

Written Response to LCAP Public Comment on June 3, 2021

The background of the questions is centered on the LCAP regulations overarching goal of having the LCFF Supplemental Grant spent "primarily proportional" [SBE] to the "unduplicated" [SBE] 'High Needs students' (your presentation and LCAP wording). The questions were concerning your presentation (notes within parenthesis) relative to the state LCAP regulations as expressed in the required format wording of the draft LCAP document attachment [notes and pages within square brackets]

In your presentation the above area of MVWSD's LCAP was presented (pages 21 first and third bullet, pg. 33, 35) concerning the required detailed explanation of "Increased or Improved Services". [pg. 58-59 of 79] to "directly serve the needs" of high needs LCAP target students. ["increased or improved by the percentage required"]

QUESTIONS 2 programs, at the top of the list of your LCAP/LCFF funding Highlight Goal 1 effective instruction

Question 1

\$2.9 million of \$4 M LCFF funds (page 35) was allocated as meeting the specific needs of "High Needs" students through the "Instructional Coaches" and the "Response to Instruction" (RTI) programs. *How does this follow, since the the LCAP document [pages 3, 22-3. etc]* shows clearly that these funds are to be and have been spent on "all sites/all students"*

Response

EC 42238.07(a)(2) authorizes school districts to use funds apportioned on the basis of the number of unduplicated pupils for schoolwide or districtwide services.

If a district uses these funds to that end, they must provide a description in prompt 1 of the Increased and Improved Services section that describes how the services support the needs, conditions, and circumstances of unduplicated pupils and how they will principally benefit from these services even though they are being made available across the district.

The following are the descriptions provided in prompt 1 in the LCAP section on Increased or Improved Services that have been reviewed and approved by the Santa Clara County Office of Education LCAP review team for MVWSD.

Instructional Coaches - Goal 1, Action 1

MVWSD is investing in an instructional coaching team to support teachers in improving their instructional practices with a focus on closing the achievement gap for students including Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students, English Learners, Foster Youth and other identified subgroups. The District will have a 1.0 FTE instructional coach at each elementary school and the middle schools will share 4.0 FTE (1.0 math, 1.0 science, and 1.0 LEA and 1.0 Social Studies) Research is clear that teachers are the single most important school based factor affecting student achievement. Students, especially Socio-Economically Disadvantaged, English Learners and Foster Youth need to have access to highly effective teachers. We believe that investing in improved teacher practice will result in improved outcomes in reading and math for our unduplicated students.

Response to Instruction - Goal 1, Action 5

The District's Response to Instruction Initiative was developed as a strategy for closing the achievement gap. Having additional teachers allows sites to lower class size for our most challenged learners which are our English Learners and Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students at all schools. The yellow ratings for English Learners and Socio-Economically Disadvantaged students in English Language Arts and orange ratings for these subgroups in mathematics on the California Dashboard indicate a need to continue to provide programs to target support to these groups. Lowering student to teacher ratios and targeting the needs of students should result in improved outcomes in reading for students.

Question 2: "effective instruction"

The requirement of LCAP documentation is to show in this case: **how is RTI a particularly effective supplementary program funded by the Supplementary Grant of LCFF that is targeting "High Needs" students?** I asked **how can this be the case**, when RTI staff (as I noted "temporary teacher" positions = non-tenured) are at all sites, not concentrated at "High Needs" elementary sites [also LCAP "unduplicated students"] and these teachers have not had access to the student achievement database that permanent teachers have. **RTI is a direct student support program that has LCFF funded staff at "all sites" distributed equally** [pg 3 of 79 "Goal 1, Action 5" "each site has dedicated STEAM teachers"] even though some elementary sites like Castro have giant academic Gaps and especially high concentrations of "High Needs" students. [Supplemental Grant funds]. Other elementary sites like Huff have a very small number of "High Needs" students [LCFF/LCAP "unduplicated"]. **THIS QUESTION is not about Middle School sites/** which are stated as targeted to "students who need intervention are given an RTI period in their schedule" [pg. 23-24]

Response:

Teachers are hired to teach STEAM to all grade levels at all schools. These teachers work with grade level teams, during collaboration time, to review student data and create student groupings which allow the students' primary classroom teacher to provide students small group targeted instruction while the other students receive hands-on science instruction during the school day. Because the RTI teachers are teaching science to all students they do not need access to the students' data, although it is provided to them. It is the classroom teacher's responsibility to use the data to target the instruction for students each week.

Yes, these teachers, similar to coaches, are in what is considered temporary positions. We do this as funding for these positions can change yearly depending on the state of the District's budget. We expect that teachers reapply and interview each year so that we have strong teachers in these positions.