

**Berkeley High School Site Council**  
**April 30, 2013, 4:15 - 6:00 p.m., Room 213, C Building**  
**Minutes**

**Present:**

Staff: Pasquale Scuderi, Wyn Skeels, David Stevens, Robin van der Vegt

Parents: Rita Himes, Margit Roos-Collins (first half of meeting), Landi Ehnle, Diana Kuderna, Satish Rao (second half of meeting)

Students: Sophia Olaya-Hermes, Alyssa Pace

**Absent:**

Janelle Bugarini, Anne Busacca-Ryan, Laurie Rodney, Jessica Lopez, Michelle Russell Nakayama, Cooper Walton, Shira Rothman, Farah Otero-Amad

**Meeting called to order at 4:25 p.m.**

**Beginning Business Items**

- SGC Members sign in
- Establish a quorum

Quorum established

- Approve agenda

Agenda approved, with some re-ordering.

**Comments from members of the BHS Community (Information)**

There was no public comment.

**2013-2014 Safety Plan (Discussion/Decision)**

Margit (as Safety Committee Chair) explained that the Safety Plan had been approved by the Safety Committee subject to a contingency, in order to ensure that the school will complete the process of assigning staff as disaster team captains. The Safety Committee approval wording is:

“Approved, contingent upon completion of the Disaster ICS position chart before the Safety Plan is submitted to the Office of Student Services, where completion is defined as decision by ICS branch chiefs and commander on first and backup team captain assignments and notification by principal to assigned staff.”

**Motion by Diana Kuderna, seconded by Landi Ehnle:**

**2013-2014 Safety Plan is approved by the BHS SSC, subject to the school’s meeting the Safety Committee’s contingency before sending the Plan to the Office of Student Services.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Status of request to School Board for SSC role clarification**

Christina Faulkner, BUSD Director of Curriculum and Instruction, has been considering how best to progress with this issue and has consulted with Co-Superintendent Neil Smith. If it goes to the Board, then the Board will refer it to the Board Policy Subcommittee for resolution, likely to be a months-long process. Officers and Principal awaiting her input on next steps.

**Updates on SSC data and document requests: Powerpoint from January SSC meeting, April request by Dave Stevens to BEA re options to measure impacts of Constructed Meaning P.D. on student literacy. (Information)**

PowerPoint distributed to SSC members electronically.

As to SSC request to BEA, Stevens spoke with BEA Director. BEA has no resources to fulfill our request on its own. Also it is unclear to them how to look for impacts from CM teacher training.

Himes: it's difficult to hear that the school thinks an action item is working, and then not be able to get data to look at that.

Scuderi: CM is a very wide program that affects all teachers. Some of the math program and CAHSEE results may be a result of CM training. They don't know.

School has decided to focus on CAHSEE results since the students say the CST results are not reliable.

(further presentation by Stevens was deferred until the implementation discussion, later in meeting).

**Proposed Bylaws Changes (Decision)**

At the prior meeting, SSC had approved in principle (no quorum) two bylaws changes to allow for better SSC availability during the early fall. Secretary had slightly amended one of them subsequently to make intention clearer and to reflect change recommended by SSC. Group read the current proposal and voted to approve and send to School Board with a request that they be adopted.

**Moved by Pasquale Scuderi, seconded by Wyn Skeels:**

**That the two proposed bylaws changes be approved and sent to the School Board with a request that they be adopted, where the new bylaws would read as follows:**

**The term of office of the SSC shall be October 1 through September 30 of the following year, or until such time in October as the new SSC is fully constituted. And SSC member may be re-elected for subsequent terms, without limit. [new clause is underlined]**

**[On the bylaws page about the size and composition of the SSC, a note would be added as follows]**

**NOTE: At least two SSC student representatives shall be sophomores or juniors so that they can be present to create a quorum for the meetings in September at the end of their SSC term of office.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

### **Review and adoption of minutes (Decision)**

This time was used to get missing information for prior minutes so they could be finalized and circulated. They had previously been approved by the SSC subject to getting the missing information.

Minutes of October 30, 2012: Principal clarified that the Professional Development plans were not uploaded to a public online site.

Minutes of December 18, 2012: Principal clarified that the correct amount for the 2012-2013 EIA/SCE funds was indeed \$86,562. The amount specified in the 2012-2013 SPSA (\$106,812) is incorrect.

At the end of 2011-12, we had a total projected budget of \$90,000 for 2012-2013 and that included the 0.3 FTE in support for Jessie Luxford's position from the previous year, plus a 1.2 FTE to Parent Resource Center, projected to cost \$62,967.

