



BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
BERKELEY SCHOOLS EXCELLENCE PROGRAM
 2020 Bonar Street, Third Floor
 Berkeley, CA 94702
 Phone: 644-8717 Fax: 644-8923

Gavel down: 7:15 p.m.

2020 Bonar Street, Room 126

Parking on street or in open lot at Browning and Addison St.

- | | | | |
|----------------|------|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | 7:15 | 1. | Call to Order/Introductions & Site Reports |
| | | 2. | Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda |
| | 7:30 | 3. | Chairperson's Comments (Chris Martin & Elisabeth Hensley) |
| | | 4. | BSEP Director's Comments (Natasha Beery) |
| [Action] | | 5. | Approval of Minutes 2.25.14 |
| | | 6. | Public Comment |
| [Discussion] | 7:50 | 7. | Subcommittee Report: Music/VAPA Subcommittee |
| | | | (BSEP Resource 0841) |
| [Discussion] | 8:20 | 9. | Focus on Student Engagement and Student Achievement
(Donald Evans, Superintendent) |
| [Discussion] | 9:00 | 9. | (Natasha Beery) |
| [Presentation] | 9:15 | 10. | (Liz Karam) |
| | 9:30 | 11. | Adjournment |

This meeting is open to the public and subject to the Brown Act.

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

February 25, 2014

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

P&O Committee Members Present:

Sergio Duran, Arts Magnet	Keira Armstrong, Washington
Tim Frederick, Cragmont	Ellen Weis, Longfellow
Moshe Cohen, Pre-K	Elisabeth Henry, King (co
Shauna Rabinowitz, Jefferson	
Danielle Perez, John Muir	
Darryl Bartlow, John Muir (Alt)	
Chris Martin, LeConte (co-Chair)	
Catherine Huchting, Malcolm X	
Lea Baechle, Brabo, Oxford	
Dan Smuts, Rosa Parks (co Rep)	

3. & K D L U S H U V R Q ¶ V & R P P H Q W V
Co-Chairs Chris Martin and Elisabeth Hensley
No comments were made.

4. % 6 (3 ' L U H F W R U ¶ V & R P P H Q W V
Natasha Beery, BSEP Director

Beery provided the following handouts:

• BSEP Resource Key Issues (PowerPoint Slide from her presentation to the School Board on February 12, 2014),

• BUSD Memo from Charity DaMarto, Supervisor of Family Equity and Engagement and Natasha Beery, Director BSEP and Community Relations, dated February 12, 2014: Report

Family Equity and Engagement and Natasha Beery, Director BSEP and Community Relations to Donald Evans, Superintendent dated February 12, 2014: Report on Office of Family Engagement and Equity. Beery cautioned that this document was not a proposal or a recommendation to the P&O Committee or the Board. DaMarto will be making a presentation to the P&O Committee in May. Beery stated that the current Office of Family Engagement and Equity was created as a pilot project to look at decentralizing the way the District provided family engagement support throughout the district. The pilot is providing site coordinators at 3.0 FTE for six selected elementary schools, funded from the BSEP funds. DaMarto

will be some metrics, and that is what will be required going forward in the LCAP process and the District's progress toward particular goals. Lamar asked if this included an incremental progression and could the P&O Committee, in the future, the amount of the investment increasing over the years or capping out somewhere. Whatever the model was chosen, one way to structure it would be to do it incrementally, for example, the District might not be able to do the \$832K Model 1, but we could build towards it. The District could start with Model 2 for K-5, and over time, with LCAP being a 3-year plan, build toward Model 1. Lazio asked if a school site had their own ideas about how this position could be constructed, how would they communicate that? Beery stated that sites should contact Pam Marto, who would appreciate the feedback from sites that do or do not have some version of the site coordinator/parent liaison. Lazio asked if the

higher than the average. The additional of schools shows scores from neighboring and other significant districts. In comparison to Oakland, the scores for African American and White students are somewhat

