

**BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES
June 16, 2020**

P&O Committee Members Present:

*Jonathan Weissglass, *Emerson*

Carla Bryant, *Oxford*

*Weldon Bradstreet, *Rosa Parks*

*Heather Flett, *Washington*

*Terry Pastika, *King Middle School*

*Aaron Glimme, *Berkeley High*

Josh Irwin, *Berkeley High*

*Shauna Rabinowitz, *Berkeley High*

**Denotes Steering Committee Member, all Steering Committee members were present.*

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

Judy Appel, *School Board President*

BUSD Staff:

Brent Stephens, *Superintendent of Schools*

Natasha Beery, *Director of BSEP and Communications*

Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*

Danielle Perez, *BSEP Program Specialist*

1. Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was held online via Zoom. At 4:01 p.m. Chairperson Bradstreet called the meeting to order. Members and attendees introduced themselves.

2. Establish the Quorum/Approve the Agenda

The quorum was established with 6 Steering Committee members present.

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

3. Chairperson's Comments

Chairs Bradstreet and Pastika thanked everyone for making time to attend the additional meeting.

4. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

5. District and SBAC Update

P&O Representatives Carla Bryant and Josh Irwin,

Brent Stephens, Superintendent of Schools, and

Judy Appel, School Board President

Director Beery noted that much to be discussed as district and SBAC updates will also relate to agenda item #7 when the committee will discuss BSEP plan changes.

Rep. Irwin began by stating that the most recent SBAC meeting was well attended with about 35 participants on the call. The biggest takeaway is to understand that Dr. Stephens has been trying

to structure cost saving measures categorized by time period: Tier One for immediate implementation, Tier Two to be implemented later on in 2020, and Tier Three which contains proposals for the 2021-22 budget. The overall cut goals have remained steady. It is obvious that a lot of thought has gone into the process, and that staff at the District Office have scoured all available opportunities and avenues to locate any possible areas that can be reduced. The Superintendent also explained to the SBAC that with ongoing COVID and equity issues, new costs will come into play as well. The SBAC reviewed equity considerations of distance learning, trying to make sure that in the end we can meet a lot of these new expected expenditures. With all the uncertainties moving into the Fall, the legislature and the governor may come back with new numbers, and there is hope that the federal government may assist with additional funds, but pending any developments from state and federal funding, the Tier One of reductions will go to the School Board in the next couple of weeks. See slides for details.

Rep. Irwin continued, explaining that furloughs would begin with unrepresented managers and then represented groups later if needed. These plans include trimming everything possible, including a reduction of nutrition services to take-away only, and reduced need for teacher substitutes. It may be painful, but there is a pathway to about \$5 million in reductions without impacting equity. There was an addition of \$500,000 for elementary school day camp, to care for kids of families who have to work or for children of staff, providing child care with learning enrichment. The proposed mid-year cuts would require revised bargaining between the district and its unions to negotiate furlough agreements, which would save about \$600,000 per furlough day across the district. The majority of layoffs would not happen until Tier 3, and though initially cuts to the Transportation Department were being considered for this year, now those would not happen until next year if necessary.

Dr. Stephens added that in this year, assuming that the reduction package for tomorrow night is approved, there are some limited layoffs. The district has a plan to achieve \$8 million in savings with 7 layoffs total in 2020-21. Two of these proposed layoffs are in the first tier of reductions, and five are in the second tier. This is not a large number considering the dollar amount we're after, but it is still painful. If state revenue continues to decline and no federal relief package is offered, we would expect that in the 2021-22 school year we would talk about increasing class size and consider layoffs of classified and certificated employees.

Rep. Rabinowitz asked if those employees impacted by the first tier of layoffs have been notified yet. Dr. Stephens answered that employees have not yet been notified, pending final School Board approval the following evening. These particular positions are classified and so the time requirements for layoff notification are different than those for teachers. Classified employees are entitled to a 60 day notification window.

