



SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM

Tuesday, October 1, 2024

MINUTES

Attendees

Stacy Gerard, Parent

Amy Rodriguez, Principal

Rachel Griffiths, Parent

Idesha Fraser, Chairperson, Parent

Kimberlyn Fraser, Parent

Michelle Ravvin, Parent

Dave Ravvin, Parent

Kevin Lemon

Sarah Haftz, Parent

Cassidie Giammarino, Teacher

Sureeta Collie-Cyrus, Parent Coordinator

Idesha Fraser, Parent

Joseph Gonzallez, Teacher

Irene Vallejo, Teacher

Shakeema Brathwaite, UFT Chapter Rep designee

Olivia O'Neal, PTO Co-President

Meeting was called to order at 2:38 PM. Seconded by S Gerard. Welcome from Ms. Fraser, inviting new families. Next session, we will approve notes. AR will be taking notes. Talked about deciding on hybrid meetings. If we want to offer online meetings, we need to identify which conditions when meetings can be held virtually. If we offer virtual meetings, we need to record meetings. Ms. Fraser opened the floor for discussions. Stipulations were read. Question was: Is everyone comfortable? Parent shared meetings should be accessible, everyone should be able to see and be part of the process.

SLT notes are meant to be posted on the website. Allie agreed to be the note-taker. We will combine this month's minutes and will be reviewed and shared with the wider community. Goal is to have as many voices as part of the conversation as possible. Sarah Haftz made a motion, O'Neil seconded. The bylaws will be amended to reflect the change.



SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM

Per the bylaws, the question was asked if we need any more time to amend. Asked for consensus. SH made the motion OO seconded. IF will bring draft with the changes, team will sign, and bylaws will be finalized.

Time was provided to review.

CEP is a fill in the blank platform. Our goals are dictated by the DOE. Equity and partnership fall under those goals. 8% increase called for in literacy, which is a big jump. SWD 10% up is the goal for literacy. Big gap between general performance and SWD performance. However, a lot of SWD students don't take the test, so we might not be capturing their data accurately. Of the SWD students who took the test 18% were proficient. This year, for math and ELA 4th and 5th graders will take the test on the computer. Scores were relatively flat for fifth grade over last year.

June 25, 10% increase for literacy for economically disadvantaged students. Where are these numbers coming from? Does the city think this goal is achievable? The percentages are set by Amy and are a reach goal. They are something to strive towards. What percentage of the school is economically disadvantaged? That number isn't always accurate as it's self-reported.

How did we do last year? *Review for the next SLT - did we hit our goals?

282 is setting the pace city-wide. 2% loss in math schools. X? Rise. Our school held steady amongst dramatic drops in the city last year. When we receive the testing data, we see it in comparison with the rest of the city.

Math

Goal: 3 and 5 to 58% for black students. 3 and 4 11% increase for economically disadvantaged students. Please change the wording for this goal, as it hits a certain way for students of color. Goals for everybody. Triggering for the community. The goals are for the groups that are lowest scoring. Do we have goals for everyone? Or do we focus attention? The verbiage around "black students" can make them feel less. How can we refine these goals so they're less triggering?

*Revisit this verbiage for next meeting.



SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM

Supportive environment: Increase 9% in families reporting how they feel about school support for their children. We get high numbers for teachers but lower numbers for administration. Response rate to that survey is around 25%. Can we brainstorm with EB on ways to increase engagement? Olivia to follow up. Need to bring more people in. Imagine communication is an area of concern - what do we want? What needs to be communicated, and what's the sweet spot? Can we find a middle ground for communication - some people think not enough and some think too much? What works best for most. As technology improves, we can improve, for instance QR codes for information. Link in PTO communication committee. Using class parents for communication.

*Come back to communication.

Chronic absenteeism SWD decrease 10%. ELL chronic absenteeism decrease 10%. (Let's do work on this language.) These numbers are based on days missed per year. What are the barriers for getting to school and how can we encourage attendance.