Karam felt that the tax base from last year to this year was pretty much the same, there is not a lot of new revenue being generated by new properties. There are some City

of increases to the various BSEP Resources. Meanwhile there are other pressures Indirect Costs that have to be paid up, and the staffing costs have increased. Martin asked if the Indirect Cost rate changes if COLA is not instituted? Karam replied no. It is the last year that the books are closed and credit lags behind actual experience. She referred to FROXP-0) Difference WKH LQFUHDVH PDNHV D ELJJHU GLIIHUHQ 66%, but does not make much of a difference to the other resources. Lazio asked a question

are not connected to enrollment. Any of the funds that are particularly affected by enrollment, such as CSR, (because of FTE/Teachers), School Site Discretionary (because it is allocated on a per student basis), and Music/VAPA fund (because it is directly tied to the number of 4th and 5th grade students), will be reaching breakpoints in the current year. Library funds are allocated per student but staffing is by site. At this point, Parent Outreach, Professional Development, Program Evaluation and Technology will experience less of an impact except in the areas where some resources are allocated to students. Frederick asked if keeping the fund balances was to protect programs from potential overages that are anticipated due to enrollment and things like that? Beery confirmed that fund balances provided a cushion for such things as costs/salary increases. She stated that a rule of thumb had been to figure out the staffing and then build in a 3% personnel variance over that. The current thinking is that percentage may need to be higher because last year a 1% one-time bonus to staff followed by a 2.5% salary increase and a one-time payment of 2.5% for a total of 6% was more than the variance of 3% that was built into the budget. Karam added that last year's deficit spending was much more than typical but the idea was to provide consistent programming. Fredrick stated that as we get toward the end of the Measure we have more certainty about what that spending is going to be and so the pressure, in some ways, to keep a fund balance that is larger than it has been historically lower, because if we had absolute certainty we would be attempting to spend down to zero at the end of the Measure. Beery stated that was her initial expectation as well.

specifics have not yet been released, but 24:1 is an absolute cap. The resistance if you go over 24, but a complete loss of funding if you go over 24:1. In grades 4 and 5, the BSEP Measure requires 26:1. One of the things that must be realized is that if the District decides to go to 24:1 at the K level, it would probably have to keep 24:1 in 4 and 5 as well because there is no way to change class sizes between grades 3 and 4. Smith wanted the committee members to be aware that there were trade-offs here.

For Middle School, beginning with the 6th grade, the GF funds 36:1 with BSEP funding down to 28:1. Necessary FTE for 6th would be 1.12 and in 7th and 8th .64 for a total of 1.75 Necessary FTE for Middle School.

Smith noted that according to the Measure, once class sizes have been achieved, the remaining CSR budget can be used for Middle School Counseling, Expanded Course Offerings and Program Support. Smith discussed the 8.0 FTE on the second page under 'L V F U H W L R Q D U \ ' ([S D Q G L A S & P N K e d t o c h a n g e s , w h i c h c r e a t e s for both K-5 and middle school reduced from 5.5 to 2.75 FTE. Those 2.75 FTE in each are not actually being eliminated but just moved out of BSEP to the General Fund.. Special Ed expenses same in under budget but because of 0 D L Q W H Q D Q M O E R e q u i r e m e n t s - that the costs of Special Ed in a district would not decrease unless there is significant reason - these costs can be transferred to Special Education and it seems to be a win/win for both. What is also missing in the Program Support that has been there before the Middle School and High School math class size reduction. Recently, the District reduced class size in 7th, 8th and 9th grade math from 28:1 to 20:1. In trying to keep the budget sustainable over the length of the Measure, this additional cost cannot be sustained. Smith stated that the cost of the average teacher had gone up \$3,000 over the Teacher Template calculation from the S U L R U \ H D U % H H U \ Q R W H G W K D W D W W K H W R S R I W K H V H F a calculation made each year. Last year it was \$86,100, this year \$89,100

Smith then passed out the BUSD Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document FY 2014-15 With Updated Enrollment and Averages 2014-02-25 which included the reduced class sizes in middle school math as well as the 5.5 (for 2nd grade teachers) so that the committee members could see the cost difference. The difference between this handout and the first one is approximately \$1M.

Beery handed out the BSEP CS Multi Year Projections Based on CSR Recommendations for FY 2014, P & O v 2014-02-25. This Multi Year Projection takes

BUSD Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document FY-2014 With Updated Enrollment and Averages, v 2010-25 and the BSEP CSR Multi Year Projections Based on CSR Recommendations for FY 2013, P & O v 2010-25 indicate the price of inaction and why cuts need to be made.

