

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 11, 2014

P&O Committee Members Present:

Sergio Duran, Arts Magnet	Keira Armstrong, Washington
Tim Frederick, Cragmont	Elisabeth Hensley, King (co-Chair)
Boyd Power, Emerson	Dawn Paxson, Emerson/Willard
Mara Mahmood, Jefferson (Sub)	Margaret Phillips, Willard
Danielle Perez, John Muir	Aaron Glimme, Berkeley High
Darryl Bartlow, John Muir (Alt)	Larry Gordon, Berkeley High
Chris Martin, LeConte (co-Chair)	John Lavine, Berkeley High
Catherine Huchting, Malcolm X	Catherine Lazio, Berkeley High
Dan Smuts, Rosa Parks (co-Rep)	Ramal Lamar, B-Tech
Patrick Hamill, Thousand Oaks	Louise Harm, Independent Study
Radha Seshagiri, Thousand Oaks (Alt)	

P&O Committee Members Absent:

Moshe Cohen, Pre-K	Kim Sanders, Longfellow
Lily Howell, Pre-K (Alt)	Ellen Weis, Longfellow
Shauna Rabinowitz, Jefferson	Bruce Simon, King
Yusef Auletta, LeConte (Alt)	Austin Lloyd, BHS (Alt)
Lea Baechler-Brabo, Oxford	Orlando Williams, BHS (Alt)
Juliet Bashore, Rosa Parks (co Rep)	

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

Mark Coplan, BUSD Public Information Officer
Donald Evans, BUSD Superintendent
Javetta Cleveland, Deputy Superintendent
Julie Sinai, Board Member
Karen Hemphill, Board Member

BSEP Staff:

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director
Valerie Tay, BSEP Program Specialist
Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support

1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports

At 7:16 p.m. Co-chair Chris Martin called the meeting to order by welcoming attendees, and by asking P&O members to report on School Governance Council activity at their sites.

2. Establish the Quorum

The quorum was approved with 18 voting members initially present. 13 voting members are required for a quorum.

3. Chairperson's Comments

Chris Martin and Elisabeth Hensley

No comments were made.

4. BSEP Director's Comments

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

No comments were made.

5. Approval of Minutes: January 28, 2014

MOTION CARRIED (Lamar/Glimme): To approve the meeting minutes of the January 28, 2014 P&O Committee Meeting.

The motion was approved with a showing of 14 hands, with no objections, and 4 abstentions.

6. Public Comment

No comments were made.

7. Subcommittee Reports: Library/Technology Subcommittee, Music/VAPA Subcommittee

Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Last Tuesday, February 4, 2014, there was a meeting of the Music/VAPA Subcommittee. It was well attended and included members of staff as well as parents. The subcommittee discussed music as well as arts funding in general, including why dance, drama, visual arts were not funded at the schools as much as they had been in the past. One of the factors mentioned was space limitation. There was also a general discussion about the transfer of VAPA funds (to the General Fund) for teacher release time, and the affect of the dwindling fund balance on the VAPA program. The next meeting will be held on March 4, 2014.

Martin asked if there was any discussion on how to sustain the program. Beery stated that the Music/VAPA structure shifted during a time when the General Fund needed more support. At that time, BSEP began funding not only supplemental music teachers, but also the music teachers that supplied the release time for 4th and 5th grades. Also, because BSEP pays for release time in both CSR as well as VAPA, there is an unintentional overlap in funding coming from BSEP. That is an area of concern that will become an item for discussion.

Beery stated that McCulloch will be going to the Board in March to talk about the sustainability of the VAPA fund, and present various scenarios of what could be done within the constraints of the current funding structure and what could be done if there is a shift in the structure. Martin asked how the models would be formulated, and Beery responded by saying that she, McCulloch and Deputy Superintendent Cleveland would be working on that together.

Library and Technology subcommittees met jointly last Tuesday, February 4, 2014 and discussed specific areas of intersection, such as digital literacy and what is currently being done in elementary classrooms. There was an interest in reviving the development of a district-wide survey of the current use and future needs for instructional technology. Beery suggested that type of needs assessment would probably be best done in the broader context of BSEP Measure preparation. She will bring that topic to a preliminary BSEP Measure Planning Group, with P&O Co-Chairs Martin and Hensley, Board Directors Julie Sinai and

Josh Daniels, and Superintendent Evans , who will be meeting together to talk about the next steps in this process on February 19, 2014.

Beery noted that she will be going to the Board on Wednesday, February 12, 2014, to make a brief presentation of the BSEP Annual Report and the First Interim Report. It was presented a month ago as a consent item but was pulled for discussion. The Board of Directors asked Beery to comment on the trajectory for BSEP resources, focusing on areas of expenditure that might not be sustainable through the end of the measure unless changes are made, as well as which resources have stronger fund balances, and the reasons for that. She is currently in the process of preparing a report on this matter.

