

MEETING NOTICE

CHAIRPERSON: Chris Martin

AGENDA

- 7:15 1. Call to Order & Site Reports
2. Establish the Quorum/ Approve Agenda
3. Chairs' Comments (Chris Martin & Elisabeth Hensley)
4.
- [Presentation] 7:30 5. ***Recommendation for the expenditure of BSEP funds for Professional Development in 2012-13***
Neil Smith, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services
- [Presentation] 8:00 6. ***Recommendation for the expenditure of BSEP funds for Program Evaluation in 2012-13***
Debbi D'Angelo, Director, Berkeley Evaluation and Assessment
- 8:30 7. BSEP Manager's Comments (Monica Thyberg)
- Action Items**
- [Action] 8:40 8. ***Recommendation for the expenditure of BSEP funds for Class Size Reduction in 2012-13*** (Monica Thyberg)
- [Action] 9:00 9. Statement from the P&O Committee regarding Superintendent search
- [Action] 9:20 10. Approval of the Minutes: 2-28-12, 3-6-12, 3-20-12
- 9:30 11. Adjournment

**Upcoming P&O Meetings:
May 1, May 15 and May 29, 2012**

Berkeley Unified School District
SUPERINTENDENT SEARCH

LEADERSHIP PROFILE ASSESSMENT

PLEASE CIRCLE THE GROUP YOU REPRESENT:

Administrator Board Community Faculty Parent Student Support Staff

1. What do you consider to be the two or three most significant strengths of this School District?
2. What do you consider to be the two or three most important challenges or issues facing this School District?
3. Please share two or three characteristics which you would like to see in the new superintendent:
4. Please share any additional thoughts you might have below or on an additional sheet of paper.
5. Do you know someone you feel would be a good candidate for the superintendent's position? If so, please write his/her name and address or phone number here or send it to Hazard, Young, Attea & Associates at the address or phone numbers listed below, or via email to office@hyasearch.com.

Thank you for your comments. Please bring this completed form to your interview session, fax or email it by March 14th to:

HAZARD, YOUNG, ATTEA & ASSOCIATES
office@hyasearch.com
Fax: 847-724-8467

While all of the characteristics listed on the survey are important and may be highly desirable, the purpose of the survey is to determine the most important characteristics for our new superintendent at this time and for the next few years. Therefore, please identify the eight (8) most important statements to you as you consider the needs of the District and the "Desired Characteristics" of its next leader.

I would like the new Superintendent to:

1.	Have a clear vision of what is required to provide exemplary educational services and implement effective change.	Y
2.	Act in accordance with the District's mission, vision, and core beliefs.	Y
3.	Strive for continuous improvement in all areas of the District.	Y
4.	Hold a deep appreciation for diversity and the importance of providing safe and caring school environments.	Y
5.	Promote high expectations for all students and personnel.	Y
6.	Hold a deep understanding of the teaching/learning process and of the importance of educational technology.	Y
7.	Increase academic performance and accountability at all levels and for all its students, including special needs populations.	Y
8.	Encourage a sense of shared responsibility among all stakeholders regarding success in student learning.	Y
9.	Provide meaningful guidance for systematic and comprehensive district-wide curriculum, instructional services, assessment programs, and professional development.	Y
10.	Utilize student achievement data to drive the District's instructional decision-making.	Y
11.	Be visible throughout the District and actively engaged in community life.	Y
12.	Identify, confront, and resolve issues and concerns in a timely manner.	Y
13.	Listen to and effectively represent the interests and concerns of students, staff, parents, and community members.	Y
14.	Maintain positive and collaborative working relationships with the school board and its members.	Y
15.	Develop strong relationships with constituents, local government, area businesses, media, and community partners.	Y

26. Please add any additional comments you wish to make regarding what you believe are necessary characteristics for a superintendent.

27. If you know of someone that you think would be a good candidate for this position, please share their name and contact information below.

