

Quincy Public Schools Curriculum Committee Minutes

Board Office Conference Room #214

January 13, 2014 – 5:00 p.m.

Committee members present: Debby Cashman, Stephanie Erwin, Denette Kuhlman, Jan Leimbach, Jeff Mays, Cheryl Vogler, Jan Zeidler, Jim Rubottom, Jan Cory, Lauren Kiest

Board members, staff and others: Anne Cashman, Kim Dinkheller, Carol Frericks, Ed Husar, Jeff Kerkhoff, Jody Steinke, Julie Stratman, Dan Sparrow, Mickey Elliott, Joel Murphy

1. Call to order

Jeff Mays, committee chair, called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. Jeff asked those present if they had any agenda items they would like to see added, and Debbie Cashman stated she would like to add intervention at Quincy Junior High School.

2. Information provided to Committee

A. District Improvement Plan

Carol and Julie presented a progress report on our Rising Star District Continuous Improvement Plan. This was an overview of the work that has been done so far. Carol said the district team has been assessing, creating, and monitoring the improvement plan. Carol stated that 21 indicators have been assessed and they will assess 20 more. Carol went over the top indicators in detail with those present. She stated the district team has been working on a district wide vision statement. The committee has created and reviewed the vision statement and will present it to the Board. She pointed out this has been circulated throughout the entire district, with input from district and building level rising star teams. There was discussion on indicator ICO5, "The district will provide a cohesive district curriculum guide aligned with state standards or otherwise places curricular expectations on the school." The district is working to provide a cohesive plan to align our entire curriculum to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Carol stated this is a work in progress and she and Julie are monitoring the plan. Julie pointed out they are currently using an Environmental Scale for Assessing Implementation Levels (ESAIL) as a tool to monitor curriculum and ensure fidelity. Twice a year they will use ESAIL as a guide to instruct teachers on what they should be doing, it is not used as an evaluation tool. Jan Cory asked if it is possible to mesh ESAIL, the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching and the Illinois 5Essentials Survey. This would possibly provide one set of things to look for on a walk through in classrooms. Carol agreed and stated they are attempting to make connections between the Danielson Framework and the 5Essentials Survey for faculty. She mentioned using Danielson as the foundation for performance standards, and Jan Cory suggested we focus on the elements in the other monitoring tools that align with Danielson.

Carol presented a PowerPoint on the District SMART Goals for current 7th graders which provided data on their spring 2013 ISAT Math performance, along with 2013 Fall Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Data for Math. Carol pointed out that MAP is a formative assessment. The purpose of using MAP is to have students perform in the fall, winter and spring and see if they are growing and improving in their performance. There were questions from those present on the legitimacy of the test given that the scores are so low. Carol stated that the test provides more detail about the students and what they can and cannot do, as opposed to ISAT which only tells us if they did or did not meet expectations. MAP tells

us what students have control over, and this informs our instruction as to what they need to know, and what they can learn to do next. She pointed out that with MAP students are able to answer questions as far as they can go; they are not limited to a set number of questions. If the student answers a question correctly the test presents a more challenging item, and if they miss a question, MAP offers a simpler item. The test narrows in on a student's learning level. Carol said teachers can look at the results and use this for personal goal setting and interventions, such as ALEX online tutoring. The students will take the test 3 times during the year which will show growth, unlike ISAT which only tells us if a student met or exceeded the expectations for that grade level or not. MAP will tell us if a student is performing at grade level, and if there was growth. MAP provides information on where students are struggling, and helps teachers identify the areas of concern, and determine the next step to help the student show academic growth. MAP also helps teachers look at the curriculum and see where there are gaps. Dan Sparrow said this is a diagnostic tool that provides information that can be used to help small or large groups of students. Kim Dinkheller stated the tests are being taken while we are aligning to the CCSS, and the test shows the gaps, and these can then be addressed. Dan and Kim stated they are trying to provide kids with intervention and enrichment opportunities and this will help guide them. Carol stated MAP is a purchased tool from Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA). MAP test information can be accessed immediately by schools and teachers, as well as the district. Debbie Cashman pointed out ISAT is taken in spring and the data is not available until November. MAP is available beginning at the kindergarten level; currently cost and the technology available are prohibitive. It is felt that the information from MAP will help address student promotion, and help with a student growth model for teacher evaluation goals. New legislation, the Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA) requires all Illinois districts to implement a standards-based principal-evaluation system with student achievement indicators by September of 2012 and teacher evaluation systems with student achievement indicators by varying dates in 2016. Carol said the goal for alignment of ELA and Math curriculum is to be available to all faculty on Curriculum Connector by August 1, 2014. Carols stated that MAP assessment scores can be aligned to online curriculum to personalize the curriculum for a particular student. For example, MAP results can be uploaded to a program like Edgenuity to individualize a student's plan.

