

BSEPPLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES  
February 23, 2016  
BUSD Offices–TechnologyRoom126  
2020 BonaStreet,Berkeley,CA 94702

P&O Committee Members Present:

Victoria Hritonenko, PreK

Dawn Paxson, Emerson

Shauna Rabinowitz, Jefferson

Danielle Perez, John Muir (co-Chair)

Rob Collier, LeConte (Co)

Hans Abramson Ward Longfellow (Sub)

Bruce Simon, King (co-Chair)

Elisabeth 1 Tf 11.283 8.022 Td [(J)-13(o)11(na)-2(t)6(ha)-2(n)]TJ ( )Tj -0.011 Tc 0.011 Tw [(C)-7(he)-13(r)-



Advisory Committee/PAC. There may be two dates in March that might work out, and Beery will keep the committee informed.

MOTION CARRIED (Paxson/Harm): To approve the meeting minutes of the February 9, 2015 P&O Committee Meeting. The motion was approved with a showing of 12 hands, no objections, and 3 abstentions.

6. Public Comment

Peggy Scott stated that she had been a P&O committee member in 2010-2011. She passed around screenshots of excerpts from the Berkeley High School SARC (School Accountability Report Card) for 2012-2015. She saw a drop in the math and science test scores and felt there was a correlation with some class sizes being over 33, that she felt was a trend. She noted that one out of three students in the district were at BHS and thought this and other specific statistics in her handout should be reviewed. Scott expressed her appreciation for the committee's work.

7. BUSD/BSEP Update (Comments)

Donald Evans, BUSD Superintendent

Evans stated that the Cabinet was looking forward to seeing the results of the voter poll at their day-long meeting on Monday, February 29<sup>th</sup>. He planned to return to the P&O with updates.

Beery added that in addition to looking at the results of the voter poll, they will begin to look at the feedback from the Community Workshop and various stakeholder groups and feedback from the P&O. This information will eventually become part of the recommendation that will be brought back to the P&O as well as the Board in April.

8. Recommendation for the Allocation of BSEP Class Size Funds in FY 2016-17

Pasquale Scuder, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services

Scuder provided the following:

Memorandum to BSEP Planning and Oversight Committee from Donald Evans, Ed.D., Superintendent and Pasquale Scuder, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services dated February 23, 2016: Draft Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Class Size Reduction Funds in FY 2016-17

Scuder passed out the Draft Recommendation for Allocation of BSEP Class Size Reduction Funds in FY 2016-17. He noted that the class size recommendations were for the following:

K-3: 20:1

4-5: 26:1

6-8: 28:1

BHS: 28:1

Scuder added that even though the state has changed its contribution for class size, and also changed the target from 20:1 to 24:1, the BUSD elected to keep K-3: 26:1



could be covered by 1.0 FTE, then there could be some flexibility with FTE for other classes/enrichment. Scuder mentioned the student welfare/attendance coordinator and what other funding sources could be brought to bear on that position to free up the site discretionary money. Lamar wondered if it could be funded by LCFF. Scuder thought the GF could be used to cover the costs as a possibility. Beery also clarified that the measure state STA would be staffed at 18:1 but actual is even better, a 15:1 ratio, which was different than BHS ratio of 28:1.

Lazio noted her concerns with the wording that the GF is "subsidizing" BSEP for Page Two, and Scuder acknowledged that he had to change that wording. She also expressed her concerns around what she felt was a low contribution from the GF for class size ratios and desiring a larger commitment from the GF. Beery said that was being discussed. She added that sw 2g 0 Tw 2.58 1JT03j0 T6 0 72%T hoTj3on2%T

In response to a question, Scuderion confirmed that the 3-4-5 Combo came about when the decision was made to move to a single TWI program at LeConte. It allows current TWI sites to add a half-day teacher so they could have some grade level pure instruction in the combo classes and rearrange their day to make their schedule work a little better. The need will go down as they phase the program out to LeConte. Scuderion confirmed that TWI at Thousand Oaks was not subsidized at the same rate. He noted that he could put together something in more detail about the 3-4-5 Combo as the FTE does not perfectly align with grade level.

Collier encouraged the people that would be attending the Cabinet meeting on February 29<sup>th</sup> to always think of the communications and at least they go through the vast quantities of details. How it is framed now will be quoted and have a ripple effect going forward, e.g., class size, the broad takeaways and the ramifications of them. Beery mentioned that one of the things some people have said is if you are considering anything besides 20:1, that is not class size reduction. They have never seen the teacher templates where we start with 34 or 36 and then we reduce from that.

