

PLEASE POST

PLEASE POST



San Diego Unified School District
Office of Accountability
Monitoring and Accountability Reporting Department

District Advisory Council for Compensatory Education Programs
Executive Board Meeting – May 7, 2014, 6:30-7:30 p.m.
Harold J. Ballard Parent Center * 2375 Congress Street * San Diego, CA 92110

EXECUTIVE MINUTES

ITEMS	DESCRIPTION/ACTIONS	ACTION
<p>1. Welcome/Call to Order/ Approval of Minutes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action item: Approval of draft Minutes from March 5, 2014 by Amy Redding, DAC Chairperson 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chairperson Redding called meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. with quorum established. District staff present included Superintendent Cindy Marten, Chief of Staff Staci Monreal, Executive Director/Office of Accountability Ron Rode, and Director of Budget Development Ami Shackelford. DAC Executive Board members in attendance were: Amy Redding, Suzy Reid, Eric Gonzales, Sally Smith, Helen Green, Rocco Greco, Emilia Castillo, and Moira Allbritton; Imani Robinson and Gabriela Contreras-Misirlioglu joined the meeting in progress. Diana Cruz also participated. Smith moved, with Gonzales seconding, approval of draft minutes of March 5, 2014 meeting; the motion carried unanimously.
<p>2. Business a. Four Digit Budget Code Report</p>	<p>a. Informational: Amy Redding, Chairperson</p>	<p>a. The team discussed the last general membership meeting, noting the uptick in audience participation translated into extension of meeting and some break from meeting protocol. Recommendations for improved flow include requesting handouts for all future budget presentations and using a “parking lot” strategy for managing “hot topic” feedback items.</p> <p>Suzy reviewed attendance data. She and Howard will follow up with Area Superintendents to ensure adequate representation, especially from sites with high concentration of Title I-qualifying students. [See attached information]. It was suggested that the LCFF Summary be provided to the District’s new QA department; the Chairperson will follow-up. Eric moved, with Sally seconding, to decline participation/refrain from comment on the Cluster Congress document provided; motion carried unanimously.</p>

PLEASE POST

PLEASE POST

ITEMS	DESCRIPTION/ACTIONS	ACTION
<p>continued - a. Four Digit Budget Code Report</p>	<p>a. Informational: Amy Redding, Chairperson</p>	<p>a. Sally moved, with Helen seconding, recommendation to agendize Parent Advisory Leaders input document for March general membership meeting; the motion passed, 8-0-1. Rode deferred to Marten and Monreal, who concluded that the 4-digit budget code pilot would provide enhanced transparency but would not promote identification of expenditures that positively impacted student results. [Marten noted that there is no 1-1 correlation between funding and results in education – that a child is more than a test score.] Furthermore, Marten does not think that the 4-digit pilot can be aggregated for a large system. She feels that now that we have LCFF and LCAP, we will have a broader spectrum of metrics to review that will help evaluate all 12 Quality Indicators.</p> <p>Lastly, she concurred that the intention of seeking best practices was noble but that it would be a poor use of resources to roll out 4-digit coding district-wide, reminding those gathered that she inherited this board directive and would have made a different recommendation. Monreal shared her experiences as principal at Marshall Elementary regarding discipline metrics as an example of what CSTs wouldn't measure. Protracted discussion by those present ensued. Board members expressed a number of concerns, including that the agendized informational report was not delivered, that this was a Board of Education action, that there was no expectation that only CSTs would be used as the metric, that a primary objective was transparency, efficiency, consistency across sites, and accountability, that we sought more detail as to the impediments on implementation of the 4-digit budget code, and that the general membership needed to receive a presentation so that the body could be involved in decision-making. It should be noted that board members also expressed appreciation of staff time in joining us, recognized the issue of limited resources, and desired that reliability/measurability/validity/relevance be satisfactorily established prior to widespread implementation.</p> <p>Q: Did SDUSD do the pilot? A: Yes. Q: Is there a report? A: We have reviewed initial data; draft is definitely not in a format ready to be shared.</p>

