

**District Accountability Committee  
Meeting Notes  
Tuesday, May 5, 2009**

**Welcome & Introductions** – DAC Chair, Peter Ruh

**Bylaw Discussion & Vote** –

Waiting for Fall for by-law votes

Exec Membership positions will remain as is until Fall

**Board Report** – Board President, Ken Roberge

DAC reports have been helpful

Crunch time for Board – retreat next week to discuss issues.

**Legislative Update** – Director of Communications and Legislative Policy, Briggs Gamblin

Report on budget at state level – Mid- January

SB 163 has passed and will go to the Governor for signature

**Vote for DAC Exec**

Teegan – Chair

Chuck – Chair Elect

Sharon – Vice Chair

Jennie – Secretary

David – Treasurer

**Sub Committee Reports**

**Destrat & Metrics** – Barry Eakins

Report gives background of this ongoing issue with respect to the 2000 Open

Enrollment Study and the 2005 Stratification Study.

Recommendations –

District should use two metrics in tandem: signed FRL and ELL differentials as measures of the difference between the demographics of students attending a school and living in the schools attendance area.

The number that reported should be signed (+ or –) for the differential.

Report the number of students in each group to account for schools with small populations that create large differentials.

Confidence interval, to differentiate between a significant difference or a statistical anomaly.

Plan not targeted at every school – should it be?

Realistic goals should be set. How do you measure when you have met your target without a goal?

Problems -

Committee could not find the definition of stratification. It is not in the previous studies or on the website.

Databases - Multiple home-address databases & some data collection and processing has changed over time.

Challenge to staff to do ongoing analysis – board should be aware.

#### Plans for future work

Evaluate opportunities available to students within the FRL and ELL subgroups.  
Evaluate individual school funding, especially with respect to PTO/PTA contributions and Title I and grant monies, for systematic discrepancies that could lead to reduced student opportunities at each school.

Determine the best achievement metrics (e.g., CSAP scores, literacy data, high-school graduation rates, ESL Program 'graduation' rate) to assess whether destratification efforts increase student achievement.

Gather data to track tendency for students to stay at their enrolled school, as a potential way to identify programs that are making progress in their destratification efforts by reducing student attrition.

#### Comments –

Superintendent, Chris King – FRL used in part to avoid involving ethnicity – advised by attorney. Destrat is a goal in itself – not only for academic achievement.  
Board President, Ken Roberge - Board Retreat – we will be discussing achievement of goals as related to destratification.

#### **Vote –Approved**

#### **Budget Survey Results – Chief of Planning & Assessment, Jonathan Dings**

Summarizing Budget Survey results.

Results for responses that self identified as DAC or SIT members.

- 1 - How best to spend BVSD funds
- 2 - How best to spend Stimulus funds

#### **Budget Report – Executive Director of Budget & Procurement, Bill Sutter**

400 million – Regular Operating Budget

Deficit due to declines in SOT (Specific Ownership Tax -New Cars), Interest Earnings and Property Tax Collections.

Breakdown of Increase from SFA (School Finance Act)

#### **8 Million Increase from SFA**

- 3.8 Million Fiscal Finance Factor (1/26/2010 – Decision as to distribution.)
- 4.2 Million**
- .7 Million amount down in interest
- .6 Million amount down in SOT
- .1 Million CDE takes off the top
- 2.8 Million**
- 1.5 PERA
- 1.2 Health Insurance
- .1 Million (\$100,000) Remaining

**Vote to provide input by forwarding DAC survey results to board– DAC must provide feedback on budget spending. Vote passed.**

#### **Continue – Subcommittee Reports**

## **New School Report Card – Charles Tucker**

Acknowledged that he left Suzette Fike off of the authorship.

### Modifications to existing report card.

Looking to add – Current year's goals and Prior Years results (Past 2-3 years) with graphic representation from SIP's. As well as CDE Growth Model data and link to CDE website.

Had to take things out. Reduce size of Teacher Quality and Parent Satisfaction as well as School Climate. Replace Achievement Data with the CDE Growth Model data.

### Recommendations –

Tracking of goals over time - prior year's results from SIP – allow a blurb from the principal to qualify their achievement – if an ambitious goal.

