MINUTES

1.) P. DeGuzman – has been approached regarding discipline and punishment, the punishment does not seem to equal the crime. For example, a student who has been ditching is taken out of class which amounts to ditching another class. D. Dragos said they try not to do it, but usually it’s because of processing time and depends on the time of class the student is taken out. D. Dragos said it also depends on the facts of the case in a case by case basis. The second issue P. DeGuzman brought up is students expressing concern regarding the amount of fights on campus. There is a supposed increase, last semester there were 12 and this semester is one so far. P. DeGuzman wanted to know what administration’s take on this is. D. Dragos said according to past data we’re actually at less. D. Dragos said it’s more of an awareness level and volume and intensity in addition to higher profile fights (which leads to the perception that there are more fights). D. Dragos said it’s proportionally the same. Consequences are proportionate to level of intensity. D. Dragos said Robe and team tries to be on top of it and have quick response time. P. DeGuzman asked if higher profile has to do with gangs. D. Dragos said no and one high profile fight was a brother and sister. D. Dragos said the ones we thought would erupt with gangs didn’t. P. DeGuzman said, just to clarify, the numbers are the same; D. Dragos confirmed and added that fights seem to come in cycles according to peaks and cycles, so they [administrators] try to be sensitive to those peaks. P. DeGuzman’s third issue is that he’s noticed the second bell after 4SR hasn’t been going off. J. Ichiroku and E. Harbison have also noticed. D. Dragos said they will check on it. J. Ichiroku added on to the fight issue. She feels like there’s been an increase, especially around finals. J. Ichiroku wanted to know why there seemed to be an increase. D. Dragos said at that time there were a couple of instigators who have since been taken care of (as in not here anymore). J. Ichiroku asked if there was a consequence for almost starting a fight. D. Dragos said there is a process that has to be followed, and has been/is being followed, and administration is staying on top of all this as far as they are procedurally able.

2.) J. Ichiroku passed out the results of the second semester survey and reviewed them. Stars are repeated issues. The top two seem to be repeated. As FAC, we asked as our big question, why does D. Dragos think the same things keep coming up? D. Dragos said he thinks people aren’t getting information and/or need further clarification. D. Dragos is still working on discipline policy, but EdCode is vague in many ways, so he can’t give us specific, cut and dried consequences all the time. J. Ichiroku asked for a date of expectation, but D. Dragos said he doesn’t know, it’s just being worked on. J. Ichiroku said we still don’t have a school safety plan. D. Dragos said it’s almost done and they’re finishing it up (it’s gone from about three pages to 100 pages) and as soon as he can we will all get copies. S. Goins asked for the name of the district safety director (Dwayne Datman). D. Dragos said Datman has all the information. J. Ichiroku asked about our fire drill. D. Dragos said we will be having a fire drill this semester. J. Ichiroku asked if we will be trained for the fire drill. D. Dragos said at the next full site collaboration at the end of March after WASC. J. Ichiroku said the next site collaboration is in June. D. Dragos said he will make sure we are given the information ASAP, though he can’t require us to come to a meeting. He will offer a voluntary
meeting and will give written information to those who don’t want to come to the meeting. J. Ichiroku said that’s why it was brought up first semester. S. Goins said staff typically has responsibilities related to the Safety Plan (in a Critical Incident, Mr. Smith opens the South Gate nearest his door) and that can be parceled out on email, and D. Dragos said the handbook from last year has a brief, not very thorough plan that can be followed in the interim.

