

School Accountability Advisory Committee (SAAC)

Minutes October 14, 2019 Administration Conference Room 1:30 pm

Charlie Richardson Elementary School Dean

Julie Seymour Middle School Dean

Janyse Skalla SAAC Chair

Corrie Dunkerton SAAC Vice Chair

Chris Dole MA School Board Liaison

Laura Barrette Elementary School Teacher Representative
Michael Herbert Middle School Teacher Representative

Brad Cheatwood Parent; MA PTO President

Melissa Billiard Public Member

Cheryl Darnell Parent; SAAC Secretary

- I. Introductions and Attendance
 - a. Janyse called meeting to order at 1:37 pm
 - b. Attendance: Charlie Richardson, Julie Seymour, Janyse Skalla, Corrie Dunkerton, Laura Barrette, Michael Herbert, Brad Cheatwood, Melissa Billiard, Cheryl Darnell **Chris Dole absent
- II. Review and Approve Meeting Minutes from 9/23/19
 - a. Corrected spelling of Dunkerton and Billiard on 9/23/19 minutes
 - b. Michael motioned to approve minutes from last meeting- Corrie seconded
- III. Review and Approve Agenda
 - a. Brad moved to approve agenda; Corrie seconded
- IV. Business
 - a. DAAC Report- Janyse and Laura
 - i. SAAC Training- Janyse attended
 - learned goals: Admin presents information; SAAC provides group discussion, feedback
 - 2. handed out proposed SAAC schedule, topics, presenters
 - ii. DAAC Mtg-Janyse & Laura attended
 - 1. Teacher evaluations in district highly complex & differ from how MA evaluates teachers
 - 2. Discussion on upcoming election, 4A on ballot (Laura asked how they plan to fund the school once built- no answer)
 - 3. Met Superintendent Somers- he gave overview of what he's been doing; meeting with Julie & Charlie in 2 weeks

- b. School Board Report- Chris (in his absence, Janyse presented)
 - i. 10/2/19 Emergency board meeting- decision to not renew Don Griffin's contract with MA due to non-performance
 - ii. Christianna Herrera selected as MA COO top runner
 - 1. 14 day due diligence- community research/ask questions
 - iii. 10/10/19- Board meeting
 - 1. C. Herrera presented to Board and public interview
 - 2. Board deciding on presenting Herrera with offer
 - 3. Status on high school
 - a. Public confusion on funds usage for infrastructure & land for MA secondary school- letter sent to MA community clarifying (Janyse handed out copies)
- c. Survey- Julie
 - i. Survey Format
 - 1. Continue survey used in past with tweaks, or change?
 - 2. Focus Groups formed from survey results- randomly selected groups of parents to answer questions about topics
 - 3. Past surveys- Mid-year= parents to school; End of Year= student to teacher
 - 4. Janyse & Brad spoke on Jamie Holstein's recommendation of "net promoter score" (1 question via email, i.e., "Would you recommend MA- yes or no?")
 - 5. Charlie- a. net promoter score in lieu of standard survey and b. focus groups
 - 6. Focus Groups-Julie
 - a. Process = randomly invite groups of parents (2 per elem and middle) to ask questions that SAAC chooses to ask
 - b. Ideal size = 10 parents; ideal time = 1 hour
 - c. Open-ended questions to get further useful info- audiotape sessions for later analysis
 - d. Handed out article on Focus Group Discussions
 - e. Marty- want to make big decisions for a school from an informed place
 - f. Corrie- need shorter survey and create focus groups
 - g. Brad- cut 60-70% of past surveys
 - h. Charlie- ID 10 questions and send out 1 a week?
 - Michael- likes net prom score; give people opportunity to have voices heard
 - j. Corrie- 10 questions we could gather from past survey data?
 - i. Julie & Janyse- noted theme of "lack of communication"
 - k. Charlie- give all parents opportunity to voice
 - Brad- perhaps cut down slowly- many are used to being able to give feedback; Charlie- Board meetings = good place for parents to share lengthy thoughts
 - m. Janyse- Purpose of surveys is to drive focus groups; paper survey with postage?
 - n. Marty- how choose what to ask?
 - Charlie- smaller group decide 15 question survey (2 parents, 2 teachers?)
 - Corrie- use MA Parents FB page to ask parents what they'd like to be asked
 - q. Michael- what's helpful for deans to know?
 - r. Marty- frustrated with recipients of email not reading/responding; is part of communication complaint that there's so many avenues?
 - s. Julie- last year's SAAC recommended communication flowchart detailing channels used for communication
 - t. Corrie- too much info coming in to parents

