

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

3.

*Co-Chairs Chris Martin and Elisabeth Hensley*  
No comments were made.

4.

*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 to Donald Evans, Superintendent dated February 12, 2014: Repor*

*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 progress toward particular goals. Lamar asked if this included an incremental progression and could the P&O Committee see, in the future, the amount of the investment increasing over the years or capping out somewhere? B 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 DaMarto, 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 listing of schools shows scores from neighboring and other significant districts. In comparison to Oakland, the scores for African American and White students are somewha

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: the Indirect Costs that have to be paid went up, and the staffing costs have increased. Martin asked if the Indirect Cost rate changes if the COLA is not instituted? Karam replied no. It is the last year that the books are closed, so it lags behind actual experience. She referred to

-(b) Difference:

66%, but does not make much of a difference to the other resources. Lazio asked a question about the difference from last year's rebates (\$80,000) to this year's rebates (\$120,000) to which Karam replied that part of it was an estimate. Part of the reason she thinks BSEP might have gotten more revenue was that there were organizations that qualified as exempt that did not file their exemptions early enough so that they would not have to pay the taxes. Then they have to go back and be reimbursed. Beery noted that the two major categories for rebates are organizations that are non-profits and low-income seniors. Karam said that the commercial rebates are fairly big and the low-income senior rebates are pretty steady (they tend to be the same people year after year). She thought from a dollar point of view, they are not-for-profits. Karam thought that when the Measure is new, people are more tuned into the fact they can file an application and a turnover happens in organizations or schools, they come back and file for a rebate.

Beery referred to *BSEP Resources, First Interim Summary FY 2013/14* that she shared with the Board. This document indicates where the current funds are now, for example when looking at CSR 0841, the Revenue in the current year 2013-14 was \$15,867,723 and \$12,305,200 went to the teacher transfer (Contributions to the GF), leaving \$3,562,523 for program allocations, Program Support, Middle School Counseling, etc. Expenditures were \$4,157,340 drawing upon the fund balance so that the deficit spending was \$594,817. The fund balance at the beginning of the year was \$901,809 and drawing on your reserves of \$594,817 leaves you with an Ending Fund Balance of \$306,992. When planning for the next year, another \$594,817 cannot be drawn from the Ending Fund Balance of \$306,992, which leaves the fund in the hole approximately another \$300,000. In looking at the resource allocation for next year, this fund will only receive \$202,511 (previous handout of \$500,000). Beery will have to propose some changes when he makes his presentation later in this meeting. Similarly, the Site Discretionary Funds has a small fund balance and will not be getting a whole lot more in the coming year. Beery has not given the allocations to the Principals and the SGCs yet

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 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade students), will be reaching pain points 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 cost/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 most of the budgets. 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, is 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 and





specifics have not yet been released, but 24:1 is an absolute cap. There is not just a penalty 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-3 level, it would probably have to keep 24:1 at 4 and 5 as well because there is no way to change the class sizes between grades 3 and 4. Smith wanted the committee members to be aware that there were trade-offs there.

For Middle School, beginning with the 6<sup>th</sup> grade, the GF funds 36:1 with BSEP funding down to 28:1. Necessary FTE for 6<sup>th</sup> would be 1.12 and in 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>, .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

He also pointed to changes, with RtI<sup>2</sup> teachers 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 came in under budget but because of -MOE requirements - that the costs of Special Ed in a district should 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, is the Middle School and High School math class size reduction. Recently, the District reduced class size in 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> 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

a calculation made each year. Last year it was \$86,100, this year it is \$89,100.

Smith then passed out the *BUSD Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document FY 2014-15 With Updated Enrollment and Averages, v 2014-02-25* which included the reduced class sizes in middle school math, as well as the 5.5 (for RTI<sup>2</sup> 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 CSR Multi Year Projections Based on CSR Recommendations for FY 2013-14, P & O v 2014-02-25*. This Multi Year Projection takes

*BUSD Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document FY 2014-15 With Updated Enrollment and Averages, v 2014-02-25 and the BSEP CSR Multi Year Projections Based on CSR Recommendations for FY 2013-14, P & O v 2014-02-25* 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 8<sup>th</sup> 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, and 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 a good point, if we run out of classrooms, then what? Lamar said he was looking at the arguments against Measure A and thinking about the questions just raised. It would be nice if we could show some kind of evidence to pose against some of these arguments because it is a question as to whether or not some of the peoples concerns were actually addressed. There was agreement on this statement. Martin stated that he appreciated that this seemed like a really hard decision to make and that it seemed that 24:1 was not logistically possible this year. It seems that the hard decision was made and it seemed logical to him. Smith stated that when he and Beery looked at 24:1, at Kindergarten, it would make a difference of 5 teachers. They did not look at TK, those were left at 20:1. That would be the total saving throughout the district. There were two other places in the district where there were two more reductions, with a savings to BSEP. Armstrong asked if staffing for math teachers could come from the GF and Smith responded that it could come from LCAP. The elementary schools contributed approximately \$450,000 to literacy coaches and just to take that expense away from the sites and say the central office would pay for literacy coaches,

- was re-enrollment between levels, at 6<sup>th</sup> grade and 9<sup>th</sup> grade. One of the difficulties for people changing addresses is that they must do the paperwork at the central office, not