017 in Room 126. He added that 85-90% of all the money in school districts is spent on personnel.

2. Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda

Co-chair Simon took a count, and there were not enough members to establish a quorum at 7:32pm to approve the agenda or the meeting minutes. Those would be held until a quorum could be established.

The quorum was established with 12 voting members present at 7:45pm and 15 voting members present later in the meeting. 12 voting members were required for a quorum.

MOTION CARRIED (Bradstreet/Huchting): To approve the agenda of the April 25, 2017 P&O Committee Meeting. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

3. Chairperson's Comments

Co-Chair Danielle Perez and Co-Chair Bruce Simon

Simon acknowledged and thanked Co-chair Perez for chairing the meetings during his absence.

4. BSEP Director's Comments

Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations

Beery had no comments at this time.

5. Superintendent's Report

Donald Evans, Ed.D.

Evans stated the School Board Meeting for Wednesday, April 26, 2017 would include a discussion of LCAP and an update on BTA. The Wednesday, May 3, 2017 meeting would focus on budget priorities with proposed cuts to the FY 2017-18 budget and including recommendations for reductions for FY 2018-19.

6. Approval of Minutes April 11, 2017

After the quorum was established and the agenda approved at 7:45pm, there was a brief review allowed for the April 11, 2017 P&O Committee Meeting minutes. (Members do not have to be present at the meeting to vote to approve the minutes. After reviewing the minutes, making any necessary changes and if the minutes were correct enough to be entered into the public record, members could vote to approve.)

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Schoenfeld): To approve the meeting minutes of the April 11, 2017 P&O Committee Meeting as written. **The motion was approved by 11 votes and 1 abstention.**

7. Public Comment

- Glimme noted that after the BHS Site Committee budget discussion and allocation meeting, he was tasked with voicing the concerns of several of the committee members about some of the things BSEP site monies are used to fund. In particular, the funding of college advisors takes up over 1/3rd of their budget, almost \$200K, and many committee members felt that college/career advisors at the high school should be funded by the District as a core function.
- Eknoian gave his thanks for the RtI² information that he requested earlier (*Approximate RTI Service Scope for SY 2016-2017 as of 3/19/17 -1 page document with pyramid graph*) handed out at the 03-21-17 P&O Meeting and subsequently emailed to committee members). He looked it over and wanted more detail. He asked what he could say/not say at a Board meeting if he wanted to address concerns as a member of the public who was also a member of the P&O Committee. Simon noted that all of the information in the P&O Meeting was published and public information. Per the Brown Act, Eknoian could talk about anything he had seen, heard or read as long as he represented himself as an individual and not speaking for the Committee.
- Schoenfeld wanted clarification about sex education provisions for the middle schools, looking for support around its presentation, trainings, and budget. Scuderi stated that there was not a district-wide formal adoption of a specific curriculum although there was a suggested list. He thought they were meeting that obligation through Health and Wellness units and minimum hours of HIV training for curriculum. Susan Craig, Director of Student Services, may look at universal adoption of a sex ed curriculum for middle schools. Evans added there was attention earlier in the week about another district where parents had an opportunity to weigh in on sex ed curriculum. Scuderi will check with Craig and share the latest information with Beery to send out to committee members.
- De Mucha Flores stated that a good job was being done on goals and objectives and wanted to know more information about metrics—where are they? Referring to Glimme’s public comment about funding college/career advisors as an example, he wanted to know where they could see a report that showed how many applications were completed by seniors and the demographics reflected. He wanted metrics not only for accountability but indicating constant improvement. He was concerned about Berkeley youth, particularly African American and Latino, because it was known the academic gap they were experiencing was a real thing. Glimme responded that the things De Mucha Flores brought up were things the BHS Site Committee evaluated. The metrics and reports produced by the programs they fund were part of the funding process. Glimme added that as a teacher, every professional development meeting they have focused on working on that issue, every week. That was the goal they talked about more than anything else. De Mucha Flores said that from an elementary school perspective they didn’t see or hear a lot about it. Things were shared in aggregate pieces. He noted that the Dashboard was an improvement, but he was not impressed by it. Makler responded that it pleased him to see accurate, measurable, demonstrated improvement, which makes him feel gratified about the money that was being spent, but he wasn’t sure about things like RtI² and the end results for that. Simon responded to De Mucha Flores by saying this was a venue in which he could ask for data, if there were things he was not already receiving. The District collects

and publishes an enormous amount of data and felt they would share it with the Committee if they were not already getting it. Simon added that it was very hard to draw a straight line between some of the larger things BSEP funds and those outcomes. If it were easy to draw a straight line between smaller class sizes and student achievement, everyone would be doing it.

