

Open Classroom School Community Council (SCC) Minutes

Meeting date: Wednesday, Jan 11, 4:30pm

Format: Zoom!:

<https://slcschools-org.zoom.us/j/84915898003?pwd=VVhRSjdoVExWdUxuRjcwV3J1S2NOQT09>

Attendees

Expected SCC Attendees: (Absent highlighted in blue)

1. Karen Holman (Principal)
2. Timothy Kryselmire (Chair)
3. Alejandra Acosta (Co-Chair)
4. Aliska Julian (Past Chair)
5. Danielle Polk (Vice Chair)
6. Maile Cowley (Treasurer)
7. Aileen Hampton (Secretary)
8. James Smith (Teacher Rep)
9. Kristin Salazar (Teacher Rep)

Other Attendees:

Ashley Anderson: Representative from the District. She may be formally asked to serve as a board member and attend SCC regularly. She cannot participate in SCC. Exec members provided clarification that the steering body is no longer SCC like it was last year.

Information Items

Discussion Items

A. Land Trust / School Improvement Plan

Ms. Holman hopes to keep everybody current on the progress/process for submission of land trust. Land Trust will support math development, PBIS, and music; all of last year's money has been spent. The OC has been able to secure a math specialist (Julian). The PBIS committee has been meeting; there is a little extra set aside for PBIS which integrates in the Student Improvement Plan (SIP). This is meant to be more unified and developed with more community support. The OC naturally already has great stakeholder representation.

The program must be finalized by 20JAN. The comprehensive needs assessment needs to be completed by 27FEB. This will be submitted back to the OC in March for revisions then final submission will be beginning of June. This means that this will be written before school is out; there may be some tweaking in September once end of year data is received.

A reminder that the SIP goals include a literacy goal for kindergarten to improve by 5% at composit level. The math goal is a 5% increase. Also, PBIS implementation. The gap achievement goal are for those children who have an IEP. The goal is to reduce the gap in language arts to less than 10%; this may still need to be adjusted.

Last year's Land Trust was spent the way it was intended to be spent. SIC has been involved in the discussion. At this time, the intention is to use the money to support a reading program by getting paras and reading specialists.

The process should go quickly once they say go.

Ms. Acosta wondered what action items can be expected so exec is not scrambling at the last minute. Ms. Holman stated that the support she'll need from parents is with the comprehensive needs assessment piece. This includes the parent survey and wondered what areas the parents are wanting to see improved. There will also be a similar survey to the staff.

The hope is to look at data other than just test scores; this includes referrals to her office and how the children are doing mentally. The SIP has a literacy, math, climate, and achievement gap goal.

Multi-language kiddos are not as much of a concern for us; the school population does not have a lot of ESL children.

By 27FEB the school needs to know what data to utilize. Ms. Acosta wondered who is responsible for the research and if there needs to be guidance or opinions from exec? Ms. Holman stated that she will run this by exec and they'll have an opportunity to provide input. Ms. Holman will have data from tests; but the achievement gap data is a bit trickier to get. The biggest part of this that exec will have input for is the climate goal.

Ms. Cowley stated that SIP was done in September for this year's funding; Steering Body will need to vote on this. Ms. Holman stated that things are going to be going quickly, it will be tight to get the steering information out to the parents and may need to be communicated by email.

Ms. Julian pointed out that the philosophy committee has a survey each year. This may be utilized to address climate goals. Nick 'somebody' would be a good person to talk to. Ms. Holman requested that Ms. Julian agreed to do this. Ms. Cowley stated that Danielle and Ben, chairs on philosophy, also know some information; Nick had trained Danielle about this specific survey.

Ms. Salazar stated that last year the school had some PBIS work to be in compliance with the climate goal. Will this work need to be completed this year? I don't think the philosophy survey played into the goal for that reason. Ms. Holman pointed out that the school now has a PBIS committee to address this. Last year they utilized the classroom agreements in the PBIS; some staff uses it, some didn't like it. Now they implement the Four B's. This is also to be implemented in the common areas like hallway / cafeteria / recess. Ms. Holman does not want to overstretch expectations on staff and have them try to meet too many different goals. Ms. Salazar asked if the literacy and math goals are data driven and Ms. Holman confirmed, in addition to the achievement gap. There is some data that

can be utilized for climate goal; things like if children of color are more represented in behavior plans / punishments. It doesn't appear to be an issue in this school or at least it's not something that Ms. Holman has noticed. The biggest issue is that children with learning disabilities are not performing. Ms. Salazar agreed that the OC does not have a diverse population, but they do have a high percentage of kids with IEPs.

Ms. Cowley stated that she looked up the philosophy meeting minutes from November; it mentions that they are planning another cafe in February. They will likely get a survey out sometime before then. You might have a survey with a cafe and interaction from the community coming up; this may be a good time to get input from the community. Ms. Holman asked that exec communicate to the steering body with the SIP information and that we need input from parents on the climate goal to continue with PBIS. If they feel like a different area should be addressed, additional conversations can happen.

Ms. Hampton stated that the last cafe was poorly attended. Ms. Holman added that the committee was concerned about this and wondered if they should rethink having another cafe. Ms. Hampton stated that they decided it was worth doing again; the ones who showed up thought it was worthwhile. The committee added that it was bad weather that night and it seemed like it interfered with another OC event; it may be good to not have the event double booked.

Ms. Acosta stated she will add this information to the February Steering Agenda.

Ms. Holman stated that the initial SIP goals need to be submitted by 28APR. Ms. Cowley clarified that the land trust grant funds these goals? Ms. Holman stated that because the OC has such limited money, they need to use that to buy curriculum and to fund the salaries of certain people.

