

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 21, 2017

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

P&O Committee Members Present:

Terry Pastika, *Jefferson*

Danielle Perez, *John Muir (co-Chair)*

Byron Pakter, *LeConte*

Weldon Bradstreet, *Rosa*

5. Superintendent's Report

Donald Evans, Ed.D.

Evans noted that it was a busy time of the year for the District, and the P&O Committee would be hearing the Second Interim Report and its impacts on the district.

Teachers would be presenting Next Generation Science Standards and an update on Common Core mathematics at the Wednesday, March 22, 2017 School Board meeting. There will be a first reading for staffing budget priorities, and Evans noted there would be cuts with more to be made. He noted that many school districts would be making cuts as a result of the Governor's budget. Also on the agenda would be a discussion of possible financing for teacher/employee housing.

6. Approval of Minutes March 7, 2016

There was a brief review allowed for the March 7, 2017 P&O Committee Meeting minutes. (Members do not have to be present at the meeting to vote to approve the minutes. Everyone has a chance to review the minutes, make necessary changes and if the minutes were correct enough to be entered into the public record, members could vote to approve the minutes.) A typo for Beatrice Leyva-Cutler name on the attendance list was noted for correction: Leyva-Butler should be Leyva-Cutler.

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Schoenfeld): To approve the meeting minutes of the March 7, 2017 P&O Committee Meeting with the above mentioned correction. **The motion was approved unanimously.**

7. Public Comment

Balch stated that she asked her Independent Study/IS administrator how they could get information from the district survey and was unable to get an answer. She noted that IS was a part of Berkeley High School/BHS, and they don't know who of their population, responded to that survey because they don't get that information. Beery responded that Debbi D'Angelo, Director of Evaluation and Assessment, could help with that, but was not able to attend the meeting tonight and added that D'Angelo could be reached during her office hours daily from 4-6pm or by email to answer questions. (Berkeley Research, Evaluation & Assessment/BREA: <http://www.berkeleyschools.net/departments/bea-berkeley-evaluation-assessment/>) Beery confirmed that Balch could work with D'Angelo about maintaining confidentiality with the IS site survey.

Perez added that during a conversation with another SGC person, there was some confusion about who could look at surveys. She felt that needed clarification. Beery responded that there had been issues with that before, especially around open-ended questions that pertained to individuals. D'Angelo worked to provide the information needed while maintaining confidentiality. Perez asked about SGCs sharing survey responses with the school, and Beery stated that D'Angelo would help evaluate questions/answers that would be appropriate to share.

Huchting asked for clarification about surveys, were they the same or different? Beery responded that there was a core district survey that had the same questions.

Glimme added, in reference to Balch's concerns above, that BHS does not do a site survey. The high school had stopped doing the survey many years ago because the results were not helpful. The BHS SGC takes proposals from teachers/students/others for the distribution of their site funds.

Schoenfeld asked if other schools have teachers take a survey that was more internal regarding school climate and administration. How do teachers provide that information?

levels.

4. **Noted additional costs:** The District had to increase the contribution to Special Education for a **total of \$274K**. This was for agency support services as well as a Board-approved one-time expenditure of P&O (as per 21-10-10 of the ET /LBody

BSEP P&O Committee

Cho asked what prompted the BHS Redesign. Scuderi stated that they had a team analyze the way the most effective high schools were structured, particularly at the entry point of 9th grade. The District was not in line with that research in terms of the level of personalization offered and coherence and calibration around curriculum. There was a long-standing concern about the way students were assigned to different schools and the structures we were setting up in terms of how teaching and learning happened in 9th grade. There seemed to be a need to do something structurally different. Our program was segregating kids a little too diffuse in terms of what was being taught. The system was proving to be inherently inequitable in terms of the choices that kids make and receive in the 9th grade student assignment process. Leyva-Cutler, in reference to ADA, added that every SGC should monitor the attendance of students in our schools.. She encourfoutuden

they would do that would require thinking deeply about it. The alternative would be to provide a straight

Glimme asked whether there was any information about the adjustments for 3rd grade Necessary FTE of -1.56. Nitschke responded that was to align the actual class size with the built-in 20:1 calculation.