Kong thanked the P&O for the work they did. She noted last week a parent talked about issues at LeConte with the decrease in FTE. She appreciated that they were able to bring their concerns and have their issues addressed.

(Note: At this point in the meeting, 7:45pm, a quorum was established at 12 voting members. Simon directed the members to approve the agenda and the meeting minutes from April 11, 2017. See items 2 and 6 above.)

- Bryant affirmed with her committee colleagues about having metrics that were understandable and added that she felt it was possible to draw direct lines. Referring to the Superintendent's comments about budget cuts, she said people would start to ask about "value added."
- Huchting agreed with what was being suggested. She noted that it begged the question of how the individual SGCs were working. There may not be enough time or enough education/training when you became an SGC member in the beginning. It might take a half a year to figure out the right questions to ask. Experiences at SGCs and schools might be comparable and/or different, but the education gained by being on the committee helped.

8. Recommendation for BSEP Funds in FY 2017-18: Update to Plan for CSR and Support for Teaching

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, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services, Dated: April 26, 2017, Subject: Recommendation for Expenditure of BSEP Funds for Class Size Reduction and Support for Teaching 2017-18 (5 pages)*
- *Berkeley Unified School District FY 2017-18 Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document v 2017-04-20, Appendix A (2 pages)*
- *FY 2017-18 Teacher Transfer Summary of Proposals, April 20, 2017*

Scuderi passed out the handouts and noted that they were latest copies. They had been slightly modified, and he highlighted the things that were different from the previous iterations of the documents.

1. *Class Size Reduction and Support for Teaching* document:
 - Page 4 – Classroom Support: There would be combination classes for Thousand Oaks/TO for grades K-1 and 1-2. He noted that the language profiles there could accommodate this, but it was not a solution to under-enrollment for those classes. They will discuss a permanent solution for bilingual classes at TO with the Board in June. Costs to subsidize the program at TO were reduced by creating these combinations classes.
 - BTA staffing changes remain as previously discussed.
 - A new addition was that the TWI program support at LeConte would be maintained. The school's concerns about reduced FTE were heard and support

would be provided for what he felt was a unique program in the District. They wanted parents to feel confident signing up for this, that their kids could access instruction and it could be available to all students, including those who were needing support in English as a first language in addition to Spanish acquisition.

Beery stated that there was a small recalculation in the Teacher Template to accommodate the differences in the CSR. She stated that the difference between the last proposal and the current one was \$85K, or less than 0.5% of the entire amount. Beery noted the way elementary, BHS and BTA teacher template calculations are made, based on teaching load and pupil load. She added that often small adjustments happened after the P&O approved the budgets and that as long as the changes were less than 10% of the budget, it did not have to return to the Committee for review and approval.

Questions and Responses:

- Huchting wanted clarification for Page 5 of the *Class Size Reduction and Support for Teaching Classroom Support (BTA, LeConte) \$266,237* and how that was shown on page 2 of the *CSR FTE Planning Document*. Beery confirmed that the “Program Support LeConte” and “Classroom Support BTA” on the *CSR FTE Planning Document* should add up to that total.
- De Mucha Flores asked for clarification on the decreased enrollment for BTA. Was it due to re-matriculation back to BHS? Scuderi stated that it was hard to know. Some of it may be due to the city’s changing demographics, fluid enrollment, or state criteria for placing students in continuation schools/involuntary transfers (attendance, credits earned, select high-level behavior infractions). BUSD did not usually do involuntary transfers and added there were possibly only between 3-5 transfers for behaviors in the past 6-7 years. He noted that the enrollment was about 70, but could bump up to around 100 as kids come for a semester to do credit recovery. They are currently looking at what an 18-month plan might look like if they put forward to the Board a revision to the involuntary transfer process and boost enrollment. If that was not done, then they may consider returning to a straight continuation model where the students would be just pursuing a high school diploma. BTA offered a much broader range of courses. Scuderi asked for and received the following numbers for seniors who were credit deficient that never took advantage of that program in their 4-year trajectory, who were probably not going to graduate high school and for whatever reason didn’t want to go to BTA, and that was only 33 students out of roughly 800 in the senior class. It was a surprisingly diverse group: Language Learners, socio-economic, race/ethnicity, and he felt gentrification and the involuntary transfer were playing a roll in the lower enrollment.

