Members Present:

Sarah Capitelli*, Jefferson Elementary*

Sabrina Jefferson*, Thousand Oaks Elementary*

Katherine Nee*, Willard Middle School*

Deminika Spears*, King Middle School*

Eric Van Dusen*, Cragmont Elementary*

Abby Paske*, Washington Elementary*

Sarah Abigail Ejigu*, King Middle School*

Sandra Loving, *BAM Elementary*

Mimi Pulich*, BHS*

Deirdre Tansey*, Emerson Elementary*

Heidi Wagner, *Rosa Parks Elementary*

Members Absent:*

Denise Dafflon, *LeConte Elementary*

Hya Honorato, *Oxford Elementary*

Timesha Harris, *John Muir Elementary*

Ann Reidy, *Oxford Elementary*

*Members are not marked absent if another representative from their site was present at the meeting.

District Employees Present:

Patricia Saddler, *Director of Programs and Special Projects*

Meeting called to order 6:15pm by Dr. Saddler.

Motion to approve agenda by Paske, seconded by Wagner, approved unanimously.
Dr. Saddler asked group to share out any new information members had learned about the LCAP. Information volunteered:

- LCAP provides funds to King MS for restorative justice counselor to reduce suspensions.
- Also RTI Coordinator at Washington Elementary.

Dr. Saddler distributed folders with full Board Document 0460. She explained that BUSD is the only district in the state to have a Board Policy guiding and governing how LCAP Supplemental funding business is conducted. Main points for committee to consider include the overview of the role of the Parent Advisory Committee (PAC), including minimum and maximum number of members, composition of membership, term of service, etc. Dr. Saddler did outreach with Principals to recruit current PAC members in each required capacity. In particular she highlighted that two year term helps with continuity in dealing with the intense but important work of the committee. Dr. Saddler encouraged members to bring this information back to share with their school sites and advocate for students.

At the first Board Meeting in October the PAC roster was submitted to Board by Superintendent Evans. Dr. Saddler confirmed that each meeting requires a quorum and that quorum was met at this meeting. Board reviews meeting minutes and agenda monthly to ensure proper adherence to district policy. District also has a DELAC Committee which serves a similar purpose to the

LCAP required English Learner Parent Advisory Committee, even though the district is not required to maintain that committee due to not having the minimum threshold of ELL students. Dr. Saddler attends each DELAC meeting to provide LCAP updates. She will also be providing a timeline for LCAP development in "Friday Notes" to Board Directors.

PAC is to give input into any changes to the LCAP plan for the coming year. Group will learn about the programs provided to engage in that recommendation process as the main work of the committee. No later than May, a draft plan will be provided to the Board and an executive summary, which will then be translated into Spanish. Dr. Saddler directed members' attention to the attached Exhibit (E 0460) which outlines the PAC's recommended represented groups, including a recommended Student Advisory Committee which in the previous year was satisfied with student focus groups from the three middle school campuses and the high school for feedback around services provided. As an example, Dr. Saddler described how district employees presented questions to an AVID class to find out what was working in the students' perspectives, if there were any worries, and what more supports might be needed.

It was pointed out that the quorum requires that specific types of parents (for example representing economically disadvantaged, English learners, etc.). Dr. Saddler responded that she would be looking at revising bylaws to ease those requirements, as group has always had representatives from each site with very few exceptions.

Question: What is the difference between the policy document and the Exhibit?
Response: Exhibit is an administrative regulation that supports the implementation of policy.

Dr. Saddler explained that bylaws require a notice for committee meetings at least 72 hours in advance with a posted agenda, that minutes must be taken and approved with a quorum at subsequent meeting by committee. Previous meeting's minutes will be presented for approval at next meeting in January. PAC is sanctioned district committee and as such the group holds time at each Board Meeting for approved committee statements to the Board.

