



PAJARO VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT MISSION STATEMENT

The Mission of the Pajaro Valley Unified School District is to educate and to support learners in reaching their highest potential. We prepare students to pursue successful futures and to make positive contributions to the community and global society.

FEBRUARY 7, 2007 SPECIAL BOARD MEETING DISTRICT ALTERNATIVE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT ADOPTED MINUTES

District Office - Boardroom
292 Green Valley Road
Watsonville, CA 95076

1.0 OPENING CEREMONY – MEETING OF THE BOARD IN PUBLIC – 7:00 PM

Vice President Turley called the meeting of the Board in order at 7:07 pm.

1.1 Pledge of Allegiance

Trustee Nichols led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

1.2 Welcome by Board President

Trustees, Leslie De Rose, Sandra Nichols, Karen Osmundson, Kim Turley, Libby Wilson, and Willie Yahiro were present; and President Doug Keegan arrived at 7:09 pm.

2.0 APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Trustee Nichols moved to approve the agenda. Trustee De Rose seconded the motion. The motion passed 6/1 (Keegan absent).

3.0 VISITOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Sylvia Previtali, community member, spoke of her concern for the costly construction suits that the district is currently involved in and how they will be affected by Mr. McHenry's leaving. Inquired as to why the district did not accept arbitration when given the opportunity. She's concerned about the general fund moneys that are being used to cover legal costs.

4.0 STUDY SESSION: DISTRICT ALTERNATIVE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

II. Overview of Program Improvement

Terry McHenry reported on the Local Education (LEA) Plan, which was adopted in July 2006 with the overall direction to improve academic achievement to meet AYP and API. The plan has standards-based teaching and learning for all with the following essential components: standards-aligned materials with emphasis on academic language; pacing schedules; formative assessments; systematic and structured teacher collaboration by grade level/department. Academic language training uses resources such as Secondary Academic Language Tools (S.A.L.T.), Frontloading techniques in elementary classrooms, Guided Language Acquisition Design (GLAD), as well as Student Writing Enhanced by Educational Technology (SWEET). Pacing guides were developed to look at integration of content area instruction in order to support the learning needs of all students. The District has purchased EduSoft software to collect and analyze formative assessments and benchmark tests and state test data. In terms of English Language Development, services have been evaluated by an

external consultant with the purpose of revising the English Learners' master plan. Ongoing staff development for EL is intended. He continued to report on how Special Education, Extended Learning, Focused Leadership, and Parent and Community Engagement programs are also working towards focusing on academic achievement. In the past couple of years, the district had school walk-throughs, which have focused on looking at classroom practices and on collecting data.

Recipients of High Priority School Grant that do not meet API two out of three years could be placed under state control. Hyde Elementary and Pajaro Middle School are currently working closely with SAIT team. In addition, if Amesti, MacQuiddy and Lakeview do not meet their API targets this year, they will have a SAIT. He explained the Federal Sanctions in Program Improvement for the following schools in Years 1 through 5: Year 1: Landmark and Radcliff; Year 2: Ann Soldo; Year 3: Alianza, HA Hyde, MacQuiddy, Pajaro Middle; Year 4: Amesti, Calabasas, Lakeview; and Year 5: EA Hall, Freedom, Hall District, Mintie White, Ohlone, Rolling Hills and Starlight. The DAG committee's primary function is to oversee and direct the seven Year 5 schools.

I. Introductions

Dr. Mays introduced and thanked all members of the DAG Committee for their participation in this process, which is very intense. Present at the meeting were: Carolyn Savino, Rhea DeHart, Ylda Noguera, Catherine Hatch, Doug Keegan, Sylvia Mendez, and Terry Eastman. (Faris Sabbah is also part of the committee but was not present). She especially thanked Chris Lopez-Chatfield for her guidance and facilitation of the process. She began her presentation by speaking about the Theory of Change that developed in the 90's, where decisions were school-based; in the late 90's early 2000's the theory of change moved the focus to a district-level decision-making system, calling for strong district-level leadership. The challenges at the district are: services for English Language Learners as well as the use of data for decision-making.

Carolyn Savino briefly commented on how the process had truly involved union participation and the accomplishments of the teachers throughout the process.

III. Overview of DAG Process

- a. Review of Data**
- b. Initial Team Visits**
- c. Corrective Actions - presented to staffs**
- d. Monitoring and Support –Monthly DAG team visits**
- e. Review of Progress – School Reports to DAG by Principals and Union Reps**
- f. Review of the research on reconstitution**

Dr. Mays and Mrs. Lopez-Chatfield presented an overview of the DAG process, which included: review of data; initial team visits; correction actions presented to staffs; monitoring and support with monthly DAG team visits; review of programs via school reports to DAG by principals and union representatives; and finally the review of the research on reconstitution (dismantle school staffs). It was specified that all corrective actions were used with consensus from the entire team. The team focused their observations on the nine Essential Program Components (EPC), which support academic student achievement in English/reading language arts and mathematics as measured by the Academic Program Surveys (APS). The EPC are designed to meet the needs of all students through the State Board of Education- adopted and standards-aligned instructional materials including interventions, appropriate instructional time and pacing schedules, professional development for teachers and administrators, and assignment of fully credentialed highly qualified teachers.

Data reviewed was based on assessment data, such as CST, and CELDT, School Plans, and on Academic Program Survey. In the initial team visit, the committee observed every classroom, they interviewed all staff and some parents, and they held a discussion/debrief among team members. When corrective actions were developed, they were presented to staffs and members of the committee

divided into teams to monitor and support each school. A bi-monthly report of progress from each school given by the principal and union representative is received and reviewed by the committee.

IV. Overview of Findings – Chart with all schools

Mrs. Lopez-Chatfield offered an overview of findings for all seven schools in: 1. Standards-based Teaching and Learning; 2. Data Driven Decision-making; 3. Academic Intervention and Support; and 4. Partnering for Focused Leadership. The chart indicated which school had specific challenges or if the area being observed was a district-wide challenge.

V. Sample – Freedom School

a. Findings and Corrective Actions

b. School Report to DAG

c. Highlights

Mrs. Lopez-Chatfield asked Jean Gottlob, Freedom principal, to offer her report of how the process with the DAG Committee has been at her school. She reported on areas of success and on those posing a barrier in the corrective actions that were presented to the staff.

VI. School Highlights – Schools’ reports to DAG Committee

a. Ohlone

b. Hall District

c. Starlight

d. Mintie White

e. E.A. Hall

f. Rolling Hills

The following principals gave the board an individual report for their respective school: Gloria Miranda of Ohlone; Marilyn Frandeen of Hall District; Erin Haley of Starlight; Olga de Santa Anna of Mintie White; Artemisa Cortez of EA Hall; and Rick Ito of Rolling Hills. They focused in presenting what they felt was an area of success as and area of challenge in the schools’ corrective actions findings.

Board members participated with comments and questions throughout the presentation.

5.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, the Board’s study session was adjourned at 9:35 pm.

Secretary