Bedolla asked if BTA was a continuation or a vocational school. He had experiences with European companies where they have strong vocational programs with good results. The BTA’s purpose was confusing. Scuderi stated that BTA had been functioning as a continuation school, though in 2006, by board declaration, the school was called an alternative school and continuation school, which were difficult things to reconcile. An alternative school provides the opportunity to obtain a high school diploma, A-G eligibility, and the ability to move on. A continuation school can include heavy doses of career training, an independent study component and in most cases, continuation meant a strictly bare bones program that led to the pursuit of a high school diploma, not college eligibility. The current principal was interested in making a go of BTA as a true alternative school with a heavy career tech component. BTA was awarded a \$275K grant from the state to develop career readiness

programs. It had a piece of a larger state-wide grant that was earmarked explicitly for alternative school programs. There was an identity crisis with the school, and they needed to iron out definition, purpose and policy in the next 18-24 months. Bedolla asked how Independent Study/IS differed from the continuation path. Scuderi stated that the kids in the IS program were considered BHS students. That group of students technically were not students needing credit recovery, but needed an alternative setting or format, and he noted a student could earn more credits in a semester at BTA than at BHS or IS. They were each serving two different goals. At least 85 IS kids were taking at least two classes at BHS. They were not offering the IS option to students at BTA, and that was something they could look at.

- Beery clarified that the Bilingual Maintenance Program at TO (1 FTE) at \$102,399 would not be in the budget for 2017-18 since they had decided to go with the combo classes.
- Eknoian asked if there was a way to earn partial credits toward graduation through alternatives like work equivalents. Scuderi said that happened in the past, and they did it less often now due to having quality control issues around determining what kids were getting credit for.
- Makler asked for clarification about the funds for Program Evaluation:
 - Was it a new program? No, in Measure A it was grouped with PD and Technology and shared 9% of the Net Tax Revenue. Those were reorganized for Measure E1, and Evaluation was moved to support high quality instruction under CSR, along with ECO and PD as all are connected to teaching/teachers.
 - Where and how was it funded? Was it combined with other General Fund/GF monies or essentially the analytics for the District? Beery responded that Evaluation was a large component of the analytics for the district. The BSEP funding for next year would be about the same amount as under Measure A, or approximately \$672K or 3.25% of revenues. Sometimes additional funds became available to support Evaluation and PD functions, but BSEP carried the bulk of that.

Beery noted that in the past, an additional summary picture for multi-funded programs/purposes, such as PD or Evaluation was given. It was not done this year due to the transition from Measure A to Measure E1 and its complicated moving parts. They could begin to provide that information. Makler thought it was a continuing question of whether or not there were tools available, whether or not the District was investing in tools and personnel for Evaluation. For Makler, having Evaluation called out as a budgetary item of 3.25% of the overall budget emphasized that significant resources were going to that. Was the information being presented in a form that people could digest? Beery responded that when the plan was brought forward there was a discussion about how to focus that department in key areas. She noted those concerns had been raised, especially that this department was trying to do a whole lot of things at once. It may be necessary to drill down in certain key areas so that we could be sure that we were deriving the best use of those funds and data that was usable for making decisions. Scuderi added that one of the things the department did was to build capacity for people at their sites to evaluate their programs. He stated that at the beginning of the next board meeting, there would be a teaching and learning item where core staff from Rosa Parks would be presenting how they have been teaching and responding to students' reading progress. He thought it would be a great example of how their people on the ground were using formative data in very actionable and timely ways for kids. There were broad-based program analytics but the most important ways data was used

was at the site and the teacher-to-kid level.

Makler asked if BREA had presented to the P&O or the Board and Glimme confirmed that they had many times. Beery added they frequently did that for the LCAP Parent Advisory Committee as well.

9. Recommendation for BSEP Funds in FY 2017-18: Library

Becca Todd, District Library Coordinator

Todd provided the following handouts: Berkeley Unified School District Memo, *To: BSEP Planning and Oversight Committee, From: Becca Todd, District Library Coordinator and Pasquale Scuderi, Asst Superintendent for Educational Services, Dated: April 25, 2017, Subject: Recommendation for Expenditure of BSEP Funds for Libraries in FY 2017-18 (7 pages)*

Todd stated that Plan was essentially the same as the first reading at the prior P&O meeting. The only adjustment that she made from the presentation she gave at the previous meeting was around the recommendation on how to deal with summer school. She noted that on Page 4 of the document handed out, under Hourly Extra Duty, Summer Extended Day Library Program was listed. She provided funds for Summer School by taking \$5K from the Reserve for Personnel Variance and noted that adjustment on the allocations on Page 7. She felt that was a safe reduction. There was still a fund balance that was \$1K less than previous

