

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 28, 2020

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

P&O Committee Members Present

Collin Eyre, *Berkeley Arts Magnet*
Alisha Graves, *Cragmont*
Pamela Hyde, *Emerson (Alt)*
Chris Wallace, *Jefferson*
Vanessa Garza, *John Muir*
Stephan Cohen, *Oxford*
Weldon Bradstreet, *Rosa Parks*
Laura Babitt, *Rosa Parks*

Heather Flett, *Washington*
Terry Pastika, *King Middle School*
Rita Gaber, *Willard Middle School*
Aaron Glimme, *Berkeley High*
Josh Irwin, *Berkeley High*
Chelsea Toller, *Berkeley High*
Shauna Rabinowitz, *Berkeley High*
Felicia Bellows, *Independent Study*

P&O Committee Members Absent*:

Tamara Perkins, *Early Childhood Education*
Jane Logan, *Malcolm X*
Evon Williams, *Berkeley Technology Academy*

Jose Rodriguez, *Longfellow Middle School*
Martin de Mucha Flores, *Longfellow M.S.*
Jennifer Sitkin-Morgan, *Willard M.S.*

**Alternates and co-reps are not marked absent if another rep is present. Currently there is no representation from Thousand Oaks elementary, and only one representative from King Middle School.*

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

Judy Appel, *School Board Member*
Janine Waddell, *BFT Vice President*
Cynthia Allman, *BFT Executive Treasurer*

BUSD Staff:

Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*
Ann Callegari, *Family Engagement and Equity Supervisor*
Danielle Perez, *BSEP Program Specialist*

1. Call to Order and Introductions

At 7:14 p.m. Chairperson Bradstreet called the meeting to order. The meeting began with introductions around the table. Rep. Glimme shared that BHS continues to struggle with achieving quorum for the two separate site committees.

2. Establish the Quorum/Approve the Agenda

The quorum was established with 13 voting members present (increased to 14 later in the meeting). Chair Bradstreet noted that the Site Funds Report and Family Engagement agenda items will reverse order, to allow Ann Callegari to present first.

Chair Bradstreet asked for a motion to approve the agenda, Rep. Rabinowitz moved to approve the agenda, Rep. Glimme seconded the motion; the agenda was approved unanimously.

3. Chairperson's Comments

Chair Bradstreet announced that Dr. Stephens could not attend the meeting due to travel, which wasn't known until after the agenda was published. As a result, agenda item # 14, the discussion of equity processes, will shift to a following meeting. Other agenda items for the current meeting will receive expanded time.

4. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

5. BSEP Director's Comments

Jay Nitschke, Director of Technology for Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations
Director Nitschke had no comments.

6. Superintendent's Report

Dr. Brent Stephens, Superintendent of Schools

Dr. Stephens was attending an out of area professional conference this date and was not present.

7. School Board Update

Judy Appel, School Board President and BSEP Liaison

President Appel was attending the City Council meeting and was not present.

8. Approval of Minutes

January 14, 2020

Rep. Rabinowitz noted a misspelling of "class" in the first paragraph of page 5.

Rep. Irwin moved to approve the corrected 1.14.20 meeting minutes, Rep. Wallace seconded; the minutes were approved unanimously.

9. 2018-19 Annual Reports: Family Engagement

Ann Callegari, Family Engagement and Equity Supervisor

Ms. Callegari introduced the following documents:

- 2018-19 Family Engagement Annual Report
- 2018-19 Family Engagement Measure E1 Budget Summary
- 2018-19 Family Engagement Measure A Budget Summary
- [OFEE BSEP Presentation](#) (slides)

Ms. Callegari began by explaining that the '18-19 school year was the last year in which BSEP funded OFEE staff. BSEP paid for 3.27 FTE, and there was only slight variance between the projected expense and the actual costs. She explained that the main variance to note in the report is the roughly \$6,000 savings in professional development spending (included in the Services and Operating Expenses totals). In 2018-19 the Family Engagement conference that OFEE staff would usually attend was held too far away to be a realistic trip. In 2019-20 this conference will be in LA, and OFEE staff will definitely attend so the program will make up using those unspent funds this year.

