

Berkeley High School Site Council
April 16, 2013, 4:15 - 6:00 p.m., Conference Room B, D Building
Minutes

Present:

Staff: Pasquale Scuderi, Wyn Skeels, David Stevens, Janelle Bugarini, Robin van der Vegt, Anne Busacca-Ryan

Parents: Rita Himes, Margit Roos-Collins, Landi Ehnle, Diana Kuderna

Students: Sophia Olaya-Hermes

Absent:

Laurie Rodney, Jessica Lopez, Satish Rao, Landi Ehnle, Michelle Russell Nakayama, Cooper Walton, Alyssa Pace, Shira Rothman, Farah Otero-Amad

Others present:

Mary Hurlbert

Meeting called to order at 4:18 p.m.

Beginning Business Items

- SGC Members sign in
- Establish a quorum:

Quorum not established. Two students must be present for a quorum and only one attended.

- Approve agenda
- Agenda approved

Comments from members of the BHS Community

There was no public comment

Review and approve minutes for January 15, 2012

Minutes adopted unanimously, with no changes

Principal's Report (Information)

Physical plant: there was an issue with asbestos in the ground but that appears to be resolved. Hoping can move in to building in spring 2014. Probably new classrooms will go to AHA so they can get out of A building, which has had boiler problems leading to very hot classrooms episodically. Music program will regain two classrooms they had lost. Derby/Moellering Field is looking good and should be ready to open in July.

STAR [CST] testing will happen next week. They expect there will be no STAR testing next year while the state reviews its testing program.

Assessments: They are gearing up for the post-assessments (= summative assessments). Admin had expected this year to be just English, math, social studies, but 15 subject areas have

developed assessments to use this year. Some teachers may use these assessments in late May for course review and some may use as part of their final exam. Results should be in Illuminate by July 1 at the latest. Scuderi can make results available to SSC – can send out a summary sheet to everyone and make detailed results available to those who want to come in and look at them.

CAHSEE: Results are in from this year's tests and pass rates are up. 86% of students passed the math CAHSEE, 89.3% when students with Individual Education Plans (IEP's) are omitted. 84.4% of students passed the English Language Arts (ELA) portion, 88.4% if omit kids with IEPs.

African American student pass rate was 76%, a gain from last year. Pass rates in AMPS went from 64% last year to 87.2% this year. The students who were in the sophomore Summer Bridge program had a 100% pass rate. The Summer Bridge students used iMentor in four Saturday sessions. The AHA, AMPS, and CAS students did practice CAHSEE tests in class and their teachers used Illuminate to identify areas of weakness and work on those.

The school's overall English pass rate went down slightly, but AMPS, AHA, and CAS ELA pass rate went up. Stevens: need state numbers to put trend lines into perspective (i.e., did state pass rate go up or down overall this year?). They aren't yet available.

Freshman Bridge Program: The junior year cohort from that program are thriving, with high numbers on track for graduation and taking and passing AP's.

At Risk Index: Stevens has been developing this – a ranking of risk factors that influence a student's academic outcomes. Allows more meaningful examination of outcomes and more effective targeting of interventions. For example, there are 38 students with no risk factors other than being African American. Their CAHSEE pass rate was 96% this year. They are finding that three or more risk factors seems to be the threshold where things get shaky for the kids.

Ruby's Mural: It went through the approval channels and the AHA teachers said no to installing it.

Data question: Himes requested that district provide data on impact of teacher training in Constructed Meaning and Academic Language. Stevens sent the request to BEA on the spot.

Review Proposed Bylaws Changes (Discussion/Decision)

Discussion of language requiring at least two student SSC members to be younger than seniors so quorum possible for September meetings. Himes recommended specifying they be sophomores or juniors, since elections are in spring, so rising freshmen could not run. Other change extends normal term into whatever point in October the new SSC is ready to be seated.

Group approved both changes. Discussion of how to move this forward to the Board without a formal vote (vote not possible due to absence of quorum).

Implementation status of SPSA Action Items: Goal 3, Action Item 3.1, and Goal 4

Summary by action item (Pasquale Scuderi) (Information) (15 minutes) (4:55 - 5:10)
Discussion (15 minutes) (5:10-5:25)

Notes are keyed to action item numbers in the 2012-2013 SPSA.