Questions and Responses: None

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/De Mucha Flores): To approve the recommendation for BSEP Funds in FY 2017-18: Library. **The motion was approved with 14 votes and 1 abstention.**

10. Recommendation for BSEP Funds in FY 2017-18: Music/VAPA

Pete Gidlund, VAPA Supervisor

Gidlund provided the following handouts:

- Berkeley Unified School District Memo, *To BSEP Planning and Oversight Committee, From: Pete Gidlund, VAPA Supervisor and Pasquale Scuderi, Asst Superintendent for Educational Services, Dated: April 25, 2017, Subject: Recommendation for Expenditure of BSEP Funds for the Visual and Performing Arts Programs in 2017-18 (8 pages)*

Gidlund noted that the only change made from the first reading was to the wording from “VAPA Librarian” to “VAPA Technician” on the second paragraph of Page 3 of the above-mentioned handout. The position changed based on the information from the classification study. All the budget numbers are the same. Gidlund highlighted and clarified that the reason he was able to find money to fund the middle school pilot dance program, comparable and competitive with the 0-grade music program was the current cost of staffing being lower given the relative experience level (and therefore cost) of teachers. Currently teachers have less impact on the VAPA budget, but that will not stay the same in the future. He emphasized the dance program was a pilot program and if it became successful, he hoped Principals would provide ECO funds for it to continue.

MOTION CARRIED (Upp/Bradstreet): To approve the recommendation for BSEP Funds in FY 2017-18: Music/VAPA. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

Scuderi expressed appreciation for Todd and Gidlund as two of the most passionate, committed administrators they had in the District and they kept the Library and Music/VAPA

programs going.

11. Developing Leadership and Community Engagement: Spring Workshop?

SGC and/or P&O Bylaws Concerns

Natasha Beery

Beery wanted to hold a discussion about SGCs and the P&O Committee around the following directions:

- The SGC bylaws need to be updated with the new Measure E1. She said they were decent bylaws but people had questions about how the SGCs function. Some of that could be addressed in the bylaws as well as through better training/orientation and better collaboration with principals/BREA.
- How could SGCs function better?
- Developing leadership by ensuring there were voices from the community represented on the P&O Committee and the SGCs. What can we do to improve that? We have talked with our partners in OFEE about the possibility of having a spring workshop in late May and could that happen?
- Otherwise we end up in September going to the people who are already informed about these committees and get ahead of the year's process by opening the doors and engaging people early so that the SGCs and the P&O were not mysteries.

Beery hoped the discussion would lead to the development of a subcommittee that could work on the bylaws and one that works on leadership development questions.

Discussion:

- Huchting opened with a comment around the way in which the existence of the SGC committee was disseminated in the school environment. How do you even know it exists? Where does it come from? How do you get to be on it in a somewhat democratic way? Huchting stated that in her experience it had gotten better in the sense that there was more of a school-wide awareness of what it was. It could be so much better and institutionalized in a way that was done so well with other things. The other concern was that participation was hard when you were a newbie and she suggested that there might be a way to add specific training meetings to the calendar. Could there be a pre-meeting meeting with more senior people on hand noting that without some prior knowledge one could feel lost. There was also an imbalance of power between the old timers, the new timers, as well as the principal. It was difficult to remind the new members that they were equals at the table and when there was turnover on an annual basis.
- Simon agreed with Huchting and mentioned that the principal power issue was complicated because they were the ultimate authority and had more knowledge, in theory, about what went on in school than anyone. That was hard to counterbalance. One of the issues that he had seen over and over again was around concrete training for leadership on the Brown Act and making sure they were communicating ahead of time not voting at meetings where something was introduced, all the things that we do in the P&O committee. That would help the functioning of the SGCs more. He asked if there were better or different models to the big training typically done at Longfellow at the beginning of the school year. Even if the training was spectacular, it was covered in one night at one location and if you didn't attend you didn't get the benefit of it.
- Eknoian asked about streaming training meetings like they do for the school board

meetings. If you can't attend you could at least log in on your device and watch what was going on. Nitschke confirmed they could not stream from Longfellow. Beery thought they could make a video that could be watched after the meeting.

- Beery said there was talk about "cloning" a few of the BSEP staff to go to the sites, similar to her visits to BHS to help their SCC by coaching the principals and the chairpersons. She thought the office could divide people up to do a "health check" on what the strengths and challenges were for the SGCs.

