

# Edison Regional Gifted Center Local School Council Regular Meeting

20 SEP 2016

## High Level Summary

The following lists key actions/decisions of the meeting. Details can be found in a subsequent section.

- I. **Call to order / Roll call**
  - A. B Whitford called the meeting to order at 7:01PM
  - B. In attendance (quorum present)
    - i. K Valentine
    - ii. S Quirke
    - iii. J Magas
    - iv. E Perez
    - v. B Whitford
    - vi. D Silvers
    - vii. D Barber
    - viii. C Gourash
    - ix. B Katz
    - x. M Sevig
  - C. Unable to attend
    - i. J Martensen
  - D. Also in attendance were 14 community members
  - E. There was a partial audio recording made of the meeting and the meeting was recorded (video) by one of the stakeholders
- II. **Approval of agenda [7:02PM]**
  - A. B Whitford moved to strike two items from the agenda
    - i. Bylaws
    - ii. Approval of minutes
  - B. B Katz moved to approve the agenda with changes, S Quirke seconded
  - C. Passed unanimously
- III. **Principal's Report [7:06PM]**
  - A. K Valentine gave her monthly report which included the following topics
    - i. New staff (Special Ed teacher)
    - ii. Changes in enrollment (1 less student than projected)
    - iii. Assessment (NWEA, PARC and BOY)
    - iv. Professional Development
    - v. High School Night and Grade Level Parent Meetings
    - vi. Parent engagement
    - vii. Steps taken for school improvement including a listening tour to collect information on what the school is doing right (parental involvement, dedicated staff, desire to innovate, etc.) and areas for improvement (communication, Vertical Alignment, Special Education, etc.)
- IV. **Chairman's Report [7:35PM]**
  - A. B Whitford gave a quick update on the following topics:
    - i. D Oberhardt's appeal (still ongoing)
    - ii. New LSC bulletin board in the school lobby
    - iii. New conference call system being tested
- V. **PPLC Report [7:38PM]**
  - A. D Barber reported that the PPLC had held its first meeting which was mostly an organizational one (setting meeting dates, setting objective) [add write-up]
- VI. **PTO Report [7:40PM]**
  - A. H Steiner gave a report that covered the following topics:
    - i. Current allocation report
    - ii. PTO board met with K Valentine to address gaps in the budget
    - iii. Track-A-Thon
    - iv. PTO membership drive

- B. There was discussion regarding funds that would be rolled over into next year. H Steiner stated that \$20-\$30K would be rolled over into the next year. Rolling over funds was acceptable provided that the community was made aware of the PTO's intention to do so before raising funds.

**VII. New Business [7:45PM]**

- A. K Valentine presented 2 expenditures that needed to be approved for subscriptions to instructional materials
  - i. Scholastic (\$2,225.01) (Taken from Class Subscription Fees account)
    - 1. S Quirke moved to approve the expenditure, J Magas seconded
    - 2. Approved unanimously
  - ii. Tynker (\$3,600) (Taken from Computer Education account)
    - 1. B Whitford moved to approve the expenditure, E Perez seconded
    - 2. Approved unanimously
- B. K Valentine proposed transferring \$5,600 in the internal accounts donated to the school to covers Fine Arts and Science
  - i. B Whitford moved to approve the transfer, S Quirke seconded
  - ii. Approved unanimously
- C. K Valentine proposed to move PTO donations to the corresponding lines
  - i. S Quirke made the motion to approve the move, M Sevig seconded
  - ii. Approved unanimously
- D. K Valentine presented three balance transfers that needed to be approved
  - i. Non-personnel (\$.48)
  - ii. CPS error in Hyperion/Oracle (\$2,189.75)
    - 1. K Valentine moved to approve the transfer, B Katz seconded
    - 2. Approved unanimously
  - iii. Negative Balance due to enrollment being down one student from the projected enrollment (\$4,500)
    - 1. K Valentine made the motion to approve the transfer, E Perez seconded
    - 2. Approved unanimously
- E. There was discussion regarding ERGC's participation in the Chicago Children's Choir.

**VIII. Old Business [8:14PM]**

- A. There was discussion regarding the following committees
  - i. Budget Strategy
    - 1. B Whitford made a motion to create the committee with C Gourash as chair, S Quirke seconded
    - 2. Passed unanimously
    - 3. C Gourash accepted the position
  - ii. Technology
    - 1. After discussion regarding the merits of having a committee it was decided to table the discussion until there was more information available
  - iii. CIWP
    - 1. After discussion regarding the merits of having a committee it was decided to table the discussion until there was more information available
  - iv. Communications
    - 1. Discussion of this committee was tabled
- B. There was discussion regarding the Principal Evaluation. It was decided that it be best to have the training take place during a meeting.

**IX. Open Forum [8:51PM]**

- A. There was information provided by S McNabb regarding chairing the committees in that the focus was coordination rather than being knowledgeable about the subject.
- B. There was discussion regarding various budget-related items including Special Education funding and CTU funds.
  - i. Line 114 funds cannot be spent and the amount is about \$6,200. These funds used to be a separate fund but were rolled into Line 115 this year.
  - ii. Only 1/3 of CTU funds were spent. Unused CTU funds can be donated to the school by the teachers.

C. There was discussion regarding the launch, maintenance of the new web site and how it would be evaluated.

**X. Schedule/Agenda [9:03PM]**

A. B Whitford listed out items for upcoming meetings including inviting J Doyle to speak about technology at the school and training for the Principal Evaluation

**XI. Adjournment [9:03PM]**

A. B Whitford moved to adjourn, S Quirke seconded

B. Approved unanimously

C. Meeting adjourned at 9:03PM

**XII. Action items**

| <b>Date Raised</b> | <b>Action</b>  | <b>Assigned</b> | <b>Due Date</b> | <b>Status</b>   |
|--------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|---|
| 20 SEP 16          | Provide a comprehensive version of the Principal Report with the rest of the community through Facebook and other means. | K Valentine     | 18 OCT 16       |   |
| 20 SEP 16          | K Ng to attend LSC meeting   | K Ng            | 18 OCT 16       |   |
| 20 SEP 16          | Provide list of technology assets that could not be accounted for  | K Valentine     | 18 OCT 16       |   |
| 20 SEP 16          | Provide information on 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Parent Meeting in next newsletter   | K Valentine     | 18 OCT 16       |   |
| 20 SEP 16          | Ask for feedback on the conference call system used during the meeting   | B Whitford      | 18 OCT 16       |   |
| 20 SEP 16          | Find out where CPEF money had come from.   | C Gourash       | 18 OCT 16       | Closed.<br>E-mail was sent on 25 SEP. Reply indicated that this was a Principal Achievement award given to Mrs. Oberhardt, who then donated it to the school. |
| 20 SEP 16          | Find out where money to pay for CCC had come from in the past  | C Gourash       | 18 OCT 16       | Completed. Information sent.  |
| 20 SEP 16          | Inform PTO on allocating money for the CCC   | H Steiner       | 18 OCT 16       |   |
| 20 SEP 16          | Define what the Tech Committee would do  | B Whitford      | 18 OCT 16       |   |
| 20 SEP 16          | Invite J Doyle to speak about technology at the school   | B Whitford      | 18 OCT 16       |   |
| 20 SEP 16          | Provide updates on the analytics data of new web site  | K Valentine     | 18 OCT 16       |   |
| 20 SEP 16          | Confirm graduation date  | K Valentine     | 18 OCT 16       |   |

## Meeting Detail

The following provides more comprehensive detail of the meeting however it is not a transcript. Please listen to the audio of the meeting for exact proceedings.

