

Ludlow-Taylor LSAT's September 2025 Meeting Notes

Meeting Date/Time/Location: Monday September 15, 2025 @ 6 in L-T's Multipurpose Room

Attendees: LSAT Members LaQuontinesha Atchison, Angelle Baugh, Yakeema Blackstone, Channing Cooper, Chris Hanley, Andrea Lisell, Beth O'Connor & Jasmine Tingling-Clemmons attended in person; Lesli Jackson and Principal Miller joined virtually via Zoom. Approx 10 additional parents attended in person.

Principal Miller prepared the slides for the meeting (attached with minor edits).

Final Meeting Agenda (circulated 9/12) annotated with meeting discussion:

1. Welcome & overview (presented by Principal Miller)

- Quick review of meeting agenda (see slide 2).
- Review of '25-'26 LSAT members (see slide 3).
- Review of LSAT's role as advisory to Principal (see slide 4).
- Review of Principal's participation in LSAT (see slide 5).

2. Nominations & elections of Chair(s) and Secretary

- Quick review of roles of LSAT Chair & Secretary presented by Principal Miller (see slide 6).
- Nominations for LSAT Co-Chairs open (facilitated by parent LSAT Member due to Principal Miller's virtual participation & logistical issues).
- Parent LSAT Member nominated Beth O'Connor (parent) and Ms. Cooper (teacher) as Co-Chairs. Seconds and thirds. No other nominations. Elected by acclimation.
- Nominations for LSAT Secretary open (facilitated by newly elected LSAT Co-Chair). No volunteers. Suggestions of using Zoom transcription/recording to facilitate. Still need a nomination per LSAT rules/for person responsible for sending notes to DCPS, etc. In absentia nomination of Ms. Jackson, who served in the role several years ago. Ms. Atchison confirms with Ms. Jackson that she is willing to accept the nomination. Elected by acclimation.

3. Comprehensive School Plan (CSP) review/approval (presented by Principal Miller)

- Reviewed proposed CSP goals for '25-'26 (see slide 8).
- Two categories of goals: school-developed and DCPS-developed. Some of each under most of the 4 categories of goals.

- First two categories of goals are Literacy & Math. Literacy Goal #1 and Math Goal #3 (60% of 1st-5th graders below or well below grade level at BOY will attain their stretch growth by EOY) are school-developed. Last year we had similar goals, because there is evidence that kids who are behind grade level need to obtain stretch goals if they are ever going to catch back up.
- Literacy Goals #2-#4 & Math Goals #1-2 are DCPS-developed. They set the targets for the percentage of kids in various grades who will attain a level of mid or above grade level by EOY. Literacy #2 and Math #1 = 80% for grades K-4. Literacy #3 & Math #2 = 70% and 67% respective for grade 5. Literacy #4 looks at DIBELS data for grade K-2 and requires 90% of students to reach their grade-level benchmark by EOY. We had similar goals last year with percentages somewhat adjusted by DCPS.
- Next category of goals is Connected to Schools. This category exists because evidence shows that kids who feel connected to school take more academic risks and achieve higher levels of performance.
- First goal in CiS is decreasing the Chronic Absence Rate for kids with IEPs from 28.33 to 23.33. This CAR stands out relative to all CAR for all kids at LT, which is only around 7%.
- Second goal is increasing overall student sense of belonging from 72% to 78% and Black students sense of belonging from 59% to 65% via student behavior support plans. Measured through survey give to students several times throughout the year.
- Third goal is increasing overall student sense of safety from 63% to 69% and for Black students from 60% to 66% through trust-building interactions. Sense of safety relates to peer to peer interactions and whether students feel safe to take academic risks.
- Fourth category of goals is Prepared for What's Next. Where we're looking at ECE practices. These are both DCPS-developed goals, but we agree with them. They both focus on teachers' implementation of curriculum – Building Blocks math curriculum (Goal #1) and Strong Start, etc (Goal #2).
- Parent LSAT Member asks about whether percentages in DCPS-developed Literacy & Math goals are LT-specific or district-wide. PM explains that they take into account school context/proficiency over time and we are one of 3 schools in our Cluster with percentages this high.
- Parent LSAT Member asks about differing language used in goals (mid or above in most vs proficient in Literacy Goal 3) and PM explains that they are equivalent, just need to edit for consistency.
- Parent LSAT Member asks if there is any data drilldown in students with IEPs based on intensity of services. PM says yes, higher CAR with higher intensity of services.