This report presents the findings of the Leadership Profile Assessment conducted by Hazard, Young, Attea & Associates (HYA) on March 10, 12, 13, 14, 2012 for the new superintendent in the Berkeley Unified School0. 56417(t)-2.536 44()-2. 661d7())2.36 i6(s)-1.7465()-0.47 36(e)3.157 r()-0.47 i6(s)-1.746 (t)-2

Td

]

Online Superintendent Profile Survey Results

In addition, differences were examined for statistical and practical significance to determine whether mean scores by stakeholder group differed. Results indicate that, for many items, the various stakeholders were in agreement. On the other hand, there were several items that certain stakeholders valued more than others.

Teachers were significantly more likely than parents to select the Vision and Values item “Have an understanding of how equity is part of developing high standard of academic excellence.”

Parents were significantly more likely than teachers to select the Vision and Values item “Promote high expectations for all students and personnel.”

Students and parents were significantly more likely than teachers and administrators to select the Community Engagement item “Identify, confront, and resolve issues and concerns in a timely manner.”

Teachers were significantly more likely than community members, parents, and students to select the Communication and Collaboration item “Lead in an encouraging, participatory, and team-focused manner”.

	ALL (679)	Admin (40)	Comm (58)	Parent (422)	Student (21)	SS (60)	Teacher (78)
1	Recruit, employ, evaluate, and						

	ALL (679)	Admin (40)	Comm (58)	Parent (422)	Student (21)	SS (60)	Teacher (78)
--	--------------	---------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------	-----------------



committed to Rtl, that Rtl is data-driven , based on specific needs of students, and that it needed to be expanded.

5. Universal Learning Support System (ULSS)/Response to Intervention(Rtl) in Practice

Neil Smith, *Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services*

Neil Smith said that several years ago, while BUSD was developing its ULSS program, the rest of the country had been developing a similar program called Response to Intervention (Rtl).

Berkeley has since adjusted ULSS to bring it in line with the national Rtl. Because ULSS/Rtl is included in the administration's proposal for BSEP Class Size funds, Smith invited two teachers to present a view of ULSS/Rtl at the elementary and middle school levels.

Mary Wrenn (Willard)
Speech & Language Therapist/Special Education Department Chair, Willard Middle School

kids take 6 periods, which is not true. He said that the above adjustments actually make the staffing more accurate.

Discussion followed, including the following comments:

The recommendation appears to take assets from BHS and add assets to the middle schools.

Are BSEP funds being used for basic needs which are just called it RtI?

Shouldn't BHS have an RtI program?

Will there be enforcement of the minimum ECO class size of 20 students, for classes with more than one section at BHS, as stipulated by the P&O?

Is this the best use of BSEP funds?

When asked how the recommendation could add funds to the CSR Reserve, and at the same time increase Program Support grants, Neil cited three reasons:

A 3.17% Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) which increases projected CSR revenue by roughly \$450,000,

Declining enrollment, which means BSEP dollars which are increasing due to the COLA, provide services for fewer students, and

More efficient staffing.

Smith and Pauline Follansbee then walked the P&O through the *Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document* (Teacher Template). On page two, Smith noted the increase of 5.5 FTE for middle school ULSS/RtI. While there were no cuts to Expanded Course Offerings (ECO) or Middle School Counseling, Smith confirmed that Berkeley High, which is currently overstaffed, would lose approximately 5.88 FTE total. It was noted that this would amount to an increased class size of roughly 1-2 students in non-P.E. classes. (Classes are already staffed at 38:1.)

7. Report from Superintendent's Budget Advisory Committee (SBAC)

Larry Gordon and Greg Wiberg

Larry Gordon reported from the SBAC committee, which met just before the P&O meeting. He said that BUSD is preparing for the following three budget scenarios: Scenario A: a \$3

BSEP/Measure A PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES
March 20, 2012

Malcolm X School Library
1731 Prince St., Berkeley

P&O Committee Members Present:

Keira Armstrong, <i>Washington (Alt)</i>	Lea Baechler-Brabo, <i>Oxford (Alt)</i>	Nicole Bowen, <i>Arts Magnet</i>
Mariane Ferme, <i>Berkeley High</i>	Aaron Glimme, <i>Berkeley High</i>	Larry Gordon, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Patrick Hamill, <i>Thousand Oaks</i>	Esther Hirsh, <i>Berkeley High</i>	Diana Kuderna, <i>Berkeley High (Alt)</i>
John Lavine, <i>King</i>	Catherine Lazio, <i>Willard</i>	Chris Martin, <i>LeConte (co-Chair)</i>
Brittini Milam, <i>Washington</i>	Jay Nitschke, <i>King (Alt)</i>	Dialy Paulino, <i>Cragmont</i>

Cleveland then described the District's scrupulous procedures for making expenditures, both for payroll and for goods and services, noting that all checks require two signatures. She also noted that BUSD paychecks are run through the Alameda County Office of Education.