Stephanie Erwin stated that Math is a huge issue, and feels there are not enough math interventionists. Adoption of Chicago Math was touched upon again, and Julie stated we are using Chicago Math with fidelity; all are on the same page. Jeff stated Julie recommended using Chicago Math with the proper professional development and oversight, and stated it is based on extensive research.

B. Curriculum Committee Task Force

Denette Kuhlman stated members met last week and set the parameters of the task force. There were 3 issues to be considered, graduation honors, grading and promotion policy, and grading practices. The task force decided to address graduation honors first, and discuss the others at a later date. They will seek approval from the Curriculum Committee to expand the task force to a district-wide committee, and select stakeholders from each building. If approved the district-wide committee will meet 4 times, and then make a recommendation to the Curriculum Committee at the April 7, 2014 meeting.

Carol went over other Large Unit District Association (LUDA) policies and pointed out that our Grading and Promotion Policy (6:280) is on our website under School Board/District Policy Manual/Instruction/Grading and Promotion. We have adopted the Policy Reference Education Subscription Service (PRESS). We must determine if we are enforcing our policy or not and also survey other schools using PRESS on whether they are enforcing the policy. Jeff brought up the high percentage of students who declined remediation in the past, how that will or should affect retention.

Dan Sparrow said they are looking at giving students 2 years to remediate, and if they decline help, then possibly retaining them. Jeff feels we will have better information to make retention decisions because of MAP, and the wide array of technological assistance available. Carol stated that of the 47 LUDA districts they investigated, 18 of the 47 had added additional procedures or made changes to the PRESS policy. Jeff suggested looking at these additional procedures, and stated any changes we make would have to go through the policy committee. Joel Murphy stated administrative procedures are not part of our policy. PRESS was not adopted formally by the Board. Murphy claimed that the Board can review administrative procedures but not adopt administrative procedures. Carol pointed out examples of changes some districts have made to their policy. Cheryl Vogler pointed out if new remediation procedures are written into our policy then possibly funding would need to be provided. Jeff feels the next step should be to contact the other districts and dig deeper, ask how many students they retain. He stated if we want fidelity we must be more protective of our policy. Carol presented Dunlap school district's policy to the group as an example of changes made to policy to address retention. Those present agreed the logistics of accommodating increased student retention must be addressed.

C. District Technology Plan-Technology in the Classroom

Joel Murphy said in regards to technology in the classroom they are deciding where they want to be in 5 years, and will work backwards from that and set up funding. He stated the goal is to promote better delivery of instruction. All schools will have wireless access by the beginning of the next school year. There were questions on Bring Your Own Device (BYOD), Joel stated staff will have access, but policy issues must be addressed before students will have access. Denette Kuhlman stated that the foundation has money to spend on technology but needs specifics on what to purchase. The tech sub-committee is still making decisions on the specifics of hardware/software/staff development. The state has directives in place regarding technology. We will table this issue until next month.

3. **Recommend to the Board of Education for Action** –none
4. **Consider any other matter relating to the Curriculum needs or concerns of the District** – Intervention at QJHS
5. **Questions and comments from the Public**
6. **Adjourn: 6:45 p.m.**

NEXT MEETING: Monday, February 10, 2014 – 5:00 p.m.