Ms. Acosta stated that there is a steering meeting on 11APR which may be a good time for the steering body to vet. This agenda item could be on the next three meetings and there could also be a preliminary vote. Ms. Holman reiterated that the final submission is early June. Exec discussed the possibility of having an early June Steering Meeting. Ms. Acosta asked if the steering body needs to vote on the final submission? Ms. Holman clarified that it's likely only going to be small adjustments like switching the funding source or changing the wording. As long as the steering body approves the initial SIP in April and so long as the actual goals aren't asked to be change, we likely won't need steering to vote again.

The committee discussed policy surrounding Steering Body voting obligations. Mr. Kryselmire clarified that Steering body has final vote on budget / land trust / SIP and to develop and implement policy, approve and implement budget, be a part of hiring, and to obtain feedback and concerns from classrooms. Ms. Cowley directed the committee to look at a specific section of the charter; it indicates that SEC will present the student success plan to steering body for discussion and final

vote. The members discussed whether a June steering body meeting / phone call early June would be best or if the approval can come through an email chain.

B. School Fees

Ms. Holman explained that there have been problems with several families not being picked up on time. They were being sent to aftercare, but it's difficult to staff aftercare and is usually dependent on which kiddos are signed up. The problem is Nicole is only there until 3:30 and teachers are not in the building. SIC discussed a school fine for late pickup; Becky wasn't sure if it would comply with district policy. Her suggestion would be to increase the hourly rate for aftercare. SIC is thinking that the \$6 hourly rate should be increased to \$30. This amount is a bit more affordable, but also painful enough that parents would be incentivized to pick up their children on time.

Ms. Julian wondered if this information has been communicated to the community? Ms. Holman has asked the teachers to discuss this during their next parent meeting. There are consequences for late pickup, sometimes even contacting law enforcement.

Ms. Acosta stated that she doesn't think a mass email that the police are going to be called will land well. Further, Ms. Acosta stated that she assumes that the particular families have been communicated to; it may be important to initially let those parents know of the consequences. Then the community can receive the information via parent letters.

Ms. Holman stated that where they have landed currently is that it will be listed as a school fee; it will require that it be discussed twice and then submitted to the district by the end of this month. Therefore the \$6/hr rate will be changed to a \$30/hr drop in rate.

Ms. Acosta pointed out that families sometimes have emergencies; Ms. Holman agreed and stated that this is not what the teachers and staff are worried about; it's been more of a chronic situation with specific families.

Ms. Salazar provided that as staff they're concerned because they're not going to leave a kid at school. Somebody is going to watch them, but it's frustrating sometimes. It feels like they're being taken advantage of. \$30 drop in rate is appropriate.

The members wondered where the dollar amount came from? Nicole had suggested \$20. It's important to add that any family that qualifies for fee waivers would be waived anyway.

The members wondered if there is support in aftercare? Ms. Holman stated that it depends on the day. The \$6 / hr rate was difficult to manage and they are trying to do away with it. Nicole was doing nothing but billing for aftercare; they need to be able to budget for staff members. This emergency drop in is likely not going to cause that big of a strain on aftercare. The plan is to state that there is

no daily rate, the fee is for kids not picked up on time. Ms. Holman clarified that the rate \$30 total for the afternoon and not just hourly after Ms. Salazar inquired.

Ms. Hampton asked how the OC will charge a fee like this and how will it be paid? Further, what happens if it's waived? Maybe the parents are finding it cheaper to be late than pick the children up on time? Ms. Holman clarified that there has not been a charge as of yet and no inconvenience has been placed on the parents at this point. Nicole would send it the same way she bills aftercare. If the family is on a fee waiver, it's noted on their file and it would be taken care of. Ms. Hampton wondered further if there was any teeth to this payment? Ms. Holman stated not really, if somebody really wants to push it they will send reminders; but they're not going to tell a child that they can't come back to school or withhold anything from them. It's always important to look at it through the child's lens; they know the burden they are placing on the staff; they don't want the children to feel bad about the situation. Sending them to aftercare takes the pressure off the children and the communication goes to the parents.

Ms. Cowley provided a suggestion to create a new fee and call it something different. She hopes that the hourly rate doesn't go away completely. Ms. Holman reiterated that it has been a pain for Nicole and for parents to track down who was there on a drop in rate and who she needs to bill. Further, staffing issues have been horrendous around this issue. Sometimes you have six kids, sometimes you have forty, but you have to staff for forty. Ms. Cowley clarified that they are not utilizing the hourly rate currently and Ms. Holman confirmed.

Mr. Kryselmire stated that it's very important to not refer to this as a fine or anything like that as wording tends to get to people. He likes the idea of an emergency drop in rate of \$30. Ms. Salazar stated that it was easy enough for teachers and the secretaries to send kiddos to aftercare, but the billing afterwards was a nightmare; she hopes to save Nicole from that.

Ms. Polk stated that this may be a good opportunity to have these families connect with their community support representatives. Further there used to be a carpooling document that was filled out; maybe these families just need this type of support.

Ms. Holman wondered if anyone has any problem changing the fee? Ms. Acosta stated that she has no issue with the quantity, just to be careful with how it's worded. Ms. Holman stated that it would be considered a fee, not a fine. Steering exec will need to vote on this.

The members discussed the difference between aftercare and after school enrichment activities when an outside agency comes in and runs these. Children usually can't qualify to waive fees for these types of afterschool activities because it's not run through the district / school.

Voting Items

- A. Approval of minutes from last meeting: Alejandra moves to vote / voting was unanimous

Any Other Items

Next Meetings

Confirm dates for next three SCC meetings

- A. February 8, 2023
- B. March 8, 2023
- C. April 12, 2023
- D. May 10, 2023

Adjourn: Tim motions / Alejandra seconds