Ms. Callegari wanted to then provide a status update for the OFEE program, see slide presentation document for details. Slides provide the history, mission, current status, and future goals of the OFEE program. A major overarching goal is that school and program staff will honor and recognize our families' knowledge, and that families will truly engage with schools, building a relationship that promotes the outcomes we want for kids. If done with fidelity, this will make a difference and improve outcomes. Rep. Flett asked if there is any way to correlate aspects of the OFEE program with positive success in addressing the achievement gap. Or if the available sample size is too small, perhaps there are observations that Ms. Callegari could provide anecdotally. Ms. Callegari responded that general research says you will see that improvement if the work is done with fidelity.

The program is currently fulfilling needs as they arise, but the next challenge is figuring out how we make the program systemic, to achieve these outcomes. In this diverse community, it's the gap between our staff and our community that is problematic. Ms. Callegari expressed that the only way to bridge this gap is to empower both staff and families. Our staff are empowered to teach, but need to also be empowered to increase those meaningful relationships. For example, when OFEE staff are present in meetings for attendance, they meet with parents ahead of time and the tone of the meetings shift. The meetings can be a lot more asset-based, focusing on what assets the family can bring to the process to affect positive change. But while it's good being the bridge, we can move the needle faster if everyone on staff is acting as that bridge. She also noted that the shift in the city's demographics comes with a feeling of colonization for many families. We see increases in homelessness. It's been really challenging to meet students' needs with the current level of staffing.

Responding to Ms. Callegari's desire to create a Middle School family engagement pilot program, Rep Babitt asked how realistic it is that the pilot will be realized, and how members of this body could help promote that possibility. Ms. Callegari responded that she has no idea where the money might come from yet. In 2019-20 SY the staffing costs for OFEE were moved to LCAP budgets, as Lit Coach FTE funding moved from LCAP to BSEP at the direction of the SBAC in 2018-19. She expressed a desire to see how we can support the middle school sites, specifically Longfellow. Rep Wallace felt like this program is making a difference and expressed that it should be elevated in the community, and noted that the Berkeley Public Schools Fund (BPSF) has been really supportive. Chair Pastika asked if it would be possible, when the '20-21 plan comes to the P&O, to include ballpark funding estimates for this pilot. It may not be appropriate for this group to take action on, but it would be good to have. Bringing information on how the previous pilot of the overall OFEE program would also be helpful.

Rep. Irwin asked if, when you look at what is successful at getting community attendance to events, there is a correlation between effectively serving families and how far they live from their school. He asked if distance may be keeping the school from being the hub for services. Ms. Callegari responded that for example the Cragmont PTA has recently funded Uber services, to help families get transportation to meetings, but that the culture is still shifting as far as families feeling comfortable taking advantage of it. Chair Pastika asked if Ms. Callegari thought that restructuring or refinement of the OFEE program could help address achievement gap. Ms. Callegari responded that she doesn't envision removing OFEE staff from sites, but rather having

them each exclusively at a single site. So restructuring would be expanding rather than contracting the existing structure.

Rep. Rabinowitz asked how the OFEE staff make themselves known, is it broadly or more targeted to certain families. Ms. Callegari answered that because there are only two OFEE staff at the very complicated high school, and because those staff are the newest to the program, they only have capacity to focus on certain students. The point of OFEE is to make sure underserved students are getting the resources they need. Rep. Glimme noted that .5 FTE of of the Parent Liaison staff is funded by BSEP site funds. Ms. Callegari concluded by acknowledging that serving BHS presents challenges, and another ongoing challenge is connecting with and looking at how to properly support Berkeley Technology Academy (BTA).

10. 2018-19 Annual Report: Site Program Funds

Danielle Perez, BSEP Program Specialist

Ms. Perez introduced the following documents:

- 2018-19 BSEP Site Program Funds Annual Report
- 2018-19 Site Fund Measure E1 Budget Summary
- 2018-19 Site Fund Measure A Budget Summary

Ms. Perez began by explaining that the Site Program Fund budget is comprised of a smaller budget for each of the 19 schools and programs in 2018-19. The site fund budgets were comprised of money from both Measure A and Measure E1 BSEP allocations. As with all Annual Reports, the goal of this review is to compare actual spending to the plans for use that were presented to the P&O in the Spring of 2018 in advance of the 2018-19 school year.