Martin asked Smith to educate the committee on reduced class sizes for middle school math, and Smith stated it was one of the strategies that was implemented a number of years ago when the District looked at trying to strengthen algebra in the 8th grade. The District had looked once before at raising CSR in middle school math but it packed the Boardroom and people at middle schools were very unhappy at the possibility of losing it that may happen again. Smith said that he was a proponent of lower class sizes in middle school math and the high school program was only recently changed. The smaller number of student contacts for the math teachers, the ability to provide greater intervention and really monitor student progress over the year, Smith felt it had been effective. Smith talked with the secondary principals before creating this budget because he saw the lack of sustainability if continued in the same way and knew that some cuts had to be made. Smith talked with principals

are arbitrary. Duran asked if that would include facilities costs, because the demographic study showed a significant increase. Beery said that was appropriate if we run out of classrooms, then what? Lamar said he was looking at the arguments against Measure A and

K D V Q ¶ W P R Y H G was Referred to the G between level at 6th grade and 9th grade One of the difficulties for people changing addresses is that they do the paperwork at the central office, not

BSEP Measure Planning Timeline

January -July 2014

Timeline Development

- x Measure Planning Overview with Superintendent, BSEP Director, P&O
- x Draft BSEP Measure Planning Timeline to Board March 12, 2014

August 2014 -December 2014

Groundwork for Stakeholder Process

- x Consultant RFP in August; awarded in Fall 2014
- x Measure Planning Committee Formation
- x Develop Topics, Groups, Calendar and Format for Stakeholder Meetings
- x Analyze City Tax Polling from Spring 2014
- x Update to Board November 15, 2014

January -June 2015

Stakeholder Meetings and SGC Polling

- x Stakeholder Meetings: Information and recommendations of key groups and individuals as background for large -scale community processes
- x Possible SGC Polling on BSEP Measure Purposes
- x Recap to Board in May/June

Summer 2015

Planning and Preparation for Community Processes

Fall 2015:

Community Process

- x Preliminary stakeholder work brought to public forum/town halls
- x November Board Meeting: Update on stakeholder and public discussions of purposes and structure of the Measure.

January 2016

School Board considers key decisions:

- x Tax Rate options
- x Allocations to each purpose of the new Measure

February – March 2016

Public Opinion Survey

- x Tax rate and educational purposes
- x Review other tax measures considered by City of Berkeley

April 2016

Draft Measure to Board

June 2016:

Final version of Measure adopted by School Board

November 2016:

Measure on November 8 Election Ballot

BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Berkeley, California

MEASURE A OF 2006
"BERKELEY SCHOOLS EXCELLENCE PROGRAM"

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
June 30, 2013

BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Berkeley, California

MEASURE A OF 2006 FUND
"BERKELEY SCHOOLS EXCELLENCE PROGRAM"

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
June 30, 2013

CONTENTS

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT	1
FINANCIAL SECTION:	
BALANCE SHEET	3
STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES AND CHANGE IN FUND BALANCE	4
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS	5



INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT

Board of Trustees
Berkeley Unified School District
Berkeley, California

Report on the Financial Statements

We have audited the accompanying balance sheet of Measure A of 2006, also referred to as "Berkeley Schools Excellence Program (Measure A of 2006)," of Berkeley Unified School District, as of June 30, 2013, and the related statements of revenues, expenditures and changes in fund balances for the year then ended, and the related notes to the financial statements, which collectively comprise Measure A of 2006 financial statements as listed in the Table of Contents.

Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these basic financial statements in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; this includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditor's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these basic financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the basic financial statements are free of material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditor's judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity's

Opinion

In our opinion, the basic financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Measure A of 2006 as of June 30, 2013, and the changes in financial position for the year then ended, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Emphasis of Matter

As discussed in Note 1, the financial statements present only the financial activity of Measure A of 2006, and do not purport to, and do not, present fairly the financial position of Berkeley Unified School District as of June 30, 2013, and the changes in financial position for the year then ended, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Our opinion is not modified with respect to this matter.

Crowe Horwath LLP

Sacramento, California
January 31, 2014

BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
MEASURE A OF 2006 FUND
"BERKELEY SCHOOLS EXCELLENCE PROGRAM"
BALANCE SHEET

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
 MEASURE A OF 2006 FUND
 "BERKELEY SCHOOLS EXCELLENCE PROGRAM"
 STATEMENT OF REVENUES, EXPENDITURES AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE
 For the Year Ended June 30, 2013

Unrestricted General	Class Size	School Discretionary	Visual and Performing Arts	Public Information Planning and Oversight	Professional Development, Educational Program Evaluation and Technology for Schools	Parent Outreach and Translation	School
-------------------------	------------	-------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	--------