3.) P. DeGuzman pointed out some solutions (printed on the back side of the survey results), and J. Ichiroku facilitated the discussion about the solutions. P. DeGuzman clarified that there are people who are here who have been here in the past when things worked that can be utilized to help current administration refine policies. D. Dragos said he’s open to it, but some people he’s approached won’t do it without compensation (which he completely understands). D. Dragos said he’s happy to talk to anyone about specific problems people want to express. He said they’re trying really hard to work with anyone who offers to help, but sometimes the rules call for a progression of due process, and sometimes when emotions are involved people forget there is a process that has to be gone through. J. Ichiroku said when people who have been here for a long time are saying things aren’t working anymore, they should be listened to. D. Dragos said part of the problem is that things done in the past weren’t legal, though they were immediate solutions to difficult situations, and now that they’re trying to remedy that and do things the right way, people aren’t understanding that. S. Goins wanted to know if D. Dragos had informed staff of the change of policy. S. Goins said she’s hearing the frustration, just tell us what it is. D. Dragos said things aren’t that clear, things have to be looked at in a case-by-case basis because there are so many open-ended possibilities. D. Dragos and S. Goins went through several scenarios. S. Goins pointed out that infractions such as gum-chewing surely warrant a different set of consequences than taking a swing at a teacher and those examples could be used to set some guidelines for teachers to go by. J. Ichiroku said staff just wants something. D. Dragos said he will share some more basic guidelines. J. Ichiroku said some people feel the consequences are not adequate. J. Ichiroku said also it’s not just what specifically happens so much as knowing something will happen. K. Santos said she’s had some teachers come to her wanting specifics, and she’s had a variety of requests. D. Dragos reiterated it varies from case-to-case. J. Ichiroku reiterated the problem with not being notified of suspensions and not getting referrals back. D. Dragos said they do grade-level discipline; there are exceptions but typically K. Santos does 10th, D. Dragos does 9th, J. Jobes does 11th and 12th. D. Dragos said teachers get the paper back after the consequence is meted out. J. Ichiroku said teachers who have never gotten paperwork back believe then that no consequence was ever given/followed through. D. Dragos said they are dealing with them, but sometimes there is a lag and they are working on it. D. Dragos said for teachers to talk to the grade level administrator, then come to him if nothing has happened. J. Ichiroku went on with the next solution – online restricted access to verify suspensions and referrals. D. Dragos and K. Santos will look into this. P. DeGuzman asked for clarification regarding where suspensions go (paperwork). D. Dragos said they go to Letty for the log, then Rosa for attendance; if it’s Special Ed the case carrier will get a copy. D. Dragos will ask Hawthorne administration about this (their system was discussed as a possible solution and/or model). J. Ichiroku then brought up the hat suggestion. D. Dragos said the problem with hats is it becomes a property issue, which he understands the benefit but it also increases liability with holding property. GENERAL DISCUSSION REGARDING HATS AND SCHOOL-WIDE POLICY D. Dragos said he will not bluff and enforce a rule that is not backed up in EdCode, but he can and will enforce rules made for the classroom by teachers. S. Goins brought to the principal’s attention that he as the lead administrator on campus could make the rule to be followed. D. Dragos said he did not have the staff to enforce a rule like that campus-wide and did not want to spend the time on managing the collection of hats himself. He reiterated that he would, however, back-up any teacher who made such a rule in their own classroom. D. Dragos said he will work on getting a printed disciplinary process...
D. Dragos said he will continue to press on hanging the wire issue, though he has no direct control of it. D. Dragos said he will ask about a canopy, but it is a facilities issue. D. Dragos said he will continue to press for facilities issue(s) to be dealt with.

4.) Regarding installing cameras in PAC – FAC is unclear about what exactly the problem is. P. DeGuzman said maybe there doesn’t need to be cameras - it’s a problem with the hallway. D. Dragos said the teacher(s) secures the stairwells because they have to let the kids in. D. Dragos said kids can’t get into main building. FAC requests further clarification on this problem for next meeting.

5.) D. Dragos clarified survey issues for him to follow up on.

6.) E. Harbison asked for an update on the Dean issue. D. Dragos said interviews were Friday, and the Dean position should help immensely with back-up on discipline. E. Harbison clarified that teachers can email grade-level administrators after sending referrals for update, and D. Dragos and K. Santos said they both email teachers with information.

7.) S. Goins asked the principal for clarification about “getting bogged down with stuff”. She asked D. Dragos what a typical day looks like for him. D. Dragos said there is no typical day, in an ideal world he’s spending time in classrooms observing. But things don’t work that way – he spends time being pulled away for meetings and dealing with minor-level discipline. We are short staffed at this site for administrators and hopefully the Dean position will help with that. There are more kids on campus, but also more teachers. Also, there is no lottery here now, so the population has changed. S. Goins suggested D. Dragos gives a lot of support for the same reasons D. Dragos just sited. D. Dragos and K. Santos said at this site, class sizes aren’t bigger because we have more teachers. S. Goins asked what the Dean will be responsible for. D. Dragos said first tier is triage on discipline. If it’s something the Dean can deal with, good; if it’s a higher level discipline issue, it will be passed on to an administrator. The second tier is another body to walk around and be visible on campus. The Dean can’t suspend but can pass on for suspension. The Dean is basically a deputy administrator.

Scheduled next meeting
E. Harbison briefly re-capped the meeting, and we set a date for the next meeting. Next FAC meeting will take place on Wednesday, March 17, 2010 from 3:15 PM to 4:15 PM in D. Dragos’ office.

Any Issues Or Concerns that FAC needs to know?
Contact any FAC member with your concern or issue (via email or a note in our box) and we will add it to the list to be discussed during the next meeting (time permitting, but we will eventually get to it). If you wish to remain anonymous, please indicate it on your email or note.

Paolo DeGuzman mr_deguzman@yahoo.com
Kimberly Faulkner-Camacho kimfau@msn.com
Erica Harbison imtherikkster13@yahoo.com
Julie Ichiroku mrsichiroku@yahoo.com
Erika Magana ms.magana@juno.com
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