The highest proportion of site fund spending was to pay for Staffing, which is true for almost all BSEP budgets. The next highest category was spending on Contracted Services, and then spending on Books, Supplies, and Equipment. Ms. Perez explained that the overall rate of spending versus allocated budgets varied significantly from school to school and between elementary and secondary schools, for many reasons outlined in the Report. The Report includes a list of the average rate of spending versus available budget for each level of school (elementary, middle, high school, and pre-k programs). It also includes a list of Site Plan Addenda completed by all SSCs in the 2018-19 school year, which essentially provide a comparison for how plans and budgets were changed from the 2018-19 SPSAs that are published for each site. Using this information it is possible to get a more accurate picture of spending priorities at each school in 2018-19 than you would have simply by looking at the original plans.

Ms. Perez noted that when new Principals start at a school, how they cope with executing the site plans and budgets created by their predecessors can vary widely. In the case of Thousand Oaks, for example, the new Principal in '18-19 was tasked with recruiting teachers to work after-school for extra intervention to use \$18,000 budgeted for that purpose. It was not a realistic goal to spend that much in this year and so that budget went under-expended to a large extent. It is difficult for a new Principal to recruit teachers with whom they don't yet have relationships, and also difficult to implement an overarching program to administer long-term afterschool intervention in their first year with a set of students and staff. On the other end of the spectrum, at

Longfellow in '18-19 the new Principal's plan and budget had fewer challenges; the budget allowed for contracts that were enacted as planned and paid for positions which were filled. So that budget was expended at a higher rate despite also being administered by a new Principal.

Rep Irwin asked if there were overall driving factors to the trend toward sites only spending about 75% of their available budgets, particularly because this question has been brought up at previous meetings about other BSEP budgets. Ms. Perez responded that for site funds in particular we have to consider how much of an available budget for each school is made up of carryover funds from previous years, which cannot be used to pay for ongoing staffing, and so aren't applicable to the most expensive portion of any site's annual budget. Carryover funds must be used, then, for one-time expenses, and sites have to weigh whether it is advisable to spend a lot of money on a one-time program that would then disappear after a year or two, to the dismay of students and/or staff. In some cases sites do land on a single big-ticket budget item that fits their needs. For example, in 2019-20 BHS is increasing the FTE of staff who are Teachers on Special Assignment (who are considered temporary in their positions each year because they may always be re-assigned or choose to go back into classroom teaching) with the knowledge that the increases will not extend beyond a year, and BHS is also purchasing \$50,000 for technology cohort devices. Or consider how, in '19-20, Willard is using \$30,000 for a year-long contract for inquiry-based professional development.

Chair Pastika asked if Principals might benefit from direction on how carryover funds can be spent. Ms. Perez answered that the Budget Analysts work very closely with the Principals to advise them about how best to apply their carryover versus their current year funding to the priorities the Principals bring into their budgeting meetings. However, it isn't appropriate for either Fiscal Services or BSEP staff to recommend particular programs or educational directions, which would be more appropriate coming from Ed Services. But, given how many Principals we do have in their first or second year at the moment, it might be helpful for us to look at putting together some kind of "cheat sheet" the Principals might appreciate having on hand.

Rep. Glimme noted that other school districts have more flexible and faster procurement systems. BUSD doesn't use any pro-cards (district account credit cards) for example, and our system slows down the PO/purchasing process. You have to plan well in advance when you want to spend district money, compared to something like being reimbursed by a parent group, which can happen more easily. Teachers and admin need to be aware and cognizant of which pots of money exist and how "fast" each one is to utilize. Chair Pastika followed up that then of course you can easily see how carryover might build up over time, if the slow systems delay spending in many small ways. Rep. Glimme added that considering carryover in that context is even trickier, because in his experience each big jump in carryover has resulted from a unique situation, and it's very difficult to impossible to plan well enough to prevent them all every year.