### In Attendance

(14 non-LSC) including R Wilson, H Steiner, K Swindler, K Fitzgerald, S Colella, W Raphael, C Nicholson, D Zielinski, A Bernotas, S McNabb, V Spence, W Scanlan

#### I. **Call to order [7:01PM]**

- A. B Whitford called the meeting
- B. In attendance (quorum present)
  - i. K Valentine
  - ii. S Quirke
  - iii. J Magas
  - iv. E Perez
  - v. B Whitford
  - vi. D Silvers
  - vii. D Barber
  - viii. C Gourash
  - ix. B Katz
  - x. M Sevig
- C. Unable to attend
  - i. J Martensen
- D. There was a partial audio recording made of the meeting and the meeting was recorded (video) by one of the stakeholders

#### II. **Approval of agenda [7:02PM]**

- A. B Whitford said he wanted to strike the item regarding the Bylaws from the agenda as J Martensen had been handling that and was unable to attend. E Perez added that approval of minutes should also be removed. B Katz moved to approve the agenda with those changes, S Quirke seconded
- B. Passed unanimously

#### III. **Principal's Report [7:06PM]**

- A. K Valentine began her report by reminding those in attendance that what she was presenting was not an exhaustive report of what has happened in the last month, but instead a high level overview. A comprehensive version was sent to the LSC in a Word document which would later be shared with the rest of the community through Facebook and other means.
- B. K Valentine explained that the report was ordered to reflect the Principal's Competencies.
- C. Strategic Planning for Continuous School Improvement
  - i. SY16-17 Staff Hiring (Strategic Planning for Continuous School Improvement)
    - a. Karen Ng joined the staff as a Special Education Teacher. K Valentine said she had been doing an excellent job and received a lot of positive feedback. K Ng has 7 years experience with this being her first year in CPS. Being non-tenured she will be receiving the same mentorship as the other non-tenured teaching staff (mentorship with tenured Special Education teacher). She is also participating in specific grade-band time. She is working with the Case Worker, J Doyle and C Nicholson. K Ng was unable to attend due to a prior commitment but will be attending a future LSC meeting to introduce herself.
  - ii. Enrollment (Strategic Planning for Continuous School Improvement)
    - a. K Valentine explained that she had included the following information in the report to the LSC
    - b. Current enrollment was at 276 students. The school was projected at 277 due to trends starting with FY14. Due to having one less student than projected there would be a negative balance that would need to be cleared. This was on the agenda for the meeting. K Valentine said she estimated that to be around \$4,500, which is the amount the school receives per student in Student-based Budgeting (SBB) Program. CPS had not provided the definitive amount and K Valentine had asked Mrs.

Leon and other principals to see if it had shown up at other schools. It had not shown up and when it did the school would need to clear it by September 27<sup>th</sup>. She reiterated that the amount that would probably need to be paid would be under \$4,500.

- c. M Sevig asked if the vacancy could be filled later. K Valentine said that vacancies were not handled by the school but by the Office of Access and Enrollment. The school sends a list of vacancies and the OAE fills them, if possible. OAE has been made aware of the vacancy but they go by the number on the 10<sup>th</sup> day. Even if the vacancy was filled in the future because the 10<sup>th</sup> day was the previous day (Sep 19) the school would still need to pay the negative balance.
  - d. K Valentine explained that the school was in good shape for the 20<sup>th</sup> day at which point CPS would make adjustments to the SGSA funds and Title I funds. She believed that there would probably not be any negatives as they would be cleared at the 10<sup>th</sup>-day hurdle. CPS would be looking at groups of 10 to consider adding/subtracting funds after a certain date but on the 10<sup>th</sup> day they look at each pupil.
- iii. Assessment (Strategic Planning for Continuous School Improvement)
- a. K Valentine said that homeroom teachers should be sharing out the schedule for the NWEA assessment. She further explained that some logistical changes needed to be made due to some unforeseen issues. This is why the schedule was sent out and then taken back. Some students had started that day and things had gone on seamlessly.
  - b. K Valentine said she had the results on the PARCC testing from the previous year. CPS had asked to have the results sent out that week with a letter they were drafting but the letter was not ready. K Valentine hoped it would be sent out by the end of the week and be sent home with students on Friday. If the results need to be sent out by mail that will cost the school a couple hundred dollars in stamps. In the spirit of being fiscally responsible the intention would be to send them home with the students. K Valentine would be notifying parents if they would be sent home. The school is required to keep a copy of the results on file so if something happens to prevent them from getting to the students' homes there will be a copy available at the school.
  - c. K Valentine said she was starting to analyze the BOY data from last year and this year and that the analysis would be shared at the State of the School Address that is required by CPS. This needs to take place before mid-November so she suggested adding an item to the next meeting's agenda for time before the meeting for the Address. During the Address K Valentine would run through all the school-level data including attendance, enrollment, PARCC, NWEA, 5 Essentials Data. Most of the information has been seen by the community before but she would package it in a way that would be easier to grasp for those who are not data-savvy. That can be shared with the entire school community as well.
- iv. Professional Development (Strategic Planning for Continuous School Improvement)
- a. K Valentine said that the school was underway with Professional Development (PD).
    - 1. All non-tenured teachers had started their mentorships. K Valentine was meeting with some teachers while others had assigned teachers in their areas of expertise. K Valentine has worked with some teachers to coordinate shadowing at other schools.
    - 2. Some teachers had requested PD outside of the school. That had been approved and budgeted for. She has encouraged teachers to call out any PD they are aware of and interested in.
    - 3. K Valentine explained that Grade-band Teams were done during the Principal Directive Time she is afforded each week.

This time will be used for common planning, focusing on Cycles of Inquiry (COI). She stated that she could further explain that to anyone that was interested. She went on to explain that the COI consisted of evaluating data in a well-rounded manner as it relates to interactions with the children among other data points. It is a holistic approach that helps teachers address issues in the classroom based on research into best practices. Action plans would be created from this approach which could then be implemented and monitored. While the implementation of the COI was structured, the topics could be determined by the teachers to address individual areas of improvement for the students. This initiative would begin at the end of the week.

