

**BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**June 2, 2015**

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

**P&O Committee Members Present:**

Lily Howell, *Pre-K (Alt)/Malcolm X*

Madhu Marchesini, *Arts Magnet*

Dawn Paxson, *Emerson/Willard*

Terry Pastika, *Jefferson (Alt)*

Shauna Rabinowitz, *Jefferson*

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

0 Laura Ba(crs0-g dyI

**1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports**

At 7:00 p.m. Co-chair Danielle Perez called the meeting to order by noting this was the final meeting for the committee for the 2014-15 school year and welcoming attendees and asking them to introduce themselves

**6. Public Comment**

Toni Stein, MLK/BHS parent, stated that during the BHS site plan review, the item at the bottom of the list was felt to be important enough to be moved to the top of the list. She hoped that during the review, the Committee members could note that.

(noting \$750K), whether it was the district's intention to absorb these Literacy Coaches? Scuderi responded that there is a discussion now about "Page 2" funding forcing this issue and having to address offloading/transferring expenses for that portion of "Page 2" at least for next year as they look for more solid funding. Lazio, as a representative to the Superintendent's Budget Advisory Committee/SBAC, stated that they are rejecting increases for 2016-17 and of the extra \$750K LCAP money that could be allocated, only \$20K goes to more Literacy Coaching. The following year, there is nothing, and this year there was only \$10K. LCAP has only picked up \$248K of the Literacy staff,

11/16/16

- rough times. It would be lovely for BSEP to be able to expand on its other missions when there is additional money coming in from other sources.
- x Marchesini asked if the committee takes into account how much the different PTAs make and noted that some PTAs make more than others. Beery confirmed that the PTA money does not come into play as the BSEP site allocations are made. Marchesini noted that seemed sad, as some schools are so small. Beery stated that the way the allocation is made is on a per pupil basis, per the measure, and not looking at other available sources. The PTA Council recognizes that there is huge variation across the district and there had been discussion around that. Beery noted that some districts, such as Albany, pool their PTA funds. Sharing funds was once discussed here, and it might come up again. It would have to be approved by the PTA Council. Simon stated that not all the numbers shown may be accurate. Nitschke added that this was just the budget that runs through the district and the checks that pay for staff may not reflect what the total overall revenue is. Baechler-Brabo said that the PTA at her school works with the SGC on funding certain things that make it onto the Site Plans, but there are some things that aren't necessarily listed. Site Plans are not representative of the total budget each school has. Tay stated that there has not been a uniform way to get the total school budgets, which offers some challenges, but they are more complete than they have been in the past. Beery described a few things on the Budget Summary spreadsheet: OBJ means Object Code, DDF means District Defined Field, BSEP Site Funds Resource 0852 etc., and all numbers are used for internal accounting to indicate where the funds come from and what they are specifically used for.
  - x Babitt stated that she noticed that the District does not do Cost Benefit Analyses; for example, there was no discussion around getting different scenarios for providing a literacy program besides having Literacy Coaches. She felt this was expensive and could the goals be met in less expensive ways? Lazio noted that the Vice Principal positions at King also serve as counseling positions. Although there is nothing in the Measure that says we can't fund Vice Principals, she felt there should be, because there is a perceived conflict of interest there. As a parent she respected the site's decision, but as a taxpayer she thought it raised some questions in terms of spending site money for administrators. She noted that it was a big chunk of money: \$103,750 and about as expensive as counseling services. The money was ancillary or extra money for some of us and noted that we needed to be responsible, careful and to have a discussion about whether this was the best use of these resources. Simon responded that it was the responsibility of the SGCs every year to collect information about how to best use the funds to serve the needs of the students at those schools. He noted that the Literacy Coaches have in effect become a mandated cost over the past couple of years because the District has required that the schools pick up a portion of the cost. All of the other expenses listed under the Budget Item column were under the discretion of the site administrator and the School Governance Council. Although he had been very vocal at his SGCs over the years about the difficulty of using the data that they are provided to make those decisions, it was the responsibility of the SGS to make those decisions. Gross added that as a teacher herself, she thought the Literacy Coaches played a different role than any contracted employee could play, unless the contracted employee could be guaranteed a contract year after year, because they build relationships with students over an

extended period of time. They know the students as readers over a long period much better than she did and stated that had a lot of value. She felt it was hard to envision a contract worker playing exactly the same role. Babitt added that she felt that there