PLEASE POST

PLEASE POST

ITEMS	DESCRIPTION/ACTIONS	ACTION
<p>continued - a. Four Digit Budget Code Report</p> <p>b. Awards Ceremony</p> <p>c. LCAP</p>	<p>a. Informational: Amy Redding, Chairperson</p> <p>b. Informational: Amy Redding, Chairperson</p> <p>c. Informational: Amy Redding, Chairperson</p>	<p>a. Shackelford recommended looking at alternatives that would assist SSCs in tracking migration from budget to amended budgets to actuals. She also stated that the 4-digit code remained doable. Redding requested, with consensus of board, that staff present “Vices and Virtues of the 4-Digit Budget Code” at the June 2014 DAC general membership meeting. This presentation shall report out the pilot data for one sample site and compare to the data that the site could review under the proposed LCAP. Redding also requested that Monreal provide a “Best SSC Practices” talk at a future DAC meeting.</p> <p>b. The upcoming Awards Ceremony (May DAC meeting) was discussed. Gonzales moved, with Allbritton seconding, to provide sites with perfect attendance receive books for library; the motion was passed unanimously. Redding will request binders and A-to-G inserts for DAC members of the District separately.</p>
<p><u>LCAP Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Document is very difficult to read in current format. -LCAP does not include process for which data will be disseminated; all metrics need to be public. -Current “School-wide Climate Survey” is inadequate; requests supplemental SDUSD climate survey is developed and utilized by every site. -Concerned that the review/reporting of metrics does not specify how, when and by whom during years; this type of information was part of LEA Plans. -Seeks clarification of the budget for Quality Teaching. -Lacks audits for appropriation of funds as part of accountability. -Current schedule of site inspections is inadequate. -Target population does not align with metrics. (pg. 8) -Unclear how this document promotes accountability for Supplemental and Concentration grants. We need far more specificity about target populations (e.g., low-income, English learners, etc.). -Overall lack of accountability throughout LCAP for GATE-identified students; GATE only appears one time. -Will SDUSD segregate performance data by subgroups delineated? At each site? (page 10) -What metrics will be used for measuring teachers? (pg. 11) LCAP needs to provide a way to measure like-subject, like-grade student outcomes across teachers. Example: Advanced 6th grade Math scores of different classes compared to each other. 		

ACTION

c. LCAP Comments

- What are the metrics for Quality Leadership?
- What are the metrics for Professional Development?
- District not implementing own policy on differentiated instruction for Seminar students in plan.
- What will be different/improved for students? We need measurable goals with either a percentage gain or raw value gain (i.e., *more* students).
- Where is the baseline data? Most of these metrics are already collected so SDUSD needs to put into the document where we are performing today or else we will spend a year planning, designing, etc., and not be able to statistically demonstrate where we have made progress. Especially as we implement Common Core and do not receive individual student test results, this baseline data is crucial.
- Troubled that, as of 7 May, 2014, the website still reads that translation of document is pending.
- Short of holding a forum at each school, the DAC needs to applaud the stakeholder engagement process used by SDUSD. Truly, this is the level we expect for all future engagement.
- Y1 = Y2 = Y3 verbiage is hard-to-read and lacks meaning.
- Omission of GATE throughout document is striking.
- This document singles out only 2 minority groups for measurement; is this because there is not an achievement gap for other groups or is it because the other groups lack effective, vocal advocacy? (pg. 9)
- Recommend adding “Post-IEP Meeting Survey results” already collected by Special Education Division to list of metrics. (pg. 13)
- Recommend adding “Percentage of Students for whom parent/teacher conferences are held” by reporting period as a metric for parent engagement. (pg. 13)
- Do we have a metric to measure access to technology – both Assistive Technology and i21 – for students with disabilities?
- Several LCAP items suggest that we are not currently complying with Ed Code with regard to students with disabilities (i.e., access for TK/K students, pg. 20-21; create/monitor implementation of appropriate programs/services, pg. 21-22). What are the metrics for students with disabilities who are not graduating/completing transition?
- Where does this document describe a unified system as recommended by Dr. Hehir? On page 27-28, we are still segregating PD for students and English Learners and Students with Disabilities.
- No mention that I can find of Universal Design for Learning, which would reinforce learning by all vulnerable student subgroups.
- ELAC and DELAC are maintained on pg. 42, but DAC is not delineated. Respectfully request this oversight is corrected. -Calling it an accountability plan doesn't make it an accountability plan.
- Allbritton Action Item:** Will develop visual aids to District Priorities/Expenditures for May general meeting.
- Contreras-Misirgliolu Action Item:** Will send example of instrument used to evaluate Quality Teaching.
- Gonzales Action Item:** Will send link to web-based parent evaluation form for teachers.
- Greco Action Item:** Will send policy/procedure reference re: Seminar. [Completed, topic is detailed in Administrative Procedure #4236.]

PLEASE POST

PLEASE POST

District Advisory Council – Executive Meeting
Page 5, Draft Minutes – May 7, 2014

ITEMS	DESCRIPTION/ACTIONS	Action
3. Agenda Setting Set the March 19th, 2014 General Agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action: Amy Redding, Chairperson 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allbritton moved, with Green seconding, to approve the agenda for May 21, 2014 general meeting; motion passed unanimously.
4. Discussion of Future Topics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Strategic Planning Project – Best Practices – Dashboard Presentation – Becky Philpott/AIR Grant Information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of future agenda items 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topics tabled due to time constraints.
5. Public Comments	Open forum for public comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Professional Development is not meaningful if it is not specific to the teacher’s needs. -Troubled that PLCs are used to produce teacher-created materials in lieu of curriculum. This means teachers are not teaching students x hours per week, which hurts students now. This is an inefficient and substandard means of curriculum development, which hurts students later. -Core will not address the needs of all the listed subsets of students. (pg. 8).

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Executive Board Meeting: May 7th, 2014 * 6:30-7:30 p.m.

Harold J. Ballard Parent Center

Child care and Spanish translation are provided at DAC General Meetings only

Next Scheduled DAC General Meeting: March 19th, 2014 * 6:30-8:00 p.m.