Clarification: 3-year plan was just approved last June, using a new template, with projected 3-year revenue. Funds could possibly be reduced in other areas this year, the group may hear proposals to add spending in LCAP to prevent loss of services; the PAC's voice will be very important in that process. Last August more money became available than projected, Dr. Saddler advocated for it to be spent on students directly despite not being in the plan, she went to public stakeholders to gather ideas for that. Those ideas included programs around preventing sexual harassment as a particular problem at the High School, restorative practices to reduce punitive discipline, a school attendance and welfare worker for habitually truant students, and extra support for high school math. Dr. Saddler then directed committee's attention to 2017-2020 LCAP Budget Projection handout. Explanation of main goals of LCAP plan as it corresponds to budget items.
Mimi Pulich presented a subjective overview of the role of the PAC to help orient new members, provide history of committee, and clear misconceptions. Main points:

- Group does not identify new programs; that has not been its historic role.
- Group does not have a vote, Board decides; group provides suggestions.
- Group members should not expect to become experts in every program because of time restraints.

Question: Though group does not identify new programs, what if members see opportunity to align existing programs with goals, for example with the Bridge Program, is there room to consider aligning that under Goal 2?

Answer: Can certainly be discussed, has not been experience that as new proposals come forward that they are submitted to PAC, nor is PAC encouraged to send ideas directly to Board. Dr. Saddler does a good job of taking in ideas and feedback from various stakeholders including PAC, EAC, from Board Members, etc. The group's impact is more indirect than direct.

- Group hears from people implementing programs, asks questions, looks at evaluation data; also affirms plans and recommendations and then provides feedback via comments to School Board and Superintendent on the new plan. Comments can be skillfully applied to effect change in implementation.
- Overview of programs, it is helpful to see the money aligned with these programs. PAC is always interested in the percentages of budget. For example, to prioritize hearing from programs that take highest percentages of budgets, like RTI. Conversely, group has historically felt that amount spent on Math should be higher. Previously many items were multi-funded, and it is still the case currently but if so it is included for group to see which items are entirely supported by LCAP and which are shared with other funding sources.
- Initially PAC membership was drawn from SGC's, and budget owners would come to pitch ideas for spending. PAC subsequently wanted to see subgroups tracked, for example minorities, English learners, homeless/foster youth, socio-economically disadvantaged etc. Initial feedback revolved around consistent implementation across sites, desire for more consistent programs.
- The first PAC's had concerns that the program evaluation data was not the best way to judge programs. Also again the lack of math support. Previous PAC's advocated for adding money to math and evaluation, now group needs to make sure data is collected correctly to be of use.
- Members need to know terms "unduplicated students," "TSA,"; know Lina Andersen, LCAP Evaluator. Due to Brown Act, members cannot privately communicate with each other regarding committee business outside of meetings, and group must deal with that constraint. Members also advised to know State Dashboard.
- Keep in mind that none of the money is guaranteed. The upcoming budget for next year will have $1.8 million in cuts from General Fund, and as PAC members they have the opportunity to explain that LCAP money could be spent on positions but that would change a position from multi-year, to year-to-year.

Question: In Behavioral Health Services, why is grades 6-8 not included?
Answer: In the district implementation is complicated, but middle schools are allocated a full-time counselor which supplants funding for parent outreach and discretionary spending on behavioral health, which was decided by principals at those sites.

Question: How does it happen that new programs are identified and implemented if it's not from PAC?
Answer: Dr. Saddler takes input and ideas from many stakeholder groups to Cabinet and Ed. Services, also identifies needs based on data and input from service providers, who are higher level educators working to identify highest needs for students and also to figure out implementation. PAC can raise questions how data is collected and presented before it goes to the Board, which can have impact on its reception.

Dr. Saddler reminded members that when they enter these meetings they are not necessarily thinking about their particular school, but should be thinking of the specific students the targeted funds are meant to serve, and to view the data presented through that lens. School-specific data is distributed through SGC's.

Dr. Saddler presented district data from TCRWP (Teachers College Reading and Writing Program) assessment results in reading.

Question: Do IEP students include those with 504's?
Answer: No.
Question: Can students fall into multiple categories, i.e. African American and with a disability?
Answer: In State Dashboard yes, in LCAP terms of Unduplicated Students for funding, no.
Question: Is there data for English Learners or students learning a second language?
Answer: Yes there is, but it isn't included in LCAP because State goal is based on SBA in English. Teachers value the TCRWP assessment results highly, but because it's not consistent across multiple districts the State and District must use the SBA standardized results in comparison.

