



Curriculum, Assessment and Instructional Services, 2011-2012
MINUTES: October 12, 2011
Ed Services Conference (ESC) Room, 2:00-3:30

Topic	Notes/Actions Taken	Person Responsible
<p>Welcome and opening remarks; Review purpose of committee and commitments (review, 5 minutes)</p>	<p>Welcome, Sign-In, and Opening Remarks; <i>Parking Lot</i> charts provided. Curriculum, Assessment and Instructional Services (CAIS)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. is the result of the alignment of numerous district committees 2. ensures cogency with the SVUSD Strategic Plan (adopted 2007-2008) 3. supports and implements wildly important goal: <i>Optimal learning for every student by name, by need, by skill</i> 4. promotes professional learning 5. contributes to professional reflection 6. provides curriculum leadership 7. serves as district ambassadors 8. focuses on learning <p>The <u>role</u> of the CAIS committee is advisory and task/product-oriented. Please avoid cell phone interruptions and engage 100%.</p> <p>Additional Opening Remarks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The November CAIS mtg. is cancelled due to OARS training in San Diego. • Micheline introduced Cheri Rigdon, new Psychologist to SVUSD. • Lisa M. will be speaking on Science Fair on behalf of Principal Williams. • Patti Baer and Amber Baker will provide updates today on Transitional Kindergarten (TK) and progress made by County TK Task Force 	<p>Micheline G. Miglis, Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services</p>
<p>Common Core (informational, 5 minutes)</p>	<p><i>High Desert Common Core Consortium (HDCCC)</i> Micheline provided an update and answers to questions from Sept 7.</p> <p>Common Core...partnering...smooth hand-off between teachers, it will not be necessary to have every grade level or subject attend <i>HDCCC</i> ...some dates are terrible – we will do our best to work around the existing schedule and Micheline suspects there will be some changes to</p>	<p>Micheline G. Miglis</p>

	<p>the schedule once the Consortium gets going.</p> <p>Cyndy G- commented on the amount of ‘homework’ involved. Micheline agreed...this is a huge commitment.</p> <p>Teachers who have confirmed their participation on behalf of our teachers in SVUSD: Lora C.-retired/volunteer; Cathy B.-Yermo School; Rebecca H.-SVHS, Mathematics; Heather G.-SVHS, ELA/Literature; Katherine H.-FIMS; Ruth W.-Admin/TVIS, Micheline-Admin/DO</p> <p>Opened for questions: Robin A. – How will the High Desert Common Core Consortium information be disseminated? Micheline asked CAIS for suggestions. Micheline summarized: PLC Wednesday’s would be an appropriate venue as well as here at CAIS (we will schedule for a future agenda) Stephanie C. - Those not attending may want to give input, can they? Micheline said, “yes”, teachers are encouraged to contact the SVUSD reps to the <i>HDCCC</i> and via CAIS.</p> <p>Micheline will contact the aforementioned <i>HDCCC</i> teachers and ask that they present info and progress to CAIS in February.</p>	
<p>Transitional Kindergarten (informational, 5 minutes)</p>	<p>Mrs. Amber Baker, teacher/LES and Ms. Patti Baer, principal/LES will continue to serve on the County Task Force.</p> <p>Patti and Amber reported to CAIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The work of the Transitional Kindergarten Task Force is finished and the end result is a Tool Kit (a handout was provided) • LES has total of 9 kinder classes and Mrs. Baker is piloting the OWL program, (Pearson), same standards as Kindergarten, more developed for younger children • Micheline commented that she supports the use of the Pearson OWL curriculum for various reasons including it is aligned with Pearson <i>Reading Street</i>, our existing K-5 Reading/ELA adoption. It is also research-based. • One of the over-arching goals of TK is reduction of referrals to Special Education and serving the existing students in our attendance boundaries sooner • Patti - we already have an alignment for Common Core 	<p>Amber Baker, Teacher Patti Baer, Principal</p>

Standards (Kindergarten CC). The website is tkca.org

- The state has new program they are currently piloting which requires 1 hour per child to assess students in TK upon enrollment. At this time, it is a local decision to use the readiness tool or not. Patti and Amber are very interested in viewing the readiness assessments.
- Patti and Amber recommend adoption of OWL curriculum which aligns with our current Pearson ELA program,
- We need to reach out to community and our military partners.
- Parents can appeal transitional kindergarten enrollment pending board policy; however, this program can be presented as a positive program for their child.

