

DSIC Meeting - 01/31/2023

Call to Order: 4:15pm

Overview:

- Brief overview from Dr. Chad Jones. Meeting is focused on District of Innovation work. Overview of public area – sound check and video check.
- Introduction from DSIC Chair Sara Ryan

Review of items from previous meeting – DSIC Secretary Heather Turicchi

- Reviewed answers received from Mr. Bates and Human Resources regarding questions from previous meeting
 - Non-Certified teachers and what can be done if they leave their contract early:
 - LCISD can revoke their local certification
 - Do we want to keep someone in the classroom if they do not want to be in the classroom
 - There will be a committee process for details that must be established if innovations are approved
 - Sara and Heather will be on those committees or other teachers
 - District will always look for certified teachers first
 - District is not giving up on finding certified teachers
 - Can the calendar innovation stipulate earliest start time
 - Clarified innovation can address first day of instruction, but can stipulate an earliest start date (ex: no earlier than August 1)

Committee Discussion:

Ms. Ryan led discussion of the remaining innovations. Innovation #1 and #2 were discussed in last meeting. Moving on with additional discussion of innovations #3-6.

Reminder that two innovations were removed from the previous meeting since they were already allowed by current law (Innovation to require less working days with same pay and innovation to allow for credit if attendance is below 90%).

1. Innovation #2: Calendar
 - a. Member: If the calendar changes to have an earlier start date, how does that impact teachers on 192 contract
 - i. Mrs. Marchena: Contract days do not change. When those days start/end could be affected. May work the additional days before or after the school year.
2. Innovation #3: Professional Development discussion
 - a. None needed
3. Innovation #4: Explained that this innovation impacts secondary more than elementary

- a. This innovation allows for more than one administrator to be a campus behavior coordinator.
 - b. Received clarification of what a behavior coordinator can do. Clarified that currently some responsibilities can only be completed by this individual on campus.
 - c. Comment: This would be very helpful on 6th grade campus.
4. Innovation #5:
- a. Chair explanation: This innovation allows for suspension of students at younger grades who have behaviors beyond what is currently allowed for suspension
 - b. Member Comment: Why did the language change from grades 3 and below to grades 2 and below
 - i. Chair: Current law allows grade three students to be suspended. This corrected the innovation to only apply to grade levels impacted (grade 2 and below).
5. Innovation #6:
- a. Chair explanation: Alternative placement does not necessarily equal Alternative Learning Center, rather it is an alternative environment
 - b. Member question: Isn't this SESC
 - i. No. This is not a placement in a special education program
 - c. Member question: Who would watch students at elementary campus in ISS setting? (No additional staffing comes with this) How would this work?
 - i. Chari: That would be committee work with district leadership to develop plan
 - d. Member comment: Two things need to be considered
 - i. This has to be consistent across all campuses. There needs to be behavioral playbook and all campuses need to follow it.
 - ii. There needs to be a chart. This type of action equals ISS; this type of action equals ALC
 - 1. Campus flow chart
 - 2. Campus manual
 - 3. This must be followed everywhere
 - e. Member comment: Can the verbiage of the innovation be changed from "go back to home campus" to "go back to classroom"?
 - f. Clarification: The non-traditional classroom would not be SESC
 - i. SESC is a special education classroom and only students that are identified through an ARD can be placed in that classroom.
 - ii. Federal law must be followed with regards to special education services. That is why middle sentence of this innovation is included.
 - g. Member comment: I think the verbiage should stay as "home campus" since it is not always beneficial for a student to return back to the exact same classroom. Home campus language allows for more flexibility.
 - h. Member comment: Is this really a good thing – to suspend a 6-year old student?
 - i. Member comment: Point is that the student has extreme behavior impacting the classroom.

- i. Member comment: Would the student go to ALC – There is a concern with young children being with older children with poor behavior
 - i. Chair: Young students would not be in same environment as older students
 - j. Member comment: It takes time to collect information for a student to be referred for SPED services for something like an SESC classroom. This takes 45 days for a student to be placed in other environment.
 - k. Member comment: Evacuation of one classroom due to a student behavior impacts not just that classroom but the classroom where the rest of the class are sent.
 - l. Member comment: Appreciate the language that reflects restorative practices. Temporarily removing a student from the setting to receive restorative practices in a small group would be good.
 - m. Member comment: Recommend verbiage change for better parent understanding.
 - i. Change end of the innovation language to be “...their traditional classroom setting.”
 - n. Member comment: Campus implementation does not always equal what is supposed to happen.
 - o. Member comment: How do you pay for this?
 - p. Member comment: Past role was to go to campuses and be there for 2-6 weeks supporting the student and training the teacher on how to handle these behaviors.
 - q. Member comment: I’m an elementary assistant principal – remember that this is an extreme. It feels more like a bridge for a student that needs more support. Administrator on large campus and can only think of 1 student in which this may be applicable. We want to give students tools they need to be successful.
6. General Discussion:
- a. Member comment: Why DOI now?
 - i. Chair: To support us as a large growth district
 - ii. Member comment: Growth does not require these changes like calendar change.
 - b. Member comment: Start date for coaching may start even earlier
 - i. Member comment: UIL sets start/end dates for many sports
 - ii. Member comment: Some coaches do not receive good stipends for the extra work.
 - iii. Member comment: Starting earlier will start district matches earlier, practices would start earlier.
 - c. Member comment: What happens with dual credit students if we start earlier? School starts two weeks before community college starts.
 - i. Member comment: From past experience, first week will be normal “start of year” activities. Week 2 for me was having students get started on college applications. This could also be enrichment activities. This is the

same issue seen right now with Spring semester when students return after winter break, but college classes do not start for two weeks.

- d. Member comment: Proposal for change of calendar. Proposals...no earlier than:
 - i. August 1 (current wording)
 - ii. 2nd Monday in August
 - iii. August 15
- e. Vote: Calendar / First day of instruction
 - i. August 1 – 2 votes
 - ii. 2nd Monday in August – 36 votes
 - iii. August 15 – 15 votes
 - iv. Verbiage of Innovation #2 changed to not start prior to 2nd Monday in August.
- f. Vote: Change Innovation #6 language to “...transition the student successfully back to the traditional classroom environment.”
- g. Vote: Should we move forward as a District of Innovation?
 - i. Yes – 43 votes
 - ii. No – 18 votes
- h. Vote: Individual votes on each innovation
 - i. Innovation #1
 - 1. Yes – 51
 - 2. No – 9
 - ii. Innovation #2
 - 1. Yes – 47
 - 2. No – 13
 - iii. Innovation #3
 - 1. Yes – 57
 - 2. No – 3
 - iv. Innovation #4
 - 1. Yes – 52
 - 2. No – 8
 - v. Innovation #5
 - 1. Yes – 53
 - 2. No – 7
 - vi. Innovation #6
 - 1. Yes – 45
 - 2. No – 15

Meeting Adjourned: 6:06pm

On 2/1, we examined the data and broke it down as follows:

Attendance:

According to the roster, we have 91 DSIC members (This is after we removed non-voting members -ex-officio- positions). Here is a breakdown by total and group:

| Description | Present | Absent |
|-----------------------------|---------|--------|
| Active Members | 61 | 30 |
| Teachers | 49 | 18 |
| Non-Teaching Campus Staff | 5 | 2 |
| Non-Teaching Central Office | 2 | 0 |
| Parent Representative | 2 | 6 |
| Business Representative | 2 | 1 |
| Community Representative | 1 | 3 |

Voting 1/31/2023:

Here is the summary of voting results. Only those present at the meeting voted.

Summary of Results:

| Vote | Become DOI | Innovation #1 | Innovation #2 | Innovation #3 | Innovation #4 |
|---------|------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| YES | 68.9% | 80.3% | 73.8% | 90.2% | 82.0% |
| NO | 29.5% | 14.8% | 21.3% | 4.9% | 13.1% |
| Abstain | 1.6% | 4.9% | 4.9% | 4.9% | 4.9% |
| TOTAL | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

| Innovation #5 | Innovation #6 |
|---------------|---------------|
| 83.6% | 70.5% |
| 11.5% | 24.6% |
| 4.9% | 4.9% |
| 100.0% | 100.0% |