- way at the orientation and describe it as a deliberative dialogue session simply titled as “How to Have a Meaningful SGC.”
- x Babitt stated that the LCAP plan (Supplemental and Base funding) was the overall vision and goal of the district. Strategically, the District is supposed to be lining up with those goals and measures in the LCAP plan. If Literacy Coaches are deemed to be the best method and practice, and it lines up with the goals, then that is fine, as long as it is established that way, and we have the conversation. When we talk about a Cost Benefit Analysis/CBA, what is the best practice to get to this goal? Our site plans and BSEP plans are supposed to line up with the district goals. She was wondering overall if we took the time to link this back to the overall strategic goals, does it address the issue, for example at BHS, that things are supposed to line up with WASC/Western Association of Schools and Colleges (accreditation) goals. Are we doing that at each site to get to those goals and objectives and how we do that includes the establishment of best practices and of CBA, that could be rolled out at every school with the help of the SGCs. Howell said that spoke to increasing communication across SGCs and in looking at this budget at the end of the year she noted that there were things that other sites did that were very clever or a smart way to do something/fund particular programs. Howell wondered if there was a way to find out more information before sites submitted their budgets and get support and feedback across SGCs about how they are tackling very similar goals. Beery stated that was written into the bylaws of the P&O. One of the purposes of the P&O is to provide that bridge, that forum for those discussions to happen. We could increase those opportunities. (See BSEP Bylaws, Sections II and III in the BSEP P&O binders or [http://berkeleyschools.net/uploads/bsep/P-O\\_Bylaws\\_adopted\\_4-23-08v3.pdf](http://berkeleyschools.net/uploads/bsep/P-O_Bylaws_adopted_4-23-08v3.pdf) online.)
  - x Various committee members gave an appreciation for the budget summary document.

## **8. Roundtable – Effective & Inclusive SGCs**

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director*

Beery provided the following handout:

- *Best Practices for School Site Committees* (6 pages)

Beery noted that some ideas about the SGC process were already being shared (see previous item above). She noted that given where we were with recent changes and grappling with LCAP, we should use the P&O Committee as a forum to reflect about going forward in October and planning the orientation next year. One of the functions of the BSEP office is to help support recruitment, elections, election reporting, supporting the management of the SGC meetings, give templates, take minutes throughout the year. We often hear from the SGCs when there is a challenge or something that the BSEP office is asked to weigh in on. Beery has been tracked all of these instances and sent out a memo after the elections and more recently noted to the BUSD School Board Policy Subcommittee that there were things that the SGCs needed clarification on or wanted to change. The Board Policy Subcommittee was willing to look at any possible changes that might need to happen around the bylaws, maybe in August. A lot of what is being talked about is more about process and not necessarily about bylaws.

Beery wanted to review the *Best Practices for School Site Committees* that was handed out at orientations and built on over the years based on conversations like these. She intends to follow up on a BHS request for a survey on their thoughts.

- x Recruitment: Beery wanted to hear thoughts on timing, method of candidate recruitment, making sure there is a diverse and representative group of people, a balance of new and historic voices, once the candidates are selected how they are presented to the rest of the site's community,





because it wasn't productive. She asked for advice on that. She also noted they had



It has not been without challenges, and now there is the inclusion of the LCAP into the district-wide budget with BSEP. Most of the budgets are sustainable to the end of the Measure, but all of the resources are deficit spending, drawing upon their fund balance or other sources in order to sustain what needs to happen. The District is in a period of higher enrollment growth with higher associated costs with some programs. It is also a period of lower COLA increases, which is how the tax measure grows. That has been challenging as some of our expenses are outstripping revenues.

Beery was pleased to report to the Board that we have a P&O and SGCs that are very engaged. She noted that the P&O had a quorum every meeting this year. She will be speaking to the Board about priorities and raising BSEP awareness.

Beery stated that she will be presenting themes to the Board:

- x Educational Priorities: create brief idea papers to have ready for the fall when there will be engagement with stakeholder groups;
- x Fiscal Planning: Before we start launching into a wish list that BSEP might pay for, staff will see what various options might be, update costs and find possible options with legal consultation around the Measure, the impact of the Split Roll tax restructure and what options are, models and projection for the General Fund/LCFF/Governor's Budget;
- x Options for Public Process: creating town halls, seminars, workshops, voter polls, focus groups, participation to make informed decisions

Stein asked how the Soda Tax will be integrated and who will be the liaison to that group. Beery stated that there will be people that will be looking at that, but it is very new and they are just getting their first receipts. It looks like they will be doing well.

Beery presented the *BSEP Measure Planning and New BSEP Measure* overview slides, a map of how we get to November 2016. She stated the planning groups, groups that are not writing or planning the Measure per se, are work groups doing the ground work: fiscal modeling, educational priority outlines, and beginning to do some of the public process outlining. She hoped that the committee would weigh in on the public process as to what is effective in thinking about the SGCs, the PACs, the LCAP process or other processes people have been involved in. Some of the work will be done over the summer, and there will be seminars and workshops in the fall. There will be a presentation of idea papers in outline form to the Board in some of the general areas and updating them on some of the general ideas and challenges that we've seen in CSR, issues that have arisen in Libraries and using those as foundations for dialogues. We should be able to refine cost and rate structures and have

