

**BSEP Minutes for March 3, 2014**

**Berkeley High School**

**Location: Conference Room B**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Community</b>	<b>Attended</b>
Sara Cerami	Student	Yes
Nia Hampton	Student	Yes
Aaron Glimme	Teacher	Yes
Hector Cardenas	Parent	Yes
John Lavine	Parent	Yes
Maya Smith	Student	Yes
Joseph Battles	Student	Yes
Catherine Lazio	Parent	Yes
Deebie Symes	Parent	Yes
Pasquale Scuderi	Principal	Yes
Matt Albinson	Staff	Yes
Orlando Williams	Parent	Yes
Austin Lloyd	Student	Yes
Rhonda Jefferson	Staff	Yes
Jessica Lopez-Tello	Staff	Yes

**Quorum:** 4:34 pm

**Approve minutes from last meeting:** Minutes approved, one abstention.

The list of people that didn't attend that is not on the list needs to be added. Ms. Cline, she came late

**Approve Agenda:** Agenda approved. No changes without objection.

**Public Comment:**

We have Kim Turner.

Hi I'm Kim Turner, I was recommended by a BHS parent that my organization comes here to talk to you about the programs that we do. So, we're an organization, we do a lot of healing work. What I do is I coordinate our programs in schools. I have an art and social justice program called Art Esteem, and we do work in the school either during the day or after school. We also have been working on this really big project, The Oakland Super Heroes Mural Project. We use the Self as Super Hero curriculum that was created by our associate director and what it does is have students recreate themselves as super heroes to solve problems in their community. It's about finding a problem in their community and how they use their talents and skills to then create a superhero to solve those problems, so we take that into the schools. We also do PD for teachers on how to integrate the arts. We are currently doing work in three schools and visual arts in schools.

HC: Any questions?

JL: What grades do you serve? How old are they?

Kim Turner: We serve K-12 – We also do healing work, so also work with families and communities. We do healing circles, we do mindful drumming every month at our center. We try to work with the whole.

PS: How are kids getting to your service?

Kim Turner: Kids used to go to our center, but not that we are growing we also go into the schools. We do things like family art nights.

PS: Are you in High Schools now?

Kim Turner: Yes, we are in Rensselaer in Oakland. We did a mural with McClymonds last year.

JL: You would reach out to Oakland? Berkeley? Richmond?

Kim Turner: Yes, all those. We also go into San Francisco. We also did a project with San Lorenzo a couple years ago, but they lost their funding.

CL: Are you hoping to partner with BHS?

Kim Turner: Yes, and we're looking for funding too.

HC: What were you thinking, if anything, in particular for BHS?

Kim Turner: We're not really sure. We would ask the school what is something they are interested in? It would depend on what the site wants.

HC: Any questions you have for us?

Kim Turner: Well, what arts do you have here? Because most of the schools we work don't have an arts program at all.

PS: We have a relatively extensive arts program. We actually the Arts and Humanities Academy, which is an arts focus school. One option would be to contact my assistant Amber Spencer, and we can put you in contact with our art department head who is Andrea Sanguine. And if you are providing something that we are not meeting in our current arts program, then they can recommend we can look into it further.

HC: I wanted to give you an update with what is going on with our budget. Just a few minutes ago, we got an email from Natasha Beery, she has just informed us that the BHS allocation for this year will be around \$695, 000 that is about \$9300 less than last year. Obviously that does not count the carryover yet, so there might be some additional money. But if you remember from last year we used a big chunk of the carryover from last year. So, there may not be much more assigned to us. The reason for this is twofold: 1) The allocation per student at the district level is being reduced from \$233 to \$230 throughout the district, and that has to do with the fund balance in the BSEP funds and accumulated impact of salary increases and the deficit spending. Also, the fact that the cost of living adjustment this year is very low because of low inflation. 2) Enrollment – it has decreased again.

AG: The per pupil goes down when the total population goes up. That happens at the front end, and it'll get to us in a couple of years.

HC: The good news is that Natasha is optimistic that with the LCAP process some of the positions we are currently funding through BSEP might be in fact re-absorbed into the general fund. That might free up some of the resources, for us to work with. We might even be able to fund some new programs.

