

Title I Advisory Council
Monday, January 14, 2019, 6pm to 8pm
Woodville K-8
Minutes

Present: Shereika Tucker, Talethia Edwards, Carolyn Hector Hall, Marie-Claire Leman, Allison Stachnik, Rebecca Johnson, Davina Young, LeAnne Ponder, Anita Whitby-Davis, Latrenda Jackson, Shari Gewanter, Charles Williams, Theoria Clark, Steve Mills, Maria McIntyre, Ed Feaver, Courtney Atkins, Mary Jo Peltier, Ashley Scott, Michele Prescott, Lisa Mehr, Patrick Wright, Randall Austin, Michele Gayle, Jessica Andrews, Victoria Williams, Elizabeth Rudd, Steve Sears, Nicole Patton Terry.

Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve the agenda was made by Shari Gewanter and seconded by Charles Williams. Approved by the body.

Woodville spotlight by Principal Mehr

Woodville is a K-8 which means the school grade is based on 9 rubrics. One of these is middle school acceleration. They are trying to improve that with Algebra I and an Agricultural high school class. They are also working on improving learning gains for the bottom 25% and the overall proficiency in ELA. The goal is to achieve a school grade of B. They are building their Ag program: they received a 50,000 USDA grant and this is the first year of the program geared to 4th through 8th grade.

With Title I funds they have hired qualified staff to bring ratio down and get students on grade level; they have increased parent engagement through activities like bingo for books; they are working on student engagement by having clubs and groups such as the Sci Fri group, access to technology through the mag lab and music after school program. Title I funds also provide some professional development.

One characteristic of the community is that it is rural and parents don't live close to the school. Families are dependent on school transport so it is hard to get parents back to the school later. Davina Young, parent at Woodville, described the tight community: there are 600 kids in K-8 and every teacher knows all the kids. A lot of grandparents are involved at the school because parents are going back and forth to Tallahassee for work. They can't always field teams for all the sports but students can play with Nims if Woodville doesn't have enough kids to field its own team.

Announcements and Updates

Ms. Ashley Scott gave us two updates of things to come:

- 1) School District Newspaper: to publicize all free services and events that are available in the district
- 2) Parent Resource Center: a space at the district with computers and other resources – available by next fall.

Presentation by Dr. Michelle Gayle - AdvancED Systems Review

District moved to district-wide accreditation instead of school-level. It made more sense to evaluate all schools together because we are system and not just a collection of schools. This will be our 3rd cycle of district wide accreditation. The team will arrive Sunday Feb 3 2019 and leave on Wed Feb 6 2019. There will be 8 people on the Team. On Monday: an overview of district office; meeting School board members; evaluating academic services; meeting community partners; meeting principals; meeting parents. On Tuesday: the team will visit 8 schools in teams of 2 visiting classrooms and looking at teaching and learning; interviews with parents, teachers and administrators at each school; then after the visit they will conduct the superintendent interview. On Wednesday: the team will be bringing lots of questions to Dr. Gayle. Then they have an exit interview and then they make a recommendation to AdvancED

Questions:

Mr. Feaver: is this done across the State? Dr. Gayle: Yes, across the State and Nation

Do they talk to the kids? Yes, they talk to the kids – interview sessions with 3rd through 12th graders.

They are looking for continuous improvement and in the end they make recommendations and suggestions for improvement. Do they look at Charter schools? No – there is a different accreditation body for Charters.

Whole group – orientation around the draft priorities

1) Financial incentives to attract and retain committed and experienced teachers in Title I schools, in recognition of the higher needs of students in Title I schools.

This should not be seen as far-fetched. There is a sense that financial incentives would have to go through the bargaining system – supplements can be tricky. To attract the best and brightest to Title I schools we have to acknowledge that it is harder to teach at Title I schools and that a different job deserves a commensurately different pay.

The Legislature provides too little money and we have to fight for it. We have to work on securing more funding to meet the needs of all students. And at the same time, stakeholders have to negotiate how this money will be spent. Principals do have to decide what they will do with their allocation of Title I funds but it won't be sufficient to meet the needs of our students. Many ways to spend the money: more bodies in the classroom, better pay for those we train to work in Title I schools with the expectation that they will stay for a certain number of years.

MC Leman: To address needs of Title I school students, we should not be limited to money within Title I budget. Money does and should come from the District to achieve equity of outcome between schools.

C. Atkins: Teacher retention at Title I schools: could the district ask for a 3 year commitment? Since teachers cannot go to transfer day until they have worked for 3 years, there is a basic commitment of 3 years, at least for new teachers.

Sheri Gewanter: You need the right teacher with right principals in Title I schools.

C. Atkins: We could ask the business community to provide incentives and make it a program.

Anita Whitby-Davis: District has to stand behind the administrator to have time to move the needle. Regarding salaries, you get what you pay for. Recognize that it's a calling but they'll leave if they can get more money elsewhere.

Mr. Feaver: We should cost out our proposals. What kind of investment are we asking for?

We want to look at (or have the district look at) cost analysis of proposals. We might also consider piloting some of these ideas before expanding them. We want to find data from places where teacher incentive measures have been used.

Ms. Scott explained that we lose Title I funds when we roll-over more than 15%; we are only able to get back that 15%.

2) Addressing the causes and consequences of economic and racial segregation, namely the lack of equity of resources between schools.

This is the underlining reason for all our work – the reason we need to address the needs differently in Title I schools. We made a clear and compelling case for the inequity between schools when we met with the School Board last year. This is the backdrop of everything we now propose.

T. Edwards: There is a trend to have every school specialize and have its own unique programs. Do we achieve equity when we each specialize? And isn't literacy what each school needs first and foremost?

We should not forget the importance of training parents to be resources to their children – parent engagement \$ to give parents new skills.

3) Providing equitable and comprehensive access to quality pre-K programs and intervening earlier (K-2) with a focus on lower class size and more paras.

We want to better understand what is currently going on in our pre-K programs – everyone seems to have a piece of the pie. We need to get the stakeholders together to really understand the landscape. We want to look into having our own head start programs in the schools. LCS might not be prepared for Head start grant and its requirements.

We understand that Head Start funds slots across the district. As does ELC. We see a need for a coordinated plan of all the providers. Where do the gaps start and end between the different sources of funding? Can we create better collaboration between the various agencies that work on this?

4) Fostering cooperation between Title I schools in recognition that we are all serving ONE community and that we share students through lateral and vertical feeder patterns

(not much time to discuss this) We recognize that we don't use the same methods of intervention everywhere and when a child changes school there is often lost time as we re-establish MTSS. We need better sharing between schools in recognition that we serve many of the same students.