- u. Marty- centralize info
- ii. Timeline
- Janyse- Before next SAAC, Michael & Laura work on questions for survey; Corrie & Cheryl also volunteered
- b. Marty- motioned to create 15 question survey and then focus groups; Brad seconded
- d. NWEA Assessment Data and Information- Marty
 - i. DIBELS
 - satisfies legal requirements of READ Act and (K-3) funded in part by Early Literacy Assessment Tool (ELAT) Project grant
 - 2. MA purchases DIBELS for 4th & up
 - 3. DIBELS monitors young elem students' progress in basic reading skills
 - 4. DIBELS K-3 3X per year; 4th & 5th beginning and end of year
 - Karen Michael- Director of Literacy & Intervention- ID students with needs & support
 - 6. Individual students at any grade level can be progress monitored
 - ii. NWEA
 - 1. Administered 2x per year, grades 3-8
 - 2. Can be used as screener
 - 3. Aligned to state standards, but not standardized—adaptive test/immediate results (RIT score) based on difficulty of questions student answers correctly
 - 4. Rigorous test for those giving best effort
 - 5. Tracks student growth over time
 - 6. IDs opportunities for differentiated classroom instruction using NWEA Learning Statements- based on large national dataset (2015 norms) – NOT specific to skillsets of individual student- RIT score does NOT tell what specific skills within state curriculum standards the student is mastering/not mastering—therefore gives direction at classroom/grade level, but not specific to what help individual students need
 - iii. Using Data to Evaluate School Performance
 - 1. Appropriate expectations of the school using this data
 - a. CDE uses this data to evaluate schools in absence of CMAS, tracking achievement & growth
 - b. For DIBELS and NWEA, CDE views 50th percentile as benchmark for growth and reference for achievement- if above 50%, you're good; if below 50%, you're not (VERY SIMPLISTIC)
 - Therefore, it's not an achievement level based on what we think students should know
 - c. Historically, MA has very high achievement results
 - d. Growth = # students below 50% at beginning of year compared to # students below 50% at end of year—if # decreases, growth is "good." If # increases, growth is "bad."
 - e. With NWEA, CDE also compares school's avg growth per grade level to 50th percentile growth averages
 - f. CMAS- MA is at 23-28% participation rate, therefore insufficient data for clear picture of performance
 - g. Achievement on DIBELS (K-3) this year at MA compared to district = MA has more students performing in "yellow and blue"
 - h. MA & D38 were approached by CDE to participate in study to figure out how to map NWEA results to CMAS expectations (which shows they recognize that the current way isn't very good)- both declined b/c they are asking for a lot of demographic information, which no one wants to give

- i. 2017/18 growth data (CMAS) showed lots of "red"--prompted CDE to consider downgrading the school's rating (hence, MA's Request for Reconsideration)
- j. If we had a structural growth problem in performance at MA, it would have to show up in achievement data- but it doesn't
- k. 4th grade group = growing, but consistently low each year
- I. As a school, by grade level, our achievement is very high, compared nationally
- m. Science- ranked very high (95th-100 percentile in nation), yet "growth" shows lots of red
- n. We need to consider HOW we use this data
- o. Not much has changed in student performance since 2014/15
- p. Look for trends consistent to a grade level- then ask, "curriculum issue? Teaching issue?"
- q. Marty starting pilot groups with teachers for MAP Skills intervention to address & strengthen students' weaker skill areas in math
- Janyse- curious to know how many minutes students would need of intervention

V. Next Meeting: 11/18/19

Meeting adjourned—3:00 pm