Reading is a big goal for LCAP, spend a lot of money on Literacy Coaches and so TCRWP data from Spring 2017 and SBA assessment from last year are of interest to group. Dr. Saddler highlighted the difference in scores between the two assessments, questioned if the technology is a barrier in performance on the SBA, why don't teachers or some Board members not value standardized tests? Dr. Saddler notes that technically the SBA tests are not standardized because they are adaptive. Teacher's Union has said that teachers don't want to teach to a test but Dr. Saddler, as an accountability person, points out that these tests are required and in 2018 the SBA results will drive our work with funding. State could mandate funding priorities to address particular groups or subjects that underperform. She poses the question, what can we do to build the capacity of our students to show their knowledge in the tests that will be used for all comparisons, not just in recognized within the district? There is evidence that students, particularly high school students, may not take the tests seriously. Only 62% of 11th graders participated in SBA testing last year, while the state requires 95%. Scoring at a mastery level in ELA and Math will waive college course requirements at community college level and would replace the SAT for kids that apply to the CSU system starting in 2019, highlighting the importance of the tests.

Question: 11th Grade has 62% participation, what about other grades?
Answer: All other grades had sufficient participation, though in the future district will be penalized for under-participation like that 62%.
Question: Is there a culture in Berkeley to disregard tests as not valuable, as being optional, and/or political opposition to standardized tests? One parent recalls receiving a notice from her school to the effect that these tests were optional.
Answer: The tests are NOT optional, and $5 million in district funding could ride on that participation. The city culture will be a challenge.

Dr. Saddler then presented math results, in summary overall okay performance but subgroups like African American, Socio-economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities have significant gaps in achievement.

Data point of how many students in 2016 were UC or CSU eligible was highlighted, and how many graduated. District numbers in those categories are above state average.

Question: How did these students graduate if the test scores are showing such gaps for so many groups?
Answer: Graduation is based on grades, not on test results. High School exit exam is no longer administered, though it could be reintroduced. There is potential that Board could require 11th grade SBA results at a certain level for graduation.

Highlighted discrepancy in numbers of graduating students and those eligible for UC/CSU. Dr. Evans has expressed reservations about why a D grade is passing in the district. Board would need to look at changing that.

English Learner data presented, about 9% of total student population. A big point of discussion and concern within the district is students who are "stuck," who come in at elementary level unable to access English and who continue into secondary levels without progressing; who then cannot access the other subject areas in upper grades. Those students tend to shut down in high school. AVID Excel was implemented to target those students and prevent that outcome in high school. Dr. Saddler also identified students who entered as EL in Kindergarten and hadn't been reclassified by 4th grade, and gave that list to principals for intervention and monitoring to hopefully change that trajectory. New assessment will give more info in coming year.

Presented data on absenteeism and truancy, students who have been absent 19 days or more a year. Percentage of absences has gone down, a victory. Pointed out there is no excuse recognized for absences any more per state rules, even with a parent note or for medical reasons. This becomes more important to note as students enter secondary levels, when attendance is recorded throughout the school day.

Dr. Saddler posed a question to the group: What does this little snapshot of data tell you?

