

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

April 12, 2016

BUSD Offices –Technology Room 126

2020 Bonar Street, Berkeley, CA 94702

P&O Committee Members Present:

Bridgett Bernhard, *Arts Magnet (Alt)*

Eric van Dusen, *Cragmont (Co)*

Dawn Paxson, *Emerson*

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

Deborah Simon-Weisberg, *LeConte (Co)*

Lily Howell, *Malcolm X*

John Eknoian, *Oxford*

Laura Babitt, *Rosa Parks*

Jonathan Cherin, *Thousand Oaks (Co)*

Aaron Schiller, *Thousand Oaks (Co)*

Bruce Simon, *King (co-Chair)*

Josh Irwin, *King (Alt)*

Catherine Huchting, *Willard*

Christine Meuris, *Willard*

Aaron Glimme, *Berkeley High*

Elisabeth Hensley, *King*

Josh Irwin, *King (Alt)*

John Lavine, *Berkeley High*

Catherine Lazio, *Berkeley High*

Christine Staples, *Berkeley High*

Louise Harm, *Independent Study*

P&O Committee Members Absent*:

Victoria Hritonenko, *Pre-K*

Shauna Rabinowitz, *Jefferson*

Terry Pastika, *Jefferson (Alt)*

Rob Collier, *LeConte (Co)*

Alan Hubbard,

1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports

At 7:15 p.m. co-Chair Danielle Perez called the meeting to order by welcoming attendees and asking them to introduce themselves. They were also asked to give brief site reports.

2. Est

for the majority of students, even if class size moved to 24:1. He stated, however, that the Special Education teacher-student ratio needed to be considered in the larger discussion. He said that Special Education teachers needed to be freed up to do what needs to be done to have a good full inclusion district and do the programmatic parts of their job that were not just direct service. Examples given were working with teachers, working with the school as a whole, and creating the community that has and creates acceptance for our students. When he looked at his three children he felt only two of them were well-served. He asked that before the next measure was fully crafted, it should be remembered that part of class size reduction was looking at children that have IEPs in this district.

Questions for Cohen:

- Hensley asked about the

things were really district-wide programs, e.g., Libraries, Music/VAPA, Technology and Effective Student Support. As needs and resource availability changed, there would be the means of adjusting.

Beery noted that while she did not like seeing Family Engagement and her department, “Measure Oversight, Communication, & Translation” begin “in the red,” this is because they are deficit spending right now, but both of them have substantial fund balances that will support them this year and through the first year of the new measure. This will give them time to realign the programs and resources.

Questions and responses to the overview:

- Beery mentioned the District’s bond rating upgrade to AA+, acknowledging Deputy Superintendent Cleveland’s work toward that end, and had used it as a placeholder “name” the new measure. In actuality, the District will not know what the ballot designation will be until its received from the City of Berkeley.
- Lazio wondered about some of the assumptions on the sheet. She asked for the total FTE and average teacher compensation for each of the scenarios. Also, she asked if the model included any revenue for square footage that will be coming online in the City, estimated to be around 2M square feet. The square footage assumption were available at the City of Berkeley, Economic Development website. Beery noted that those revenues would be coming in over a period of time and would not sufficiently offset cost increases. Beery said the assumptions behind “*DRAFT April 12, 2016, Comparison of BSEP 2006 with proposed 2016 Framework and Allocations*” include the multi-year projections previously presented, but the “*Framework*” only showed the first year projections. There would be the least savings in the first year because the class size adjustments were being done incrementally starting with Kindergarten. There may only be a savings of three or four classes in the first, but over time there would be more savings. For the out years, proportionally there would be a reduced cost for FTE, depending on enrollment. A little bit of enrollment growth and compensation modeled on a 1% step & column increase was built in, and the STRS retirement increases will be around 2% per year. She noted that the current projections show us going into the red in the out years under certain scenarios. Cleveland added that based on the last two measures, under which there was a shortfall the last couple of years, the District would consider having a reserve for that possible scenario. Cleveland also noted that the revenues from increased square footage would definitely help but not entirely cover increasing costs in the out years. Cleveland noted that in addition to STRS, there would be CalPERS retirement increases for classified staff. They just received those rates, and there were pretty big jumps noted in the out years. Unknowns are future negotiated salaries and state revenues. They did their best to do an 8-year projection based on current information,

the hope that would track with costs a little better and not have as many ups and downs as the State COLA has.

