

## TAGAC October 11, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Attending (members names bolded):

**J. Grab**, Eowyn Rieke, **Natalie Hval**, **Megan Robertson**, **Nicole Iroz-Elardo**, Jane Chaddick, Margaret DeLacy (OATAG), **Mike Marsden**, **Meghan Whitaker**, **Jessica Colby**, **Eric Houghton**, **Scholle McFarland**, Judy Berck, Gayle Killam, Mark Feldman, Kathleen Huth

### I. Call to Order & Preliminaries

- Announcement: adopting new agenda to debrief Superintendent's proposal
- Announcement: the TAG director will not attend tonight. His supervisor told him not to come.
- Motion to adopt May & September minutes (Meghan) second (Mike)
- Announcement: OATAG mini conference will be at Benson HS 1-5pm Nov 4th at no cost, capped at 160 attendees. 4 simultaneous breakouts, each will be presented twice so can attend 2 choices. TAG staff will present, Judy Smith (OATAG) will present. Expecting a good turn-out of educators. OATAG membership meeting that morning. (Margaret D)

### II. New Business

1. Debrief October 10th meeting regarding Superintendent's proposal for a TAG regional services model and generate additional questions.

#### **Scholle's download of info and questions asked during meeting:**

\*Superintendent had asked to be briefed on TAG services in the district, timeline, and context, and TAGAC recommendations. Many materials were prepared.

\*Attendees:

Scholle, Heather Kent, Dr. Alfonso Garcia

staff: Dr. Laura Parker, communications staff, Andrew Johnson, Superintendent

\*Just prior to meeting, staff had met with 8 principals (not ACCESS principal)

\*Staff spoke to press right after meeting.

\*TAG contingent caught off guard by change in topic, asked a lot of questions.

\*Staff outlined 8 centers: "ACCESS Pathways." Not all clusters represented. ES->MS in some cases crosses clusters. Westside families head across to the East.

- a. Q: will there still be buses? A: Superintendent did not know ACCESS used buses.
- b. Q: Lots of 99th %ile kids around W. Sylvan. Why no options there?  
A: The 8 schools selected are evenly balanced for the current ACCESS population.
- c. Q: What about new enrollment? Is this for all 99th %ile?  
A: If we had all the answers, we'd have to delay this plan until the end of this school year.
- d. Q: Need to add more students to have a full section in each site. Who are those students? What are the qualifications? Is there still a need component? How does current rubric relate to this plan?
- e. Q: 8 months is quick - what about staffing? Need TAG certification? A: There are 24 current ACCESS teachers, divided by 8 means 3 at each site as master teachers.
- f. Q: Dr. Garcia is the only MS science teacher qualified to teach HS science - who else will teach MS science? A: No answer.
- g. Q: Is staff aware that there is no class-size limit in PPS? What would it look like if the distributed ACCESS class had 10 and neighborhood side had 30? Is there a cap?
- h. Q: Would there be training to support this population, what's the counselor model?
- i. Q: How will MS students complete their HS credits?
- j. Q: For students accelerated more than one grade, how serve them?  
A: Adaptive learning pathways initially in Mathematics, digitally-enabled.

- k. Q: How provide resources to support this digital learning? Where will computers come from? A: Lots of success with corporate partnerships in SFUSD.
- l. Q: Who is this plan for?
- m. Q: ACCESS high school program at Grant cut during budget cuts by administrator regardless of a board resolution that established it. How will something like that be avoided at these 8 sites?  
A: Superintendent is in charge and controls budgets, they will do what they are told.
- n. Q: Is this a program that is applied to?
- o. Q: If this is a transfer process, will that be ready in March?
- p. Q: Where is the budget?
- q. Q: How do these cohorts integrate into site - PE, music, art, specials, electives, etc.  
A: Superintendent doesn't want TAG students segregated and wants kids on same block to be able to go to school together and get served.
- r. Q: Legal clarity - who has jurisdiction over programs -v- schools?  
A: Opened as a program and superintendent has authority of programs. Board has authority over schools.