Paxson was unsure if RtI<sup>2</sup> was still covered. Bill, that is 0.1 to [0] TW 3.750 TW ((y) 0.0044 36

Beery presented the handout Format for BSEP Community Conversation and Workshop, February and March 2016. Beery explained that the first page outlined the overview for the workshop. Superintendent Evans begins by welcoming attendees. Beery presents a BSEP PowerPoint slideshow. The attendees break into small groups for "Table Talk", where they discuss and answer table card questions (conversation starters/prompts) provided at each table. The top card is a question about class size. "BSEP Resources Discussion Guide" (second page of handout) gives facts on various BSEP funds for talking points. She noted the facilitators would also be describing using "Today's Meet" to record suggestions and questions in real time on screen. These are also archived and summarized and Beery will use the information in a report to the P&O and the Board.



need to be made clear. Otherwise we should increase the funding in BSEP to continue the program as it is. Beery stated that the way it had been framed, the fiscal issues were partly what drove this to the fore as well as the fact that the state was changing its target. Any time you construct a new measure, or renew an existing measure you would want to look at all of the components so say we know we are comfortable with what the structure is and what we think it is doing. While we might like the feeling of smaller class sizes, the question should be asked what is the purpose of smaller class sizes. If the primary purposes are more differentiation and attention, and then we ask if we know this to be the case. Is meeting the needs of the individual child through things like differentiation happening simply through reducing numbers? Superintendent Evans has mentioned that from his own experience reducing class size does not necessarily change teaching practices. Evans stated that thirty years ago when class sizes were K-32:1 and then 4-6 was 36:1, 20:1 was supposed to change practices and be accompanied by Professional Development. What happened was that some teachers continued to teach classes of 20:1 like they were teaching classes of 36:1. Evans added that he thought to see a real difference, the class sizes would have to be reduced to 15:1. He noted as well that you had to balance this need with both the resources and money we have to provide.

Harm stated that she remembered the January 26<sup>th</sup> meeting with a presentation of 4 different class size scenarios with 20:1 vs. 24:1. She noted that the middle ground was enticing, and were we exploring that middle ground at all? She also wondered about how the tax rate question was coming into the conversation. Beery stated that in October they used the "thermometer" exercise to have the tax rate conversation. The participants mostly wanted to raise the tax rate, but Beery noted that this wasn't enough to go forward with that decision, which is why we have the voter poll. Ultimately, the measure is approved by the voters, most of whom do not have children in the schools. The voter poll is important but so is discussing what is right and sustainable for our kids. The under 24:1 model was the tool we wanted to use for now as a scenario to clarify and look at what is sustainable. Too many scenarios are overwhelming to people. We reduced it to just one and will extrapolate from there. Simon appreciated the thought that went into this.

Hensley thought the Class Size Reduction item of the California Class Size Reduction Fund is now rewarding "24:1 schoolwide" was misleading and needed to be clarified. She thought it was worth pointing out that California was backing away from 20:1 for a reason. She noted that it had been a challenge to go to 20:1, referring to staffing with experienced teacher training, and sufficient classrooms. It should be noted that what will go away is the variance in class size. Huchting added that could be stated as a positive many

Collier stated that the scenarios should be seen as a positive and that would improve your child's education. He added that if there was no data to prove it, was there data to disprove it? Beery stated that there was a Tennessee randomized study with 15-16 kids per class, and there have not been many other controlled studies. The educational experience had many variables in it that holding the class size constant was not something that there were

File(s) (v) F (v) IT 8 d r g

them out in a not too confusing way to the public. Also, people should be encouraged to express their thoughts and concerns so that when the Cabinet ultimately makes a presentation to the Board, it will be in a way that is positive, and provides people with the information that they need.

Harm stated that as a teacher, a science teacher, and parent of a child in the District, she wanted to note that data can support but cannot prove. She thought data could also lend non-support and not disprove. As a parent of a kindergarten child, Harm questioned whether 24:1 would support the students as well as 20:1, and so she loved the comments Beery made about making sure the conversations were happening openly, that people could weigh in, and that there were multiple ways to look at the pros and cons of what was going on with data and with anecdotal experience.

Lavine noted that nothing that had not been talked about was facilities and facilities capacity. Enrollment was trending up and if we kept class sizes small, we will run out of classrooms. Beery said that there was just barely enough room currently and the Board would hear about that tomorrow evening. There may be enough classroom for the short term but possibly not for the