Chair Pastika asked what the dollar amount of costs coming into BSEP would be. Dr. Stephens answered that it is yet to be determined. He explained that BSEP will experience financial pressure itself, which represents the motivation behind the initial plan to reduce spending in some budgets which will be discussed later in the meeting. He continued that if the GF budget pressure continues, we may need to have conversations about BSEP providing additional relief. The information presented today is meant to set us up to better understand pressures on BSEP and what may come to pass. Director Beery answered that it will be discussed during agenda item #7 of this meeting. Chair Pastika asked, of the proposed \$8 million identified in reductions, when

are decisions due and what is the process specifically related to the role of advisory committees. Dr. Stephens responded that he is using a number of structures for feedback. This won't take shape in formal recommendations from SBAC but he has incorporated questions and thinking from that and other advisory committees as these proposals progress. Currently, specific to the P&O's work, the thinking is that we can achieve savings to the GF without changes to the Teacher Template, but we'll look at what future changes might look like later in this meeting to have it in mind. That change is probably on the table next year if budgetary pressures continue. He is planning to ask groups like the PAC and DELAC to comment on the GF budget as well.

Rep. Weissglass asked, regarding possible furloughs in Tier 2, would those result in school closures, and if so how that would impact ADA (average daily attendance) state funding to the district. Dr. Stephens responded that currently in California the question of ADA is an entirely unresolved question. The governor is proposing using ADA as a funding mechanism in '20-21, but the legislature is not. Currently we can't quite answer that question. There are 3 days in the teacher calendar that are not instructional, for PD or teacher work days. District leaders will have to engage in a conversation about whether we need instruction time or PD time more; furlough days would have to pull from one or the other. If ADA ends up influencing state funding, then that will limit how many furlough days we can consider.

Dr. Stephens noted that there are a whole variety of categorical programs and revenue sources that will also experience separate funding cuts independent of the GF reductions, including: After-School, Adult Ed, Transportation, and Nutrition Services. These are going to increase the overall sensation of a decline of services in the distance.

Board President Appel asked what role the SBAC and P&O will play in developing the budget. Dr. Stephens replied that he has been using these committees to preview drafts of what the Board is seeing. In January and February these groups were doing a lot of brainstorming, and influenced the generation of the idea set informing budget decisions. President Appel stated that her understanding was that the P&O often, and she felt it might be in the committee bylaws, has decision-making power around BSEP funds. This made her unclear about how the P&O would sign off or give a green light to ideas about changing BSEP funding. Director Beery acknowledged that this is really unprecedented, how we are having to go about this budgeting process. However, the P&O role is and has always been advisory to the School Board, and the Board ultimately makes final decisions regarding all district budgets, though Board is always highly respectful of P&O opinion. For an example, this year as COVID intervened between when BSEP plans were approved by the committee and when the plans came subsequently to the Board, the Board chose to make changes about what to accept of those plans. The Board will likely continue to do that, so we hope to show the P&O committee what may happen and what is likely to happen, and solicit their concerns as much as possible. This committee is a place where folks who have really been paying attention are being relied upon for good insights and advice, though ultimately it's on the shoulders of decision-makers like the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent Follansbee, and ultimately the Board.

6. Potential 2020-21 BSEP Plan Changes in Response to District Budget Cuts

Natasha Beery, Director of BSEP

Director Beery referred back to the summary overview of the Superintendent's budget reductions, presented at the previous Board meeting. She explained that the portions to be discussed impact BSEP budgets; some strategies are internal to hedge BSEP budgets against leaner times anticipated in the near future, and some strategies relate to BSEP assisting in relieving the GF.

She shared that she'd had discussions with VAPA Supervisor Pete Gidlund, and the changes shown in these slides represent how he anticipates the VAPA plan differing from what the P&O and Board already approved earlier this year. There are a number of programs that just can't work the same way due to changes in school structure for the Fall. Aside from BSEP measure language allowing up to 10% of VAPA funds to be shared only with Library and Technology programs, these savings will stay with the VAPA budget. There are potential balancing opportunities between PD, Classroom Support and Expanded Support Offerings. Student Support is a separate "bucket" though funds there could be redirected to some extent. Ultimately, any use of BSEP funds must be used in accordance with the measure language describing each purpose. She continued by explaining that farther down the road, we will probably be looking at teacher leader stipends, teacher-initiated PD (TIP) which is negotiated and needs to be revisited with the teachers union, the Lead Lit Coach position, PD leader positions, and the newly-proposed BREA TSA are all potential area of savings.