Kong noted that it was valuable to have Valerie Tay, BSEP Program Specialist visit the LeConte site to answer questions. Even with the district training there was a gap between the level of specificity of that training vs. what was needed at the site level to actually read and understand a budget and get up to speed on all the programming and personnel that budget represents. She stated it was a lot and a big learning curve. She thought they needed a hard-core orientation for the new and old members on site.

- Jay responded to a question about what had to be overcome to provide streaming of a training. He stated that the school board room was set up well with multiple cameras that could focus on multiple people. We could stream something from somewhere else but it would not be at all the same.

Huchting thought that there was a question of quality vs. quantity and it would be nice to reach a larger constituency as opposed to staying small. She felt it would be great to have a much bigger audience.

- De Mucha Flores said this was experienced at Cragmont and what changed participation was creating "comunidad" which translated to "community." He noted that "community" does not carry the essence of "comunidad" around the issue of trust. He noted having worked very hard to build community for the committee and felt that broadcasting the meeting online was not going to do that. How do we want to build community so that people want to come here, even though it was a sterile meeting room? How else can we do that and be creative about it? Where are the places we can go to in Berkeley or an alternative site for people to feel welcome to come in? Buildings like this are threatening for some people – it's the district office, I don't belong there – there's no sense of belonging. He felt that the meetings had to engage families in more meaningful ways and to meet them where they were. De Mucha Flores emphasized the question of how does this organization create community so that people would like to come and participate? He felt a sense of obligation because of the experience he had and the privilege to be where he was now.

- Simon appreciated De Mucha Flores' comments and noted that even if meetings were streamed it did not mean people would participate. He wanted to acknowledge what Kong said and something that has changed the quality of some of the SGCs he had served on was the way the elections were held and the way people were welcomed to attend committee meetings. Most of the SGCs Simon had served on had not had contentious votes but were able to reach consensus. He noted that at King, elections were held for the past couple of years and they had not had to call on those elected to vote because everybody that puts forth their interest on serving on the committee was welcome to come to the committee. The committee has been larger, more diverse and the conversations have been more robust and interesting. They've still been able to reach a consensus and a better consensus. He felt that was an important piece.
- Eknoian suggested having an "open mike" on our own channel that could handle whatever streaming, even if the audience was home, was better than not having

anything at all, regardless of quality. It could fill in the gaps and the community could be invited in to be a part of it.

- Lankford felt that all families knew about organizations like this and whether they felt welcome or not, they had to want to take the initiative to attend meetings. They had to want to know where the money was going and what was going on at their kids' school. A lot of times people didn't have support to come to meetings. They had to make that decision, and she felt sad they might feel it was not that important.
- Makler thought that "onboarding" might be a useful term to use. He suggested having a week night or weekend introductory 3-hour session that was an onboarding session for getting an overview/explanation of what an SGC member had to address: site safety plan, budget, LCAP monies and mandates, BSEP monies and mandates, and SGC BSEP representatives and alternates. He thought people wanted to get together with other parents.

He noted that there was a learning curve with the alphabet soup of acronyms and noted the need to have an introduction to and glossary as part of the binder.

It was not clear to him that part of his obligation was to communicate with other parents. He thought that should be reinforced.

Huchting suggested that school websites were a place where they could state what the goals and budgets were for SGC, BSEP or LCAP. She noted the newsletter could be a good device for SGC information as well.

- Leyva-Cutler suggested having coaches/mentors for the SGC members to tap into. They could give a one-hour presentation about SGCs and be available for questions regarding how things could be done or volunteer to connect with parents. Five to ten people could be identified 5-10 over the years to mentor.
- Leyva-Cutler suggested that CAS students at BHS could assist with the creation of a video/infomercial on the role of the SGC that could then be pushed out to parents.
- Schoenfeld liked the idea of sharing information with parents and the larger community as well as the idea of having a get-to-know-you meeting. Valerie Tay, BSEP Program Specialist, had answered questions she had when she was unsure of how things were supposed to go, and she appreciated having Tay answer all her questions. She thought having all the participants be on the same page for how things were supposed to be run would be great.
- Glimme stated that having the training meetings and all that went with it was fantastic. As a teacher, he felt what happened was that he was being asked to do a lot of extra work. The hours were volunteer, unpaid, uncompensated hours at work that kept him from spending that time with his family. There was a tension around the best meeting times and noted when half the committee was staff, it was a problem.
- Perez stated that in the past, there was a small group discussion about having the SGCs be a venue for communications to the families at the schools. She felt a lot more needed to be done on that front.
- Perez felt there should be guidelines for the principals around leadership, because they carry so much of the leadership role, the parents turn over all the time. She said they had to beg people at her site to be on the SGC and maybe they would stay for a year and then they were gone. She felt the principals should be held responsible for making sure things happened with the Brown Act and utilizing things like the school bulletin that went home in the kids' folders once a week. She noted it was difficult to get a one-line statement in about when the meeting was going to happen let alone what they would be going over. She felt that was a piece that needed to be solidified.

