



Wenatchee School District No. 246
Wenatchee, Washington
Minutes of October 11th, 2010
Board Review Workshop Forum
6-8 p.m. District Office

Board	Staff
Walter Newman, President	Brian Flonos, Superintendent
Kevin Gilbert, Vice President	Cabinet Members
Jesús Hernández	
Laura Jaecks	
Gary Callison	

Superintendent Brian Flonos opened the meeting at 6:05 by welcoming everyone and pointing out the new format we would be using this year. All principals would submit their information on their school's report card and be open for discussing and questions from the board. This week we are starting with the middle schools.

The following information was given to the board members from the middle school principals prior to the workshop for their review:

Packet of Demographic Charts showing:

- All WSD Elementary, Middle Schools & High Schools & state averages of MSP/HSPE/AYP results in demographic breakdowns.
- 10 Cohorts & state results of Elementary, Middle Schools & High Schools MSP/HSPE/AYP results in demographic breakdowns as compared to WSD
- Enrollment breakdown demographically with 10 cohorts & state as compared with WSD
- High School (including alternative high schools) comparison with cohorts for the HSPE/AYP results in demographic breakdown

FOOTHILLS: READING

Goal: All students will meet or exceed standard or show 50% growth on summative unit assessments based upon power standards.

Strategy/ies: 1) Identify and align reading power standards with new core curriculum 2) Create common formative assessments 3) Develop grading practices that motivate students to reach or exceed standard 4) Utilize intervention programs to provide extra time and support for student learning (i.e. iPeriod, Lunch intervention, After School Study program)

Results: Our MSP Reading scores: 6th -13.9%; 7th +1.2%; 8th 8.1%. Reading improvement for same cohort group from Spring, 2008 – Spring, 2010 was +3.6%

Explanation of Results: Focus was teaching new core curriculum with fidelity. Attention given to identifying and teaching to power standards within each unit of instruction. This was difficult to do while learning a new core curriculum. Reading focus was upon comprehension only (reading to understand) and not learning to read.

Strategies/Action Steps 10-11: Interventions (Tier One and Tier Two) for students identified through MAPS and MSP testing. Student placement in specialized reading classes. LAP classes, Grades 6-8, for students learning to read. Additional reading classes, Grades 6-8, with a focus upon reading comprehension. Use of daily learning targets/language objectives. Identifying and teaching essential academic vocabulary. Utilization of Tier Two interventions (i.e. iPeriod and Lunch intervention)

FOOTHILLS Math:

Goal: All students will meet or exceed standard or show 50% growth on summative unit assessments based upon power standards.

Strategy/ies: 1) Identify and align math power standards with new core curriculum; 2) Create common formative assessments 3) Develop grading practices that motivate students to reach or exceed standard 4) Utilize intervention programs to provide extra time and support for student learning (i.e. LAP math, extended math classes in 7th and 8th grade, iPeriod, lunch intervention, After school program)

Results: MSP Results: 6th -13.9%; 7th +1.2%; 8th +9.4%. Math improvement for the same cohort group (Spring, 2007 – Spring, 2010) was +8.4%.

Explanation of Results: 1) Difficulty matching algebra and geometry standards with 7th and 8th grade level standards and then having time to teach them. 2) New core curriculum (i.e. gaining familiarity with instructional strategies incorporated in CPM) 3) Team collaboration time was essential to teaching and providing intervention for students 4) Extended classes produced excellent student learning results

Strategies/Action Steps 10-11

Interventions (Tier One and Tier Two) for students identified through MAPS and MSP testing. Student placement in specialized math classes. LAP

classes (Tier 2), Grades 7 & 8, for students needing additional time and support. Continue extended math classes (Tier 2). Use of daily learning targets/language objectives. Identifying and teaching essential academic vocabulary. Utilization of iPeriod and Lunch intervention (Tier 2).

FOOTHILLS WRITING:

Goal: All students will meet or exceed standard or show 50% growth on summative unit assessments based upon power standards.
Strategy/ies: Focus was teaching new core curriculum with fidelity (i.e. Springboard). Teaching of “Unforgettables” (writing conventions) in all core academic classes (i.e. science, math, Language Arts, social studies).