- Different Parent LSAT Member follows up asking if there's a bifurcation between students in SCCs vs general ed classroom CAR rates. Says that lack of teachers in SCCs in the past could explain CAR there and general ed would be very different beast. Suggests that bifurcation and considering the two percentages separately could be more meaningful and avoid attaining or not attaining goals based on population changes (more/fewer students in SCCs vs other IEPs) vs actual substantive changes. PM agrees.
- Parent LSAT Member asks can't PM just force teachers to meet Prepared for What's Next goals. PM says it's about fidelity of implementation vs technically following instruction to "implement." About time, training and commitment. ECE teachers are committed, so it's about training, which is in process. Parent asks how we measure fidelity of implementation then. PM says its about data collection and providing feedback to teachers.
- Parent LSAT Member asks about how the behavior modification plans/MTSS meetings work re: CiS Goal #2 and who participates? PM explains process/participants (wellness, admin, instructional coaches/implementation) and says it is starting soon based on teacher referrals and student answers to surveys. Specific goals will be developed later this month. Any students getting Tier 3 support will have MTSS teachers at PTC meetings to explain data that led to intervention and what the intervention plan is.
- Parent LSAT Member pushes back on MTSS usually being about behavior and academic support and wanting to make sure that survey responses indicating lack of connection/feeling of safety are triggering, because connection to behavior and academics isn't clear. Principal Miller says there has been one survey and they are looking at those responses and using those as an independent intervention criteria now. Going to have 2 more surveys pre-PTCs so can get a sense of students who need a little vs a lot of support. PM confirms parents will be notified in advance of PTC if MTSS support is occurring.
- Teacher LSAT Member points out goal is re: all students, but only students in grades 3-5 take surveys. PM says also look at behavior referrals. Teacher LSAT Member wants to know what the link between not feeling connected and needing a behavior plan. Feels counterproductive. Suggests SEL support plan vs behavior plan, which feels punitive. Also notes we've had the same goal for the last few years; any evidence of how we're doing/how our interventions have been done?
- PM asks for LSAT guidance on how we could tweak language in line with LSAT suggestions. Parent LSAT Member suggests that we need to move away from punitive language that suggests student is the problem. Parent attendee follows up to say yes, counterproductive cycle where kids feels unconnected because feels

unfairly singled out and then we single them out further in response. Want to use language with positive connotations SEL support or wellness support vs behavior.

- Parent LSAT Member wants to know what percentage of students are below or well below grade level and therefore fall under Literacy Goal #1 and Math Goal #3. Principal Miller says she doesn't have data, but it's a minority percentage. We had similar goal last year and came close (got to 56%); did WAY better than national norm of 25% stretch growth.
- Parent LSAT Member says the vast majority of these goals are DCPS-provided. PM says yes, but many of the DCPS ones are very similar to what our data suggested we would have set for ourselves. Parent LSAT Member curious if other schools add additional specific goals or if most schools rely almost exclusively on DCPS goals. PM not sure; she thinks many schools just use DCPS provided goals.
- Parent attendee asked if there could be staff-focused goals. Yes, ECE goals seem to be.
- Parent attendee asked if Prepared for What's Next is by definition ECE or that's just us. PM says ECE or 5th. About transitioning to something else. We have 5th grade goals under literacy and math.
- Parent LSAT Member asks about DC CAPE results indicating that we have an issue with the performance of economically disadvantaged students and why we don't have a goal linked to those students specifically. PM says CSP is a work in progress and they're going to get feedback from IS. Will consider LSAT advice in going back to edit goals.
- Teacher LSAT Member wants to know who is on Leadership Team that considers goals. PM says Admin (PM/APW/Ms. Ward), Wellness Team (Reid/Stafford), all Coaches, all Interventionists.
- Reviewed how we did in meeting last year's CSP goals (see slides 11-13).
- Literacy Goal Evaluation (slide 11). Met some, but not all. For Goal #1, did not meet stretch growth target of 60%, but on track with 56%. Did meet grade-specific proficiency targets for grades 1-5 in Goal #2. Did actually meet K goal in the end (goal #3) at 91% (vice 88% on slide). Also met DIBELS goal #4. Making adjustments to this year's goals to reflect performance last year.
- Math (slide 12) similarly did not meet stretch growth target (51% vice 60% goal); met K-2 proficiency benchmark (80% with 75% goal); did not meet 3-5 proficiency goal (59% vs 65%, but on track). Making adjustments to this year's goals to reflect performance last year.
- Last year our Goal #1 in the Connection to School category (slide 13) looked at kids with IEPs specifically. We wanted to get to 65% feeling a sense of belonging; only got to 56% (but up from 47%, so progress). Our Goal #2 for all students was actually

adjusted after we got the BOY data, because it was so good/we had already met our goal. We got to 76% not target of 82, but have to remember we had adjusted that target to be more aspirational. The dream goal district-wide is 85%.