**Questions from meeting attendees:**

- s. Q: George is already full - boundary issues and overloading. How many students can these sites hold? (J. Grab)
- t. Clarification: certification and endorsements -v- specialization. Certification & endorsements are regulated for which age student may be taught. Specialization is not a requirement in order to teach but schools are allowed to prefer or require (possibly) for hiring. (Margaret)
- u. Q: ACCESS exists for advanced academic needs and socio-emotional needs - how does plan address both of these? (Eric)
- v. Information: last year, TAGAC did heavy vetting of TAG dept proposal which included stand-alone ACCESS and MS SUMMA-like model. Beaverton SUMMA is not geared to socio-emotional - just multiple 99s.
- w. Q: concerns about class size and blended grade (Jessica)
- x. Q: show me the work (Nicole)
- y. Q: Support for socio-emotional and 2E? (Eowyn)
- z. Q: How does proposal address TAG dept's goals of culturally-sensitive inclusion to identify and serve underserved TAG populations? (Natalie)
- aa. Q: What is the plan's approach to 1st and 2nd grade? (Judy)
- bb. Q: Are teachers shared with neighborhood schools? Travelling between sites? (Margaret)
- cc. Q: What direct instruction will be provided for accelerated students and when does digital learning kick in? What about neurotypical -v- neuro-atypical? (Scholle)
- dd. Q: Is there a model we are trying to emulate? Similar services and size of district? Would be encouraged by a success story rather than inventing the wheel. (Nicole)
- ee. Q: How is this improving services for the rest of the TAG population? (Eric)
- ff. Q: Does plan account for demand that shifts based on location? (Eric)
- gg. Q: What services will neighborhood schools receive? Equity? (Nicole)
- hh. Q: What's the role of partnerships & corporate sponsors? (Eowyn)
- ii. Question: Why aren't all students receiving equity in designated staff time -v- digital learning? Where is evidence this is equitable in dedication of staff time compared to special needs and mainstream students? (Margaret)
- jj. Q: What about all the other subjects beyond Math? (Margaret)
- kk. Q: Isn't this isolating to students?
- ll. Q: School culture and resulting atmosphere? How do we get buy-in? Dedicated training/supports or just assume existing structures are adequate? (Jessica)

- mm. Q: What is the curriculum - is this new curriculum appropriate to this model and what is the purpose of the curriculum? (Nicole)
- nn. Q: Where is the budget? Superintendent tenure is usually ~4 years. (Margaret)
- oo. Q: Are there public meetings? A review process? What is the public process and timeline and decision points? (Margaret) These pieces have to be in place before families can make decisions.
- pp. Q: discussion of availability of specials in co-location at Sabin - what is the plan? (Mike)
- qq. Q: These feeder patterns do not allow kids to stay with their neighborhood cohort. (Nicole)
- rr. Q: What about siblings? Will they be accommodated to the host site neighborhood program? (Margaret)  
A: There is a "rider" policy for Special Ed where siblings can opt to be placed in corresponding program.
- ss. Q: How will this plan to keep neighborhood cohorts together play out for DLI or FO schools? (Natalie)
- tt. Q: If the goal is to provide neighborhood TAG services, why are there 8 centers? Still separating children from neighborhood programs. (Nicole)
- uu. Q: Will there be a continuum of services? (Scholle)
- vv. Q: What is the place of this program in a continuum of service? (Jessica)
- ww. Q: How will this bring PPS into Div 22 compliance? (Margaret)
- xx. Q: Staffing issue as populations wax & wane - how will this allow for consistent teaching that is qualified for this population of students? (J.)
- yy. Q: Proposal relies very heavily on the ACCESS teachers being willing to participate. What's the back-up plan? (Judy)
- zz. Q: What is the staffing model? Training? (Scholle)
- aaa. Q: Do ACCESS teachers have specializations? It's not reasonable to expect them to train other teachers. Even harder once isolated in small groups. (Eric)
- bbb. Q: If this is a scalable model, what needs to happen to make sure it can scale evenly with respect to training? (Scholle)
- ccc. Q: TAGAC recommended district-wide cluster grouping model a few years back, how can that rec inform this proposal? (Margaret)
- ddd. Q: What is the timeline? (Margaret)
- eee. Q: Q: 2 year budget cycle, how does it all play out for timing? (Scholle)
- fff. Q: What support will be provided for teachers, professional learning communities? Is there a dedicated administrator and a training plan? (Nicole)  
Info: Beaverton gathers all teachers monthly. (Scholle)
- ggg. Q: What role does TAG director and TOSAs have in this proposal? (eric)
- hhh. Q: What role did they have in developing this proposal? (Eric)
- iii. Q: How do we make this a uniform service, coordination, training? (Scholle)
- jjj. Q: Where is the written framework when new staff comes in? (Jane)
- kkk. Q: Would this be more successful with a staged roll-out strategy? Target underserved populations? (Natalie)
- lll. Q: Hard to design for a variety of learners even at 95%ile +
- mmm. Q: Can this work hand-in-hand with local norms development?  
Comment: Don't guinea pig Title 1 schools - already burdened. Don't pilot in privileged community either. Pilot in the middle and then roll out to HU as soon as is reasonable.
- nnn. Q: When will there be a needs assessment? We are lacking in data. (Margaret)
- ooo. Q: What does the daily program look like? Who are the students, the teachers, what does their day look like? (Margaret)
- ppp. Q: move ACCESS temporarily and work on the plan? (Judy)
- qqq. Q: How many spots and how will they be filled? (Scholle)