Cleveland enhanced the graphs in the slide LCFF Funding Increase over 8 years (page 3) by indicating the areas of funding in more detail. Under the Prior Formula in 2012-13, the district received \$66M from state funding sources. The new formula aims to provide equitable funding to all school districts. Every school district will get the same amount per student for its Base Grant funding, whereas each district got a different amount per student based on the old formula. All school districts will receive the same amounts, according to grade spans, with the exception of supplemental funding and concentration funding. The Supplemental Grant funding will be based on the population of Low Income (based on Free and Reduced Lunch eligibility), English Learners or Foster Youth. In looking at 2020-21, the formula is based on the Governor's budget and the amount per student, and then there is a gap between where district is now (2012-13: \$66M) and the target (of \$82M). The gap of \$16M will be funded over an 8-year period. In 2013-14, the Governor funded 11.78% of the \$16M gap for a small increase. In 2014-15, the Governor is projected to fund 28% of the gap, which gives another \$4M to the district, and it increases both the Supplemental and Base Grants. The goal is to get districts back to what they were getting in 2007-08 (including a COLA), at a minimum. In 2013-14, the Supplemental Grant calculation is \$.8M, the higher of the Supplemental Grant calculation or the district's EIA (Economic Impact Aid: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/sw/t1/eia.asp>). BUSD's EIA was .8M/year, and the districts have to spend at least what is spent in EIA. Even though EIA is no longer a

some of these efforts now, and BHS has been funding intervention services, ELL home school liaisons and other small programs. She noted that there was a lot written about them and there was data for them.

Evans stated that the EAC - Education Advisory Committee - was examining programs at all schools sites and data about particular populations in determining whether specific programs were good and why. Hamill asked where the gap originates and accelerates or whether it was a steady increase? Evans stated it depended on what research was looked at; some say third grade, some say second grade, was the time when schools started losing African American boys. More were lost after middle school and by the time they were in high school, they can't check out because of the law, but they are "checked out." Evans stated that he could get more information for the committee, but the district was losing kids in numbers. He stated that he liked the LCAP process because the district really has to hone in to what they are doing for the targeted populations. Glimme added that what you cannot see in the data from internal assessments is that there is a narrowing of the gap over the school year and then it widens over the course of the summer. When you look at the end of year gap vs. start of next year there is a really big difference between different subgroups. Higher achieving subgroups are stable or go up in proficiency over the summer, while high risk students tend to go down over the summer. That may be a high leverage place to start. Evans stated that people have mentioned extending the year as well as extending the school day. Lamar reminded the group that there w-5(.)-J -0.004 Tc9ac -0.m.

E0s4(f)-1(ie)]1one-Q7n0s4(f)-1(ie)]1Berk4(v)-10(e(opl)-2nc)-16n0s4nd of w

BSEP P&O Committee Minutes 2-11-14
Official but not Adopted

fund CSR first, then if there is money left over, fund other things. The only worry he had was for setting precedent. He felt that as long as it could be projected to meet the numerical CSR targets and the other things that are mentioned specifically, he thinks BSEP has an obligation to attempt to do that. What he does not want to do is, if it is projected that we will not meet those class size reductions over the course of the remainder of the Measure, because of population growth, COLAs, reallocations in the GF, we should have that discussion now and not set a precedent that BSEP takes all of that on. Hensley asked what were the key questions that people would want to have answered before they could take action on a proposal from the District about the CSR budget?

Beery confirmed that 24:1 was the bar that allowed the district to qualify for CSR funding, which is a separate question from what the Measure states, which was that you begin with 26:1 and then bring it down further, so long as funds are available, to 20:1. This was already a class size reduction from 34:1, which is what the GF provides. Smuts stated that it was his understanding that under the new CSR rules, if any school site exceeds the 24:1 average, the money would be lost for the entire district.

Lamar asked about the last statement “Alternative methods to reduce class sizes in a particular year may be adopted by the School Governance Council and implemented as approved by the Board of Education (Measure A, 3. Definition of Purposes, A. Smaller Class Sizes, Expanded Course Offerings, and School Counseling Services, ii.) Glimme stated that he thought that phrase was primarily about places in the middle schools and the high school where class sizes are reduced in various ways, for instance providing for very small math classes by offsetting that with other larger classes.

Paxson wondered about whether there were numbers for what the GF funds for the ratio and how BSEP buys it down. Maybe the committee needs to see that again so that it is really clear that BSEP is still buying down quite a bit, from 34:1. As a clarification, are we recommending BSEP pick it up or are we recommending that we go to the GF and for what time frame? Hensley stated that for 2013-14 it was already determined, the GF is picking up CSR. Hensley did not think we had to say what we have to do for the remainder of the Measure, but there are not a lot of years left and what happens next year sets a precedent. Beery noted that recommendations would be for three school years through 2016-17. Mahmood asked if the committee was talking about making a recommendation for just one year? Martin stated that the P&O committee should not be making a recommendation, but that a statement could be made as to how the committee feels as stewards of the Measure, relative to the words in the Measure and the changes in funding. Mahmood added that in order to be responsible stewards of the Measure, we would need to know the exact cost. A statement to the School Board would have to be based on fidelity to the Measure, as well as some actual numbers on what it would cost and what the potential detriment could be to the existing services. What would it look like if the District continued to fund this vs. what would it look like if BSEP funded this and these are where the cuts would be and this would be what the implications would be. Lazio stated that she felt that the Committee needed more information before making a statement.

Martin said that the money was there and that the question is whether the Measure requires/asks/intends us to fund K-3 at 20:1, and that we think for reasons relative to renewing the Measure in 3 years, we feel that it is important maintain K-3 at 20:1. Glimme stated that he thought the statement could have two parts; in what we feel is a plain reading of the Measure, 1) what can be done and 2) what should be done. He felt that CSR funds have decreased and that activates that clause, CSR can be changed, but we think for the reasons stated class sizes should probably be kept at 20:1. Smuts stated that if the same

people that make the decisions on how to spend the gener-3(dke)4(r-(a)6(t2(a)4(10 36 12 13.8 ne)4(r-3(dd)-100