- Didn't look at prepared for what's next in school evaluation of CSP goals, but had been looking at Building Blocks (like last year) and CAR (and have now switched focus to students with IEPs).
- LSAT Parent Member asked if there can be goals at the Admin level re: structure and staffing or if it's just at student and staff levels. For instance, could there be goals for AP Watson? PM says no; the individuals themselves have goals that go to their ratings but those are not part of the CSP. A Parent attendee asks if there is any thought of aggregating those individual goals into some kind of admin team goal that could go into the CSP. PM says there are Admin team goals re: academics and they are all connected to the CSP, but they're not reflected in it.

4. Community Suggested Topic: Special Education Staffing (including lack of Speech-Language Pathologist)

- Principal Miller reviewed Special Education Staffing & Programming (see slide 15). Of particular note, no SLP provided by DCPS yet; also, we just lost a SPED aide LAST WEEK.
- We have 52 students who receive SLP services via IEP. DCPS sent an SLP for 1 day so far this year only to service ECE students. Working with Central Office on SLP staffing – there is a national shortage of SLPs and school psychologists (we have one of those, yay!). #1 gap in special education nationally.
- Ms. Ward has informed families of SLP services being missing and that Central Office is tracking missing hours.
- Asked Ms. Ward about special education services that we were missing last year. 14 students were missing hours; of those, 1 student still missing hours. PM does not know if she has communicated with that family yet.
- Two Parent attendees indicate that their kids are in this position even though allegedly only one such student exists. This seems like a data problem.
- LSAT Parent Member asks how Ms Ward can be responsible for providing data from the period before she actually arrived at the school (February of last year). PM says AP Watson was managing the SPED Department & collected data pre-February, but was handed over to Ms. Ward. Also Ms. Ward was the teacher assigned to make up those hours last year, so she was tracking them, tracking them being made up and communicating with families. Parent Attendee says no, she did provide information on missing hours, but there was no actual effort to make them up *and* she was actually pulled from that role before the end of the year. Parents were assured that

there would be a plan for making them up *this* year. PM says she will need to go back and talk to Ms. Ward about data. She asks LSAT for specific asks for data.

- LSAT Parent Member says 2 kinds of data. First, retroactive data: What information can she give us about what hours were missed and how/when they were made up? That way we can compare it to lived experiences to see where the disconnect is. Second, forward looking data: We don't have an SLP; we have 52 students, how are we going to formally track this (maybe once a week?) so we can make sure disconnect doesn't happen again.
- LSAT Parent Member asks if we should be bugging the Chancellor about the lack of the SLP. Would that be helpful?
- LSAT Parent Member asks if it is still DCPS policy that parents can't get hours elsewhere? PM says not yet, because we're early enough in the year that missed services plans are feasible. But for last year, we could look into that. Do they have more options now to make up missed hours?
- LSAT Teacher Member asks whether general ed teachers are supposed to be providing any SLP supports like they were expected to with missing SWD teachers last year? PM says Ms. Ward is talking to DCPS Central about that topic and whether support is feasible for some students. PM agrees that given how classrooms are organized and the specialized nature of SLP services, it is not really realistic to be asking teachers to provide that support. Ms. Ward and DCPS Central discussing.
- LSAT makes formal request for Ms Ward to attend the next meeting. Will provide questions at least 1 week in advance.
- LSAT Parent Member asks if we could put compliance with IEPs in our CSP – i.e., that 100% of students with IEPs meet 100% of their required hours (also legally required); also, perhaps, transparent communication around IEP compliance/hours. PM says she will speak to her IS about the possibility.
- LSAT Parent Member notes that there have been departures from SPED staff specific to L-T culture and not wanting to be a member of this team. In light of yet another departure, can you speak to whether this was a factor/how we can retain? PM says can't speak to personnel issues, but need to focus on support for SPED staff. LSAT Parent Member asks if there's any specialized support that they receive. PM say yes, specific types of support like co-planning between SPED and general education teachers. Using some new models for collaboration.
- LSAT Teacher Member asks if perhaps AP Watson could also attend next month's meeting.
- PM reiterates that an autopsy of past issue needs to be with an aim of advising for the future. LSAT Parent Member says it definitely is. It's about figuring out how to advise with respect to missing SLP services, especially because LSAT thought we

were drilling down on this all last year, but it doesn't seem to have worked particularly well.

5. Informal Q&A (time permitting)

- LSAT Parent Member asks for updates on DGS Fire Safety issues. PM says some progress, like elevators, but not all. Needs more specifics.
- LSAT PTO Rep says she has elevated the two issues preventing OSSE certification for the aftercare and wanted to know if there is progress on those issues. PM says no.