



Administrative Consultation Meeting
October 6, 2015
4PM – 3C04
Agenda

Time Started: 4:05

Time Ended: 4:32

I. October 15, 2015 BOE Items requiring consultation:

Office of the Board of Education:

C-5 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO BOARD POLICY GKG(LOCAL),
COMMUNITY RELATIONS, SCHOOL VOLUNTEER PROGRAM—FIRST
READING

Response: Office of Legal Services – Elneita Hutchins-Taylor

Elneita Hutchins-Taylor introduced item to committee and opened floor for concerns; there were none.

Office of Student Support:

G-1 APPROVAL OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS FOR THE 2015–
2016 SCHOOL YEAR

Response: Office of Student Support – Mark Smith

Susan Kaler introduced item to committee and opened floor for concerns; there were none.

G-3 APPROVAL OF THE 2016–2017 ACADEMIC CALENDAR

Response: Office of Student Support – Mark Smith

Susan Kaler introduced item to committee and opened floor for concerns; there were none

G-4 APPROVAL OF FALL 2015 CLASS-SIZE WAIVER REQUESTS FOR
TRANSMITTAL OF REPORT TO THE TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

Response: Office of Student Support – Mark Smith

The number of class size waivers are down 42% from last year.

Mr. Reiner asked if everything was good and that no additional concerns had come up since last meeting. He also stated that he felt that it needs to be addressed at a school campus level and there needs to be more communication with building principals as to why they cannot make some of the adjustments.

Office of Human Resources:

H-1 APPROVAL OF MATH FELLOWS' INCENTIVE PROGRAM FOR THE
2015–2016 SCHOOL YEAR

Response: Office of Human Resources – Gloria Cavazos

Jeff McCanna introduced the item and stated that this is looking at incentives for our Math Fellows that work at our campuses and that we are trying to give them a performance amount up to \$5000. He stated that he thought that was a great incentive for all of the hard work that they do.

Mr. Fuentes asked how his school could get a Math Fellow

Mr. McCanna explained that Math Fellows are assigned to certain campuses that are Apollo and that he could ask how Mr. Fuentes could obtain one because he thought that it was determined by the School's Office.

H-2 APPROVAL OF ASPIRE AWARD PROGRAM FOR TEACHERS, SCHOOL LEADERS, AND CAMPUS-BASED STAFF MEMBERS FOR THE 2015–2016 SCHOOL YEAR

Response: Office of Human Resources – Gloria Cavazos

Jeff McCanna introduced the item and stated that this concerned the changes in allocations for ASPIRE for the 2015-2016 school year due to modifications in funding; the pool of available funds had dropped. The only group maintaining the same amount was those that were under TIFF because when the TIFF grant was written, it locked in the amount for 4 years.

Mr. Reiner asked for clarification on whether everyone was eligible for the same amount,

Mr. McCanna explained that everyone was not.

H-3 APPROVAL OF PERFORMANCE PAY PROGRAM FOR THE CHIEF SCHOOL OFFICERS AND SCHOOL SUPPORT OFFICERS FOR THE 2015–2016 SCHOOL YEAR

Response: Office of Human Resources – Gloria Cavazos

Jeff McCanna introduced the item and stated that this was an adjustment where School Support Officers (SSO's) and School Chief Officers (SCO's) would be eligible for performance pay.

H-4 APPROVAL OF CERTIFIED TEACHER APPRAISAL AND DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM APPRAISERS FOR SCHOOL YEAR 2015–2016

Response: Office of Human Resources – Gloria Cavazos

Jeff McCanna introduced the item to committee and opened floor for concerns; there were none.

H-5 APPROVAL OF INCENTIVE PAYMENT PROGRAM FOR APOLLO AND APOLLO-LIKE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, SCHOOL SUPPORT OFFICERS, AND ACADEMIC PROGRAM MANAGERS FOR THE 2015–2016 SCHOOL YEAR

Response: Office of Human Resources – Gloria Cavazos

Jeff McCanna introduced the item and stated that this was a proposal where school principals, SSO's, and academic program managers would be eligible for incentive payment.

Mr. Reiner asked for clarification on what program managers were, what they did, if they were under the direct supervision of building principals and if they were strictly instructional.

Mr. McCanna stated that they were the staff that worked at Apollo and Apollo-like schools that assisted with the implementation of the program, that while at the school, they were under the direct supervision of the principal and that they helped provide instruction and support to the schools.

Office of Academic Services:

L-2 PROPOSED REVISIONS TO BOARD POLICY EK(LOCAL), TESTING PROGRAMS—SECOND READING

Response: Office of Academic Services – Dr. Andrew Houlihan

Julia Amponsah-Gilder presented item and stated that this was the addition to the EK (Local) about opt-out implications. She stated that this was to lay the foundation for what would happen if a parent decides not to allow their child to test during STAAR testing and that there was now a form that stated the implications that the parents had to sign and return to the campus.

Mr. Reiner asked if the regulations came from the state or school and if the school had any discretion beyond what the state said.

Mrs. Gilder stated that the regulation came from the state which states that state assessments are required by law for all students enrolled in Texas public schools and that the school had no discretion beyond what the state said.

Justin Fuentes asked what happens if a student opts out of the STAAR EOC.

Julia Amponsah-Gilder stated that the state of Texas doesn't allow students to opt-out of state testing. When a student doesn't meet all district and state promotion requirements, he/she is referred to a school-based Grade Placement Committee. In addition, the new Senate Bill 149 still requires a student to take the STAAR EOC. The Individual Graduation Committee (IGC) can determine that the student has demonstrated suitable proficiency in the subject of the failed EOC.

Julia Amponsah-Gilder stated that the next part was a change to district testing monitoring program that stated that the Superintendent could now ask that a school be categorized under priority and that it was no longer only based on whether the school had been under investigation. In addition, the last section changed the assessments under the teacher reassignment policy due to the removal of the Iowa/Logramos grades 1-8, Non-Target, and STAAR-Alternate name changed to STAAR-Alternate 2.

II. HASA Concerns:

Discuss Substitutes and their assignment procedures.

Jeff McCanna stated that we currently have 2007 in our system and there are 496 applicants are coming in on Thursday to interview to be added to the associate teacher pool. We currently have a system in place that if an associate teacher cancels an assignment, they are not eligible to assume another assignment for a 24 hour period. We had hoped this would deter the exact type of behavior that we are having issues with at this time.

III. Houston Area Alliance of Black School Educators (HAABSE) Concerns:

No concerns submitted.

IV. AHSA Concerns:

No concerns submitted.