4. A week of August PD was completed and it aligned with all the CIWP agenda items. There was a lot of time and effort put into creating a strong foundation for collaborative work.
  5. K Valentine said there was work toward building trust due to new faculty, herself being new and it being a new school year.
- v. High School Night and Grade Level Parent Meetings (Building A Culture of College and Career Readiness)
- a. A High School night was planned for the 28<sup>th</sup>. It would be co-hosted with APMA and Ms. Passolt was communicating with some in-demand schools. K Valentine said there would be a representative from Whitney Young, likely someone from Northside College Prep and some magnet schools that are of high interest such as Chi Arts as well as high-performing neighborhood schools. This would take place in the gym with interested parents and students being able to ask questions.
  - b. There was a meeting on the 30<sup>th</sup> of August with the middle school team, Ms. Passolt and K Valentine. The purpose of the meeting was to meet with the 7<sup>th</sup> grade parents and address the anxiety due to the Selective Enrollment process. A letter was sent out to the parents outlining expectations in terms of grading policy, expectations and how late work would be handled in grades 6-8. The idea was to get students used to the format in 6<sup>th</sup> grade so they are ready for it in 7<sup>th</sup> grade and continued through 8<sup>th</sup> grade where historically there has been a drop-off in terms of work ethic. If any parents had questions it was suggested they speak to K Valentine.
  - c. Mr. Barber is organizing an 8<sup>th</sup> grade parent meeting whose focus is the high school application process, information regarding the 8<sup>th</sup> grade trip and graduation. There is a tentative graduation date but there needs to be confirmation that it will not conflict with other graduation dates. This is scheduled for the 3<sup>rd</sup>, but this has not been communicated out to the parents yet and will be included in the next newsletter.
- vi. Parent Engagement (Parent and Community Collaboration)
- a. Over the past month V Spence has taken on the Volunteer Coordinator role. There were two parent volunteer orientations to discuss expectations and the process of getting set up as a volunteer.
  - b. K Valentine is currently working to set up parent coffees which have been a tradition at the school and well-received in the past. She was still thinking through the structure of those and asked that if anyone had feedback to discuss it with her after the meeting. What K Valentine was tentatively thinking of doing was to set them up in advance so that working parents could make arrangements to attend. She said she would try to find a time that was convenient for the largest number of parents and that they would be by grade bands (K-2, 3-5, 6-8). This would allow for larger groups and multiple options for dates. This would avoid having to discuss information that was not relevant to all parents. If anyone had suggestions K Valentine asked that they approach her with them.

- vii. Principal Professional Development (Disciplined and Reflective Leadership)
  - a. K Valentine was recently accepted into a network that focused on instructional rounds. This was something that she was trained in during graduate school. The rounds consist of a group of six other principals and observe what students are doing, the teaching that is going on and then reviewing the data that has been collected and how it stacks up to a problem of practice that the group is working on.
  - b. K Valentine started a Professional Learning Community (PLC) on Balance Literacy which focuses on all elements of literacy (reading, writing, word acquisition, word work) and how it fits together in a meaningful way. Due to previously being a middle school and high school it is important to her to brush up on this and see how it can relate to ERGC's teachers. K Valentine will be observing other schools, working with experts in this field who will come to the school to present. This will be a year-long PLC.
- viii. Steps Taken (Listening Tour)
  - a. K Valentine discussed what steps have been taken in regards to her listening tour.
    - 1. 1-on-1 parent meetings
      - a. over 40 families
    - 2. 1-on-1 staff meetings, except security
    - 3. transition meetings with outgoing staff members
    - 4. anonymous staff survey
      - a. very honest and transparent
    - 5. meetings with community leaders and school partners
      - a. Youth Guidance
      - b. Ald. Deb Mell
    - 6. District-level staff
      - a. Special Education compliance
    - 7. Building walk-throughs
      - a. Aramark
      - b. Safety & Security
      - c. Engineer
      - d. APMA
    - 8. Regular meetings with APMA administration
    - 9. PTO and LSC Chairs
    - 10. If anyone wants to meet 1-on-1 just ask to get on calendar
- ix. Next (big) Steps (Listening Tour)
  - a. Deep Data Dive
  - b. Student Focus Groups
  - c. Curriculum and Resource Review
- x. Trends – Strengths/Sources of Pride (Listening Tour)
  - a. Talented Students
    - 1. K Valentine said we have the most amazing, talented, special and unique children
    - 2. Children first
  - b. Dedicated Staff with Growth Mindset
    - 1. No sense of complacency
  - c. Involved and Generous Parent Body (Time & Resources)
    - 1. Anyone who wants to volunteer should see V Spence
  - d. Desire to Innovate
    - 1. Not sure how to implement this
    - 2. STEM/STEAM
  - e. Focus on Whole Child
    - 1. Test Scores
    - 2. Social/Emotional support
    - 3. Community support
  - f. Desire to Provide Individualized Instruction
    - 1. Social/Emotional learning

- 2. MTSS
  - 3. IEP/504 Plan
- g. Deep Respect for ERGC Traditions
  - 1. Fear Fest
  - 2. Lock-in
  - 3. Ms. Corbett's tea party
- h. "Whatever It Takes" Mentality
  - 1. Going above and beyond to make sure students and teachers are supported
- xi. Trends – Growth Areas (Listening Tour)
  - a. K Valentine explained that there was more detail in this set of items not because there was more emphasis but because she wanted to give information on what has already been done to address them.
  - b. Communication & Collaboration
    - 1. Need for user-friendly methods of communication and creative spaces for collaboration
      - a. Regular newsletters through Constant Contact
      - b. Staff newsletter
      - c. Parent meetings
      - d. Regular staff meetings
      - e. Google Classroom in middle school grades
      - f. Greater organization of parent volunteers
  - c. Curriculum/Resource Review
    - 1. Need for getting deeper understanding of what curriculum is at each grade level
    - 2. What resources are available
    - 3. What came out was Technology and Science
    - 4. K Valentine said she would be working with various teacher groups to address how to approach this
    - 5. Updates will be shared with LSC
    - 6. Up until now the focus has been to get up and running. Now it is shifting to improving
  - d. Vertical Alignment
    - 1. K Valentine said that, in her professional opinion, the first step is to get a sense of what curriculum actually looks like.
      - a. What is being done
      - b. scope and sequence
      - c. what the standards are
      - d. create units that are more microview
    - 2. There is need to address how vertical alignment will meet unique needs of students, especially those that are extremely accelerated.
    - 3. K Valentine said she met with Elizabeth McLaughlin (?) from Gifted and Talented that day, along with some teachers, to discuss how to address this in both short-term and long-term.
  - e. Special Education
    - 1. There were issues with IEP compliance and communication with parents
    - 2. This has been one of K Valentine's primary areas of focus during last two months.
    - 3. There is a communication plan in place for parents with diverse learners which sets expectations.
    - 4. There has been refinement in some students' support.
    - 5. Some faculty were sent to Progress Monitoring Professional Development
    - 6. K Valentine has been in meetings with CPS and ODL staff. Parents, Network staff and student case managers have been invited to those meetings.

