

Site Council Meeting

November 28, 2012

1. Call to Order

Attendees: Roger Avedon, Anu Hoey, Jamie Adams, Don Geddis, Teresa Pai, Colleen Golden, Betsy Miller, Leslie Huie, Ingrid Kitahata, Katie Pierce, Angie Padian, An Chen, Julia Zhen, Jay Beams

2.0 Approval of minutes for October 24, 2012 - Done

4.0 Current Business

4.1 Single Plan for Student Achievement

4.1.1 Approval of Revision to Goals 1, 2, 4

- Jamie submitted a revised draft incorporating last meeting's comments for Goals 1, 2, 4.
- Individuals to review and comment after meeting

4.1.2 Discussion of Goal 3

- Is this something that can be measured, reported on, on an ongoing basis?
- If the PEP goals are met then is that measuring the Differentiated Curriculum (D.C.)?
- PEP is project-based whereas D.C. is occurring everyday in class.
- What are we trying to say in this Goal? Provide a D.C. for each grade level or provide an individual method to achieve the standard grade level curriculum? It should be an individual method to achieve the standard goal.
- Ingrid says: If the testing scores are improving then doesn't that mean the PEP goals are met and individuals are improving?
- Teresa pointed out we may need data points over time to better understand if we are achieving the goal.
- The goal of differentiated instruction (per student/ kind of learning level) has been met but we don't have a differentiated curriculum.
- Roger asks: Are all the "Goals" in the Single Plan "mission statements" or are they supposed to be goals that are met and move on to newer goals?
- An suggested: Common Core – Anthony Ranii told parents at the Superintendent Coffee that the testing would be more individualized

(eg. If a student's answer to the first test question is "A" then the test would change to ask different questions following the path of the test taker.)

- Pushing the curriculum further is the same as Operation Risk.
- Katie: Differentiated Instruction is good at the lower band to help lower level learners. Teachers: do you have a DC or do you add to the core curriculum? Coleen: At 1st grade level, everyone does Open Court Reading. If there are some students already reading at the Open Court Level, then we move them to "hallway reading", and onwards and upwards. For math then they advance to math tiles, etc. This differentiation is using up the same class time not in addition to base level learning. Some students are doing Open Court while others are doing high level reading at same time.
- Katie had a suggestion: Could the teachers in each grade take 2 subjects (Language Arts and Math) and say here's core curriculum, then make a list of additional curriculum above and beyond. At the end of year report number of kids doing above and beyond.
- Ingrid gives an example of concrete differentiation happening in our school right now. Mathletics: DC is happening and concretely showing that they have met a level above and beyond. Math is more of a measurable subject: kids are getting the tough problems. English is harder to measure in a concrete way.
- Jamie asks for clarification: Are you trying to measure it in a public way? Our goal is not to measure the accelerated kids, we want to get all the kids to a level and get them all accelerated.
- Roger notes: Lots of machinery in place to get below benchmark up to benchmark. There isn't a piece that addresses students who come into the grade with some mastery of subjects to push them further ahead.
- Julia suggests: Utilize teachers' specialties to lead that ONE subject for the few students who are excelling. Crystal Springs or other private schools have this. Ingrid and others point out: Junior High is more specialized than at the elementary school. Julia notes: Right now students are "stuck" with one teacher. Coleen and Ingrid and others: Elementary should be collaborative and more holistic not specializing at such a young age.
- Jamie suggests options for resolution: 1) leave the goal as is, 2) change it to reflect some sort of documenting/ communication of achievement of goal.

