

**Superintendent's Two Way Immersion Task Force  
Meeting Minutes from November 1, 2011**

Time keeper – G. Martin  
Process Observer – P. Furlan  
Minutes – M. Hernandez

Meeting started with review of group agreements and review procedures of public comments. Task Force members can only listen but cannot respond; after public comment, only voting members of the group can comment. Agenda for the meeting was reviewed.

**Public comment:**

Liz Fuentes – Commended group for taking on issues facing TWI issues. Noted concern that before looking at the location of the school, Task Force should be looking at how the ELs are doing across the programs (TWI, Bilingual, Mainstream). She asked that Task Force look at what will be done to close achievement gap as the District and Task Force is not asking right questions. How are we looking at our ELS? How are they doing? Need to have Spanish speaking community present to hear their concerns. All ELs need to have the skills to write and get into college.

**A motion by T. Alper (Rosa Parks Parent rep) was introduced:**

To remove Cragmont and Thousand Oaks as possible sites for consolidation of TWI school. Identifying the best site for consolidation is one of the tasks of the group. Over the time the group has been working on this, those sites have never been considered, given they are too far removed and are not realistic options. Taking them out of the list of possible sites to consider will stream line the decision making process to choose site.

Motion seconded by S. Pinelli (Cragmont Parent rep)

**Votes for motion** – all in favor, except E. Tamondong-Bradley (Cragmont Principal absent, and A.Gallegos-Castillo (LeConte Parent rep) voted no.

**Comments related to the passing of the motion:**

J. Sikes (TO Principal) - Stated that the TO community wants to have discussion about how to improve the bilingual program as part of the work the TWI Task Force is doing.

D. Iniguez (TO Parent rep) - TO still wants to be on the table to improve program and be part of the conversation.

P. Casetta (TO Teacher rep) – Parents at TO met last year, some want current program to continue as is and others want to continue as a TWI Program. Parents want a resolution as to how to improve current bilingual program.

N. King (Cragmont Teacher rep) – Cragmont parent also supports motion.

C. Campbell (BFT) – Follow up to J. Sikes and P. Casetta’s remarks – if change is going to impact TO, information needs to start to go out to families in December, if real desire to change program in 2012-13, lots of work needs to happen in next two weeks regarding review of raw data.

A. Lopez (TO Parent rep) information on the proposed consolidation and the possible impact for TO is just getting out. Discussions and sharing of information needs to be happening more.

TO reps requested clarification that in fact, the vote for the motion was that vote is only for site consideration, not participation in the committee discussions on the program, therefore TO will still be part of the conversations of the TWI Task Force.

Impact of Task Force work on all 4 sites:

Separate issue at TO and possible change to program. If the ELAC is not meeting until December, nothing can be done, if there is desire to do something that impacts the program in 2012-13.

Based on current time line of Task Force, in January- February part of the discussion is also looking at district wide program and TO.

M. Hernandez, A. Gallegos-Castillo, G. Valdez (LeConte Parent rep), D. Iniguez will work on development of survey and guiding questions principals and site reps can use for engaging their school community in the discussion.

F. Romero (Rosa Parks Parent rep) Concerned that ELACs and DELAC are not consistent and not very well attended, schools system is inconsistent. How can we reach more of the EL parents? If ELACS and DELAC are our vehicles for reaching EL families and gathering their input and concerns, how can we expand to reach more parents?

In order to be ready for January/February discussions, a subcommittee should be formed for discussion of TO program and district wide English Learners program.

### **Report from Facilities - Lew Jones**

Franklin Adult School- Basic structure of site was for K-5, but now it is more set up for being an adult school. Adult school funds are now part of the overall general funds, have consolidated program and now focus on certain aspects, still using most of space on site. Program has tended to serve day classes and other skills and ESL programs in the day. Change would need to happen on the mission and programming so that it could work out to have shared place. 37 or 38 classrooms, several small flex spaces, no library, a cafeteria, and an auditorium. Most sites are using all the space available. Adult school could modify program to free up more rooms.

Rosa Parks – Retrofitted has a total of 22 classrooms, two small flex rooms, a library and a cafeteria.