HC: I also wanted to give you an update on the submission for the proposals. We did switch this year to a form based, and it hasn't been completely a smooth process. So, the good news is that we have more time this year to make decisions. I think we will have to consider today, and is not on the agenda, consider changing the deadline to give people more time to submit their application. Because this is an online form, they don't have a way to go back to it.

AG: I should have brought up this earlier, but we need to have a P&O report. There are a couple of issues that may impact the H.S.

**P&O Report:**

AG: Important thing in the last P&O meeting was the class size reduction we already talked about. The other thing was changes to the funding on class size particularly in K-3. The State is not funding the class-size reduction funding in the same way than the past, and that creates a bit of a budget hole. No changes coming for right now. But as we begin to plan for the new measure, if continue to do the 20:1 ratio or switch to the 24:1 K-5 those are questions that are beginning to be asked and thought about. There is no significant changes in the 20:1 in K-3 for the foreseeable future. At BHS we may lose 1 FTE for 9<sup>th</sup> grade Algebra 1 classes. What they cut from the budget was 5 FTE for class size reduction in middle school and HS. And 5.4 FTE for RTI that they moved into the general funds. Currently there is no math class reduction in the BSEP fund.

CL: Next year, they are looking at eliminating the ECO (Expanded Course Offerings) classes.

PS: Basically ECO is a fund we were given to fund courses for extra classes in the school day. Such as Labs, AP support classes, etc. Other schools cannot do this.

**SSC Report:** No one was able to attend.

**Principal's Report:**

PS: For the purposes of the work that we do in this committee, I've been trying to push the district to give me some clarity on what we might expect in terms of an increase in funding for LCAP. There are basically three things being projected. 1) The increase in base revenue, our regular operating money. For the district is currently projected to be 2.5 million for next year. 2) The supplemental budget in relation to LCAP, which is the funds that are supposed to be increased at the State level to specifically fund ELL, Socio Economic disadvantage students and Foster Youth. 3) Class size reduction Statewide, which they have been including in this calculations because that will be reduced over the next couple of years. My question to the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent is: As we start putting together our wish list for LCAP what should we be thinking about what the money will look like? Could a 15-20% increase be a safe number to start working with? I've given a "yes" to start working with 15-20% increase which would mean, 400-500,000 of the 2.5 million dollar increase. That is sort of some spread of numbers that we might use today as we discuss what to off-load. I can tell you right now that our Teacher Leadership would take a big chunk right off the bat in terms of base revenue increase. We can have more of that discussion when we get into the letter.

Other things I can talk about in terms of declining enrollment; we don't know exactly what the reason for that is, we do know tonight is the first night where non-BUSD families will be registering and we are down about 40 students from where we were last year. We have about 167 people enrolled tonight. Sometimes when the economy is good enrollment in private schools goes back up, so people on the fence go that way.

Attendance is up again, thanks to the team. We are currently at 2.6% increase for the year, which is significant from where we've come in the last three years, which 1% for a school this size is a big deal. So we've been able to hold on to a 1.6% increase for the year, we will have more than done our job.

Suspensions are also down again; we're still struggling with disproportionality. The Superintendent has some ideas on how to dig into that from a different dimension. I can tell you we have 98 different suspensions through February 15<sup>th</sup> and we had 300 last year. So we are notably ahead of where we were in terms of trying to drop that number. Another positive thing is our math program, in our WASC report one of the measurements for engagement was the number of African American students enrolled in higher mathematics or even get into that Algebra 2 threshold; we had a very dismal number a couple of years ago and we still have a long way to go. Our enrollment of African American students in Algebra 2 or better went from 17% to 35% -- it was an 18% increase. The pass rates of African American students in those classes are also up. Hopefully we will start seeing that translate in more standardized measures, CAHSEE pass rates and the new SBAC.

The last thing I want to tell you about is about this new State testing system. For whatever reason, we were selected to be a pilot school for the new Smarter Balance Assessment Consortium (SBAC), the issue is the new way in which these tests will be administered is web-based, so we have to give them in classes and online. Instead of being in test mode for a week, we're having to device a schedule that will span a month. My big problem with this is that I think that is a better assessment than STAR had, and I don't want to push this to AP and IB windows. We have to figure out a way to do this where we have a chance of framing this as something beneficial for kids and the community.