7. K Valentine will be at every IEP meeting. Due to not many children at ERGC having IEPs this is achievable
- f. MTSS
1. Main priority in the CIWP
  2. Teachers want support around Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 differentiation.
  3. Is the school moving students onto next level of learning before they have a robust understand of current content.
  4. Meeting with related services team every other Thursday.
  5. K Valentine asked MTSS Coordinator to provide both and action plan and a rollout plan. Once it is done it will be shared.
- g. Trust Building.
1. Increase trust in all levels. K Valentine attributed this to the amount of change.
  2. Efforts have been mainly with staff.
    - a. PD around collaboration and relationship-building
    - b. Communication is transparent
    - c. Opportunities for feedback
  3. S Quirke asked, regarding Vertical Alignment, if CPS mandates how gifted education is provided or if it was up to the individual schools to decide. K Valentine answered that CPS did not mandate at this time. She further added that she was talking to E McLaughlin to compare how it was being done at other schools. S Quirke said this was a good way to talk about the difference between Accelerated and Gifted education.
  4. S Quirke asked for a clarification on what the difference was between Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 meant. K Valentine explained that it could be best seen as levels of independence while still meeting the goals with Tier 1 being students who were most independent able to take instruction. Tier 2 would be more hands-on, smaller groups, in or outside of the classroom and more intensive. Tier 3 would be more restrictive and a step before a recommendation for an IEP.
  5. S Quirke asked if this model was important at ERGC which has classrooms with 1 teacher, no aide and 30 students. K Valentine agreed and further explained that it helped students who were in the middle in terms of being very advanced compared to their peers in other schools but not quite working at a college level.
  6. S Quirke asked if teachers were basing their assessment of students based strictly on data or if they were also including information such as experiences (from their own with the students and/or from previous grades), anecdotal, or intuition. K Valentine answered that it should be strictly data-based but that the definition of data could include anecdotal information as well as experiences/interactions with the students. Even if the intent was to restrict the data, she did not believe it was possible. S Quirke said she was trying to see if the data only came from testing, to which K Valentine said it would not.
  7. K Swindler asked what grade bands were. K Valentine explained them as:
    - a. Primary: K, 1, 2
    - b. Intermediate: 3, 4, 5
    - c. Middle school: 6, 7, 8
    - d. Special (still trying to figure out how to get them to meet)
  8. S Quirke commended K Valentine on attending all the IEP meetings.
- D. B Whitford reminded the attendees to sign the sign-in sheet

**IV. Chairmain's Report [7:35PM]**

- A. B Whitford said there was not much to say regarding D Oberhardt's appeal stating that the lawyer representing the LSC had still not been paid which could further delay the process and as of that moment there was nothing the LSC needed to do.
- B. B Whitford asked if the LSC bulletin board had been put up. K Valentine stated that it should have been installed that day behind the security desk under the white ERGC sign.
- C. B Whitford stated that a conference call system was being tried out for this meeting. He further explained that it would be one-way with people only being able to listen. He added that some people were already listening in. He asked for feedback or suggestions on how to improve communication during the meetings.

**V. PPLC Report [7:38PM]**

- A. D Barber reported that the PPLC had its first meeting which was organizational. They put together a hand out which D Silvers distributed to attendees. The meeting was primarily to establish roles.
- B. A parent asked what PPLC means. D Barber explained it stood for Professional Personnel Leadership Committee. He then read out the role of the PPLC. He then read a description of what the PPLC's role is.
- C. During the meeting the committee established meeting norms and schedule (the same day as the regular LSC meetings, after school). Meeting agendas would be posted 48hrs beforehand.
- D. S Quirke asked if they were open meetings. D Barber confirmed they are.

**VI. PTO Report [7:40PM]**

- A. H Steiner distributed printouts of the latest allocation statement to the LSC, stating that more would be available at the PTO's first meeting that Thursday.
- B. H Steiner stated that the PTO had held an allocation meeting after the LSC's budget meeting (S Colella confirmed this) with K Valentine to discuss gaps in the budget. One of the bigger items was a \$22K allocation to the non-personnel needs along with lesser items that met STEM and technology needs. So far, the PTO had only allocated \$37K for the year. The plan would be to wait until after the 20<sup>th</sup> day of school to meet with K Valentine and see what further needs there were at the PTO board meeting on Oct. 12. She added that the plan was not to keep the remaining \$75K for the long-term but to allocate most of that money. H Steiner welcomed questions but deferred to the treasurer who has a much better understanding of allocation.
- C. H Steiner stated that Track-A-Thon, the biggest fundraiser of the year, would be rolling out that week. Alex Burki and Karrie Stanley are co-chairing and H Steiner thanked E Perez for helping with the information packet.
- D. B Whitford asked how much the PTO was intending to roll over into the next year. H Steiner answered that K Valentine had suggested, and the PTO agreed, that the amount of money rolled over should not be large. She brought up the sentiment that upper grades such as 8<sup>th</sup> would prefer to see the money used in a way that they would be affected by it. She said that the amount would be \$20K - \$30K to provide a cushion in the case of an emergency. She did not believe it to be \$100K. K Valentine agreed with that.
- E. E Perez asked how this related to the statement that L Garcia-Juarez had brought up (in a previous meeting) that money should be spent during the year it was intended to be spent in. H Steiner said she had been talking with L Garcia-Juarez and that his latest statement was that if the community was made aware and understood that some of the money would be rolling over then it was acceptable. She added that if anyone had an issue with this to contact her. She further added that the allocation information was shared during LSC meetings and PTO meetings but not online due to fears of CPS being made aware of this information. The PTO had held onto a lot of money the previous year but it was with the best intentions as it was in cooperation with the previous administration and related to budget cuts. She reiterated that she would like to hear anyone's opinion regarding this.
- F. H Steiner announced that the class with the highest PTO membership enrollment would win \$100 for their class.

**VII. New Business [7:45PM]**

- A. K Valentine explained that there were some expenditures that needed to be approved. The PTO had already transferred funds into the internal accounts, the LSC just needed to approve the expenditures due to them being over the \$2K limit voted on at a previous LSC meeting.

