

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES
January 26, 2016

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

P&O Committee Members Present:

Victoria Hritonenko, *Pre-K*

Madhu Marchesini, *Arts Magnet*

Eric van Dusen, *Cragmont (Co)*

Martin de Mucha Flor TJ /TT1 1 Tf 0 Tc 0 Tw 3.065 0 Td ()Tj EMC /P <</MCID 19 >>BDC 0.002 Tc -0.002
lereP T

L-2(i)-5(d(a))TJ2.3375 0 Td ()Tj 0.002 Tc -0.002 Tw[5Ri6(an)11ce,a)]TJ 0 Tc 0 Tw2. 892(S)23(EP)]TJ 0 T

accounting systems work. Previously the committee saw a budget vs. actual and saw that between the implementation of the budget at the beginning of the year and the actual there was basically a 1.11% variance. Between plan and actual there was a larger variance of 3.75%, which was still in the realm of what was usually factored: 3-4%.

Beery thanked the committee for bringing forward the suggestion. Her department will try this format for the reports in the future. For the plans, they will try to do an FTE alignment to give the committee some sense of the evolution of the program itself.

Lazio thanked Beery and stated that her intention was to move the financials to an “at a glance” summary. She had some suggestions about formatting that she will discuss with Beery offline. In response to a question from Wincher regarding the spending details of middle school counseling funds, Beery noted that middle school counseling simply breaks down into FTE or number of staff at each site (1.2FTE at the smaller middle schools and 2.4FTE at the larger middle school). Beery asked

Beery asked tTd ()Tj [(2.4F)63p(r)3(e)4(s)-1(pon 0.2

write the new measure, we might choose to be less specific so that we can have flexibility. Howell noted that it was a fluid process and that LCAP works in that way. She thought it would be helpful to have regular meetings regarding funding and getting clarity instead of guessing/being confused. Appel stated that one question that comes up a lot around BSEP money and included as part of the LCAP, is whether funds can be supplanted. All LCAP funds have to go to targeted students. It would be helpful to have a joint conversation and see that everyone has very similar values. For the last several years, Beery has invited the PAC, along with the SGCs, to the orientation for school leaders, and when the LCAP came into being, Deputy Superintendent Javetta Cleveland went and gave a talk to the SGC training and was surprised at how interested they were in looking at this information. Beery noted that the LCAP PAC may not know much about BSEP. Part of what she wanted to do tonight was to show how the LCAP funds are being spent and how that was lining up with BSEP. b Tc L1.03 0 Td ()Tj [(s)-1(how)]TJ 2.36 0 Td ()Tj (h

there for a while. Evans added that the questions became: Was it the program? Was it the implementation of the program? What interventions did we have for these students? Are these interventions working? The last piece was the funding: Could BSEP provide funding for this, should LCAP, or both? What resources have we plugged into closing the gap? Evans said they are trying to figure out exactly what the answers are, because there are schools that have done really well. The question becomes what are they doing? We have some models that are working. Eknoian expressed that he would like this to be part of our discussion. There was a question about what might have been learned from the visit to see the Culver City model. Beery stated that this was a large discussion that could be added to a future agenda, because it was one that we should devote more than just public comment on. Evans said that as we look at the many things BSEP was funding, the question becomes what impact is it having on the students?

Glimme added that as a teacher in the district, equity and achievement gap was pretty much the only thing they talked about. He didn't think it was fair to say they never talk about it. Committee members noted their frustration about not having a way to look at data if a particular program made any sort of improvement. Committee members voiced that they wanted it put on the agenda for discussion. Appel stated that there were a lot of presentations made to the Board that are on YouTube. Beery will forward the appropriate links and build some time into the agenda to more globally discuss a way to articulate how the different funds available can be brought to bear to ensure that every student has the same access. 2020 Vision and getting rid of the racial predictability of outcomes had been there for awhile. The GF, BSEP and the LCAP supplemental had been used, but how could we target the vision broadly, and then focus on what each child and school should have in terms of academic excellence, enrichment, engagement and equity. Wincher was curious about whether there was any way to measure the success levels of these programs. Are the programs we are pouring money into working? Perez stated that was a conversation that could be had at another time in order to give it its due. Beery confirmed that some of the things coming up would be

Proposition 30 of 2012 improved school Mproveptedff30FFed [/Bottom]/BBox [5j 0.2 0 Td ()0 T

BSEP

challenge in putting this together was that some of the savings or some of the sum of TJ 0 Tc ()Tj -0.00

tax

way. One of their big investments, comparatively, was with Family Engagement. Was that seen to be effective and was that a place where BSEP dollars could be increased? Was there Professional Development in differentiation that could be increased? What was it that we could be doing that we could add more dollars to?

In response to a question regarding the voter poll, Beery said that the phone poll would be an 800-person poll, with a split sample for some questions. It will be a one shot deal.

Beery is asking is d

(a)TjdTd ()Tj -4 05w [(as)-5(k)-4j [(o)-10(.m)3o-2(e)ups8 -1.15 TJ ()Tj (be)Tj 3.02 Tw (we)Tj 0 Tc 0 Tw 1.4an0.002