Director Beery explained that the color-coded slide showing HQI expenses highlights which budget pieces were newly added for '20-21. *For example, the 504 Coordinator position was approved by both the P&O and Board, but is now on the "freeze" list to not be implemented. BHS Principal Schweng said there may be room in the BHS plan to take on one of these frozen positions but that has yet to be confirmed. Additionally, social-emotional learning, culturally responsive labs, and contracts in the HQI budget have been put on hold for now.*

This will alleviate some of the draw-down of the CSR/HQI BSEP funds. Back in February, as the 36:1 adjustment was made to the GF contribution toward the TT, we saw how that would impact the BSEP fund balance trajectory. Just this week, district leaders did look at a 37:1 GF contribution and how that would impact this BSEP CSR budget, but it begs the question of how that would be sustainable through the life of the measure. In the previous SBAC meeting, Rep. Chabot recalled that a previous Multi-Year Projections had already raised concerns that the change in the GF contributions at 36:1 would draw down available BSEP funds, such that by year 6 we're getting to where it wouldn't be sustainable in the final two years of the measure. So a more radical change, like the GF going to 37:1, would mean BSEP funds would hit that unsustainable point even more quickly, if we don't adjust related HQI budgets, or if we don't adjust class size in the district overall--another lever requiring an emergency declaration.

Char Pastika asked when the conversation about changing the GF contribution, and its addition of \$930,000 to the BSEP CSR budget, would take place. Dr. Stephens answered that this would be a Tier 3 strategy and that we have a year to figure it out. He stated that for the coming '20-21 year, we have a painful but practical way to get to the \$8 million target without revising the TT. He continued that we should prepare to be a bit more conservative with BSEP budgets given the new reality. There are several key milestones that will impact whether we have to take this step for '20-22: what the US Senate does to relieve state budgets, a possible August budget revision from the state, and the January 15, 2021 Governor's Budget. We ought to be paying close attention to

each of those indicators and will continue to engage in these conversations so that we can prepare for what may come.

Chair Pastika asked for the cost-benefit analysis around delaying the 504 Coordinator position, as the rationale around creating it originally was that it would save the district in litigation costs. She asked if litigation costs are expected to be less than any savings in reduction of the position. Dr. Stephens answered that the initial calculations and rationale haven't changed, but budget outlook pressured this decision. The biggest need is to keep in compliance with regulations, and without this position we may need to ask the BHS administration to take on more oversight to achieve the same intended outcomes.

Director Beery explained that two of the factors influencing the MYP trajectory are flat COLAs (cost of living adjustments) and the "grandfathered" larger 4th and 5th grade classes. These are residual from the previous measure in which class sizes jumped from 20:1 in K-3 to 26:1 in 4-5, but as those phase out toward the balanced 24:1 class size in the new measure, *BSEP will have higher expenses as those higher grades begin to require more teachers*, and BSEP will have to provide proportionally more FTE. We may have to start thinking about whether we need to revisit class size.

Chair Pastika asked if the P&O would be asked for a new vote on any changes to already-approved plans and budgets for the 2020-21 school year. *Director Beery confirmed that in most cases the committee would not be asked to vote again based on Board decisions*, though she would be coming back to share what the Board has decided, and in some cases to engage the committee for feedback. She also stated that something as substantial as changing the TT would and should come back for a committee vote. She noted that the district hasn't ever had to completely redo a budget cycle before, and district staff would welcome committee thoughts on that.

Chair Pastika asked, given that we are currently in year 3 of an 8-year measure, and given a worst-case scenario with an additional \$930,000 to the CSR budget with a TT adjustment that could cause BSEP funds to run out in year 5, when that decision conversation would happen, and how the Board and the P&O would be updated. Dr. Stephens responded that as we move forward, it is important that the Board be kept updated both by its designated representative attending these committee meetings, but also more directly in the Board chambers specifically addressing the interrelatedness of BSEP and the GF. President Appel added that much is still very unclear, depending on outside factors. The District is waiting to see if the state or federal government will send more financial support. We still need to provide a balanced budget by the end of the month, while not knowing how much money the district will actually have. Director Beery agreed that we have to have an approved budget by this deadline per state law. District leaders keep looking at hypotheticals, and at some point we have to load the budget so that it can be certified, though we may make changes down the line. Rep. Bryant asked if there is anything in the BSEP measure allowing us to go back to change a major portion, such as class size numbers. *Director Beery answered that the only way to change class size is in case of fiscal emergency, in which the budget has to have negative certification and be approved by the Board and ratified by the County.*

7. Recommendation for use of BSEP Carryover Funds in 2020-21: Office of Family Engagement and Equity

Natasha Beery, Director of BSEP

Director Beery explained that this plan for carryover funding for OFEE is the same as was presented at the last P&O meeting. There have been no changes.