BSEP made a cut to their funding of Parent Resource Center. That left the school without enough funds for Parent Resource Center. The reason the totals became confusing was because money had to be shifted around to cover everything. The District offered to cover Luxford's position with hourly intervention money, which freed up the rest of the EIA/SCE funds to cover the Parent Resource Center. So: the \$86,562 covered salaries, benefits, everything for Letty Amezcua (at 1.0 FTE) and Irma Parker (at 0.2 FTE) and there's an additional \$10,847 that's been encumbered with probably an additional six weeks of expenses left. So there will probably be carryover of about \$10,000 to \$15,000 at the end of the year. [subsequent clarification: amounts required for a particular individual's FTE can change over the course of a year, for example if that individual chooses a less expensive health insurance option or other benefit.]

**2013-2014 Single Plan for Student Achievement (Information/Discussion) – when and how it will be addressed by SSC.**

Principal will come to SSC at May 21 meeting with a proposed 2013-2014 SPSA based on his work with staff, especially Leadership team. They will be reviewing the full three year WASC plan and deciding which action items to include next, building on what was accomplished and not accomplished this year. SSC vote on the draft plan will be on June 4.

Hard to reconcile SPSA that is overseen by SSC with WASC plan. What we are trying with our single year plans is very different than the procedure used at most schools, which just use the WASC plan and highlight what's being emphasized in a particular year.

Principal wants to reach the point of getting more input from SSC about our priorities and proposed modifications for the document. Ehnle noted that it is a problematic process to bring a proposal to the SSC and ask for our vote – all sort of last-minute. Group agreed that only evident remaining way to have input this year was for individuals and workgroups to bring their proposals and proposed priorities to the May 7 SSC meeting and he could take those to the next Leadership meeting to be discussed and potentially incorporated before he returns with proposal on May 21.

### **Implementation status of SPSA Action Items 2.1**

Summary by action item (Pasquale Scuderi) (Information)

Discussion

2.1.1 done this year for everyone taking Algebra or Geometry, but the pre-assessment approach wasn't as successful as it was for history or English. They'll still be able to use them to show what the kids learned by the time of their summative assessment. But testing kids' level of geometry knowledge when they've never studied geometry doesn't tell much about what level of math mastery they bring to the course. Math Department says it would be more useful to administer a diagnostic test to show areas of weakness and mastery in math generally instead of testing course-content-specific knowledge.

Where this worked well, for example, in 10th grade Social Studies, the pre-assessment involved a writing prompt and several source materials and tested writing ability. Do essentially same test with different prompt in the spring. Math Department might switch to doing their pre-assessment at the end of the first quarter in the course material. Some pre-assessments in math were actually helpful, in that some kids have had the subject the year before, in 8th grade, and pre-assessment shows how much they learned.

Himes: if common core math curriculum is more integrated and cumulative in its approach and we're shifting in that direction, then perhaps the current pre-assessment that's being used now would actually work fine with the common core. Any way to avoid overhauling this and then overhauling it again when core is in place?

Scuderi: Good question. Three years ago when they were first talking about putting these assessments in place, they consulted with Ann Shannon about course outlines and getting more coherence in the department, and she helped them design the math pre-assessment to be at the intersection of the existing California state standards and the common core standards.

Unfortunately the state hasn't made a choice about whether the state assessments will align with the common core which integrates math subjects throughout grades 6-12, or the traditional sequence reflected in the California state standards [separating algebra from geometry in different years].

High-end math students are doing fine. BHS Math Department and Scuderi think part of the reason the mid-level students are having some trouble is the sequencing – the fact that they have a year away from Algebra while taking Geometry, and then teachers must spend an inordinate amount of time reviewing Algebra 1 at the beginning of Algebra 2. IMP 2, 3, and 4 will have a relatively easy time transitioning to common core. But it will be controversial whether or not to go to the integrated math in place of the traditional sequence.

Rao: Are there results from other districts showing improved performance from use of the common core, integrated approach?

Stevens: This is the international approach. It's used widely outside the United States. Better term for it than integrated math would be international math. So there's lots of experience with it.

Scuderi: He can't answer Satish's question about specific outcomes.

Common core is required to be taught by 2014-2015.

Is integrated/international, common core math the same as IMP? No: IMP is "interactive" math; has some aspects in common with common core but it's not the same. IMP is build on stories and themes. The international pathway or common core integrates geometry and algebra and shows relationships between how both subjects are used.

Scuderi thinks main concern people have about moving to common core is they want to be sure there's a clear pathway to being ready for Calculus.

Stevens: District staff have put together a plan so every kid can get to Calculus using the common core.

Himes: what's going on in math at BHS, big picture? Apparently scores aren't that great. Is there more to the school's plan for improving it than just bringing in pre- and post-assessments and the common core?

