

Meeting # 8

Date: Thursday, May 24, 2012

Time: 12:30-3:30

Location: District Office

Notes

Staff Present: Luke Hostetler, Dawn Christiana, Kathy Lorson Howell, Jaylani Evans, Sarah Kalstad, Michelle Jacobs, Mike D'Hondt, Pam Pottle, Shirley Prichard, Donna Morris, Nicole Talley, Stephanie Johnson, Carolyn Hinshaw, Katherine Baehr, Lisa Peterson, Trina Hall

Meeting Items:

1. Sharing Sub-Committee Work: Each subcommittee shared out their work to date, including 1) definition of task, 2) progress to date, 3) next steps, and 4) support needed.

Learner Attribute Subcommittee:

- Combined PYP school required reporting standards, Bellingham Promise and a mentor example from Hawaii Department of Education statewide report card.
- Narrowed to four big ideas:
 - Complex Thinker: The ability to demonstrate critical thinking and problem solving strategies
 - Collaborative Learner: The understanding that it is essential for human beings to work together with respect, compassion and integrity.
 - Self-directed learner: The ability to be responsible for one's own learning through creativity and innovation.
 - Quality Producer: Continuously challenges themselves to produce quality performances and products.
- Questions to consider:
 - Is there another name for "Collaborative Learner?" to remove the redundancy of the word "Learner."
 - Possibly "Collaborative Contributor"
 - Does IB need a separate report card?
 - Some areas will align and be the same, but others will need specificity for IB schools.
- Next Steps:
 - Wording of 4-3-2-1
 - Aligning teacher understanding of the criteria

Literacy Subcommittee:

- Combined the 80 literacy standards to support teachers and families with a more manageable reporting tool including reading, writing, speaking, listening and language.
- Developed a process using vertical alignment of CCSS standards. (Tools developed by North Carolina, Kentucky and other early adopting states)

- Completed reading and writing report card drafts
- Questions:
 - Should there be a separate data sheet for families to view the assessment?
- Next steps:
 - Complete speaking and listening sections of the report card
 - Complete indicator pages for teachers and families
 - Share drafts with teachers in upcoming grade level meetings

Math Subcommittee

- Shifting from current PEs to CCSS Math is proving more challenging than ELA.
- Many options for this transition:
 - All move to CCSS standards for the report card
 - Gradual change of the report card by grade level
 - All wait until CCSS is implemented
 - May only report on partial list of the standards
- ESD is facilitating Math CCSS sessions
 - May 30th teachers involved with this training will meet to consider next steps for math in Bellingham. The reporting subcommittee for math will attend the meeting and use the information discussed to determine next steps for reporting
- Rough draft of possibility for math:
 - Math CCSS is organized by domain with clusters under each domain.
- Questions:
 - If the Mathematical Practices are not the academic standards would we want to include them in a standards based report card?
 - The CCSS considers the Mathematical practice **the standards**
 - What standards will we align our math reporting to for next year?

Science Standards Subcommittee

- Science is in the middle of everything. They are drafting the Next Generation Science Standards and will be available.
- New Science standards from WA, but will be old when Next Generation is complete and probably adopted.
- Old standards and new standards were reviewed for alignment:
 - Scientific Process standards are included in both documents
- Draft of report card:
 - Process and Content included on the report card
 - Will include which specific kit is taught in our district on the report card guide
- Next steps:
 - Committee will meet to determine next steps

Tech/SIS Group

- Determined training session schedule
- Shared a power point for providing information to colleagues
- Embedded it in the One Schoolhouse PD for Wednesday
- Committee will be included in the interface with developing our system
- Next steps:
 - Assist in determining which teachers would like to take part in the early adopted trainings, and who are interested in being trained as trainers?
 - Talk to principals about your suggestions about which teachers

Elementary Conference Committee

- Reporting system, Common language, Expectations and roles
- The committee reviewed the parent survey results:
 - Parents really want to continue with that one on one time with families
- Common practices (a menu of ideas that would be acceptable for all teachers in all schools)
- District-School-Teacher-Family are the four components that need to interact in a way that would be beneficial to all
- Beliefs and Values were developed by the committee, some include:
 - All families have dreams for their children and what the best for them
 - All families have the capacity to support their children's learning
 - Families and school staff should be equal partners and responsible for building partnerships
- Family Engagement:
 - Is an on-going shared responsibility that encourages and supports information and education opportunities to build a strong foundation.
- The Family Engagement Model (FEM) is a three-dimensional model showing teacher to parent communication options for:
 - Tier I: All students benefit from
 - Tier II: Some students
 - Tier III: Few students need support
- Smaller subgroups of the conference committee are working together to develop the engagement model with a goal for this to be developed by fall 2012