Micheline – how to share with the rest of kindergarten teachers? Do we bring in psychologists for their experience with evaluations and experience with early childhood development?

We will likely need to schedule a Board Workshop. Micheline will calendar that with Cabinet. Micheline recommends that Patti and Amber give the presentation - sometime after January 2012.

Cheri R asked question - should we meet with kinder teachers first?

Micheline reminded CAIS committee teachers to keep their colleagues updated on any and all CAIS news and developments.

Patti reminded everyone to use the handout for reference

Mandy P asked what if students are too young.

Patti explained how the dates would work regarding birthdates, eventually date moved to September for all.

Micheline states we need to assess the student and interact directly with child, gather info. from parents, TK/K classes may be a possibility

Stephanie asked - Do we use Dataquest system before or need to purchase, do we need board approval?

Micheline explained system already in place, not an additional cost.

Patti advised that it is state law, making sure you have the right teacher in place, right credentials, by site needs

Micheline explained contract language will be followed in hiring process through HR. TK also involves business services, will need furniture, manipulatives, etc....

Lora C. asked question based on an example - Kids in transitional kinder and 2 kids in class on-track, ready to go to 1st, 2 are not, 2 are in between...if they master can they go to 1st?

Amber commented that we cannot retain in TK must advance to kinder

	<p>Melody asked – what happens if a child comes at age 6 and has no kinder and no transitional kinder, where would this child go? Patti commented that they would likely go to 1st grade but might be placed in kinder depending on their birth date.</p>	
<p>District Blueprint Assessments, 2011-2012 (informational, process-oriented, 50 minutes)</p>	<p>The CAIS teachers shared site poster charts (<i>pluses and deltas</i>) as a result of administering the Blueprint Assessments and site debriefings. [NOTE: The feedback is included in these minutes, at the end.] Teachers also provided an overview of the Blueprint Assessment results.</p> <p>Micheline opened up for anyone to start – asked Cameron S to keep time – refer to charts/notes from teachers/sites for minutes. The following schools/teachers presented data and information: YS – Melody/Cyndy G. FIMS – Aubrey SVHS – Cameron LES - Patti & staff NSES Heidi AEC – Stephanie TVIS – Kristen S., Nora C., Kathy B.</p> <p>Summarization: Stephanie – AEC had a lot of kids who didn’t hit 35% but did hit 33% which is good...some over and above was good...was able to come up with interventions using the results of this data (much better than former <i>Benchmark</i> Assessments). Heidi – NSES had one teacher recommend 45% instead of 35% as the goal for the first administration of the Blueprint Assessment, concern with those below 35%, looking at which ones that may be retained next year, making sure they get modifications/standards, Patti – LES had lots of kinder blueprints, those who were able to do it shows what kids know, it gave information on “achieving” kids, gave a different type of information, it looked at the strands distributed in the blueprints that mirrored the CST Cameron – SVHS English did really well, students knew how to apply, it was clear that they have a good understanding, math is still a struggle for our students, standards not addressed yet given time of year, some kids knew the answers even though standard had not been taught yet, same for H/SS and Science, SVHS has always been very strong in ELA Stephanie – AEC went through past scores which showed that students are still having the same problems, showed weak areas in students are the same with kids throughout the years</p>	<p>CAIS members Task Force Teachers</p>