Review of 2012-13 Budget Scenarios

Cleveland distributed a handout showing: 1) how she and her staff arrived at the Budget Cut Target amount for 2012-13, 2) how this target will impact BUSD over the next two years, and 3) how they determined what budget items to recommend for cuts. She shared three scenarios for meeting the District's Budget Cut Target. She said that once the District determines cuts have to be made, she and her staff come up with a Budget Cut Target that goes to the Superintendent's Budget Advisory Committee (SBAC). She said that Committee reviews staff recommendations and decide if that want to accept or revise the Budget Cut Target recommendations.

Cleveland said that after the Governor's May Budget revision ("May Revise"), she would present its fiscal impact to the SBAC. She did not rule out a reversal of proposed cuts. She explained that going forward the SBAC will come up with its own budget cut recommendations. The Superintendent will take staff's and the SBAC's recommendations into account, and then draft his own recommendation which will go to the Board for their decision.

Cleveland noted that the governor's initiative proposed for the November ballot would have a powerful impact on the district's budget. Should the initiative fail, much deeper cuts would have to be made in 2013-14, erasing the district's reserves.

BSEP Manager's Comments - Review of Administrative Recommendation for BSEP Class Size Budget-2012-13

Monica Thyberg

Thyberg manager remarked that since the last meeting she had ruminated on how to best address the discussion that came up about CSR. She said the discussion on CSR had revealed different levels of clarity on the issue and she was therefore recommending that P&O members meet in subcommittee to discuss the issues and to arrive at some consensus prior to the Superintendent's April 10th presentation to the P&O.

Thyberg summarized the Superintendent's recommendations which are designed to use BSEP funds to help reduce the projected deficit in the General Fund (GF) for 2012-13.

She said his first proposal, a savings to BSEP and the GF, involved refining the enrollment formula at middle schools and at Berkeley High School to account for students taking fewer than six classes and to factor in classes being paid for by sources other than the GF and BSEP.

She said that the Superintendent's second proposal involved using BSEP Program Support funds to finance a portion of ULSS teachers' costs. Thyberg said that although the Superintendent welcomed the Committee's suggestions, he wanted P&O members to know that he had carefully deliberated before making CSR recommendations that he felt were legal and in BUSD's best interest.

The History of 6/5 school-site allocation formula

Thyberg explained that the Measure was passed based on the 6/5 formula, meaning that BHS students took six periods and teachers taught five periods. She said that in reality, at the beginning of the Measure (1986) and throughout the 90's, many students were actually taking seven or eight periods, which had resulted in huge classes at BHS. Thyberg said the first attempt to address this was a mid-nineties formula which allowed 50% of the students to take a 7th class. She said that the upshot was that the BSEP Measure of 1994 allowed for the funding of Expanded Course Offerings (ECO) (for students taking a 7th class), just as long as monies were available. In 2001 there were insufficient funds, and no ECO classes were funded from BSEP. The current BSEP Measure of 2006 contains the 6/5 formula written into the Measure, to ensure that students taking 6 periods are covered by an adequate number of teachers. Then ECO was extra to allow for students to take an extra course in science and in other classes.

Regional Occupational Program (ROP)

Thyberg explained that ROP refers to yearly contracted courses that were offered at BHS but were paid for by the county. She said that in the past, students taking ROP classes had been included when the BSEP staffing formula was run, essentially "double-staffing" those classes. The CSR recommendation would remedy that.

Funding ULSS from BSEP Program Support

Thyberg said that although initially she had had reservations about the appropriateness of BSEP's funds going to finance ULSS, she had changed her mind. She explained that the ULSS program, a general education program and not a Special Education program, had started as a pilot program at Willard and had been enthusiastically received by teachers.