- Makler suggested conference call phones or bridge lines for people to call in to meetings. He felt that one extended session led by mentors to orient people was a good idea.
- Bryant noted diversity was hard and took work. People access SGCs differently and participate for different reasons/agenda. Principals have to manage all those agendas, and the only way to do that was to build community. How do we access SGCs around all of the different things and understand the budgets for those different things? Some of the people at her SGC work for other school districts so their conversations were at a different level, about data, alignment, decisions that make sense so all children are making it. They brought another set of skills to the table and decisions that brought value. Two years from now, it may be a totally different discussion, which meant we might have to access different types of information then. Maybe there were workshops people could access based on what they're ready for. She stated she had the assumption that whatever we did in the school had to align with the District as a whole, that the sites couldn't be operating or rolling in different directions. The only way she could understand how to roll with what was going on was to understand how we were measuring how successful we were at doing it. If we have done a thousand things to give people the information and they still didn't get the information, it was not working. We have to constantly rethink and question ourselves about whether our current structures were set up in such a way that we truly believe will want people to engage.
- Beery stated that what she had been hearing was something she struggled with as she worked with the P&O and the SGCs in trying to balance the external requirements, like the Brown Act and its purposes, Roberts Rules, stipulation as to structure, who's on what committee, but sometimes those statutory requirements got in the way of a larger need and purpose which was voice, participation, and information getting where it needed to be. How do we know we are speaking for others if we haven't figured out how to ask or communicate with them? Could there be other things we do in partnership with LCAP and other committees that are also trying to inform and engage? She noted the comments and questions from SGCs about voting issues, the sterile room, and welcoming. Could we have more town halls or parties, more things that people want to come to where we could also engage them?
De Mucha Flores noted that he was willing to sit on a committee around this but wondered "what was our theory of action or what was our if-then?" Having clear statements around "If we are going to do this, we will expect these results," would help this group to determine what BSEP, P&O or LCAP was about. We could reflect on these if-thens and give those models to SGCs.
- Simon referred to the public information released due to the Brown Act and noted that every school had a site plan which was aligned with the District. The only place he knew where to find those was in the board meeting minutes. He knew the minutes from every SGC meeting were supposed to be public and was unsure of a better place to put this but the BSEP office and he did not know what was possible or what it would take. His cursory survey of the individual websites was that they were all over the place, each one different. Could there be a link from the district website? Beery stated that the site plans were all available there as consolidated site plans on each of the individual school websites and noted that they were impenetrable. They were based on a template from the state. In the past they tried to create a summary by site that was not sustained, noting the additional work it took and that it was easier to

comply with the structure than to address the purpose. She would take the list to discuss further with others and invite the committee members to attend further meetings to discuss bylaws, if-thens and theories of action.

- Upp wasn't clear on the end goal, was it to get clarity on the SGCs, get more people involved or add more diversity? She noted that they had many groups at her school and people participated where it made sense to them, involved where it added value, meaning and where they could contribute. She noted this was her first year and she was getting up to speed on some very dense material. What were we asking our families to do? We could be bringing information to them in their spaces but should we continue to do outreach and strengthen alliances with the groups we have already? Huchting responded that that sounded great but felt it missed a sense of the over-arching way we were all connected. We may have one-to-one relationships with all these individuals or groups. Her concern was that they didn't understand how they all came together, especially around the money. It's \$28M and every student in the District, regardless of where they go to school, was affected by it. They didn't even know to ask the questions because they didn't even know what the questions were to ask. She was afraid if they stayed in little groups, as important as it may be, the big picture would be missed. She felt there were still parents that didn't know about BSEP and that was a concern.

12. For the Good of the Order

For the Good of the Order is time set aside for members to bring up items not discussed or addressed during the meeting.

De Mucha Flores mentioned that the Cragmont principal Hazelle Fortich was leaving, and he felt she was a great principal and credited her with changing school climate.

13. Adjournment

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

Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support