Scuderi: Definitely on CST they're very low. What he's focused on is "Let's get teachers teaching the same content at the same time so they can collaborate with each other and make adjustments." So developing common assessments was a first step.

What the math department meant by "teaching the same content" when he arrived was that they taught from the same textbook. But textbooks are mammoth, expensive, they contain standards but are not necessarily aligned with standards. The work of the past couple years has been to identify the standards that show up again and again, the ones that appear in both the state standards and the common core, and design the curriculum to match those standards. They need to deepen that work by exploring tutorial options. They need to improve the jumps from Geometry to Algebra 2, and the jump from Algebra 2 to Math Analysis. Both are huge jumps unless a student is really proficient.

Himes: so you're going for a culture shift so department does more of sharing best practices?

Scuderi: yes, across the school and all departments. Holding people to some expectations. We're trying to make more use of BPAR process as it was designed to be used, for helping teachers improve their teaching. Building a base of instructional strategies, classroom organization, and common content that can be assessed formatively over time. Also curriculum creation. Don't think we've ever had a clear curriculum here. There've been a lot of people doing what they want with very good intentions. As to instructional strategies, he still has to argue with people as to why they should post an objective and agenda on the board – sometimes the same people who want process observers at meetings to ensure that the meeting agenda gets followed will argue that following an agenda is not something one should do in a classroom of kids.

Rao: with the exception of Geometry, which is out there by itself, he's been impressed with how integrated his kids' math teaching has been. Probability comes up year after year, starting in 4th grade, which is great since it's so useful. Concepts keep being repeated. So the traditional math curriculum, following state standards, already repeats and refines concepts to a degree that has surprised and pleased him, as a mathematician.

Stevens: With the common core, international standards, my kid's getting probability starting in kindergarten.

Ehnle: She's heard frustration from kids at the extra amount of review that the assessments have caused. There's always been the regular review of prior material at the beginning of the year, and now there's a second round of review in connection with the assessments. Gets tedious for some kids.

Scuderi: not sure how to avoid that.

### **Presentation on February 2013 CAHSEE results and relationship to risk factors**

Dave Stevens presented a chart showing the 10th grader results on the February CAHSEE. Subsequent official numbers from the state will be slightly different but these are correct as of now and very close to what the state formula will produce. Results are broken out by ELA and Math and within those, by ethnicity, students with IEPs, and English learners, by Learning Community [LC]. Special education students and all students with Individual Education Plans [IEPs] are not included in the other columns but have their own column. A blank cell means that there were fewer than ten students in that category so numbers are not published to protect student privacy.

Cumulative pass rates at BHS are pretty high – kids can take it once as sophomores, twice as juniors, and three times as seniors, so the great majority do pass it.

Shaded cell means results are higher than on last year's CAHSEE. So, for example, pass rates rose for African American students in every group except AHA and CAS for English Language Arts and CAS for Math. For students as a whole, the pass rates went up on Math in every Learning Community.

Satish Rao wants to see the 2012 numbers for comparison, to know the amount of change in these pass rates.

Low pass rates for English learners and special education is okay – if have high pass rates, that means that a school is not following the guidelines. Supposed to exit them from English learner category when they start doing well.

Bottom chart on left shows total sophomores in each math course in each LC, and show the percentage of each of those groups who passed the Math CAHSEE. School did two interventions prior to administration of Math CAHSEE:

1. CAS, AHA, and AMPS gave practice test in November. Every kid who took it got feedback on which standards they were weak on, they got an answer key and the test back so they could look at what they got wrong. Teachers could use Illuminate to know what standards the group was weak on and they did follow-up with packets or homework, instruction targeted to those standards. AMPS pass rate came way up – maybe 15 points. CAS rose very slightly, but all three went up. (Talking about Math).
2. Bridge program had a much more intensive intervention, coming into school on four Saturdays, to do iMentor, which was developed by some people living in Berkeley. Kids can also access it remotely (from their homes, etc). iMentor gives them their scores by individual math standard and they can retake a test on a given standard up to five times. It charts their progress, gives them predictions about their likelihood of passing, and is really motivating to kids. Five of the kids used it the night before to take practice tests. Only the sophomore Bridge

cohort did this. AMPS has been having its juniors and seniors do this for a number of years, but this is the first time the school's tried having a sophomore cohort take it. The sophomore Bridges group had a 100% pass rate on the Math CAHSEE. Note from chart on bottom right that that cohort has a very high risk factor [3.2] relative to other groups in the school. [1.97 for school's students as a whole, for example]. [These are the risk factors that Dave Stevens has been developing]. And when they've tested the validity of the risk factors at predicting CAHSEE outcomes, the R squared was .92 – so very high correlation. Makes it that much more significant that the Bridges group, with a high risk factor, nonetheless had a 100% pass rate. Not all the kids went to all the Saturdays, but half of the Bridges kids are AMPS, CAS or AHA so they also got the November testing in class and that intervention.