She explained that ULSS had ended up being applied to special education because at the time the contract was being negotiated, the District was mainstreaming Special Ed students into regular ed classrooms, and special educat

whether those funds might go to literary coaches, or another priority (ULSS coordination?) rather than increasing the BSEP reserve.

5. Motion to extend the meeting to 9:45 pm

Greg Wiberg/Aaron Glimme

The motion was unanimously approved.

6. Restructuring BUSD Parent Outreach services

Thyberg said the district had been conducting meetings to explore a new site-based parent outreach program. She said that the Superintendent would present his recommendation for a new pilot program to the Board on March 25th. She the distributed a PowerPoint handout describing BUSD's rationale for implementing a site-based program and about how Parent Liaisons at school sites promote student success. Discussion followed, with the understanding that Thyberg would take the P&O's comments to the Superintendent.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:45 pm.

11

BSEP/Measure 1A PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 16, 2012

1

Malcolm X School Library

1731 Prince

to participate in general committee meeting discussions. She said that while some controversy existed in the community around the planning role of this committee versus the planning role of BUSD's paid professionals, there was no controversy surrounding the P&O's role as an oversight working group.

5. BSEP Class Size Funds – A Historical Perspective and Analysis of the Administration's Recommendation for the expenditure of the BSEP Class Size Reduction Monies in FY 2012-13

Dan Lindheim, former P&O co-chair

Lindheim noted that when he was co-chair, he had always been acutely aware of the importance of adhering to the Measure so BUSD could return to the voters in good faith and ask them to renew it. He stated that Measure A of 2006 monies had become so integral to the District, that a failure to reaffirm the BSEP Measure would have disastrous consequences that could lead to huge class sizes and even bankruptcy. Lindheim said that although Berkeleyans had supported the Measure thus far, things could change. Then he cautioned the P&O to continuously look forward to the next election and to avoid situations that might give fodder to opponents. By way of example he said every single Berkeley neighborhood association had voted against the Measure when it was last on the ballot.

Analysis of Class Size Reduction Staffing Ratios in the 2012-13 School Year

Dan Lindheim, former P&O co-chair

Lindheim said that from his perspective the most critical thing for next year was whether or not there would be enough FTE to meet the BSEP Class Size Goals (20:1 K-3, 26:1 4-5, 28:1 6-12). He said he had looked at the BHS class-size data to see how BHS was adhering to or veering from the Measure's specifications. Having studied the Superintendent's recommendations for the expenditure of CSR monies, he said he wanted to determine what difference it would make if, as proposed, BUSD adjusted the BHS enrollment used for allocating FTE by staffing PE classes at a higher figure, and removing ROP classes, and pro-rating students who take less than a full class load.

Lindheim said he was surprised to find that current class size average at BHS, excluding PE and ROP is actually lower than last year, 26.7:1 compared to 28.7 last year. Saying that there were fewer large outlier classes and much more compression around the 28:1 class-size this year, Lindheim asked the P&O to consider whether BUSD was in compliance with the Measure's terms with a 28:1 class size, a 28:1 average class size, or a 28:1 median class-size. Lindheim said that this year if you eliminated all BHS classes below 23:1, BUSD would still meet the required 28:1. He said this was not only remarkable but might also explain why the administration had reviewed the numbers and had concluded that BHS was overstaffed. However, Lindheim warned that if BHS lost 6 FTE, the student teacher ratios might not look so good in the future and class-size spread would quickly grow.

The Administration's Proposal to Staff PE Classes at a 38:1 Ratio

Lindheim said he had no problem with this plan because the Measure explicitly excludes PE from the Class Size Goals. As an aside, he pointed out that PE had never been clearly defined in the Measure's language and that begged the question as to whether dance, for example, should fall under PE, under art, or even, in certain cases, under anthropology. He cautioned P&O members that they should be clear about what classes actually fell under this PE umbrella.

Regional Occupational Program (ROP)

Lindheim said that at first he had been confused as to why the administration wanted to subtract ROP classes from the total BHS enrollment when calculating 28:1 staffing requirements. He said he then realized that what the administration was saying was that ROP classes are already funded by ROP. Providing BSEP staffing for ROP class sections is double-funding. He noted that, since there are so few ROP classes, removing the ROP classes would make very little impact.