Responses:
- We see improvements in data for Latino students, numbers show improvement.
- White children are still doing good.
- Makes one wonder if the test being adaptive and its trajectory dependent on the first few questions, which have challenging wording different from what students are used to particularly for our unduplicated students, how can parents and state have impact on that test because it decides funding later. If LCAP money should be addressing that what can we do?
    Response: Will be addressed in the summary at end.
- Is the TCRWP an oral test?
    Dr. Saddler's response: it's the child reading to a teacher, answering oral questions.
    Comment: it is such a different type of test from the computer test, hard to tell which is more valid. Teachers side with TCRWP, but funding is from SBA.
- Keep in mind that TCRWP is not just an assessment but the entire reading curriculum, and contributed to an uplift in reading scores. PTA's and SGC's had chosen to provide funding for literacy coaches in the past, but LCAP now provides targeted money for that purpose.
    Question: How would the data that was presented to support bringing on Literacy Coaches years ago mesh with the new data on the SBA performance? Does the curriculum only work for some groups of students and not others? Is the problem curriculum, as some previous PAC members have claimed. Have we seen gains from this and the Literacy Coaches for these subgroups?
    Another question: Are the materials used by the Lit Coaches similar to or the same as what is presented in the SBA's? Does how they learn with the Coach and the teacher correlate to what they see in the test? And how does the data from old-style test (CST) map to the district assessments, versus how the SBA is mapping to TCRWP results?
    Response: SBA is aligned with Common Core when the CST was not, and the previous test was standardized where the SBA is adaptive. Very hard to compare.
- Emerson showed improvement after sending students in small groups to library for practice testing on Chromebooks. Dr. Saddler added that parents can use practice tests with their students through SBA website. Teachers don't believe in SBA and so push back on practice, which will make process harder. Principals have stated a lack of support citing changing demographics and the belief that LCAP funding tied to performance won't be relevant in coming years, Teachers' Union is anti-standardized test, teachers want to institute their own assessments, and a School Board member has expressed disbelief in standardized state testing in general; all are challenges to be dealt with.

Dr. Saddler adds that priority for herself and accountability person, along with Dr. Evans and Ed. Services, the goal must be to be honest with the data and what it's telling us, and ultimately we

want our kids to be successful, to be able to show what they know, and so we need our kids to be adequately prepared for technology along with being able to do things like reading well.

Question: Does Berkeley still provide internet services to low-income residents?
Answer: Dr. Saddler isn't aware of that program. Perhaps service providers offer similar, like Comcast subsiding rates based on income, to help families access technology. There have been some negative experiences with private companies trying to use a presence in school as provider to sell products to families. Still looking for an "honest" partner. Share out if one is found. Some cities have put out municipal wi-fi, for example Minneapolis, which has tiered rate based on income. Perhaps connect with city of Berkeley to look at a similar plan?

Question: Have we compared dashboards from other districts, to see if they have similar transition around technology learning curve? Is it necessarily just our teachers' adherence to TCRWP or could it be the format change?
Answer: Yes and no. Data has been presented but is still incomplete, and also '14-'15 was supposed to be a test year for the SBA's, not to provide usable data. In coming weeks more data will be added for further evaluation, updated years, and new subgroups. From county meetings word is that most districts saw flat results, no real increase or decline. Most other districts have built assessments that align with common core while Berkeley is unique in using TCRWP. We should have assessments that compare with the SBA.

Question: Don't the math assessments within the district align with Common Core?
Answer: Yes, but they are end-of-unit assessments and not comprehensive, which also makes it hard to identify which students need intervention. Will roll out a pilot in middle school, Online Screener, despite resistance to address this issue. Starting next week, every student will do a 20 minute screening assessment to identify students who need intervention. This diagnostic will help identify needs for additional support.

Dr. Saddler asks if the group would like a Chair and Vice Chair, or two Co-Chairs, who will help set the agenda for the meetings in advance. Both Co-Chairs from previous year are not returning. These leaders will also usually make the statements to the Board. Volunteer to Co-Chair from Deminika Spears and Maya Glenn. Motion to approve nomination of Co-Chairs from Paske, seconded by Loving, approved unanimously.

Next meeting dates distributed, potential for more meetings added in April and May, it will be a busy time and if any members cannot attend please arrange for another representative from site, and alert Co-Chairs. Ideas about proposed eliminations and changes will come at the same time, will need review. Survey this year will change and need attention. Dr. Saddler requested that members send any questions, via email or phone or appointment, so that she can support the group as much as possible.
Dr. Saddler introduced (in absentia) Lina Andersen, the LCAP Evaluator, who reports once a month to the Board on LCAP progress on actions and services. In upcoming meetings Pat will be educating group on what the LCAP actions are and how effectiveness is measured. Lina will

share reports to Board with group. Documents shared at the meetings will be distributed in digital copy as well.

Question: Where is the evaluation data that was supposed to come in last August?
Answer: Decided not to complete the heavy evaluation at the end of the year, used data from throughout the year and the delayed SBA data that came out this same month.

Meeting Adjourned 8:00pm.