3.1.1 Happened at the beginning of the year. Currently crafting next year's.

3.1.2 Mike Weitz and Amy Burke (Math Lead Teachers) have gotten a lot of common core training but for this year, assessments will be based on existing math standards. State says school can do an integrated sequence incorporating international standards or an alternative. Could have an accelerated track. The in-house common assessment will be the current ones but tipped more towards the common core, because the transition to common core courses won't happen next year.

They need textbooks that support the common core. They were hoping for direction from state in March about standards but the state left it up to schools. They expect supplemental course materials that support the common core to be available this fall.

3.1.3 They've done it. The history assessment in 10th grade is a writing assessment.

3.1.4 Don't have interim yet.

3.1.5 He's not sure. Needs to hear from Heidi or Jorge.

3.1.6 Up to 15.

3.1.7 The science and math pre-assessments weren't good. The kids didn't understand the information. Assessments need to be diagnostics. The science department wants to give the kids a chance to take 2nd and 3rd level mid-term assessments so they can get to mastery. [EXPLAIN?] Those would be for a grade.

Bugarini: In AP and IB Spanish classes, teachers are using Illuminate to inform ongoing instruction – get guidance as to what kids do and don't understand.

4.1.1 Idea is to “build by borrowing.” They can now use these common assessments to find the teachers whose kids are learning a concept best and get that teacher to share her/his approach with other teachers of the same course. This is beginning to happen during professional development and department meeting time.

On one of the professional development days, they had teacher-led workshops at which teachers shared their expertise. But at the level of figuring out who gets the biggest increases in student mastery of a topic and having that teacher spread his/her approach, they're still just beginning.

- 1) they've put some of the information online, e.g., “if you want to know about how to teach this topic, talk with _____.”
- 2) They've told department heads who's good, and it's up to those heads to make time in department meetings for that sharing.
- 3) [WHAT WAS 3?]

Presentation of proposed BSEP budget for 2013-2014 (Information/Discussion) -- (35 minutes) (5:25 to 6:00)

Hector Cardenas presented. Mary Hurlbert, from the BUSD BSEP office, attended and participated.

Overview of process and of the BSEP committee:

The role of the SSC is to give an up or down vote. If “yes,” then budget goes to School Board for approval. If “no,” then budget returns to BSEP committee to discuss. If they decide to change it per SSC request, then it returns to SSC for approval. If they decide not to change it, then it goes to School Board and both BSEP and SSC can make the case for their views.

BSEP committee uses three tools. First, they distribute a “Request for Proposal” to the school community, around the end of the calendar year. This year, they got 20 proposals back, which is more than last year.

Second, for proposals funded the year before, committee has a set of guidelines that they follow to evaluate how well those funded entities have performed. BSEP members go in teams of two to visit the funded people, collect the information covered in the guidelines, write it up, and present it to the group.

Third, BSEP has a rubric showing the standards a program or proposal must meet [example: “How many students are directly served by this proposal?”] and explaining how to score that standard. BSEP calibrates the group’s scoring by going through one proposal in painful detail to try to get on common ground about how to interpret the standards and apply the ratings.

They calculate how much it would cost if they fully funded all proposals, and the shortfall between that number and their actual BSEP allotment tells them how much they have to cut. This year’s funding was lower (\$705,000) than last year’s (\$774,000) due to falling enrollment. BSEP funds are tied to enrollment.

Every BSEP member gets the opportunity to speak on each item, to ensure that the same few voices don’t dominate. They go around the table for every proposal. Trade-off is that they have four or five meetings per year that go from 5:30 to 9:30 or 10:30 p.m. But that process results in high support from the committee for the final budget.

There’s always carryover funding that comes in after the budget is submitted, so they also create a carryover priorities list to show what they want funded with any extra monies. This year, they expect that all the carryover priorities will be fully funded.

Busacca-Ryan said it would be good for SSC to know how many students each project helps. Hurlbert said that the full report, including that information, that has been provided by the district in the past, is late this year due to personnel changes (she is supposedly retired), but she committed to getting that report drafted, approved, and to the SSC before our decision must be made.

Members continued discussing BSEP until 6: 25.