Proposal to add FTE to the Universal Learning Support Systems Program (ULSS)

Lindheim said that if the administration had concluded that the ULSS program was important for students' success, he questioned the P&O Committee's legitimacy to contradict or to override the District on that issue.

6. Discussion of Administration's Recommendation for BSEP Class Size Funds in FY 2012-13

Issue: The proposed change in the way the secondary enrollment would be counted for purposes of class size staffing (adjusting for PE, ROP, students taking only 5 periods).

- Q Worried about the effect of fewer FTE at BHS on class sizes in the Academic Choice (AC) program.
- A Academic Choice's current class size average is 28.3. Two years ago a mistake was made, whereby all mid-year transfer students were assigned to AC, which made class sizes balloon. That is no longer happening.
- Q Worried about the loss of FTE at BHS. What if enrollment grows next year, and class sizes become huge? This feels like an over-correction.
- A Enrollment projections are done now, again in June, and again during the first 10 day of school. If there is a dramatic shift upwards, teaching staff can be increased.
- Q Could FTE be reapportioned within Berkeley High? It doesn't feel equitable now.
- A

classes that are taught by ROP-funded teachers, 2) allocating FTE as if PE classes were 28:1 when they are much higher, and 3) treating students who take less than a full load (6 periods) as if they did take a full load, and allocating full FTE for them.

- Q What is the unadjusted secondary enrollment that is projected for next year?
- A Thyberg will provide the unadjusted projected enrollment and Teacher Template to the Committee.
- Q Why are we being asked to make these changes?
- A These changes are needed in order for the General Fund to cut its portion of classroom teacher cost, as part of its Cut Target of \$1.4 million from next year's budget, due to the dire state of the California budget.

Other Comments:

The effect of the Superintendent's recommendation is likely to be an additional 1-2 students in each (non-P.E.) class at BHS.

BHS class size varies significantly, depending on the time of year it is measured. Fall enrollment is highest. In spring, class size typically drops between .7 and 1.

BHS enrollment is harder to project than Kindergarten enrollment.

Doesn't see the necessity of making these changes, but what is the problem with doing so? Concerned about voter perception. Why change the staffing formula now? Voters could see it as a violation of the Measure.

Issue: The Superintendent's CSR Recommendation would reduce classroom teachers at Berkeley High by approximately 5.5 FTE, while at the same time increasing BSEP funding for 5.5 ULSS FTE at the middle schools.

- Q It doesn't feel right to take from BHS to give to the middle schools.
- A The Superintendent's proposal does not "take from BHS and give to the middle schools." The fact that the FTE is identical is coincidental. Two points:
The refinement of secondary enrollment is proposed in order to allow the General Fund to pay for fewer teachers. The Superintendent could instead have simply recommended that the GF fund class sizes of 40:1. BSEP would have had to "buy down" from that figure to achieve the BSEP CS goals.
The proposal that BSEP fund 5.5 middle school ULSS teachers is not an increase of ULSS FTE at the middle schools. It is shifting the funding from the GF to BSEP, again, so the GF can save money.
- Q

- A If ULSS/RtI is important, does that mean BSEP shouldn't fund it? ULSS FTE is "above and beyond" the regular classroom teacher allocation.

Other Comments:

Berkeley High needs ULSS/RtI. Why not expand this program to the high school?

Concerned about how ULSS is implemented across the district. Not all schools have an exemplary ULSS program.

How effective is ULSS/RtI without additional site funds for coordination?

Thyberg referred to the questions that had been submitted prior to the meeting, beginning with a clarification of the ULSS/RtI program. She noted that:

ULSS is not a Special Ed program.

The goal of ULSS is to help all students overcome whatever barriers they may have to learning. It serves the entire range of BUSD students, not simply identified Special Ed students.

Two years ago, when it was first suggested th

Thyberg noted that the P&O Committee could respond to the Superintendent's recommendation by making its own recommendation, for example, that additional funds from CSR should be allocated for Lit Coaches, or middle school Counseling, or ULSS coordination. She added that the role of the P&O Committee is to ask "Is this an appropriate use of BSEP funds, as we interpret the Measure?"

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation.