

## **BLT meeting notes - draft unapproved (page 1 of 2)**

### **November 8<sup>th</sup>, 8:00AM**

#### **Attendees:**

Prin. Dedy Fauntleroy; Kathleen Gillespie; Margretta Murnane; Stephen Hodges; John Hake; JoJean Peters; Maria Buceta Miller; Lucie Campbell; Marianne Hudson; Anna Dukes

#### **Old Business Discussion:**

1. Received copies of BLT Minutes from September & October Meetings
2. DF Handed out BLT Bylaws . Discussed need to update some of the sections (e.g. mention of BOC as represented on BLT), agree that may not address any needed bylaw changes until Spring.
3. Math In Focus Update – materials officially ordered and coming soon for all Math classrooms.
4. Technology Plan –Kathleen gave update. Will soon (January) be getting new computers for student use. Estimate approximately 5 per each homeroom (5 X 19). After much discussion with SPS technology team the best option for our school was desktops and not laptops. Explained logistic challenges of laptops such as charging limitations and required carts. Computers in most cases will be in pods outside classrooms such as they are currently.  
Note: mentioned that the big technology wish item from staff are SMART BOARDS. Comment that it really does change the learning environment in classrooms...amazing tool.
5. Literacy Tutoring program – Kathleen updated group that this starts Nov 12<sup>th</sup> (3-5<sup>th</sup> grade students that need little extra phonics & comprehension support); Using PTSA funds of \$7000. Five tutors plus limited coordinator time will assist about 22 students. Each student will receive hour and half per week in small group instruction. Teachers identified the students. These are students that don't qualify for SPS district literacy support funds. (Note JSIS reading support staff are really only K-2<sup>nd</sup>.)

#### **New Business:**

1. CSIP – Reviewed CSIP Goals document handed out by Dedy. This detailed format is provided by SPS - Dedy completed based on review of goals with staff and review with BLT at October this year maybe should be more about:
  - Common core alignment
  - Moving more students from Level 3 to Level 4 on the MSP test.
  - Include Social Studies so that it is something the staff will spend time evaluating & planning changes.

## **BLT 11/8/13 Meeting Notes – continued (page 2 of 2)**

### **New Business (con't)**

2. Vacation Leave Requests being submitted more and more frequently to front office & Principal. Dedy thought it is a good time to discuss in BLT. DF feels it is important for office to have clear, consistent message & policy.

Discussion that students missing school creates workload issues for teachers; BUT, more importantly, the student misses mini-lessons in English/Math, hands on science lessons and language immersion. These type of learning opportunities often impossible to replicate outside school day.

### **Need to have clear communication to families. Ideas brought forward:**

1. Discuss relative impact of missing 1 week or 10 days of school (days per year this means) and why the district policy is not to designate vacation as “excused”
2. Clearly state to parents that if your child is out because of vacation they will be marked as “unexcused vacation” (religious holidays and funerals are not considered vacation days and are excused). Share the SPS Web site links with parents – the official policy on absences.
3. Let parents know that there is no need to create an “education plan” for teachers to sign off on. It is a great tool for the parent but really not needed by teachers. Teachers can share what missed topics will be during unexcused absences but it ultimately is parent responsibility to cover those missed topics.

### **3. Annual Fund**

Stephen Hodges said AF team had a meeting this week to discuss recruitment and strategy. Asked if BLT could continue discussion relating to AF goal & the purpose of the funds. Specifically, does the AF team make the campaign message less specific regarding what money used for? And, are there other critical needs beyond Immersion Language Assistants that a small portion of money could support? For example, would it work to say, “90% of funds will go towards IAs & interns in classrooms and other 10% will go towards XXX.”

Discussion relating to whether we should have more interns going forward since it is more cost effective than fulltime IA. Dedy will discuss issue with staff since interns have other “non monetary” costs and IAs have benefits that are hard to quantify.