- i. Scholastic
  - a. Subscriptions for K-8
  - b. \$2,225.01
    - 1. Taken from Class Subscriptions Fees account
  - c. S Quirke made a motion to approve the expenditure, J Magas seconded.
  - d. Approved unanimously
- ii. Tinker program
  - a. For STEM
  - b. J Doyle requested it
  - c. Instructional materials and lesson plans focused on programming
  - d. \$3,600
    - 1. Taken from Computer Education account
  - e. C Gourash asked if it was an annual fee or a one-time fee
  - f. K Valentine could not provide an answer but reiterated that the money was donated by the PTO
  - g. B Whitford clarified that we would need to approve another one-time payment should it arise
  - h. B Whitford moved to approve the expenditure, E Perez seconded
  - i. Approved unanimously
- iii. K Valentine said she wanted to move some money within internal accounts but was unsure if the LSC needed to vote on the transfers. She felt that, in the spirit of transparency, that she wanted to present the information to the LSC anyway.
  - a. She explained that when the decision was made not to have school fees for this year that the money from the previous fees was left in lines from last year. As an example she said that out of the previous fees \$10 from each parent contribution would go to Fine Arts, Science, etc. This year that money has been spent down and there is not enough to support those programs. She further explained that there were larger amounts in other lines that she would like to move. She proposes moving \$2,800 to Fine Arts and \$2,800 to Science which are the amounts they received last year.
  - b. C Gourash asked where the money was coming out of. K Valentine answered that there were options of where it could come from, it was simply a case of money being in the wrong "pot". C Gourash said there was a lot of money in the Donations account. K Valentine agreed stating that in the Jim Peterson Fund there were \$2,805 and that there were PTO contributions that had not been allocated. C Gourash said that she was referring to the Chicago Public Education Fund (CPEF) which originally had \$10K. K Valentine said either could be used.
  - c. B Whitford asked if there was any difference in terms of restrictions. K Valentine answered that there wasn't because it was all the school's money since it was donated. She then added that any restrictions would be around food and beverages for staff.
  - d. M Sevig asked C Gourash if she had any recommendation. C Gourash answered that the CPEF was there all of last year, not having spent half of it. K Valentine said she was fine with that. S Quirke asked where the money had come from. C Gourash said she was not sure and would need to go back through her notes.
  - e. K Valentine proposed taking money from the CPEF and any overage from the Jim Peterson Fund.
  - f. B Whitford made the motion, S Quirke seconded.
  - g. Passed unanimously.
- iv. K Valentine proposed to move the money donated by the PTO into the appropriate lines. She gave the example of \$1,750 being moved into the Fine Arts line which last year had been donated on top of the \$2,800. She further explained that these items had been listed in the initial budget report but they were not in the right lines. She was unsure if the LSC needed to vote on something like this and chose to err on the side of transparency.

- a. M Sevig asked if this was money that had been donated last year for last year's program. K Valentine answered that it had been allocated in July of this year during the Budget meeting. This was in the allocation list H Steiner had provided to the LSC. The money just needed to go to the corresponding lines.
- b. S Quirke made a motion to approve the transfer, M Sevig seconded.
- c. Passed unanimously.

B. Balance Transfers

- i. K Valentine explained that there were three balance transfers to make. They were mentioned in the last Principal's Report.
  - a. \$0.48
    1. Non-personnel amount. This was done by CPS on the back end in regards to how much the school had to pay for something. This negative balance was in Miscellaneous Charges and K Valentine said she would like to move to transfer the funds from Supplies to cover it. B Katz seconded.
    2. Passed unanimously, K Valentine abstained
    3. C Gourash pointed out that K Valentine cannot vote on budget items.
  - b. \$2,189.75
    1. K Valentine explained that this item had also been discussed at the previous LSC meeting. After inquiring with CPS they admitted that this had been a mistake on their part. They had given the school the money but placed it in one pointer instead of splitting it between two. The funds not loading correctly into Oracle not all of the funds were transferred. After discussing the matter with CPS they agreed to not charge the school for those funds. All that needs to happen is that the overage be moved from the Regular Position pointer to the Benefits pointer. S Quirke asked what the total amount was. K Valentine answered that there was a negative in the Regular Position pointer of \$5,271.58 that was covered by the funds paid by CPS and a negative balance in the Benefits pointer of \$2,189.75 which would be covered the overage from the Regular Position pointer.
    2. B Katz made a motion to transfer \$2,189.75 to the Benefits pointer, S Quirke seconded.
    3. Passed unanimously, K Valentine abstained
  - c. \$4,500
    1. K Valentine stated that there was a negative balance that needed to be taken care of by Sept. 27<sup>th</sup> which was a result of the one student that did not enroll. She estimated that it would be \$4,500. If the LSC did not feel comfortable voting on it at that time there would need to be a special meeting called to vote on it later.
    2. E Perez asked that if another student enrolled at a later time, if the school would still need to pay the negative balance. K Valentine confirmed this. She added that while it was not good for the school there were other schools who had far fewer students enrolled.
    3. K Valentine said that because there was \$8K in contingency money there was enough to cover the cost. As a side note, she said that due to Ms. Francis leaving to take a job elsewhere there were \$34K that would be coming back to the school. The date for that was unknown at the time.
    4. B Whitford asked if there was any reason to delay the vote. M Sevig said the amount was not definite. B Katz asked if a motion should be made before further discussion. S Quirke said she felt comfortable knowing that it was one student and

CPS set a per student dollar amount which could be verified after the fact so as to vote in favor by the 27<sup>th</sup> without calling a special meeting. B Katz explained that in the past there had been a vote to approve a transfer that did not exceed a certain amount with the expectation that once the final amount was known it would be shared with the LSC. S Quirke asked if the amount that had been set was close to the amount CPS had set per student. B Katz said that it had not been for the same expenditure. There was discussion about adding additional money to the \$4,500 in case the final amount is more. E Perez asked K Valentine what she believed to be a good amount to add. K Valentine said that \$5K would be a good amount to cover any increase.

5. K Valentine moved to move up to \$5K from the contingency funds to clear any negative incurred by the change in enrollment. E Perez seconded.
6. Passed unanimously, K Valentine abstained