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
MEASURE A OF 2006 FUND
"BERKELEY SCHOOLS EXCELLENCE PROGRAM"
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
June 30, 2013

NOTE 2 – CASH AND INVESTMENTS (Continued)

Because the District's deposits are maintained in a recognized pooled investment fund under the care of a third party and the District's share of the pool does not consist of specific, identifiable investment securities owned by the District, no disclosure of

(Continued)

BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
MEASURE A OF 2006 FUND
"BERKELEY SCHOOLS EXCELLENCE PROGRAM"

May 1 LCFF/LCAP: Public Notice of Opportunity to Submit Written Comments

May 1 Library Subcommittee Meeting – contact beccatodd@berkeley.net

Disbursements

2017-2018 Budget

Account	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
4000	610.2	620.7	632.4	647.0	730.4	859.6	1008.8	1217.9

Account	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
4000	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0

Account	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
4000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000

Account	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
4000	4012	4083	4248.0	4471.0	5255.0	6395.0	7628.0	9257.0

Account	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
4000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000

LCAP Priorities

These are items that have surfaced as a result of being suggested multiple times when discussing LCFF/LCAP. Note that the costs listed are one-year estimates, based on current information. In a three-year plan, these annual costs would be expected to increase. Most of the recommendations that have

E H H Q L G H Q W L I L H G D O L J Q Z L W K W K H i n c l u d e 1) S u p p o r t f o r S U L R U L W L English Learners, 2) Response to Instruction and Intervention, 3) Positive Behavior Support and Counseling, 4) Literacy and the implementation of the Common Core State Standards, 5) Family Engagement, and 6) Student Engagement, with cultural competency integrated throughout all our strategies.

I.

includes universal screening, diagnostics, interventions, and progress monitoring of students. The coaches would work with all teachers at a site as well as those students who need additional support. (8.2 Total FTE)

1 st - 400 Students (K -5)	.4 FTE x 5 = 2.0
400 th - 500 Students (K -5)	.6 FTE x 5 = 3.0
500+ Students (K -5)	.8 FTE x 1 = .8 + .2 FTE Lead Coach
Longfellow and Willard	.6 FTE x 2 = 1.2
King	1.0 FTE x 1 = 1.0

4. Teacher Hourly Intervention \$272,000

This allocation pays classroom teachers to work with individual and small groups of students who need additional support after school. Allocations to sites are based on the number of targeted students.

5. Intervention Materials and Training

RISE programs. BHS staff is working with Dr. Frank Worrell at UCB to design the specifics of this intervention program based on research.

9. Intervention Counselor at Berkeley Technology Academy \$89,100
This full -

High School summer school is designed for credit recovery to enable students who have failed one or more courses to graduate in four years. The middle school program is strictly for English Learners.

6-8 EL Only = \$4,200
BHS = \$52,000

14. Cultural Competency Training \$133 ,000

These three -day academies provide participants with foundational knowledge for infusing culturally responsive practices into their work with students, families and co-workers. The intent is to provide training for all staff during the next three years. The proposal also includes stipends for Equity Teacher Leaders to further this work

Berkeley allocates \$5,000 per elementary school for support but not direct services.

18. PBIS/Restorative Justice/Alive and Free (K -12) \$222,500
BSEP Professional Development funds currently support a full time psychologist to provide training and coaching support for school staff in Positive Behavioral Intervention System, Restorative Justice, and the Alive and Free program, seeking to reinforce positive student behavior and reduce student suspensions and time out of class. \$93,000

Restorative Justice (RJ) is a set of peacemaking practices that build relational trust and provide alternatives to punitive discipline. Infractions are viewed as 'K D U P μ D Q G L Q W H U Y H Q W L R Q V D U H W D U J H W H G W R K H O S W K community assess and repair the harm that has been done. The proposal seeks to contract with SEEDS Community Resolution Center to provide RJ Coordinators at all secondary schools (one at each middle school

Materials: Curriculum Binders per elementary site or grade 6 = \$5,000, Supporting Books = \$4,000, Fan Decks of the 12 tools = \$300, 12 Tools Posters = \$300, Abridged Guides for staff = \$300

Total materials cost per site = $\$9,900 \times 9 = \$89,100$

20. ATOD Counselors at Secondary Schools \$280,000

ATOD Counseling and Educational Intervention Support are currently provided through the New Bridge Foundation, a non-profit specializing in substance abuse prevention and treatment, at Willard and Berkeley Technology Academy, funded through a grant from Alameda County. The proposal seeks funding for services at Longfellow and King (1 staff each) and BHS (2 staff) at a cost of \$70,000 per staff member for a total of \$280,000.