LeConte –Total of 17 classrooms, 5 fewer classrooms than at Rosa Parks 3 consistent kinder classes, currently 1 TWI and 2 English, class size increases after grade 3 (all school sites). Has a small flex room, a library, a cafeteria, and an auditorium.

B. Leyva- Cutler - Ontario/Montclair conversation highlighted huge benefits to k-8 model. If BUSD moved to a K-8 TWI program. What would that look like?

LeConte could be possibility; Rosa Parks would be tricky, as possible sites for housing this model.

T. Alper - If a school was to have 4 kindergarten class, how would you prepare to work on increase?

F. Romero - How many students are we thinking about for the new school?

M. Contreras -Would it be possible to relocate adult school to LeConte?

L. Jones - What is the goal, what are you trying to move? There is a lot of pressure in north zone for spaces. That is why BAM and MX are hybrid zones to accommodate for space is schools.

District renovated spaces at Jefferson, looking at expanding to another 4 classrooms in the next 5 years.

Rosa parks has some federal restrictions around adding more spaces, it could not take adding more.

Questions for L. Jones: If the site was to recommend a k-5 move, what is facility/zone lens you would look at?

L. Jones: Generically, unless you add new schools, more students leaving north than coming into north would be easier.

Does not have sense of how many students it would be if you are looking at K8 or k5 program.

If BUSD started model as K-5 and decided to expand, could Rosa Parks be expanded to k-8? There would potentially enough space to add?

D. Dugatkin - are there any other sites L. Jones can recommend? West Campus has not been fully designed; could what could exist there be looked at?

L. Jones – West Campus facility at one point could be worked on with funding. Other than that, there are very little possibilities.

Group requested facilities information for Longfellow.

L.Argueta (LeConte Teacher rep – Malcolm X has space, available classrooms, why is it not being considered? It should be on the list if we are exploring new options, as well as other schools.

P. Furlan -Hesitates going that route, pulling other schools, PR could be problematic both of those programs have strong programs. Politics here in Berkeley would be problematic. K8 option has possibility.

A.Gallegos Castillo – It's important to look at ultimate goal, we need to make recommendation for long haul, not easiest but best thing. As we think about accommodations for program, what is the goal, how many students are we planning on enrolling?

Longfellow, originally built as K-5, but renovated to be 6-8, approximately 34rooms at Longfellow.

In thinking long term K-8 at Franklin Adult School could be looked at possible solution for 4<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup>, and LeConte be looked at as K-3. Is it possible to look at program at k-3 4-8?

If we could keep central, what would be best site to house consolidated program?

### **Report from Transportation - Bernadette Cormier**

What are implications of changing routes?

Took narrow view of how transportation might be factor and guesses of what information committee might need.

Will review assumptions of how students/routes would be rerouted and bussed.

Guiding questions:

How will students be distributed?

How can bussing and distribution be impacted by TWI committee decision?

Did not have breakdown of students with special needs.

Data source - Transportation software used to have isolated look at students.

Added TWI students into planning, created routes for eligible TWI students, determined by living over 1.5 miles beyond school location. Assumed all those who were eligible, 1.5 miles or more were going to ride, (not always the case).

Built program around morning route, as afterschool programs impact routes in afternoon.

Adding TWI students to current routes: ff TWI students did not fit into structure, new route would e created for 1.5 mile or greater distance, would utilize existing stops whenever possible. Current riders not included in routes, but all TWI students are.

Cost formula:

Used current numbers of eligible students for program (proposed number of current students in TWI = 354, Current number of TWI student who qualify for the bus routes = 194), took labor expense x annual miles to determine next expense.

TWI Route Implementation Scenarios Highlighting route structure and cost comparison were shared with the Task Force members.

Safety stops – accommodated by request for fairly dangerous streets that exist.

Should look at route costs comparison as relates to each of the schools in consideration not in relation to current cost for each school.

Questions/Comments:

Of the students who don't use the bus program, how many do not use it?

Are there any safety impacts? Installation of new traffic light, traffic safety issues. TO and MX has been advocating for traffic lights, walkways, has not been easy.