The new building opened today, it was very smooth. Teachers did great, people were unpacking and moving this past weekend.

DS: You were at the LCAP meeting with me. And it was table lady that brought up the issues of suspensions, and I wasn't sure that it made it through to you, but she was interested in seeing our suspension issued by location, by time, by officer, type of officer; is it a security person, or a teacher. Do you have that data?

PS: Suspensions are issued by administrators because no one else can. Safety Officers will make a referral, teachers will make a referral, but we've really dropped the number of suspensions for defiance and disruption. As far as where on the campus they've occurred???

DS: Meaning in class? Before school? After school?

PS: I don't think we've broken it up in quite that detail. It's doable, but I would say toward what that end is that?

DS: To understand the pattern, etc.

PS: Some of what I can tell you is that physical altercation impacts a large number of our African American students. My dean of students will tell you that way before we need an alcohol and drugs counselor, I need an anger management counselor. Some of the problems are kids who don't have problem solving skills.

HC: Maybe a better question is the reduction in suspensions a manifestation of behavior or a refocusing on sanctions? So, how effective is the alternative sanction versus the original suspension. The whole focus on reducing suspensions is you're either punishing someone by withdrawing education from them? Which doesn't seem like a very good way if they are already having a deficit.

PS: In that reduction, there are some incidents for which we would historically suspend that we're doing maybe more of. More of the suspensions are in-house suspensions, so you don't get to go home, you just might not be in that classroom the next day. Some of the things we've done last year, and this year again is that we have a cohort to identify intervention. Last year we identified where we identified a group of about 70 kids were responsible for 40% of the incidents the previous year. We've lost some of those kids because that population tends to be transient but there were 50 kids in that cohort that stuck with us for the remainder of the year and suspensions for those kids dropped about 60%. All that was, was a reorganization of resources. Administrators talking to them, counselors talking to them, parent resource center prioritized talking to them, etc. Currently we have a comparable cohort, their incidents are declining for the year; in last year's cohort without that intervention there is a sort of holding pattern. So, there wasn't a big spike from that control group from last year. There is enough positive in what we're looking at to keep going in that direction, reorganizing so that our administrators, counselors are prioritizing those kids.

**First Action Item: Approval of the letter to LCAP.**

HC: Everyone received this letter, so I want to thank Catherine's work on drafting it, and also Michael helped a little bit. I really appreciate it. Pasquale also looked at it, offered some comments and that is when I sent it out to the committee. If you have any questions on the wording, or any suggestions in terms of edits or comments, please do that.

JB: The Academic Coordinator says that is funded at 1.0 FTE, but we only funded that at .80 FTE.

PS: He's a 1.0 FTE total employee, but he's 80% BSEP.

HC: We should change that in the letter.

AG: I think this letter is fantastic, and the things listed here by enlarge, are highly appropriate for the district to look at.

JL: I plugged in some numbers from last year's funding, and the total we're talking about was about \$265, 000 about 36% of our budget.

PS: The question that I had when I was looking at this yesterday was, it seems more probable to have these things put in the general fund in relation to the increase in base revenue because the supplemental increases. My current understanding is that the supplemental funds are going to privilege new programs. There was initially a lot of hesitance to say we want to give you this new supplemental funding for these subgroups and continue to fund the existing programs.

AG: There is language in the "supplant" versus "supplement" that I don't think there is a strong decision. I think there is a good argument to be made from our point of view that this is not stuff that the district has been funding directly. This has been sort of site discretionary funds, and that we will be offering new programs. But, Pasquale does have a good point in that it is still unclear what the board will do around new programs for these targeted populations versus programs that we're already doing. I certainly feel that we should ask.

PS: I also think that is important that the EIA monies that SSC used to approve for EL and SCE, those are gone and all rolled into what we're doing now. Some of the positions that are partially funded by us to be off loaded the other half of that money will be rolled into this too.