C. Chicago Children's Choir (CCC) funding

- i. K Valentine said she was bring this item to the LSC in an advisory capacity. Historically, the Chicago Children's Choir has been at the school. Recently, she was made aware that it would cost the school \$4,500 to participate. As a result this was not something that had been budgeted for. She added that there were other music programs at the school that were funded by parents of those who participated.
- ii. If there was a desire to participate in the program the LSC would need to vote to move money for it. Any student who would want to participate could as the cost covers all the children who participate.
- iii. Another option would be to have each participating student pay the fee. Usually the program has 30 students in it when there is no individual fee so it is unknown how much each student would need to pay.
- iv. A third option would be to have the school pay part of the fee and have participants pay the rest.
- v. K Valentine wanted to have the LSC give their feedback since other music programs at the school require participants to pay their own way. B Katz noted that students need to try out if they want to participate.
- vi. C Gourash asked where the money to pay for this had come from in the past (CPS or internal accounts) as she did not remember seeing anything for it before. K Valentine said she did not have access to historical documents showing where the money came from. The information she had came from the purchase order (PO) they sent her. C Gourash offered to investigate.
- vii. S McNabb said that in the past the CCC had donated the fee to allow the school to participate but she was unaware if continued through the last year. She recommended looking into whether they could help with the financing of the program with the school or cover the cost.
- viii. E Perez asked if there was a deadline for paying the fee. K Valentine said that ideally they would like to have tryouts on Friday.
- ix. S Quirke asked if the program had existed at ERGC before and if it was across all grades. K Valentine answered that the program was grade 3 and up. There were smaller choirs across the city that would come together to form one large choir that would perform at two citywide performances.
- x. M Sevig said she was involved with the program but not through the school. She explained that she did have to pay a fee but that could be due to being in the neighborhood choir which is considered "one level up in the choir system" from the school choir. She added that there was an Albany Park choir. She also wondered where the money had come from before and if CCC had underwritten the program at the school how to get them to do it again.
- xi. S Quirke asked if the CCC was asking for the money. K Valentine said they had sent a PO.

- xii. E Perez asked if CCC had said it had been like this before. K Valentine said yes and that the school had to pay to participate.
- xiii. M Sevig explained that fees for those who wanted to participate were based on a sliding scale that could range from \$50 to \$1,200 per year per student, depending on income level. K Valentine said that it would be up to the school how they would charge individuals but that the total that would need to be paid is \$4,500. She added that she could try to talk them down.
- xiv. S Quirke asked if CCC asked to be paid by Friday or just needed assurance that it would be paid later. K Valentine answered that she would need to sign a letter agreeing to pay the fee.
- xv. M Sevig said that if there were 30 participants that would equal \$150 per participant. K Valentine added that if there were less they would each need to pay more.
- xvi. E Perez asked if this was considered an ERGC tradition. W Raphael asked if this was something the PTO could cover. K Valentine said it could. E Perez asked if this could be covered by money from internal accounts. K Valentine said that money would need to be moved. There is enough money but the LSC would need to approve the payment, which is why she had brought it up to the LSC.
- xvii. M Sevig said she thought it was a valuable program. ERGC does not offer band or choir and parents need to pay extra if they want their children to have music education. She added that the the program does focus on music education, not just performance, with the participants learning music theory, reading music and dancing which makes it valuable. Since the school does not provide music education she would support providing it in an extracurricular way. She added that as far as tryouts went, everyone got in. The caused various attendees to say that not everyone does.
- xviii. S Quirke asked S Colella if she would consider paying for the program since she was interested in it. S Colella answered that she might due to other commitments. B Whitford said that if this was something that could be provided at no cost it would be much better especially since it would mean getting a lot of people involved and it could be a community thing.
- xix. M Sevig responded to a question by stating that she was surprised to hear some students were turned down. She did know that some participants were asked to leave after being accepted due to bad behavior as the program has high expectations which adds to the value. K Valentine said that due to the program being citywide they do need to follow age restrictions due to the amount of children they have to manage.
- xx. S Quirke mentioned that at a forum held last Spring a lot of parents were mentioning STEAM. She felt this was an opportunity, at a cost that was not too high, for the school to support adding more Art.
- xxi. K Swindler asked if it would be possible to negotiate with CCC that as part of paying the fee they allow everyone who tries out to participate or even expand it. Since the school would not push back on fees they could make it as much of an open program as possible. H Steiner added that while some boys did not make it into the program the previous year, there were two girls from 3<sup>rd</sup> grade that did not make it in and that that was a bigger issue. So, she agreed with the idea of making the program open. K Valentine said she would encourage them to do so. She said she was unaware of their criteria for allowing students into the program but that they could allow up to 60 participants.
- xxii. C Gourash said that as far as funding the program if the LSC looked into what was left in donations from internal account and augmented it with donation from the PTO there would be enough money for the program. H Steiner said the PTO could not make an allocation then but that she could take the information back to the board. She added that if money was moved from a line item in internal accounts now the money could be replaced at a later time.
- xxiii. B Katz said that it should be seen as part of a broader arts curriculum as this would attract a subset of the students but not all. The arts curriculum should continue to grow by adding other ways to participate.

- xxiv. S McNabb added that it was a great cultural experience as it's been around for a long time. M Sevig stated that this year was its 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary. S McNabb added that due to it involving schools from around the city it is a great multicultural experience when they all get together to perform.
- xxv. B Whitford asked if there was a way to frame the motion to make sure the program is at the school while having the flexibility to figure out the funding later. E Perez stated that he personally didn't think \$4,500 was an amount the school couldn't cover considering how important an arts curriculum was to the community.
- xxvi. M Sevig asked if there was a fund that the fee could be paid from. K Valentine said there were various ways it could be done. Half of it could be funded from the Jim Peterson Fund. The other half could be funded from the PTO funds for Fine Arts which had just been approved, with the funds re-transferred at the October 12 meeting (PTO?). The funds would still be used for Fine Arts, but they would not be given to D Drinkwater until after October 12. H Steiner said that would be fine as D Drinkwater usually didn't submit anything until May or June so that wouldn't be a problem. K Valentine said that because there had just been \$2,800 allocated to Fine Arts there would be money D Drinkwater could use. B Katz clarified that the immediate need was to sign the PO, not necessarily pay the fee. K Valentine confirmed this and said her purpose for bringing the item to the LSC was to make sure the LSC approved of the decision to sign the PO.
- xxvii. B Whitford asked if the LSC did not need to make a motion at that time. K Valentine said her understanding was it did not, she just needed to sign the PO. M Sevig asked if K Valentine could tell CCC to hold tryouts on Friday. K Valentine stated she could.
- xxviii. C Gourash suggested asking CCC if they had underwritten the program in the past, why it's not occurring again and what it would take to have then do it
- xxix. B Whitford asked if the LSC needed to vote on anything and the consensus was that it didn't.

## **VIII. Old Business [8:14PM]**

### **A. Committee formation**

- i. B Whitford gave a recap of what had been discussed in previous meetings. He discussed the creation of a budget strategy committee to keep an eye on the budget and discuss big-ticket items. He also suggested the creation of a technology committee since technology plays a big role in the school and a lot of money is spent on it. Lastly he had suggested a communication committee but based on feedback from various other LSC members and members of the community he felt that could be tabled to a later date. He wanted to discuss if we needed any of the aforementioned committees and added that according to the bylaws an LSC member would need to chair each.
  - a. Budget and strategy
    - 1. K Valentine said she felt, due to the robust skillset of some member of the community, that this would be very helpful for her.
    - 2. B Whitford said J Martensen was interested in participating in that. He asked if anyone else was interested chairing the committee. C Gourash asked if J Martensen was interested in chairing. B Whitford said J Martensen was interested in being on the committee but not chairing.
    - 3. B Whitford made the motion to create the committee with C Gourash as chair, S Quirke seconded.
    - 4. Passed unanimously.
    - 5. C Gourash accepted the position
  - b. Technology
    - 1. B Whitford said he had talked to J Doyle about the committee and she said she would be interested in being involved.
    - 2. C Gourash questioned the necessity for creating the committee citing that hardware had already been allocated and that the remaining items were software and professional development,

which she did not believe to be under the scope of the LSC. She felt that more information was needed to determine if a committee was necessary. She thought that for now it could be an information-gathering initiative but did not feel it should be a stand-alone committee.

