

PS 3 School Leadership Team (SLT)

Staff/Teacher Members: Andrea Franks, Katie Kaufmann, Jessica I. Harey (UFT representative) Stephanie Kim, Amie Schindel, Lisa Siegman (Principal)

Parent Members: Patricia Laraia, Yin Ho, Naima Freitas, Karen Wong, Tessie Nam, Jocelyn Anker (PTA Co-President)

Meeting Dates: 10/28, 11/13, 12/16, 1/22, 2/26, 3/23, 4/22, 5/18, 6/17

SLT minutes – 3/23/16 – 7:30am – Rm 408

Attendees: Patricia Laraia, Yin Ho, Karen Wong, Naima Freitas, Jocelyn Anker, Tessie Nam, Jessica Harvey, Andrea Franks, Stephanie Kim, Katie Kaufmann, Amie Schindel, Lisa Siegman

Observers: Bob Osborne, Joe Smith

1) Discussion of PTA funded programs – Jocelyn presented but it was established that she might need to consult with Bob, her PTA co-president, since this was his area of expertise.

Lisa gave context of history of PTA funded programs at PS 3 – when she arrived 15 years ago, there were only Clay and Music.

Jocelyn stated that in the intervening years, the PTA has taken on other fiscal responsibilities. The budget has gone from just under \$300,000 to over \$600,000 with the addition of programs including Assistant Teachers, Science Support for grades 4/5, Scientist/Artist in Residence Program, Part-Time Support Specialists.

Clay and music have remained status quo. It is important to the PTA that the PTA periodically assess what it's paying for and see if the goals for the programs are being met, and if not, determine what needs to be changed.

It was suggested if possible, that it's important to have one teacher on each assessment committee.

Yin said that when the Charrette was (re-)started 3-4 years ago, it was simply to determine what to do with the accumulated surplus. Lisa said that the Charrette had evolved from that point to discuss priorities in the community. Jocelyn named some of the priorities that emerged at the most recent Charrette; they included science and foreign language. Andrea said that adding the teaching of a foreign language would create too great a strain on teachers, especially with the shortened school day. Jocelyn said that all the committees would be told that nothing could be added during the school day, only substituted for other enrichment. The addition of programs after school was raised as an option. It was brought up that the after school program is not an option for everyone. Jocelyn said that no decisions would be made by the committees, but rather they would look at all the parameters. She said that it was also important to assess long-standing programs, for example to see what the music curriculum through the course of K through 5 was relative to what people hoped for from a music curriculum.

Jessica pointed out that some people hired with PTA funding were "directly under the auspices of the PTA" while others were made using PTA funding but were administered by the school. Lisa concurred with that. Jocelyn said that because the PTA was funding all these, that it was important to have a parent perspective. Lisa said that she discussed programs and hires with the teachers, and with the PTA co-presidents. Yin said that this was an essential tension and was essentially part of P.S. 3.

Jocelyn said that the PTA wanted to do a follow-up discussion of the values, that there are two parallel processes, one is a business process, $2 + 2 = 4$, and that the two tied together.

Andrea asked if there was one committee for each of the four topics: science, foreign language, music and teaching assistants. Jocelyn said yes, to come up with proposals for the area. Katie said it would be difficult to find teachers for the foreign language committee. Stephanie added that they were having a hard time fitting in handwriting. Jocelyn said that she's bilingual but that she understood, and that perhaps Mr. Butch could do more songs in another language. Naima asked if the committees would evaluate the things we're doing already, and Jocelyn responded that they would. Stephanie suggested that perhaps the PTA could speak to teachers on a Monday afternoon about how it could support science in the classrooms. It was suggested that maybe there could be a simple survey for the teachers' input. Jessica voiced concern about the enrichment subjects that were subject to state standards. Lisa said that she had veto power over the suggested enrichment, that one of her understandings of the values of the school was that she didn't have to originate all the ideas. If there was sufficient energy and interest for something that does fit in, we can do it. If something is not going to work well for the school or the teachers, then we don't.

Jocelyn said that it was important to keep in mind that 75% of the PTA funding goes for people, and their lives are impacted by this. Stephanie and Katie expressed concern about whether SAIR (Scientist and Artist in Residence) was going to be funded, since it was not on the priority list, and that SAIR was part of science. Jocelyn said that it was more about the upper grade science support that was added. She said that it was also the parent perceptions about what was currently being done in science. Yin suggested that we should list the projects that have happened over the years. Stephanie suggested that we make a bulletin board with five photos from each project. Lisa gave the history of SAIR and said it was arrived at collaboratively when a former parent proposed it and then worked with her to arrive at consensus.

There was a brief discussion about the role of the after school in providing enrichment activities, but this was deferred for a future meeting.

2) Discussion of the next agenda item – the survey about grade composition. Yin reported there was excellent response, with 469 surveys returned, 265 current parents, 103 from recent alum parents, 47 teachers, 48 recent alums. She added that the recent alums were amazing and wanted to come talk at the town hall. She said that she and the committee were still in the process of analyzing the results, that when they said community, they “went broad.” They went to everyone “who was still in the realm of PS 3 in the past 10-15 years.” She said, “I think that it gives us a very rich picture of the role of grade composition at PS 3.” She asked when the results should be presented, that they would like to hold an event. There was a discussion about when to do the event. There was a discussion about the week between testing and spring break. Katie suggested that it be on a Wednesday evening. There was a discussion of other factors that might have bearing on it – the PTA meeting and presentation of the budget for the following year, when the next SLT meeting was. Jocelyn questioned whether it would have an impact on the budget discussion. The date of May 5th was proposed. Lisa expressed

concerns as the fourth grade classes would be returning from Frost Valley on May 4th and the teachers and parents who went on this trip were generally exhausted the following day. Andrea said she didn't think this was an issue. Tessie volunteered to poll the 4th grade about this. Yin said that the committee would analyze the data and frame the agenda and that alumni would be coming to speak since "they experienced all the grade configurations."

Jocelyn asked about next steps for the Charrette committees. Karen asked about the parents' role and Jocelyn said that the people who filled out the survey had self-identified. At this point, the teachers were leaving to go to their classes.

Next Steps and Wrap Up

- Tessie volunteered to poll the 4th grade teachers about Frost Valley on proposed date of May 5.
- Yin to present Grade Composition Poll results at next SLT meeting in April.
- Jocelyn to send out survey to teachers on which Charette items they would like to see as part of the curriculum after which an afternoon meeting will be scheduled for teachers to discuss in more detail.
- It was suggested that we add the role of the after school in providing enrichment activities to a future meeting.