	<p>Micheline stated we can look at the data, pull reports that list specifically the students, to look at students and break down into cluster groups, figure out and isolate as much as possible with specificity, to use PLC time to dig deeper, teachers/admin to dig deeper to determine specifically the common mistakes and what we can do about it.</p>	
<p>RtI Update (informational, 10 minutes)</p>	<p>Micheline provided a monthly update on the status of implementing RtI in SVUSD.</p>	<p>Micheline G. Miglis</p>
<p>Science Fair (informational, 5 minutes)</p>	<p>CAIS teachers received information pertinent to the Science Fair</p> <p>Lisa Montuerto presented information on behalf of Ruth W. Science Fair Coordinator</p> <p>Micheline states that Science Fair is not required this year however, we would like to see 4th gr and up with a Science project in the classroom. She knows there is a lot going on with other things such as RtI.</p> <p>Lisa - introduced the Science Fair Expo (gave handout), Expo on Oct.19th, Ruth needs to know the names of students who will attending by Friday (October 14) , the handout explains logistics of Expo (field trip), will be on a Saturday with busing and sack lunches provided by CNS - that's why we need names/info to make arrangements.</p> <p>Attending the Expo field trip is optional but a great opportunity grades 4 and up.</p>	<p>Ruth Williams, Principal, Science Fair Admin Designee</p>
<p>Adjourn, 3:30 Time Certain</p>	<p>The next CAIS meeting: We are not meeting in November. Our next meeting is Wednesday, December 7, 2011, 2:00-3:30</p> <p>10-min. with Task Force – informed that Oct.26th is the District's Fall Strategic Reporting...most likely in the morning, substitutes will be provided, a panel-style presentation will be the format, Mary T. to ask the panel, Micheline asked for volunteers willing to serve on the panel for the Strategic Plan...Kate H., Kristen S., Patti H., Aubrey Z volunteered. Cyndy G. to ask Renee R. and Diana S. if they would like to participate on the panel on Oct. 26th.</p>	<p>Micheline G. Miglis</p>

+	Δ
<p>KINDERGARTEN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Material was delivered on time and pre-printed for us • Great for “test prep” <p>FIRST</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFA’s appear to be ok, nothing to compare to • ELA - overall, felt Blue Prints were fair <p>K-2 overall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-2 Ample time to complete each section • Gave the student a ‘glimpse’ of what the CST will be like • Students are learning ‘test taking’ skills • Direct instructions for test administration for consistency throughout the district • Goal could be obtainable (33%) • This was an assessment to show teachers what children may already know and help guide instruction • Given in 3 sections • Growth model test • Questions better in Blue Prints tests over the Benchmark tests • Good representation of the standards • More questions on a page made it easier to enter scores into OARS <p>THIRD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good practice for CST - same format • From the standards, similar questions • Tons of time • Will show growth • Helps for future planning - re-teach - what we can accelerate on <p>FOURTH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target goal given of 35% • All standards were assessed • Schedule aligns with CST schedule • Sufficient daily time to administer assessment • Grade level administration was uniformed • Good training for students and teacher to prepare for CST: checking out materials, students mentally prepared 	<p>KINDERGARTEN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test way too long for individual or small group testing • Not great for academic results • Blue Prints, DRA, and report card assessments given in the same window • ELA and Math - needs improvement if used for academic results • ELA - questions 1-10 are not addressed on the report card • ELA - to many questions for those standards • ELA - questions may not have been organized in the best way to evaluate if students knew the standards • ELA – pictures were very distorted and hard to recognize • Math - questions #12 and #14 had a graphic of 1 item. Students gave an answer of 1 because they saw one graph. Recommend no unnecessary graphics • Students were to bubble answers, but several questions asked students to “circle” their answer • Bubbles are to small • Math - several questions regarding time, none on how to read a clock which is the standard addressed on the report card. Also, 12 questions on time is too many • Math - patterns and graphics are not simple. If the student can not readily read the picture, they have a hard time completing the pattern • ELA and Math - both extremely time consuming for both the student and the teacher, too much teaching time lost. • ELA and Math - most information from these tests were unusable on the report cards • Questions on tests were too close to each other • Questions not written in the same format as what is taught in Pearson or MacMillan/McGraw • Should be allowed to teach how to take the test, guided instruction • Students have only learned #'s 0 – 5 at test time but the questions go up to 50. (Could tiny pictures be done instead of #s <p>FIRST</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELA - Day 3, numbers 35 and 36 need to be in Day 2 as the questions go with the story “Carl the Frog” from Day 2 - Section 3 too long • ELA - spacing was an issue, need lines to separate the questions or have more space in between questions