Rep. Rabinowitz asked if PTAs can fill in and fund parts of staff positions. Ms. Perez answered that yes they do regularly fund positions particularly at the elementary sites. The Report does note in the introduction that the numbers presented only describe BSEP site funding, but that funding works in concert with other available resources like PTA, Title 1, grants, etc. Rep. Rabinowitz asked if there is any document that shows the interplay between all site funds. Ms. Perez answered that, in response to a request from the P&O after reviewing the '19-20 site fund

budget in April of 2019, she had compiled a document that summarizes all of the PTA spending that has been represented in the SPSA budget summaries over the past several years. This still is not a full accounting of PTA spending in the district, but does at least attempt to cover PTA funds that are routed through the district to pay for staff salaries and staff hourly work, and which pay for district-administered contracts for services to students. Reps. Rabinowitz and Glimme noted that some contracts that do not involve any contact with students may be paid directly by parent-funded groups. Ms. Perez added that there are also donation-funded contracts through the after-school programs that wouldn't be represented in the compilation document, because those expenses are not included in the SPSA budget summaries. This document is drafted, but there hasn't yet been an appropriate agenda item in the current year's meetings that it would logically relate to. Ms. Perez will put the finishing touches on it and will bring it to the committee as soon as there is a good agenda item with which it will fit.

11. Approval of BSEP 2018-19 Annual Report and 2019-20 First Interim

Chairs Bradstreet and pastika

Chair Bradstreet explained that the BSEP Annual Report is the sum total of all individual Annual Reports presented to the P&O over the past three meetings, and that consolidated Report will next go to the School Board for their approval at the February 5th meeting.

Rep. Glimme moved to approve the 2018-19 BSEP Annual Report, Rep. Bellows seconded; the Annual Report was approved with two abstentions.

12. 2020-21 BSEP Site Fund Allocations

Jay Nitschke, Director of Technology for Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations

Director Nitschke distributed:

- 2020-21 BSEP Site Program Fund Allocations

This document is a summary of the BSEP site fund allocations distributed to our Principals earlier in the week. Ms. Perez called the committee's attention to the through-line that can be drawn for the past several years, by looking at the rates of increase in the BSEP per pupil site allocations that are recorded in the 2018-19 Site Fund Annual Report (an increase of 8.5% from '16-17 to '18-19, an increase of about 1% from '17-18 to '18-19 equal to \$260 per student), considering the current year ('19-20) per pupil allocation of \$285, and now receiving these 2020-21 allocations of \$305 per student.

13. Teacher Template Preview 2020-21

Jay Nitschke, Director of Technology for Natasha Beery, Director BSEP & Community Relations

Director Nitschke introduced the following documents:

- [BSEP and Class Size History Presentation](#) (slides)

Rep. Babitt opened the topic by sharing that from her time working with the Longfellow SSC, their feeling has been that the issue with the Teacher Template (TT) is that it doesn't equate to need for a school with higher needs per population; it is only based on student numbers in to get

teacher numbers out. The TT doesn't address a concentration of need that the teachers have to address for the students at different sites. She really wanted to bring that up, and to express a hope that we can make the TT planning process more sophisticated. She shared that the Longfellow SSC has done comparison analysis for teacher hours to support, for example, a class at King in which two kids require additional support, versus a similar sized class at Longfellow in which 10-12 kids might need that same support. They have brought these concerns to the School Board but haven't seen the results they think are necessary. Further, particularly given the high teacher turnover at Longfellow, it becomes even more difficult to recruit and keep teachers when it's known that teaching at this school will present drastically more work than teaching at another school in the district. She proposed possible fixes such as co-teaching models to include more teachers in a classroom. Director Nitschke explained that the role of the upcoming presentation on the TT is to give committee members the basic skills they'll need to effectively evaluate the TT, but that we won't have the 2020-21 TT document until a later meeting. Chair Bradstreet added that in previous years, Assoc. Sup. of Ed Services Scuderi would present the TT to the P&O, and so we assume that our new Assoc. Sup. of Ed. Services Bajé Thiara will be presenting that info in an upcoming meeting, and it would be appropriate to voice these concerns to her at that time.