D. Dugatkin: What would be B. Cormier's recommendation for site based on transportation impact?

B. Cormier: Wherever program is located, transportation will do it. There might be impact in need for FTE to resource students, if this program is implemented, assumes that transportation and other needs would be met.

What is scenario of current costs?

### **Report from Admissions Office – Francisco Martinez**

#### Recruitment

- District preschools
- Headstart preschools
- Private preschools
- In person/telephone communication by Admissions Office staff
- School visitation hours
- School kindergarten nights
- Kindergarten Fair
  - Table for TWI program

#### Language Testing

- Testing conducted by bilingual staff in State and Federal Programs
- State and Federal Programs determines whether student are Limited English Proficient, Bilingual or English Speaking

#### Lottery Process

- TWI and bilingual lottery done first
- 50/50 language goal (50% Limited English Proficient and 50% English Speaking)
- All limited English Proficient students who request TWI or Thousand Oaks bilingual program get in
- No sibling priority (sibling priority to school but not to TWI)
  - However, Limited English Proficient siblings do get in
- Approximately 60 to 100 English speaking students apply for 10 spaces per attendance zone

- English speaking students selected by lottery
- Waiting list created
- Should there not be 10 Limited English Proficient students, students who are bilingual are considered for vacant positions according to waiting list position

Questions/Comments:

P. Furlan: Potentially, if we had a one way emersion program – if 150 kinder would want a program, is that a conservative estimate of how many students apply? How many do we lose to private program? Some families only request a TWI program as first choice, if they don't get into program, they don't enroll into BUSD.

T. Alper: 2010 census, has the result impacted diversity category map?

F. Martinez: Impact of 2010 Census is being looked at now.

P. Furlan: Are there a lot of Spanish speaking families who are requesting TWI? What is the percentage?

F. Martinez: Lots of competition for the English spots in the program. We never have a waiting list of kindergarten for EL.

Comments were made about not enough recruitment for TWI.

Bilingual testing is excluding bilingual students who could be good bilingual models. Is there a new testing process to allow bilingual to participate in program?

What is percentage of Spanish speaking EL in TWI, Bilingual, Mainstream programs K-5 district wide? (Task Force members were reminded to review charts shared at first meeting with the breakdown of this information)

Are we considering the 1/3 model (1/3 English Only, 1/3 Spanish Speakers, 1/3 Bilingual)? Or are we just using bilingual numbers to fill EO numbers when necessary?

How accurate are tests?

Sibling preference- what challenges might the TWI testing and entry into program present?

F. Martinez: If there were to be a school they would have priority into TWI program.

B. Leyva-Cutler: Students who have been assessed from Franklin and Centro Vida have not been placed in Bilingual or TWI programs. Makes it hard for families when currently both siblings don't get into programs. Need to look at that.

How many students would be interested in TWI program if school would consolidate? It would be still same number – 3 or 4 kindergarten classrooms.

D. Dugatkin: Could we look at what Berkeley needs not what we have in terms of the numbers to serve? If we are trying to make it the best that it can be, how many people would want to get into the program?

F. Martinez: Possibly 250 kinder students, most would be bilingual and EO.

C. Campbell: Families who are bilingual are notified about in August, why until then?

F. Martinez: We wait for LEP who can come in late, so we wait and save spaces to assign to TWI if they don't materialize, bilingual students on waiting list are offered spot to program.

Flyers and brochures on the program, committee needs to see fliers.  
Task Force needs to look at 1/3 model.

Obstacles for getting in: Methodology, publicity at pre-schools, headstarts, private pre-schools, phone calls, talking to parents takes more presentations for Latino parents.

D. Iniguez - how can the assessment tool (Quick Informal Assessment) be revised? Need to contact State and Federal programs to reconsider the assessment and criteria for families.

**Summary and next steps:**

Follow up slides, with AMAO information and High School data requested at last meeting distributed to Task Force.

**Next Meeting Agenda Topics:**

Presentation on QIA Assessment – Christina Faulkner

Admissions/TWI Outreach information: Francisco Martinez, Maya Hernandez

Site reports from principals

**Next meetings date:**

**December 6, 2011**

**January 10, 2012**

**February 7, 2012**

**March 6, 2012**

**April 10, 2012**

**May 8, 2012**

**June 5, 2012**