

Stewarding Body Meeting

February 12, 2024

Attendees: Gustavo Olvera, Chelsea Mabie, Cayle Tern, Rutila Galvan-Rodriguez, Allie Ivey, Vilay Greene, Wei-Wei Lou, Karen Perez, Frank Caropelo, Deb Bufton

1. Welcome & Connection

- a. Land Acknowledgment
 - i. First Nations Development Institute - reflections on Black History Month
- b. Community Agreements
 - i. Reviewed agreements
 - ii. Leaning into the agreements, particularly when looking at data is important to center
- c. Framing: Opportunity to align to SIA priorities
 - i. Focus on budget to set the tone - opportunity to lean into SIA priorities
 - ii. Learning about the progress check protocol in the hopes of feeling comfortable with the process to share with/support the Advisory Body during the next meeting

2. Budget Update from Frank

- a. Considerations & Implications for the SST
 - i. Reviewed current expenditures versus revenue including initial forecasts for 2024-25 noting a \$18.5 million shortfall (if rolling forward current activities). Looking to trim general fund budget to accommodate budget needs
 - ii. Anticipated loss of FTE given budget shortfall including the Chief Academic Officer with job responsibilities falling under the work of the superintendent beginning in the 2024-25 school year
 - iii. Current bargaining is a backdrop to the budget shortfall
 - iv. Implemented a hiring and spending freeze in November 2023
 - v. Budget committee meeting with the school board will include potential shifts to FTE and reductions in purchase services, supplies, etc.
 - vi. Will be meeting with the board in order to seek guidance related to the bargaining process
 - vii. Interested in accessing Intensive Program funds in order to maintain current positions

3. Progress Check Cycle

- a. Aim this Evening: Learning into the process to support the broader advisory later in the month
- b. ATLAS Protocol for Preview

- c. Progress Check Document
 - i. Intensive Program is built on improvement science with recommendations being the theory and the progress checks serving as an opportunity to test that theory through the PDSA (Plan Do Study Act) cycle
- d. Process for the Evening
 - i. Examine 1 Recommendation: Kindergarten EAs
 - 1. Review the Data (10-minutes) → Individual
 - a. Focusing on the success metric: Principal confirmation that all kinder students receive small group instruction throughout the course of a week (either by EA and/or Teacher)
 - i. An email was sent to all principals (not only of those principals who have kinder EAs that are funded by the Intensive Program) around three questions: *How many kinder students receive small group instruction per week by the teacher or kinder EA? What type of small group instruction do kinder students receive? What is the average length of time per day or week that kinder students receive small group instruction?*
 - 2. Describe the Data (10-minutes)
 - a. There were several schools that noted that less than 100% of their students were receiving small group instruction.
 - b. Alder is doing 75 minutes of small group instruction per day
 - c. Some of the schools with lower data had less time however this was not consistent across the board
 - d. There is a large variance across the schools
 - e. Some schools are serving all students while other schools are choosing specific groups of students to receive small group instruction
 - f. Alder is focusing heavily on reading and math while other schools are still focused on behavioral support
 - g. All schools are using their EAs for instruction
 - 3. Interpreting the Data (10-minutes)
 - a. What is the impact of the variance on student performance?
 - b. Why is there a variance in terms of percentage of students served and number of minutes in small group instruction?
 - c. What is the “other” in terms of small group instruction that kinders are receiving?
 - d. What percentage of time is occurring for small group instruction in each of the categories (e.g. reading, math, and other)?
 - e. How was the purpose of kinder EAs communicated with schools?

- f. It did take time to get positions hired at the beginning of the year and there was a higher need for behavioral support than literacy instruction. Schools were reminded to shift to literacy instruction in October (this included training for EAs). Transition time could be impacting the variance across schools
 - g. Variances could be based on the needs within the school around behavioral support as well as the training and experience of the administrator.
 - h. The variance at the schools could be a product of unfilled EA positions.
 - i. Unclear whether there was direction at the beginning of the school year with regard to expectations for the use of EAs and the time for small group instruction which could cause variance in the data
 - j. The data was difficult to interpret as the schools and school populations are different, EAs are coming with a different set of skills, kindergarten teachers teach differently which might impact how much small group instruction students are receiving, and there might be different interpretations as to what constitutes small group instruction
 - k. How much of the day are EAs able to spend time in the classroom vs. other duties as assigned? There were clear expectations to school administrators regarding the use of time to be spent on small group instruction with some duties related to kindergarten including recess or lunch duty for kindergarten
 - l. Far east county schools did not have 100% of their students receiving small group instruction tend to have a lower number of multilingual learners which could impact how many students are receiving small group instruction
4. Implications for the Intensive Program (10-minutes)
- a. Looking at the number of minutes of instruction as compared to how much better students are doing would be helpful in order to identify the ideal number of minutes of small group instruction is best practice. Next steps = provide greater guidance to schools regarding the use of EAs
 - b. Schools are utilizing them but more time is needed for the outcomes to be reached
 - c. The current data is too vague/broad and data collection is too soon to truly determine the impact of the EAs
 - d. There is some data that cannot be gathered from the graphs but will be able to be gathered through conversations with the