HC: We have a couple suggestions to change. Let's put in the letter that approximately \$260, 000 dollars based on last year's funding.

HC: Are there any other letters?

AL: Can the Outsiders Club be included among the programs that will be shifted over to LCAP? It seems like it fits that category.

AG: I think it could. One of the things included in the programs we have thus far is that they are solid positions. They're staffing. I'm not 100% sure, but I think the Outsiders Club is a very small amount of money. Where these are positions where we can make a really good argument that the district should be paying for this. It would have been paying for these if we didn't have all the economic distress for the last eight years or so. I think the Outsiders club makes more sense for something we fund. These are all ongoing programs that are important to running the school. If we keep it focused on that, I think it makes our case stronger.

CL: Are we addressing this letter to the right people? Should we also address it to the BSEP director?

HC: When I talked to Natasha about this, she suggested we send it through the BSEP office to Neil Smith, and to the advisory committee.

DS: What are we doing with this letter? Are we advising the LCAP committee? Is it a call to action?

PS: The whole LCAP process seems to be one right with advising. As the LCAP process is unfolding to the greatest degree possible we're advocating for the same things.

DS: The question is who is receiving the letter? Are they the voting power in this case.

AG: The voting party is ultimately the school board. But I think that we're trying to influence staff who are going to write a proposal to the board. To a certain extent is ultimately the school board, but to get to the school board is by getting our ideas included to what eventually will be the staff proposal.

HC: When I talked with Natasha she felt that the school board is already inundated with stuff, so if we send it to them it will get lost in the shuffle. It would be most effective to make sure the assistant superintendent has it. The idea of sending it to the educational advisory committee is that they will be doing a lot of that work with the staff, so it's good to have them informed.

PS: We should at least extend our hand and raise awareness because they will ultimately approve our BSEP budget. I think we should put that idea in their head for political reasons ahead of time.

HC: Should we copy them [School Board]? Or should we send it to them also?

AG: I don't think it matters if they are going to get a copy of that letter.

PS: The other reason I said to do it is because going back even in the year prior a group of us went over and we let it be known that we have a long term interest in moving these positions along.

HC: Let's send it to the three parties. We'll send it to Educational Advisory Committee, Berkeley Unified School Board members, and the Assistant Superintendent. Does that make sense to everyone?

AG: **Motion:** I would like to move that we approve the letter with the edits that we discussed. FTE .80 and adding the total dollar amount and that we approve it to dispatch it to the group we agreed on.

**Second:** John Lavine

PS: In the closing part of the letter. It might be helpful to point out again that we know that they are anticipating an increase in both supplemental and general funding. We are saying absorb it into the general fund with the knowledge that there is going to be a \$2.5 million increase.

We hope that you agree that with the increase in both the supplemental and base funding under the LCAP moving funding of these worthwhile programs and positions will advance the schools.

HC: Can we have a vote?

*Vote is unanimous, no abstentions.*

**Action Item – Approval of the Process to be used for developing the 2014 BSEP budget for BHS Discretionary Funds:**

HC: This is something we have done in the last few years. What it entails is approving special rule for those proceedings whereby the process has several steps, and I will go through them quickly. Essentially there are five rounds of discussion and this happens over two meeting period.

The process has several steps. There are five rounds of discussion

- 1) Us initiating discussion. We go through all the programs. Discussion is limited to 10 per evaluation and 1 min. per member. This is done so we can get to an end point within a reasonable time frame.
- 2) Rubric summary: You will get a rubric worksheet that will be sent to you before our meeting. You will grade each of these proposals based on the rubric. Then that info is sent back to me and another member who is helping out. We then consolidate into a master spreadsheet that has the totals for everyone's grades and then we project that on the screen and we go through the spreadsheet by showing how they were ranked. Each member has a chance to speak on the proposals two minutes each. They can tell us which proposals should be funded.
- 3) I will accept motions to fund or to strike the requests for funding. Each one of you will get a chance to say "I think we should fund this program at the full amount" or "I think we should fund it for this amount". Or you can propose that we don't fund a program because it doesn't meet the criteria for BSEP, etc. We go through that round, we accept motions, we have debate for a total of 8 min. per motion. We then ask for a vote on each one of the motions and once motion is carried we update the budget spreadsheet to reflect whether the specific item was approved or stricken.
- 4) We go through the process until we achieve a budget that is balanced. Once that is done, I will accept a motion to approve the budget. The debate will be limited to about 60 minutes. If you want to re-establish something that was stricken from the budget from a previous round we will need a two thirds majority. We can vote something off the budget or into the budget. Once we close debate and all amendments have been disposed of I will call a vote to approve the budget. Once we achieve a balanced budget if you want to propose for something to be included you have to tell us where the money is coming from.