How effective are the things we've tried? The trends are relatively flat. Same populations have obstacles to regular attendance. Phone calls, home visits, meetings, what are the obstacles? I don't know that we've yielded significant progress. What are the current interventions? The attendance team will meet weekly. It depends on the root causes. For students who live outside the zip code, that's a challenge. Students who take the bus, and that can be an obstacle. Families new to NYC faced obstacles. And the 60 day rule that led to turnover for families enrolled who are in temporary housing. Children with illnesses - one child only present in school 40% of the time. What are we doing in the school to make children WANT to come to school? What is the hook? Should we reward attendance, especially with chronically absent kids. Checking in with students who are chronically absent to ask them what they like about school and what encourages them. Could it be a student government task - to look at data and think about what might motivate kids to WANT to come to school. Idea: should kids be assigned a kid/family buddy? At Ms. G's previous school, there were four teams and every kid was on a team. Competed for attendance, and got a ticket, and then each month each team got a party or extra recess. Perfect attendance movie tickets. Noticing the good work of the school to great and celebrate absent kids when they are in school. Building student's self-empowerment, building rapport with parents as well.



SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM

Meeting shifted to G&T. RG shared background on how the conversation around G&T began. RG shared that IB was brought into the community as a potential “swap out” for G&T. IB assumes all students have unique talents. IB values a heterogeneous experience. Our current classrooms are not currently heterogeneous. Looking at the data, there is a gap between G&T performance and general education environments. In our gen ed classes, top and bottom scores are distributed across the classes. We find a range in each conversation. RG shared six top schools in District 13 and highlighted scores between classrooms across schools. How effective is the program? What I need periods are coming online. Groupings would be fluid, so it avoids labeling students. Committee also looked at segregation. Segregation also has an impact.

OO also shared verbiage on “People of the Global Majority.” She also shared that her student is attending the G&T program and shared that her previous teacher states “it’s not really a G&T program,” referring to the system by which students are selected, and it is based upon a lottery system. SLT makes a vote for recommendation to remove G&T and the Superintendent makes the decision. SH asked what staff, both G&T and non-G&T think about the topic. SB shared there was a sit down discussion with committee members and G&T teachers to get the conversation started. The meeting spoke with mostly G&T teachers. There are some G&T teachers who believe some kids are not learning at the same pace and they deserve accelerated learning. IB supports learning for all. We are also integrating WIN classes, which are homogeneous. If we do this already, what is the purpose for G&T. SB shared that college scholarships ask about AP and IB, not G&T. RG shared G&T classes are on a different schedule and different curriculum and that is not the case. What does accelerated learning really mean?

IF states that if the population is skewed, we cannot look at the data because the data is not accurate. She is less comfortable with the data if the G&T classes are not “true” G&T classes. Currently, lessons are being taught using the IB framework.

Question was asked what this looks like using the IB Framework look for a student who may need acceleration? IB centers student voice and advocacy. It sounds like the community is hung up on the name. Teacher shared her own children’s experiences across populations and they had a huge range of experiences. RG shared the data about classroom’s segregation. SB reviewed the disaggregation of populations and how that range changes in the upper grades. SB shared we have some of the diverse schools, we don’t see that diversity in classrooms. As a



SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM

school, how do we want to be viewed? Prior to AR's tenure, there were so many articles about segregation. The range is problematic. Whatever the process is, we need to make sure all voices are heard so a decision can be made so a robust case can be made so SLT can make a recommendation prior to G&T applications.

We have 6 teachers impacted. OO shared the optics of how this process could impact people who are going through the process. Families who have students already in the school and could be impacted by this decision.

Families would like to see a fully realized plan to voice concerns. Can this plan be developed prior to G&T application? RG shared there has been outreach and would like to come up with a communications outreach plan to help facilitate this conversation.

December 9 is when the application for kindergarten and G&T. Some expressed concern over rescinding offers from families who have already decided to list 282 as their preferred choice.

Next steps:

IF to draft an email inviting teachers and staff to join the conversation around G&T.

RG to proceed with the first parent outreach committee meeting to start encouraging parents to join also.