- rrr. Q: Roll out 2 sites next year and then double the following year and again in order to get services in all schools (Eric)
- sss. Q: Is the goal to stay in neighborhood and get services or is it to achieve economies of scale? (Scholle)
- ttt. Q: Co-location issues.
- uuu. Q: Is the vision still a continuum of services? (Nicole)
- vvv. Q: So much discussion of inclusion but all the available services screen students out.
- www. Q: Where's the accountability to verify what these centers are accomplishing? (Margaret)

2. Brainstorm: Implementation requirements and target demographic of the proposed regional services model in order for it to succeed. (Scholle)

Major points: eligibility, consistency, neighborhood relations/pathways, teaching model, special populations, models that work, diversity/equity/inclusion, timeline, training, budget, future, feeder patterns/transitions, integration/co-location, TAG continuum, accountability that programs have integrity.

Discussion of other cities' models - Houston, Seattle, Beaverton, New York City

Many have stand-alone & embedded cohorts & charters. Stand-alone models tend to persist. Pull-out programs tend to disappear. Providing stability for families is a major driver for stand-alone.

(Scholle, Margaret)

Most important aspect is socio-emotional. Families need to feel it is a safe place, where child is understood and supported. No point if that piece isn't there. (Jessica)

### **Time check - can we get anything meaningful done if we keep going now? Move online?**

### **Switch gears to produce a statement in response to implication that TAGAC signed off on the proposal.**

Things that were said during brainstorming of a response:

TAGAC formally reviewed the Superintendent's proposal for a gifted regional services model for the first time today. We were dismayed to learn that the PPS TAG director who according to our bylaws is a designated facilitator of our meetings was directed by his supervisor not to attend our meeting today. The committee came up with over 65 questions requiring answers before being able to give meaningful feedback. TAGAC affirms that every TAG student has the right to have their rate & level met and has worked tirelessly to achieve that goal. TAGAC has a rich history of recommendations that could be more readily implemented. We are delighted that Superintendent Guerrero intends to make strides in providing TAG services and is ready to take on this problem. TAGAC recognizes that this proposal is the first step at framing a long-term plan. There remains much more work to be done to figure out the many details of a roll-out plan. We look forward to learning how this plan will enable PPS to meet its legal requirement provide TAG services for every TAG student. At the moment, we do not see sufficient information for the Board to vote on this proposal in good conscience. In our capacity as advisory board to the TAG Administrator, the Superintendent and the School Board, we expect to be formally consulted before this plan is adopted and to be included in all future design meetings. We support providing accelerated learning opportunities to all students who need them. We do not support the effective dissolution of ACCESS via this proposal and require the opportunity to vet an orderly and fully-detailed transition plan that improves accessibility of TAG services for all students who need them, while meeting the needs of the existing 99th %ile population at ACCESS and throughout PPS.

### **Tabled:**

3. Brainstorm: Recommendation to Board regarding next steps for regional services model. (Scholle)