

DAAC Minutes March 9, 2015



A regular meeting of the **District Accountability Advisory Committee** was held on Monday, March 9, 2015 at BMS.

Present: Sue Johnson, Troy Zabel, Janie Hoover, Mike Foutz,, Jen Dvorak, Laurie Roberts, Gayle Reynolds, Elizabeth Zabka, Becky Smith, Kim and Rod Carter, Gus Roberts, Elizabeth vonTauffkirchen, Gayle Dupree.

1. Introductions: Introductions were made, there were some new visitors so those folks introduced themselves.

2. Approval of minutes from January 26, 2015. Gayle moved, Janie seconded to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried.

3. 2015-2016 Calendar: Troy handed out a calendar draft. The calendar committee will be meeting again soon. Here are the proposed changes: The new staff will be brought in for four days in August prior to existing staff. The existing staff have two extra work days added to the calendar for them. The budget will dictate whether or not those two days remain on the 10th and 11th of August. Conferences were mentioned, the calendar doesn't show what evenings are set for evening conferences. Kindergarten is going to be on an entirely different set of evenings because there is some state reporting that is required which determines the best timing to do those. The conferences will be aligned with when those scoring reports are due. It makes better sense. Thanksgiving holiday break is still an entire week. 2016 is a Leap Year and that will do some funky things to the calendar the second semester. Spring break will be the week of March 28 because of testing. Plus, that is what area schools will be doing. An adjustment was made for when to give staff a day off. This school year there is a day off on May 1. Next year it is proposed to be on April 29. Teacher contact days and student contact days will remain the same.

It was recommended to have the meeting dates for DAAC put on the school calendar. Perhaps something could be put on the backside listing ways for parents to get involved and list the SAAC and DAAC meeting dates.

4. Educator Effectiveness Update, Becky Smith reported: student perception surveys – this is voluntary. We partner with an independent foundation in Denver. In November third through twelfth graders were surveyed. There are four different domains. Third-fifth grade students are surveyed on two teachers every year, their home room teacher and a special area teacher. The 6-12 graders are surveyed on two of their teachers. Students can type a sentence on their survey to the teacher. This is only for the teacher's eyes. Teachers can use this information on their professional growth plans.

We get to see trends data for the following four domains:

Classroom community, classroom management, student learning and student centered environment. Last year 63% of our students gave us an *overall* approval rate for those four domains. This year they gave us a 67% approval rate. Not all districts survey their students. We are not as high as the state approval rating which is 72%. The approval ratings for classroom community we either stayed the same or went up, depending on the school. Classroom management again we went up from last year, however at the elementary school there is only

65% approval. Student learning went up or stayed the same. Student centered environment – showed improvement. Again, at the elementary only 46% of our kids said they feel it is a student centered environment. Troy and Becky are going to visit the student council at each of the buildings to show them these results and have a dialog. We want to know if the kids feel as if they are missing something. Of all three buildings, out of the 34 questions, these three items received the highest approval ratings. “My classroom is organized and I know where to find what I need”, “my teacher respects me as an individual”, “my teacher accepts nothing less than my best behavior”. These three items are contradictory to the results we see on the trend ratings. “My teacher knows what my life is like outside of school” had a 38% response. This whole survey was designed off of a national survey.

Teachers have received their results. Right now the teachers are being surveyed about their principals on leadership. That survey is 80 questions long. The principals will get their results around spring break. They can use that data in their professional growth plans. Troy will be able to use the trend data from that to see what is happening district wide.

Teacher appraisal system: 1338 committee is not designed to be a ‘sit and get’, we are welcome to offer input. Teacher evaluations – Senate Bill 191 has been around 4 years. There are five standards the state has developed. The instruction half of the evaluation system now counts, in the past it was ‘hold harmless’. Student learning: the state now expects teachers to measure how students learn in reaction to the teaching.

The state summative assessment is not a driving force in our teacher evaluation, it is given 10% weight. Our weight comes from using ongoing checks to see how a student is learning, the *formative* assessments (embedded formative practice). Each teacher is asked to do a pre assessment and a post assessment for one of the standards that is taught. We want to see how well kids are doing when they come in. The post assessment shows how much a student has progressed. Becky has been working with a group of teachers to design a system to chart student progress. We want to be able to see how much a student has grown, because we want every child to grow. Every kid counts. Not only is growth important, there are levels of growth. We want to look to see if a student grew *enough* by looking at the post assessment results on this tool that is being developed.

Points are assigned according to the growth shown by each student. With that the teacher ends up with a score which goes into the teacher evaluation. Then a formula error was pointed out to Becky, but there have been some revisions and there is a new tool that we are using in Bayfield!! We have taken what is being used in Austin Texas. In Bayfield, setting a single number as a growth target doesn’t feel right. We are going to set a *range* of acceptable growth. We are going to norm our tool for what is typical for Bayfield teachers.

5. District Unified Improvement Plan: Troy handed out information relating to the district UIP. Pre-populated data – he has used purple to highlight areas that are not high concern areas but areas that we do want to continue to work on. We struggle with growth gaps. Pink highlight designates areas we really need to focus on. The improvement strategies are still being developed, Troy handed out a sheet that suggests those strategies but he is still gathering feedback. In the district this year we have committed to get better at prioritizing specific work. Goal #1 is about getting intentional about PLC practice. We need to get more focused about our goals. These improvement strategies are attempting to do that. We need to get intentional about embedded formative practice. We assess, analyze, adjust. That is the cycle we go by in our district. We need to write really good quality assessment questions. Goal #2 (bringing focus and purpose) is all about the ‘war room’ that Troy has mentioned to us before. Prioritize what our focus should be. We have identified all of the mandates which is getting all up on the board, and

who is responsible for that work. Right now the work is being categorized into the three PLC questions. Identify who are the appropriate stakeholders in this work. Math has been identified as one of the priorities. Stakeholders are going to be brought in. A three –five year action plan is going to be built for each of the priorities. Stakeholder group involvement will be outlined with a timeline. Action plans will be brought to DAAC. Goal #3 is still a work in progress. Troy believes that we need to get the relationships right in this district. Not sure what the wording is going to look like yet.

The other thing on the UIP is to make it for 3-5 years. UIP's are supposed to be for two years but we need some of these to be more long term so we aren't always changing.

6. **Bond Study update:** Due to time, this was tabled.

7. **School Reports:** Due to time, this was tabled.

8. **Superintendent Report -Troy:** Due to time, this was tabled.

9. **The next meeting** is scheduled for Wednesday, April 8 at the district admin. building.

Sue moved, Mike seconded, to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 8:05.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Johnson, Secretary

Ideas for future agenda items: Updates for the bond study, Rtl and PLC