IV. LITERACY AND IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMON CORE STANDARDS

21. Literacy Coaches (K-5) \$474,000

These coaches have three primary functions: providing reading recovery for the lowest performing first graders, small group intervention for second through fifth graders and coaching for teachers in TCRWP. These coaches are currently multi-funded with funding for .55 FTE per site coming from central BSEP funds. Each site currently uses site funds for the additional .45 FTE.

$.45 \text{ FTE site allocation} \times 11 \text{ schools} = \$474,000$

22. Reading Specialists/ Literacy Coaches at Middle School \$200,000

These coaches would provide professional development for ELA teachers and reading intervention services for students reading below grade level.

$1.0 \text{ FTE for King, } .60 \text{ each for Willard \& Longfellow} = 2.2 \text{ Total FTE}$

23. Math Coaches (K-12) \$371,600

These coaches provide professional development and coaching for teachers to help them implement the new common core math. The District currently funds 2.0 FTE for this purpose through the BSEP professional development budget.

$4.0 \text{ FTE (} 2.0 \text{ FTE at K-5, } 1.0 \text{ FTE total for middle schools, and } 1.0 \text{ FTE for high schools)} = \$371,600$

24. CCSS (Academic) Coaches for BHS (2.0 FTE) \$182,000

As BHS begins the transition to the Common Core State Standards, these 2.0 FTE teachers on Special Assignment will lead professional development in Constructing Meaning, Academic Language Development and coach their colleagues on the implementation of CCSS. They will also guide the process to select CCSS aligned materials and develop assessments.

25. Reduced Math Class Size for Grades 7, 8, 9 \$214,000 - 517,000

Middle school math class sizes have been reduced to 20:1 for the past few years (and 9th grade classes for the last two years) as one component in the

plan to improve performance in algebra. This has been funded by BSEP Class

courses to create career pathways for students. The need for 2014
extend the fire -science and emergency medical pathway at

-15 is to

35. Gardening Program (Pre -K 7) \$176,900 (one time)
Funding is requested to enable each Pre -K, Elementary and Middle S school to maintain a .25 to a .44 FTE Garde n Instruc tional Specialist (9 -16 hours/ week) based on the number of classes at each school. This allocation includes time for student instruction 2 one garden lesson every other week 2 and garden maintenance. The anticipated total cost is \$476,000 less \$226,000 from previously allocated funds. Sites are expected to contribute \$15 per student for a total of \$72,600. The amount requested is a one -time cost of \$176,900.

-

BSEP Resource 0852
Site Discretionary Funds
2014-15 Allocation

:>65/8=5B+264516/	!"#\$%&'(&! *+,-./! 0123,,45167	"#\$%&'8&)!9:0-! ;<33,! =>/;256>31+2? @,,3;+6>31!/!+6 A\$'%8BCB>,
112 D Cragmont	421	\$96,830
113 - Emerson	297	\$68,310
116 - Jefferson	338	\$77,740
118 - LeConte	344	\$79,120
119 D Oxford	318	\$73,140
120 - Thousand Oaks	472	\$108,560
121 D Washington	471	\$108,330
123 - Arts Magnet	421	\$96,830
124 - Rosa Parks	482	\$110,860
126 - Malcolm X	527	\$121,210
128 - John Muir	282	\$64,860
Sub-Total K-5 Schools	4,373	\$1,005,790
127 D Longfellow	500	\$115,000
131 D Willard	511	\$117,530
132 D King	915	\$210,450
Sub-Total 6-8 Schools	1,926	\$442,980
135 D Independent Study* (120)	150	\$34,500
136 D B-Tech* (140)	150	\$34,500
137 - Berkeley High*	3025	\$695,750
Sub-Total 9-12 Schools	3,325	\$764,750
262 - Early Childhood (pre-K)*	341	\$78,430
Total Allocation 2014-15	9,965	\$2,291,950

Notes:

Allocations for Independent Study, B-Tech, and Pre-K are agreed-upon a figures; IS and B-Tech are given allocations at 150 per site, for Pre-K the allocation is based on the full-time equivalent enrollment.

Berkeley High School's BSEP site allocation is calculated by subtracting Independent Study's actual enrollment of 120 from BHS CALPADS 3,145

Pilot Evaluation

10 Focus Students were selected at each site, based on:

"