- Staples remarked that the language choices were well-chosen. They were much more expressive of the qualities that have come up in discussion. It would be easier for people to understand. She congratulated Beery on this.
- Hensley wondered about the order of the items listed under the Class Size
peve

Quality Instruction.” Beery added that was all they had for the first year as the savings start out small. Although IAs in classrooms are expensive, the option was discussed as a possibility. Nothing on “Page 2” was specific and if it was determined that was a better way to meet student needs, then that could happen.

- Babitt asked if the workgroup had gone through things that were negatively impacted by the current measure as it was written. She noted that for Family Engagement, BSEP says that you can’t pay for things like food, and that has negatively impacted how they could draw people in. Beery stated that those kinds of guidelines were not written into the measure, but a standard has been applied about the appropriate use of

considered that after CSR was met, if there were funds remaining then it would be allocated to the other pieces of the “Pac-Man”? Beery confirmed that did come up as a suggestion. That was essentially making everything “Page 2.”

- Huchting noted that her general concern about Program Evaluation was to see how much these programs have been evaluated. Beery stated that there would be a Program Evaluation presentation two meetings from now. It would be helpful to let D’Angelo know what data we would like to see a report on.
- Simon was curious about the things on “Page 2” and whether there was a discussion about putting language into the measure about how the money was to be distributed or was it intended to leave it wide open. As Beery recalled, they decided to leave it up to staff because with all the variation with other funding sources, there was a concern if the amount was locked in, there might not be the ability to get resources to where they were most needed. She reminded the committee that the amount of detail in the measure language - compared to other districts - shows we care and are careful. She added that she thought we should not err on the side of being overly specific because we may end up getting

- They stayed with the same title and just changed the year.
- The wording of the proposed text was pretty close to what was used in the voter poll. It reflects the primary purposes and reflects the things that the local community cares about. There was a limited amount of words that could be used in the initial text of the measure. The comma after the word technology will be changed to a period and a new sentence will begin at the word “Shall.”
- Item 3.A.ii the class size was reworded for K-5 school-wide average of 23:1 with wording around phasing until averages are met. The State defined the 24:1 for K-3 but the District will do better than the state class size for K-5. “Schools may adopt alternative means to reduce class sizes”...was suggested. There was a suggestion of adding the words “at most” before the words “of 26:1.”
- In 3.B, the word “improving” should be improve. Add “and academic experience” after the word “proficiency.”
- Paragraph describing Music/VAPA. Add a period after the phrase “professional development in the arts.” Begin a new sentence with “Musical instruments and instructional materials, services and equipment necessary to conduct these programs... at any K-12 school, as long as funds permit.” Beery could reword this sentence.
- Item 3.B.c paragraph, 2nd sentence, remove the first word “Existing.”
- Item 3.B.d, Nitschke will work on the paragraph for Technology Instruction. Change the word “in” to for before the final word “schools.”
- The paragraph.3.B.d Flexibility of Funds was struck and will reappear elsewhere.
- Note: A motion was made to extend the meeting an additional 20 minutes. Motion made by Paxson/Harm, and the vote was unanimous. This motion was made to complete the review of the measure text.
- Item 3.D Flexibility of funds: Add a period after the last use of the word “purposes.” Strike the words “Provided no purpose receives more than 15% over its designated allocation in any given year.”
- Legal to review Item 4.A.ii.
- Typo noted at 1.4.B. Term. The word “ten” in the second sentence should be replaced by the word eight.