- Teresa suggests: A small number of people from Site Council could break out later as a task force to enforce and document.
- Roger: Don't make the Site Plan a Mission Statement. Make them goals only.
- Jamie suggests another option. Keep the goal, but add a caveat: Teachers write a plan for top 10% students. How would you measure this? Even those who are not gifted can strive and thrive beyond. Take the top 5% of the 95% who have achieved our academic (goal 1). For those who are high achieving, what are we doing for differentiation?
- Goal may stay the same but the tools will change every year.
- Keep the wording "Curriculum" not "instruction".
- Students' learning is organic. Some students may traditionally score low on tests but in class they may exhibit signs of taking off on a concept (oral learners/ visual learners). They may thrive in learning more and more concepts in class.
- Katie: We want to make sure we aren't targeting GATE students. Just top achievers in each subject. Some kids excel in math but not verbal. GATE is across the board.
- Jamie notes: We have 22 GATE level students that have been identified but are not necessarily gifted. Just because a child is moving along at a quicker pace doesn't mean they should do next grade level homework.
- Jamie emphasizes that all our teachers are caring and support all the kids in their individual learning styles and goals.
- Jamie will take a crack at editing. Do we have enough to quantify it?
- Teresa suggests: In addition, can we come up with an improvement goal? For example, if trimester 1 has a result of 5% above benchmark, can we achieve 7% above benchmark in trimester 2? Roger notes: Can't do this yet. Lets get consensus that we are actually achieving this goal then year 2 and 3 we can track to see if there is effectiveness. Math Assessments are concrete and can assess improvement over time.
- Student engagement is best assessment. So not concrete assessments necessarily important to move them to next level/ grade.
- Jaime will go and edit goal 3 for top achievers and add language for some kind of measurable of goal.

4.1.3 Allocations of Funds

- Roger states: In the past there was a large amount funds as part of Site Plan. Now the money shrank. This money is usually mostly earmarked for Instructional Aides. Since we now have more money in the district should we reassess or approve that it will still go to instructional aides?
- Betsy notes: Only 5 instructional aides in the district (Crocker and all elementary schools). All other aides are “one on one” aides for special instruction. Used to be 8 aides and each classroom had a couple of aides. Things have changed a lot.
- If its not Site Plan money the Instructional Aides will be paid out of another fund in the district.
- This money is money for West and allocated by district. We should take control and use for West only.
- Motion to keep the Estimate expenditures for Instructional Aides? Katie motioned, Colleen seconded. Motion passed.
- West Parent Group has approx \$5,000 in allocations for Site Council. What can it go towards? Dr. Adams wants to use it for differentiation for Operation Risk. Pay for expert like last year she used some of it for the 5th grade re-enactment of American History.
- Motion to keep the money as a discretionary fund for Jamie to use towards enrichment at the school. Motion: Katie motioned, Betsy seconded. Motion passed.

4.1.4 Other Revisions

- Jamie welcomes additional comments after everyone has had a chance to review offline.
- Jamie pointed out that Goal 2 has been revised, adding an essential outcome for problem solving.

7.0 Future Agenda Items

- Katie wanted to know who determines our upcoming agenda items. Roger states: Site Council determines our own agenda items
- We will reserve the last meeting (May) to review our approved notes/ changes to the Single Plan for Student Achievement.
- Potential Topics for months Jan, Feb, March, April:
- 4. Everyday math/ math curriculum (bring Modelle in). Crocker was thinking of extending the math instructional time at Crocker. We should learn more about what Crocker is doing since our 5th graders are moving there soon. Jamie noted she didn’t hear anything new brewing from the current Crocker Principal, but will ask.

- 8. Gate, High End differentiation – Who can talk about it? Anu or Don (they were representatives at GATE mtgs). We would like to hear, from the teachers, what is high end differentiation in their classroom?
- 10 Computer Based Education – Margi Power wants to come and speak to us.
- 9. Lunch, Diet, Nutrition Education – This may be good for January's conversation. An is on the committee.
- Teresa asks if we can provide more on a social/ emotional level? Can we bring in more drama or creative writing? Jamie answers that these are subjects decided on a district wide level. Jamie would have to ask the district. An suggests one possibility: we could funnel some of the money dedicated for assemblies thru site council to run these programs. (It costs around \$3000 to get 2 people in to talk.)

8.0 Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.