2. Sharing of PD Model:

- Knowing the professional development and ongoing teacher support are critical to the successful implementation of a new reporting system that will positively impact student achievement, a focus of the work of the reporting committee must be on establishing a professional development model that provides ongoing support and collaborative learning for all teachers. A draft of a PD plan for June 2012 through Spring 2014 was shared, with particular attention to the 2012-2013 school year events.
 - June 2012: informational sessions for teachers to understand what is coming (new report card, new reporting system, new SIS system)
 - August 2012: Training for learning how to navigate within the new student information system
 - 2012-2013 School Year: District opportunities for collaborative learning around CCSS, standards based practices, all connected to literacy and math curriculum, instruction, and assessment – taking place through district grade level meetings and shared district PD time. We will work

with the elementary principals group and the Department of Teaching and Learning to establish specifics. The idea is to marry the initiatives and approach the work collectively and connectedly.

- 3. What are important for us to consider in sharing with colleagues?** Knowing that our colleagues need information related to the work of our committee, we discussed ideas for their involvement:
- Opportunities to reflect and give feedback
 - Knowledge of CCSS
 - Purpose for our work and changes
 - Whatever we share needs to be said multiple ways and methods
 - The initiatives are vast and must be brought together
 - Notebooks developed for each teacher with dates, time, etc. progress process with a product as the end result
 - How each group enters the process is important to consider
 - Can grade level meetings be used for additional information: Guskey, CCSS and potential plans for next year
 - Informing principals of these initiatives
 - What is at your grade level must be taught and developing an understanding of what that is must be clear to all teachers
 - Learning targets support the event that are in the grade book and on the report card
 - ***Clear expectations for the teachers in the system-shared by teachers, principals, district administrators***
 - Glossary of terms for the teachers to have this discussion

Summary of Conversation:

- Clear expectations for the teachers in the system-shared by teachers, principals, district administrators
- Transparency
- Gradual release of responsibility with differentiated opportunities for learning
- Common language, task, expectations that are doable and achievable
- Might need to be clear with administrators that we need to hear the “expectations”
 - What does deliberate look and sound like?

4. Determining Comments :

As a committee we revisited (reread) Guskey’s Chapter 4 on report card comments. We then reviewed the parameters from Skyward regarding comments and worked to answer the following questions:

1. Do we want general comment section?
2. Do we want subject comment sections? (All subjects? Some subjects?)
3. Do we want specialists to have their own comments? (Which specialists?)
4. In each comment area (general, subject, specialist)
 - a. Do we want canned comments available?
 - b. Do we want free form comments?
 - c. Do we want comments plus?

We also identified additional questions to answer:

- 1) Should comments be limited? If so, by how much?
- 2) Should comments be standardized? If so, by what degree?

Some questions more related to logistical items included:

During discussion the following questions, needs, concerns were generated. Due to lack of time to continue, this topic will be picked up at our next meeting.

Comments on the report card:	
Questions	Needs/Desires
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do comments fit in the “One Schoolhouse/Promise” • How specific can we be about comment expectations? • How do we support specialists in comments? • Teachers have already invested time into banking comments • How do we streamline? • Can the new family engagement model ease the burden of 2x/year comments? • We need to gather input from T’s regarding comments • If using banked comments, can they be edited? • Can spell check be used on comments? • Can individual teachers create their own banks? • Can schools create their own comments at the school level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments are most important to our Parent Advisory Committee • Drop down and free form can get confusing • Personalized, not over generated it needs to be about the individual student • Narrative-@end of report card in free form • Drop down: Standard, but also able to personalize • Quality report card comment samples • The ability of the dropdowns to be personalized about performance (high, med., low) • Worry about freeform comments-limits • In the future comments may be less needed • Priority goal from teacher and from parent (students)

Wrap up & Next Steps

Meeting Summary with Key Points:

- The learner behavior section is drafted and will be posted on the Discussion Board on the intranet for teachers to view and respond.
- The reporting standards for literacy, math, and science are being drafted. Other subject areas will need the involvement of teacher leaders in the content areas.
- The training video showing the new Student Information System (SIS) was shared with all teachers and will be available for viewing on the Reporting Committee intranet site.
- August training dates have been established for learning the new SIS system. Early adopters are being sought. 2012/13 training plans are drafted, with implementation phases established for various parts of the system over the next two years.
- Professional development plans are being drafted to support the teacher collaboration and calibration necessary for supporting the transition to a comprehensive elementary standards based reporting system

- There are many different ways to address comments on the report card. The committee will continue to define parameters for report card comments to best meet the needs of effective communication with families regarding student performance.

Next Meeting:

- June 1st Guskey Seminar- information will be sent out
- June 7th 3:30-5:30 discussion of comments will continue
- June 28th 8:00-2:00ish (8:00-4:00)