Looked at the way to make changes with minimal amount of work for BVSD staff  
Include de-stratification efforts in introduction letter – add asterisk to demographic area.

Wanted to take this opportunity to make the report card an Executive summary of SIP.

### Questions –

Do you think having data on goals with + and - will make principals set less ambitious goals? Had the conversation – did not want to punish those schools making ambitious goals. – Goals need to be realistic and will get input from the district, (Jonathan). Annual reports and district goals are already written this way.

### Comments -

Jonathan Dings - Ultimately he and Briggs need to determine how or if to implement the recommendations. DAC need not have the definitive answer to the question.

## **Vote – Approved**

### **Community Engagement – Megen Princehouse**

Tried to narrow focus – but also look at this from a variety of perspectives.

SB 163 keeping an eye on it to possibly change the suggestions committee has made.

### What do you need to get parents involved?

Principal leadership and parental education about the TIES process.

If the principal and staff are not bought into the process, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to engage parents in the process.

Many parents care a lot about their kids' schools, but the TIES process seems dry if not complicated, and uninteresting. Most parents don't necessarily see a connection between TIES goals and their kids.

Recommendations – (For Next Year) - Take time to do it right, keep working on it next year. Board amenable to taking the time.

Investigate/address why community engagement is not happening.  
Get principals to want to do it/provide rationale for why they should do it.  
Is SIP/accreditation plan/process an effective tool?  
Define the role of SIT regarding TIES.  
Consider varying school improvement plans by level/alternative methods (college admissions/remedial coursework/ACT scores).  
Come up with “best practices” for engagement.

### **Bylaw Review – Jeff Anderson**

The committee was charged with reviewing the current by-laws and operating practices of DAC and making recommendations for improvements.  
Also reviewing SB163. (Mostly changes the name of a lot of things.)

#### Operating Procedure Recommendations:

1. The interview portion of the school plan reviews should be discontinued.
2. The composition of the review teams should be changed so that a team is composed of the DAC representative from the school being reviewed plus at least one additional DAC member. First year DAC members will only formally review the plan for their own school (although they could sit-in on other teams) while members with experience will be on the team for the school they represent plus teams for additional schools.
3. When possible, DAC on-site review representatives should include both the DAC representative from that school and another experienced DAC member, preferably the member that reviewed the school's most recent plan.

#### Major by-laws revision recommendations:

1. By-laws should mandate annual review and update of DAC best practices document plus best practices document for each permanent subcommittee.
2. The chair-elect position should be eliminated.
3. Term limits for DAC exec positions should be eliminated.
4. DAC should not have its own budget; the treasurer position should be eliminated.
5. A Membership officer should be added to DAC Exec with specific responsibilities for training and mentoring.
6. A meeting of the general DAC membership with the board should occur during the first two months of the school year.
7. All official reports from DAC to the board should be written. When reporting to the board, the DAC chair should read summary points from the report and answer questions.
8. Seven permanent (but not necessarily active) subcommittees should be aligned with specific legislative requirements.
9. DAC membership should formally include one parent representative from each school, one to three teachers appointed by the district, one to three administrators appointed by the district, and at-large representatives appointed by DAC exec.

Get rid of Interview night. (Straw poll - 13 for, 6 on fence, 4 against)  
Goal of bylaw changes are to make sure that our time is used effectively and efficiently and create an institutional memory.  
Refer to report for motivation of recommendations.

**NO VOTE – Internal not passed to the Board.**

**Best Practice –**

Recommendations for future work –

We want to meet again next year. Take a look at the same schools to see if they continue to make progress.

Build a database or repository of good examples.

Do discussion forum again next year. SITs that attended gave positive feedback.

Create a blog or forum for SIT teams to communicate.

Recommendation new DAC members read the selected SIPs to understand what a good report looks like.

More clear instructions to the interview teams to recommend exceptional schools.

Separate – the High School issue – there didn't seem to be a best example.

**Vote on DAC Exec making the final vote for this report with revisions that were requested. Vote - Approved**

**Ken Roberge** – Thanks to DAC, a lot of gratitude for work you have done, helping to making sure our schools are as good as they can possibly be. It is amazing the amount of time that you all dedicate to the cause.