leadership in order to understand what is happening and what is needed

- e. Students who are struggling tend to have more behavior issues - looking at the intersection of this data and behavior data would be interesting to review and monitor in order to understand how small group instruction is impacting students
- f. If concentrating on individual students it will be difficult to compare as each cohort of students is different but understanding the impact more holistically will be helpful

ii. Debrief Process

1. An area to capture wonderings would be helpful so that questions that are coming up during the protocol can be answered at a later time
2. Since there was not a ton of data, the process at each piece could be shorter
3. If the goal is to get through each area there is a potential to have each be a shorter time or to have small groups focus on different areas
4. Looking at data ahead of time would be helpful for folks to be able to process and take notes. This would also help to get some answers to questions that people may have before the discussion.
5. Having a facilitator within this process is needed, however, not having a skilled facilitator would make the work difficult
6. It's important to state that the goal of the process is not to come to solutions rather to focus on the process
7. Getting the data ahead of time might allow us to get some answers to questions that people may have before the discussion.

4. Recommendations & Future Recommendations

a. Budget Connections

- i. \$7.5 million remaining after 2023-24 encumbered dollars
- ii. Over two years (24-25 and 25-26) there is approximately \$1.8 million unallocated without any reductions in current recommendations
- iii. Potential to consider what recommendations will be carried forward when evaluating their effectiveness
- iv. Proposed IP spending: Shift 4 DOME TOSAs to 4 ELL teachers, 4 additional classroom teachers, 4 additional social workers, .4 FTE Cosmetology, 1 C&I TOSA, and Cosmetology supplies and materials

b. What is percolating for folks?

- i. What is the best way to maximize Intensive Program dollars to support the current system including regarding alignment with the strategic plan?

- ii. Consider reviewing the current teacher leadership structure in the district and develop a leadership structure at the school level.
 - iii. Requested a side by side comparison of other IP funded positions and the possibility of shifting those positions directly to schools/classrooms.
 - iv. There is opportunity for Intensive Program Stewards to support and collaborate as a thought partner when thinking about next steps, timelines, alignment, etc.
 - v. For future recommendations, pairing district staff and a steward is a helpful strategy moving forward
 - vi. Ensuring that there is continued support for literacy and EAs are essential within the district
- c. New (Proposed) Recommendations
- i. **Budget:** Proposed IP spending: Shift 4 DOME TOSAs to 4 ELL teachers, 4 additional classroom teachers, 4 additional social workers, .4 FTE Cosmetology, 1 C&I TOSA, and Cosmetology supplies and materials
 - ii. **Community Engagement:** Explore professional development to strengthen family engagement practices (Dr. Mapp workshop series) - proposed amount = < \$40k
 - 1. This recommendation will support/is aligned with the district equity work
 - 2. Potential to partner with Rutila, Justin, and Gustavo on the recommendation
 - iii. **Extracurricular Activities:** Resource support for high school clubs/extracurricular activities as increased engagement is important for the well-being of high school students
 - iv. **Next Steps:**
 - 1. Gather feedback in Google Forms in order to share with the Advisory Body on 2/27 (as feels reasonable) for discussion
 - 2. Leads on the recommendations will gather materials and work to put together a formal proposal

5. Open Space/Questions/Needs

6. Next Steps

- a. February 23 or 26- Quick Tuning Meeting (30-minutes)
 - i. Will follow-up with email or doodle poll to identify a time to hold this meeting
- b. Advising Body Meeting: February 27
- c. Site Visit Dates:
 - i. Tuesday, February 27
 - 1. Every steward will visit a different school at various levels
 - ii. Tuesday, May 14