Rep. Rabinowitz moved to approve the agenda, Rep. Glimme seconded; the Recommendation was approved unanimously.

8. P&O 2020-21 Committee Purpose and Process: Guidelines for Budget and Plan Changes, Goals, and Objectives; Plans and Reports

Natasha Beery, Director of BSEP

Director Beery stated that committee members have expressed interest in clarifying how we approach our work, guidelines, and the overall business of the committee. This agenda item is in the hope for discussion and suggestions for actions and next steps. The current P&O guidelines are shared, and have been in the past. These are specific to expectations that the P&O review budget and plan changes. This does not address voting, just informational updates, though likely the P&O may want to vote given a big enough change. An issue is that with the new structure of Measure E1, the HQI budget is so much bigger and the percentage threshold is harder to hit even if it makes a substantial difference in a program. This might be one point of discussion, and the group could also discuss plan and report formats, and/or goals and objectives.

Chair Pastika wondered, in the short term, what the district needs from the P&O. For example, for the committee to meet again next month for budget matters, and/or is there something on the table to be addressed or that the district wants input on. Director Beery asked Dr. Stephens if there are any other potential issues that haven't yet been sunshined. Dr. Stephens answered that he does think the question of revising the TT is off in the future, and how we strike a more conservative stance on all budgets will require thoughtful inspection by all program managers. The milestone dates mentioned previously are still coming up through August and January. He believed that the district and this committee can sit tight through the summer and take stock as more information comes in, and hopefully federal relief. President Appel added that, for the engaged and involved committee members, there are many avenues available for ongoing updates from the Superintendent. She encouraged all to sit in on the Community Advisory Committee and School Board meetings, which go on every week through the first week of July. Director Beery added that if anything does come up, BSEP staff will inform the P&O and possibly reconvene the Steering Committee. This group is set until new members are elected in the Fall, and by then will have things to review more. Chair Pastika asked if a working group could be put together, to gather ideas in a meaningful format and get feedback from interested members. Director Beery would be happy if members put together a work group and suggestions for fall.

Rep Weissglass observed that, because of the nature of committees with significant turnover each year, there are always members who need to be brought up to speed, and the group often spends a lot of time doing that while all members are present. He proposed having an informational meeting that is only for new members, with BSEP staff, in a non-business meeting. Director Beery answered that the orientation is always built in before the first meeting of each year, but

usually only about half of new members tend to be available at that point, as many sites take time to fill elect P&O representatives. *She proposed that perhaps we might hold two orientation meetings, before the first meeting of the new year's group and again around meeting four.*

Rep. Rabinowitz asked if site fund allocations will be revisited, and also how BSEP-paid sub costs may decrease if the need for subs changes with distance learning. Director Beery answered that the district will probably still use subs, but questions still exist about how that would work out. During distance learning a sub might function close to normally, but if we're trying to reduce mixing among in-person cohorts, that's tricky. To the question of site funds, any unused funds carry over and can never be swept back into larger district-wide budgets based on the language of the current BSEP measure. However, there has been discussion that in the next measure it may make sense to change how these funds are described, allowing a sweep of unused funds for reallocation to other needy sites or to relieve the GF. Also, given that Lit Coaches are partially paid from site funds already, some have wondered if more of the site funds might be directed at the urging of Ed Services, to address needs and priorities such as equity. Ms. Perez added that a large portion of site spending is allocated toward salaries, and that can't be changed in 20-21 unless there is union re-negotiation allowing for layoffs. Of other site funds that are not paying for FTE, those can be reallocated at any point in the school year using the site plan addendum process. Many sites have already planned to leave some decisions to next year's committees based on evolving needs, as shown by the number of SSCs that didn't make any plans for carryover priorities. Rep. Rabinowitz explained that she was thinking about things like athletic coaches and tutors, who can't work with students in person. Ms. Perez answered that for something like coaching stipends, if those staff end up not coaching and the funds will not be used, the SSC can move that money to any other purpose they choose. She hasn't heard any sites discuss reallocating site funds to address district needs, given that site funds are so small in comparison to the district budget, but certainly we expect many changes to plans and budgets throughout the coming year.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 5:30 p.m.