Director Nitschke prefaced his slide presentation by explaining that it has been a while since the P&O has heard a history of BSEP and class size, and given that two-thirds of BSEP revenue has for so long gone toward Class Size Reduction, now is a good time for the group to understand the history that influenced where we are now and how we got here. (See slide presentation for more details.)

In discussing how Proposition 13 and its drastic reduction to state funding for public education prompted the creation of the first BSEP measure in 1986, it is worth noting that currently private households pay 75% of state taxes, and commercial properties only pay 25% of the overall state property tax revenue. Before Prop. 13 that ratio was an equal 50%-50%.

Director Nitschke also noted that the historical inability for the GF to sustain class size contributions is a direct result of rising costs and level COLAs (increases in revenue), and this is why we attempt to create a large fund balance at the outset of new BSEP measures, to prevent this situation from recurring yet again.

Director Nitschke also wanted to mention the 20-25 year span of work done by Monica Thyberg, who successfully stewarded BSEP from its inception to the critical and respected position that it occupies within the district today. She is currently facing some health challenges and he wanted to recognize her and keep her in the committee members' awareness and thoughts.

Director Nitschke continued, explaining that the big takeaway is that BSEP is vitally important, without it BUSD would be completely bankrupt. It is essential and woven into the success of the district. Rep. Flett asked what the important numbers are in the TT document that the committee members should be paying attention to. Mr. Nitschke advised that members pay attention to the GF contribution, which continues to decrease as the district is facing higher costs, with the result that there is a desire to put more costs into BSEP budgets. This shouldn't be upsetting necessarily, but it should be recognized. Rep. Glimme offered that the members should be angry

at the state, for not providing enough base funding to school districts to support the overall costs of providing the necessary teachers and programs to support quality public education. Rep. Glimme also felt that the place for a conversation about allocating more support for higher needs might be most appropriate when discussing different BSEP budgets. Class size contribution from BSEP is written into the measure, but other BSEP budgets contain more flexibility that could be leveraged. Note also that class sizes are still levelling to the new goals stated in Measure E1.

Rep. Rabinowitz asked how the committee could get a report of what the GF is paying across the district, for example is a large chunk of the money paying for administrators? Director Nitschke answered that they could get the district's overall annual budget, but generally speaking about administrators, the district has already cut two Director positions recently (for Assessment and for Programs and Special Projects). Looking at comparisons to other districts, sometimes we look like we spend more on administrators, because our schools are so small. We have elementary schools with only 300 students and a dedicated administrator (Principal), compared to Dublin with 900 students in a single elementary school run by a Principal and a Vice Principal. This can make our district look administratively top-heavy.

Rep. Irwin noted that the SBAC discussion earlier in the evening presented the following numbers: BSEP is paying \$14.6 million this year, and that expense will increase to \$15.9 million next year even if enrollment stays steady, just in the increases in staffing costs and with a proposed decrease of the GF contributions to teacher FTE. This is relevant to keep in mind in light of questions at the last P&O meeting from committee members who wondered why such a large fund balance had been built in this and other BSEP budgets over the past three years. This proposed change alone will use about \$1.3 million more than is currently being paid out of this budget.

Rep. Wallace expressed that he found it difficult to contemplate BSEP resources not being available at any point in the future, wondering what the district would do. Having class sizes at 36, he it's hard to imagine how that would be. The logic in the California public school system seems crazy. Rep. Hyde responded that the biggest thing citizens can do in light of this is to get Prop. 13 reform on the ballot and passed. Chair Bradstreet suggested that members can discuss activism opportunities and strategies outside of the meeting.

14. For the Good of the Order

Rep Hyde asked where the Prop. 13 reform process stands currently. Ms. Waddell explained that advocates are in the signature gathering phase to get a measure on the ballot for November. Ms. Allman added that the previously proposed ballot measure was withdrawn and re-written to be stronger, to withstand the strong corporate opposition that will inevitably come. These efforts are being referred to as action to close corporate tax loopholes, or the shorthand "schools and communities first." Rep. Glimme added that one of the groups working on this is Evolve California. The new proposed measure will need the requisite number of petition signatures by mid-March to qualify to be included on the ballot.

15. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:16 p.m.