The Support for Teaching: Professional Development Plan Overview: FY 2017-

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Schoenfeld): To approve the recommendation for BSEP Funds in FY 2017-18: CSR and Support for Teaching. **The motion was approved by 10 members, with 2 members abstaining.**

Discussion:

Irwin asked where the extra \$200K would come from if we could not get the TO enrollment needed for the assigned FTEs, if FTEs get added to “Page 2” and where would that cut be made. Cleveland responded that most of the funding would be transferred from “Page 1, the Teacher Template” to “Page 2, Discretionary Funding” noting the balance would not be -0- because of the way the Teacher Template was calculated. There would not be much impact on the discretionary programs. Beery referred to the *Teacher Transfer* document pointing out that the difference could be \$763K

Tscr 1 ou004 Tc 0.004 Tw [(T)-6(h)-4(at)

counselors. LCAP provided an additional intervention counselor at each of the middle schools to work with a specific caseload of kids and tasked with broadening an awareness of how use restorative practices and alternative means of correction for behavior issues.

Scuderi moved on to Achievement Strategies and briefly mentioned RtI², noting past spirited discussions around RtI². He noted that Literacy Coaches were also funded by LCAP to bring 1.0FTE/site baseline at K-5. Middle school coaches were currently being funded out of CC. The “Be A Scientist” program was being joint-funded by BSEP and LCAP. This was a way to add to afterschool and Saturday activities. He noted that the Superintendent started the Science Saturday program in partnership with Lawrence Hall of Science to provide hands-on experiences for students in and out of the classroom.

Questions and Responses:

Was RtI² language arts or also math? Scuderi stated that RtI² was a process more than a program. It was consistently monitoring students with the 6-week data cycles implemented at the K-5 sites and included language arts and math performance.

Schoenfeld said that at their SGC meetings they ask the teachers what they wanted, and the math teachers responded that they would really like to do intervention classes, one each for 6 and 7th grade and two for 8th grade. Where would that money come from? She noted that the data from Longfellow showed that 58.6% students received free and reduced lunch. She stated that 58.6% of students in the district were on free and reduced lunch. She stated that 58.6% of students in the district were on free and reduced lunch.

that could be used for that. Pastika asked if Program Evaluation would be evaluating the efficacy of the RTI² program. Scuderi confirmed that Program Evaluation pulls that information together as part of their work.

NOTE: At 9:29pm Co-Chair Perez asked for a motion to extend the meeting so that more could be heard about Student Support since a vote on this budget would take place at the next meeting. A motion was made to extend the meeting by 15 minutes (to 9:45pm).

MOTION CARRIED (Bradstreet/Irwin): To extend the P&O meeting by 15 minutes. **9 members approved the motion, with 2 members opposing and 1 member abstaining.**

Beery stated that further details would be given for the Family Engagement budget when Anne Callegari, Supervisor of the Office of Family Engagement and Equity/OFEE attends the next P&O meeting. Beery handed out the *Effective Student Support: Family Engagement Plan Overview: FY 2017-18* for the committee's review. She stated that the department was currently structured such that its expenses exceed revenues. It was known that there was a significant fund balance in the prior measure to draw upon due to staffing changes. It was known that unless additional revenue sources are found, there would need to be some cuts made. Callegari was already making cuts to discretionary expenditures for conferences and consultants, but they are currently in deficit-spending mode.

Questions and Responses:

Huchting referred to the CSR document and asked where the General Fund Class Size FTE of 34:1 or 36:1 came from and was there any opportunity to rethink that. Glimme said that the GF was already in a deficit and it would be difficult to ask them to do more.

Beery confirmed that the budget for OFEE did not include making reductions to staffing. If Callegari was able to keep the additional expenditures where they are, the staffing could possibly stay at the same structure for another year or two.

Beery handed out *DRAFT, BSEP/Measure E1 of 2016, FY 2017/18*

11. 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. No items were put forward.

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:38 p.m.
Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support