- 5) Motions to allocate carryover funds based in descending order of priority. Every year, we have some carryover funds that become available sometime during the year because not everything is spent and that can free up some money. So we allocate priorities so when that money becomes available we can then fund other programs that were not funded in the total budget.

Once we are done with all of that, that is the end our budget process.

JL: What I need clarification on is this new wrinkle we have to face this year which is that we have this letter we're putting out and is extremely unlikely that we will get an answer to that by the time we get to sit down and deliberate on our money. So, we're still having to put that funding together with the \$695k and including those \$250,000 in that, and then we will have to have this enormous list of what comes after that money is freed-up.

HC: In some sense is not that different from the previous process, except that the potential carryover might be enormous. So, instead of talking about \$50,000 in carryover, we will be talking about \$300,000 in potential carryover; that is one way of thinking about it.

JL: The tightening up of the budget was relatively small, but this time around it could involve a huge amount of money.

HC: We could have to come back to this table. We would have to reconvene the meeting. We've had this happened before, in fact this happened the year before last where we had to come back and look at the budget. I think if we organize this properly, we can probably have a really good sense in our minds of this budget.

AG: I think that this process has worked fairly well in the past. One of the things that has been mentioned in P&O by Natasha in particular is a priority list, lots of priority list because it will not be cleared in the time frame that we have to submit stuff to the district. They are looking more for priority list and guidance as to what we want to happen. We will prioritize, but here is a priority list of the other things we want to fund.

PS: We might also How is my EL program going to be funded now? How is my teacher leadership structure going to be funded? There are other places where I will have to address is the reorganization of budget and I don't want those things to be in conflict.

OW: What is the timeline on those five steps?

HC: It happens over two meetings. One is an ordinary length meeting, and the second meeting we've basically we meet from 4:30 to about 10pm. In the last few years we've always reached a budget with either consensus, or with a dissenting vote and/or one abstention. It's a long meeting. The process that we've used in the past is to make sure that every one's voice is heard. We go around the table so that everyone gets a chance to talk. It's exhausting, but it insures that everyone's voice is heard.

CL: Question about the applicants presentations. Do we have restrictions on the number of presentations they can make?

HC: We ask them to register for those meetings. Then depending on how many people are registered for one meeting we allocate time. So if there are ten people they get two minutes each, versus four minutes if there are half as many.



**Motion:** Catherine Lazio: I moved to approve the process.

JL seconds

The motion is to approve the process for according to the five steps that we've used in previous

- 12 in favor
- No against
- No abstentions
- 

**Action Item – Approval of Changes to meeting schedule for March and April:**

HC: We won't actually get the final numbers until mid-March, on the other hand we do have this new application form, and a lot of applicants are asking for more time because they are having some technical issues dealing with it.

We're supposed to meet again the 17<sup>th</sup> of March? I think that would be premature, so I would like to cancel the March 17<sup>th</sup> meeting and have our first meeting April 7<sup>th</sup> – first budget meeting. Second Budget Meeting would be April 21<sup>st</sup>.

April 7<sup>th</sup> meeting from 4:30 to 7pm

April 21<sup>st</sup> 4:30 until budget is reached.

HC: The evaluations are still due on the 10<sup>th</sup> – that date is set

**Motion:** Matt Albinson: motion to move meeting dates back two weeks.

*12 votes in favor  
No abstentions*

HC: I would like to take two minutes to approve giving proposals writers a bit more time.

*Approve a change in the schedule: Proposals to March 17<sup>th</sup>*

*12 in favor. No abstentions.*

Adjourn: 6:04pm