- Students were “previewed” the materials of information they were going to learn - motivating for students
- Able to see the spectrum of learning abilities for all students
- Great teaching tool for meeting standards

FIFTH

- Individual ‘student result’ reports are more realistic than Benchmarks
- Gives focus area - accurate measurement of learning

SIXTH - EIGHTH

- Improvement over Benchmarks
- CST-like; weighted
- Gave the students an idea of what they need to know for this year
- 6th grade Math questions were well written and clear (a couple of mistakes though)

HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL

- Instructions were aligned with exam format
- Larger font
- Broader questions, not just skill specific
- Felt students took test seriously
- Good practice for CST; helps students get used to different testing situations
- Figure out what works and what need to change
- Staff did a good job administering test and helping out where needed

- Extremely long on some days - especially when there was lots of reading

SECOND

- Math - question #23 the fraction was shaded in appropriately - too dark

K-2 over all

- Remove math questions from tests, CST does not have questions on their tests, the teacher reads the question
- Graphs were too dark
- Technology issues - students not in place on OARS
- Some teachers may not be following given instructions to assess
- Having to administer the assessment with no previous training or knowledge of Blue Prints
- Must be consistent with vertical or horizontal alignment of answers
- 2nd grade – Math was not CST “esque”. There was no DFA for teacher and the questions were printed on the blueprint
- Need to staple like a book not in a corner.
- Can’t enter at home – takes too much time, need to use our instructional time
- Format for Kindergarten is not appropriate

THIRD

- Needs to be as a teaching tool, not as a tool to compare teachers
- Benchmark report cut points, detail report cut points
- Time/schedule need to mirror actual CST: 2 parts a day or 1?
- Kids were frustrated by having material they had never seen
- Do we need diagnostic and Blue Print?
- ELA - not equal in the amounts of reading (some readings are much longer)

FOURTH

- Accommodations for administration of Blue Prints need to follow same guidelines for CST. ie: IEP students

FIFTH

- Need cut points: individual score printouts d not match Benchmark report
- Benchmark report did not give info by student, by skill, by need
- CMA accommodations for SpEd students
- Instructions say do the example, but do not provide an example
- No cover sheet with instructions
- ELA test - question #40 refers to incorrect sentence numbers

SIXTH - EIGHTH

- Algebra Readiness test only had 40 questions; Algebra test has 65
- No directions at top, no example
- Scramble questions to have multiple versions of the test
- Missing stop sign
- All students need to use pencils
- The schedule change was hard on the 6th graders - behavior issues after Blue Prints given
- Double answers
- Multiple choice alignment placement - needs to be aligned
- Tests were organized by period, we need ELA/Math organized by Homeroom
- Math questions too hard - seems to encourage guessing
- Recommend putting in questions that the students should know in the beginning

HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL

- Material had not been covered
- Need to have directions on top for students to follow along
- Time allotment wasn't clear
- Testing was too long, separate tests each day
- Have more flexibility in delivering exam; what students know is more authentic/results
- Were there sample questions? Should there be? Cover page?
- No place to write name on test/may not be necessary since only one version
- No indication of how many questions are in part 1 or part 2
- Missing stop pages (Math and Science)
- Mistake on grade 11 ELA question #27
- Too much time allotted for testing
- Print OARS picture of how to bubble correctly
- Algebra 1 equations were on two different lines

Question problems on assessment packet

- There are no directions for administering both parts of the testing 1 setting. "Take a break" wording
- Trouble with rosters - had to give blank answer sheets then have student or teacher re-bubble. Had teachers names on subjects not taught.
- Are there consequences for teachers not scanning by deadline? Incentive for those did?
- Part 1 or Part 2 listed - be specific