3. B Katz suggested a small task force that could work on it rather than a full committee. B Whitford asked if this would be something that B Katz would prefer to see originate from the principal. B Katz said he did and that it could then involve the LSC and other stakeholders.
4. S Quirke stated that due to technology being a great part of education that it would be important to have input from parents and teachers into how it impacts students day-to-day. C Gourash felt that technology was part of the curriculum and should be driven by what the teachers want. B Whitford explained that he felt the LSC's role is one of oversight and due to the amount of money being spent on technology that a committee would make sure things were being done properly. E Perez agreed that he saw the committee's role as oversight especially in light of the issues during the previous years regarding lack of visibility on what was being done with technology. He did not imagine that something like a tech plan would come out of a committee but that it would be more limited to oversight.
5. B Katz felt that oversight was not within the LSC's purview, rather the LSC was responsible for the budget-related aspects of technology. B Whitford asked how the LSC would be able to judge such purchases without having detailed information. B Katz said that the responsibility fell to the principal to provide that information.
6. E Perez stated that, according to the bylaws, the LSC could make suggestions on things like textbooks and software could fall under that as some learning materials did not exist as textbooks but as software or hardware. S Quirke agreed. C Gourash said that the LSC had not made suggestions for textbooks and felt that since no one on the LSC was an educator that teachers would be better informed especially when it came to things like differentiation. S Quirke asked how a committee would prevent that.
7. E Perez asked if, in the past, the LSC had questioned why certain books were being purchased at the school. B Katz answered that it had, but that it had been independent of the technology. E Perez referred to his previous statement that textbooks could be considered technology if they were in the form of software.
8. B Katz explained that two LSC terms ago the emphasis was to get to 1-to-1 in terms of hardware but there were pieces missing even with a technology committee overseeing it. He added that Google Classroom has been great and having the U of C group addressing the gaps has also been great. Lastly he stated that not having a committee would not prevent anyone on the LSC or the rest of the community from making suggestions. He said it came down to having a committee that originated from the LSC or the school administration. He personally preferred to have it originate from the teachers and the administration with the expectation that there would be much more detail in the communication with the LSC.
9. S Quirke asked the teachers on the LSC and K Valentine for that opinion, adding that if there was a benefit from having a

budget committee, would a tech committee be beneficial or not. D Barber said that if had a clearer definition of the parameters of the committee he would be able to give an answer. K Valentine agreed, adding that she would like to know what the purpose of the committee would be. She thought that putting together group of parents who were tech-savvy and with connections that could help form partnerships with the school would help innovate. She was unsure how that would tie back to the LSC but added that if the purpose was to monitor things that were investments that would be a direct link to the LSC. B Whitford said that he envisioned the committee to be more like the latter.

10. C Gourash stated that within the CIWP there was a community partnership committee that could be leveraged to create external partnerships that would bring in assets.
11. E Perez suggested tabling the discussion until there was a better idea of what he committee would do.
12. C Gourash said that at the minimum the LSC could get an inventory of existing assets. K Valentine said that she had been able to assess what was missing but not what the school had. This was a CPS requirement. C Gourash said this should have been done at the end of last Spring. K Valentine said it should have been done but that she could not find any record of it. She said she could share the list of assets that could not be accounted for which J Doyle had in an effort to find them.
13. S Quirke noted that J Doyle was in favor of a technology committee. B Whitford confirmed this.
14. B Katz recommended finding ways to foster and formalize discussion among the community in terms of how technology is supported in the classroom.
15. M Sevig said that a task force could be assigned by the administration with a committee later formed to oversee the vision that results from that. The task force would be charged with coming up with the vision and long-term plan.
16. B Whitford explained that he expected the committee to be tasked with making informed decisions. He clarified that it was not about stifling innovation but to know what the LSC was voting on.
17. H Steiner suggested inviting J Doyle to speak to the LSC about her technology plan as well as address the current issues with hardware. She added that J Doyle is very specific in her requests to the PTO, providing a lot of detail explaining how she intends to use the technology that she is seeking to acquire. B Whitford agreed. B Katz added that she would be able to provide information regarding how technology is used across the grade bands. There could be discussion regarding the technology being used moving forward and added that while the discussion was important he didn't think it required a committee.
18. K Valentine summarized what she gathered from the conversation as creating a committee to develop a new tech plan.
  - a. Address issues from first tech plan
    1. Lack of professional development tied to the hardware acquired
  - b. Address aging hardware
19. B Katz added the thought the first tech plan was focused on getting hardware into the school rather than PD.

20. J Magas asked if it would be beneficial to notify the community via the newsletter about upcoming discussions

21. B Whitford tabled the discussion

c. CIWP

1. There was discussion regarding who would be chairing the committee, specifically if teachers could chair.

2. K Valentine stated that the CIWP was driven by the principal while involving various stakeholders. The focus of the committee would be to make sure the CIWP was being carried out as it did not need to be revised for another two years. She offered to add a section to her report regarding its progress.

3. C Gourash said she was interested in the teams that are included and how that will be started. She did not know if a committee was needed for that.

4. K Valentine stated that attendance was at 99%.

5. Discussion was tabled to a later date

B. Principal Evaluation

i. B Whitford said he had asked for ideas but did not receive many. He wondered if this was due to not feeling it was a useful exercise or not ready to do it at this point. E Perez explained that he had not submitted ideas as he felt that the items most important to him were already in the evaluation.

ii. S Quirke talked about her approach to the evaluation and how it contained a lot of "eduspeak" and how that could be translated and defined to make it relevant to ERGC. She recalled the parent principal forum from last spring, what goals and values for the future of ERGC were expressed, how she came up with 5 objectives and how they would overlap with the evaluation. She recommended taking time to review one's own goals and needs and consider the rest of the school to come up with objectives that could be compared to the evaluation.

iii. B Whitford asked if it would be beneficial to table the discussion and coming up with ideas to make the discussion productive at the next meeting. S Quirke suggested making it hyperlocal.

