

MLCPA

SDMC Minutes

January 29, 2019

Members Present – Faculty: Crook, Garza, Jordan, Riley, GC, Prince

Parent: Bennett; Community Member: Alvin Byrd

### **SDMC Meetings/Welcome**

We are required to have at least one SDMC meeting every quarter.

This meeting requires feedback on one item.

### **Safety Report**

On the latest intruder drill assessment (lock-down walkthrough), we did not do well.

The security inspector was able to enter the school, after being buzzed in, without checking in. Once he was buzzed into the first set of doors, the door to our second set of atrium doors (common hallway) was not completely closed. It was possibly being kept from closing completely by an air tunnel. He gained access to the school through the second set of doors. No one from the office stopped him to tell him to check in. No one stopped him in the hall, including students.

Learnings from this drill – 1. Front office staff needs to account for everyone they buzz in. If someone fails to check in with the office once buzzed in, they need to be stopped and made to check in.  
2. ID stickers are important for visitors.  
3. The students who saw the gentlemen in the hall did not stop him. We need to incorporate some sort of training or process for faculty and/or students to question or approach strangers in the building.

Issue raised by Ms. Bennett – The restroom in the PTO room is almost always left locked on the PTO side by faculty members. This was discussed with Officer Solis. IF the goal during a lock-down is for us to be able to place all rooms on lock-down, we cannot secure the PTO room or lock it down if we can't get into the restroom to lock it from the teacher's lounge side. Faculty needs to be reminded and be sure to leave the door unlocked from the PTO side for safety and access reasons. Crook offered to look into getting a key for access from the PTO room. Suggestion was also made that we consider putting a sign in the bathroom reminding faculty to unlock the door upon leaving the restroom.

### **Modified TADS (Action Item – Feedback requested)**

This pertains to the teacher appraisal system. HISD has its own system and is in the process of modifying it.

Members of the SDMC watched a video and then had a discussion of the appraisal and development of teachers.

The new proposal is – teachers who are rated highly effective or effective be rewarded with less frequent observations.

Minimum qualifications for eligibility – 3 years teaching experience with at least one full year of teaching experience in HISD; on a term or continuing contract.

Performance requirements – teachers are appraised as effective or highly effective in instruction, planning, professional expectations and the teacher cannot be on a growth plan.

Walkthrough requirements – 1 formal, lasting at least 10 minutes and 1 unannounced, lasting at least 30 minutes

Required conferences – meet with appraiser at least 2 times a year - beginning of year (goal setting) and end of year.

Removal from M-TADS – evidence documented through 1 walkthrough and 1 observation

Teachers/Appraiser what it means – teachers have to opt-in to the program annually; 1/1 vs. 2/2; observation, walk-through, goal setting and EOY conference.

Question from Ms. Jordan – How will a teacher know they are eligible/qualified for the program? Is this something administrators could deliberately keep their teachers from knowing about? Answer – Principals should tell them about the opportunity or they should be given the information with their ratings so they know to ask for it or opt-in.

How are school leaders appraised? – School data is used for the appraisal of school leaders.

After discussion, SDMC members all agreed with the proposed changes to the M-TADS appraisal process. Dr. Crook will report the feedback to the district (talent development and performance team).

### **2019/2020 Budget Reduction**

Current proposed reduction for 2019/2020 is \$210 per student. This is the amount all schools are losing per student.

PUA = pupil unit allocation

MLCPA falls under high school PUA. For 2018-19 we were at \$3432 per student. For 2019-20 proposed amount is \$3222 per student. This helps to make up the \$106,000 deficit we have to send to the state under the recapture program.

MLCPA's 2019-20 projected enrollment based upon this year's numbers is 505. This number could fluctuate. A main factor in the fluctuation might be the size of the 6<sup>th</sup> grade class. It may be larger than initially projected. According to Mr. Prince, we currently have 300 applications for the school overall for 6-12 grade. Approximately 200 of those are for 6<sup>th</sup> grade.

With the decrease in PUA, we will have to evaluate budget cuts around the school. While nothing has been decided yet, preliminary thoughts or speculation suggests it may affect the school's hourly/clerical employees, choir, JROTC, and long term subs like Coach Steptoe. Supplies and materials will also probably take a hit and can absorb up to approximately \$30,000 of the loss. Additionally, we may consider looking at UIL and athletics costs to see if these may be impacted. Initial foresight is that we will not be cutting any faculty.

### **Staff Changes**

3 staff changes since our last meeting

Ms. Wilkerson, new 8<sup>th</sup>/9<sup>th</sup> grade English teacher

Mr. Hebert – long term substitute for Mr. Hill's history classes

Mrs. Riley moved from 8<sup>th</sup>/9<sup>th</sup> grade English to school counselor

### **Walk-on Topics**

Enrollment numbers and attendance zone - Garza questioned enrollment/attendance zone possibility. He indicated he heard this would affect our HS sports classification. This was answered in 2 parts. 1. Prince discussed things we have done for enrollment this year, including visiting with 8<sup>th</sup> graders and MS magnet coordinators to recruit high school students, tours, the success of the Man-Up conference and the thought to partner with YWCA to do a similar program for 8<sup>th</sup> graders. There is a recognition that we need to re-recruit our existing 8<sup>th</sup> graders to encourage them to stay for HS. Match day is in March, we

will have a better idea about number after that. 2. Crook addressed the possibility and hurdles with establishing a small attendance zone (1 mile radius around the school). The challenge is for female students who live in the zone. Would they too be zoned here and would we have to accept them? You can't necessarily exclude them from being zoned here solely because they are female, if it is truly an attendance zone. We may have to accept them - especially if they identify as a male. A few boys have attended YWCPA because of how they identify, There is also the question of and consideration being given to the ability for students in the possible attendance zone to be able to "opt-out" and attend a school like Wheatley. Having an attendance zone would possibly allow us to move from 6A to 4A in HS athletics.