Himes: aren't Bridge kids a more motivated group?

Stevens: Yes – there is selection bias. When they were asked to participate, they said yes; other kids were asked and said no. You could say AMPS kids are also self-selected – they choose AMPS.

Himes – yes, but they did their work in class – weren't signing up for extra work outside normal school hours.

Scuderi: every Bridge group has a 10-14 day summer session. In upper grades, they continue to have summer session focusing on team-building and leadership training and also credit recovery. Retention is good – so far only two juniors have left program, so at 27 down from 29. About 80 kids in the program right now, counting freshmen, sophomores, and juniors.

Himes: can we expand it? Do you already have all the people who are a good match for this?

Scuderi: definitely wants to expand – talking with Mayor about ideas for funding.

They've identified about 600 kids at BHS who have 3 or more risk factors and GPA's at or below 2.5. Half of those kids (300) have IEPs, so they are already getting Tier 3 intervention with a case manager. He'd like to see a program that offers support to the other 300 kids.

Questions now are 1) what % of these kids could they get involved in a program like Bridge and 2) how much money would be required and from what source? Right now, there are 2 people doing this. Bridge teacher has 55 kids in afterschool program. The way the District is set up, they have to be at 1.0 FTE with full teaching load. Need to find a way to have additional people available, since as of next year, there'll be an additional cohort – will dilute effectiveness if teachers have to spread their attention more thinly. Wondering whether can do funding like Geoffrey Canada in Harlem Children's Zone – would require a true 20/20 partnership with city and industry.

Wants to figure out how to do a radical reinvention of resourcing, so most vulnerable kids get what they need to stay in school, graduate.

Stevens: Inventor of iMentor is willing to allow BHS to expand use of it for free, so they're thinking about offering it during class in all sophomore Algebra 1 classes, for example, since that group had to have flunked Algebra 1 in freshman year in order to be in it as sophomores.

Stevens: As to ELA CAHSEE results: There was no pre-assessment in ELA in any of the LC's, so that intervention didn't occur. The Bridges program emphasized both, the iMentor program does both, but they emphasized the math. In ELA, Bridges kids had 20 pass out of 24, and the ones who didn't pass were extremely close – one was only one question from passing.

Stevens: In understanding significance of risk factors, note that not a single kid with a risk factor below 3 failed the CAHSEE.

Scuderi: The African American sophomores with only one risk factor (their African American ethnicity) passed CAHSEE at an extremely high rate – 96 or 97%. They want to start focusing on risk factors rather than ethnicity in designing interventions and outreach.

Himes: how can we publicize this more?

Ehnle: can we change the SPSA so that instead of focusing Goals on specific ethnicities, it focuses on specially helping kids based on risk factors?

Scuderi: yes.

### **Discussion of agendas for the three remaining SSC meetings**

Himes and Scuderi confirmed that at May 7 and 21 meetings, we must have the EIA/SCE and EIA/EL presentations and the BSEP vote. Need to decide how we're handling the SPSA. Must complete voting on June 4.

EIA/SCE budget projected for next year is lower than this year. Around \$72,000.

EL budget gets approved by ELAC and then must get SSC approval.

A presentation Himes would like to have: Jessie Luxford on evaluation of Bridges program.

Scuderi: BEA is doing that evaluation right now. Could be useful – not sure BEA is done with that work. 84% of junior Bridge cohort is taking 1 or more AP classes passing with a C or better, which is higher than other kids in same risk factor group.

Next year will be the first senior Bridge cohort. Thinks they'll be okay on funding because the district is interested in the model – in using it as a model. BHS has been funding it through ECO funds since it's an additional class outside regular school hours and district has helped with some hourly intervention funding.

Thinks Parent Resource Center should get more money from District. Right now, District provides .27 FTE for Irma Parker. Why isn't it higher when there's a District goal to have parent liaisons in the schools? There are a number of areas where school seems under-resourced relative to district priorities and district spending at other schools.

Himes: Seems like SSC could comment on funding of Bridges program and how we want it to be higher.

Scuderi: Yes. And he's sure they'd be happy to come. Kimberly would come. Ms. D'Adamo's sophomore Bridge cohort got the 100%, giving credit where credit is due.

Other presentations Himes wants:

At-risk model – more detailed look at it

Stevens will follow up with Yukun at BEA on whether Bridges evaluation is done.

Scuderi would also like to have us see some of the qualitative data, such as parent evaluations that ELAC collects.

Himes hoping to get a written report from BEA on Bridges.

Rao: hoping for the 2012 CAHSEE results.

Stevens: we got them last year. Official results are available online.