iv. C Gourash stated that the LSC would still need to fill out the provided form and asked if S Quirke intended to add criteria. S Quirke said it would not be additional criteria as much as it was figuring out how things like the library fit into the evaluation. B Katz explained that the principal evaluation focused on the principal's performance. He added that what S Quirke was talking about could be areas where the LSC would provide more details. The LSC would provide clear communication about what our goals are and having those goals be informed by the community.

v. E Perez asked S Quirke if she meant that the LSC would agree on how to define the terms within the evaluation. She answered that she meant more of a translation in terms of what the evaluation meant within the context of ERGC. E Perez asked if she meant in terms of focusing on making sure everyone on the LSC understood what the terms mean so that there would be less likelihood of surprises later. S Quirke agreed.

vi. B Whitford added that the LSC should also define what levels of evaluation meant giving the example that everyone be aware of what a 4 meant.

vii. B Katz explained how the LSC would be meeting more often as the deadline approached. He also said that the translation piece could be used to enable information-gathering from the community make more sense. S Quirke talked about using the amount of information expressed by the community last spring as a way to formulate the criteria. B Katz suggested reviewing that information to see how much of it still applied.

viii. B Katz talked about doing the training together during a meeting rather than separately online. S Quirke agreed.

ix. C Gourash said that the rubric B Whitford sent out was helpful but that due to it not matching one-to-one with the evaluation form it should be taken with a grain of salt.

- x. K Valentine asked if during the training there could be a discussion about setting expectations around what is achievable within a first year. She gave the example of vertical alignment not being complete within a year. C Gourash asked if it would be fair to say that the goal for this year is to have a plan. K Valentine stated that she had met with the gifted coordinator it was estimated that it would take 2-3 years per content area.
- xi. B Whitford suggested tabling the topic.
- xii. Open items
  - a. C Gourash listed out the items that still remained open from previous meetings.
    - 1. Question about additional funds
      - a. Closed
    - 2. Items related to the communications survey
      - a. Closed
    - 3. K Valentine to provide F Allende with position numbers for open positions (2 meetings ago)
      - a. K Valentine said there were no open positions
    - 4. Granting access to the current LSC website, e-mail address and facebook page.
      - a. Access had been granted to the LSC website and e-mail address
        - 1. Only question is whether or not to keep the Facebook page
        - 2. It was agreed to not use it
    - 5. Protocol for transferring closed session recordings
      - a. Closed
    - 6. Location of meetings to be the library
      - a. Closed
    - 7. Asking LSC lawyer if she was okay with individual members calling her in regards to the appeal
      - a. B Whitford said she was.
      - b. Closed

**IX. Open Forum [8:51PM]**

- A. S McNabb clarified that the Tinker program was a yearly subscription
- B. S McNabb explained that chairing a committee was about coordinating rather than knowing the subject of the committee very well. She added that chairing a committee was a good way to become very familiar with the subject
- C. C Gourash brought up some additional questions about the budget.
  - i. Line 114 (special education) are funds that cannot be spent. The amount is about \$6,200.
  - ii. Only about 1/3 of the CTU funds were spent. These are intended for instructional materials. C Gourash recommended spending those funds first. She asked if there were restrictions on those funds
  - iii. K Valentine said she had spoken with C Gourash before the meeting but wanted to bring the rest of the LSC up to speed. In regards to the Line 114 funds these were funds that used to be in a separate line but were rolled into Line 115 funds this year. Previously the school did not see those funds as they were for the district. This year they are accounting for something they did not account for last year. PARFing was a process where the school would write an appeal for more funds to cover staff needed for IEPs. This year a 4% piece that the district hangs onto is put in a locked line that can only be access after an appeal asking for additional staff to meet IEP needs. Due to the staffing model and the needs of the students it was very unlikely that the school would get that money.
  - iv. The CTU funds that were not spent can be donated by the teachers to the school.
  - v. There is \$35,000 in Computer Education in Internal Accounts.
    - a. J Doyle has created a plan for some of that money (“her dream STEM program”)

- b. B Katz suggested, for the meeting with J Doyle regarding the technology committee, inviting the community so they can give input especially if they have resources or ideas. It would be useful if they could come with a short list of what these are.
  - D. K Swindler asked about the status of the school web site.
    - i. K Valentine said Educational Networks (EN) would have it up by the end of the month. They are in the development stage
    - ii. K Swindler asked what the plan was for maintenance and updates. K Valentine said there would be three pages (ERGC, LSC, PTO) and each group is responsible for maintaining their corresponding pages. At the school there will be people on site, with K Valentine being the main person, maintaining the information on the site which will be aligned with what is in the newsletter. If there are larger updates (structure) EN would take care of that as part of the subscription fee that the school is paying.
    - iii. K Swindler asked if the current site and/or the new site had data tracking to see if the new site is a more successful communication tool. K Valentine said she did not have access to the old site but that she would be getting some analytics from EN but was unsure what that would entail.
    - iv. K Swindler asked if there were any evaluation plan to see if the new web site will be successful. K Valentine said she did not but once the site was up but that it was a good suggestion. She added that this would be something to discuss with the LSC as the EN solution was a short-term solution with the possibility of a parent-driven solution should the EN one fall short.
    - v. K Swindler asked if there was a defined goal for the new site. K Valentine said it was broad in that it was to be more user-friendly and considered a one-stop-shop. E Perez added that one of the reasons the Communications survey had been tabled was to wait for the site to launch so as to then get feedback from stakeholders to see if it was viewed as successful. S Quirke acknowledged K Swindler's expertise/background in UI/UX and invited her to help with the site. K Swindler explained various methods of receiving feedback on the new site including having 10 parents use the site and see what happened.
  - E. S Quirke thanked all those in attendance for coming out.
- X. **Schedule/Agenda [9:03PM]**
  - A. B Whitford discussed outstanding items for the next meetings
    - i. Monthly meeting in October
    - ii. Possible special meeting for training
    - iii. Having J Doyle attend next meeting
    - iv. Bylaws
- XI. **Adjournment [9:03PM]**
  - A. B Whitford moved to adjourn, S Quirke seconded
  - B. Passed unanimously
  - C. Meeting adjourned at 9:03PM
- XII. Appendix
  - A. PPLC write-up (this will be included in the final PDF file)
  - B. Transfer explanations

| Date      | Amount     | Purpose  | From Acct                                  | To Acct                                | Notes  |
|-----------|------------|--|--|--|--|
| 20-Sep-16 | 0.48       | moving contingency balancing from hyperion load to regular pointer lines           | 115/51300/290001/575                       | 115/57940/888888/575                   | moved by central office but also approved by LSC at 20 Sep mtg |
| 20-Sep-16 | \$2,189.75 | Transfer from SGSA reg position pointer to SGSA benefits points to offset negative | 225/51300/290001/703; reg position pointer | 225/51330/290001/703; benefits pointer | approved by LSC at 20 Sep mtg                                  |