Results: MSP scores dropped. 7th grade –

Explanation of Results: Learning a new core curriculum in teaching the writing process. Learning how to integrate reading and writing using new core curriculum and social studies curriculum.

Strategies/Action Steps 10-11: Continued focus upon writing conventions. Integration of reading and writing as identified in core curriculum (Springboard).

ORCHARD READING:

Goal: All 6th grade: (08-09) 67.9% (+5% growth) = 72.9% of students will be at standard in 2009-2010
7th grade: (08-09) 57.5% (+5% growth) = 62.5% of students will be at standard in 2009-2010
8th grade: (08-09) 75.4% (+5% growth) = 80.4% of students will be at standard in 2009-2010

Strategy/ies: Students will be instructed, assessed, and re taught as necessary to demonstrate understanding and or mastery of Reading and Writing skills through implementation of Spring Board Curriculum at grades 6, 7, and 8. (Spring Board curriculum adoption implemented Fall of 2009-2010.)

Results: 6th grade: 57.9% at standard = -10% decline
7th grade: 62.6% at standard = +5.1% Improvement
8th grade: 65.2% at standard = -10.2% decline

Explanation of Results: The results experienced this year are what I would classify as atypical. We always desire/expect improvement in all demographic cells within our student population. This last year all demographic cells experienced a drop in scores in 6th and 8th grade reading. On the other hand, 7th grade scores increased in all cells.

Factors that may have contributed: Newly adopted curriculum (Spring Board) implementation, State Testing redesign of content/scoring, or introduction of technology as a mode of testing. It's possible, but unlikely that differing cohort groups would significantly contribute to all cells dropping.

We provided practice and training for all students on the new testing format. We experienced minimal difficulties with the technology aspect of testing. Sixth grade tested using paper and pencil, whereas 7th and 8th tested via computer online.

We provided literacy interventions during and after school for struggling students per our normal practice.

The only significant difference that I can identify, aside from cohort groups, is the methodology of Springboard implementation by the 7th grade team. The 7th grade teachers adjusted the pacing of the Spring Board curriculum to strengthen its emphasis on the state standards. They spent additional time on the standards as they were encountered within the curriculum.

Explanation of Results: The results experienced this year are what I would classify as atypical. We always desire/expect improvement in all demographic cells within our student population. This last year all demographic cells experienced a drop in scores in 6th and 8th grade reading. On the other hand, 7th grade scores increased in all cells.

Factors that may have contributed: Newly adopted curriculum (Spring Board) implementation, State Testing redesign of content/scoring, or introduction of technology as a mode of testing. It's possible, but unlikely that differing cohort groups would significantly contribute to all cells dropping.

We provided practice and training for all students on the new testing format. We experienced minimal difficulties with the technology aspect of testing. Sixth grade tested using paper and pencil, whereas 7th and 8th tested via computer online.

We provided literacy interventions during and after school for struggling students per our normal practice.

The only significant difference that I can identify, aside from cohort groups, is the methodology of Springboard implementation by the 7th grade team. The 7th grade teachers adjusted the pacing of the Spring Board curriculum to strengthen its emphasis on the state standards. They spent additional time on the standards as they were encountered within the curriculum.

Strategies/Action Steps 2010-11: All reading teachers will use Spring Board as their core curriculum, but will place increased emphasis upon the state standards/reading targets as they encounter them within the spiral of the adopted curriculum. Mastery of the standards is necessary for students to pass all aspects of the MSP.

Year two of our implementation of the Spring Board curriculum with its built in assessments and common standards based assessments being created by the district, will allow us to analyze data within Data Director to get a clearer understanding of where additional standards based support may be needed.

Frankly, it's difficult to gauge the effects of curriculum implementation, as typically it changes how you instruct and obviously the materials you work with. This change alone has the potential to impact scores.

We have revamped and expanded our interventions at OMS to immediately address the standards. We identified students last spring and have begun the year with over 100 students at grades 6, 7, and 8th receiving additional literacy instruction. At the quarter, we will have at least another 100 students who will begin receiving literacy assistance. Many of those students are currently in mathematics intervention.

We are utilizing Data Director to pre assess our students knowledge of the standards and identify common areas of weakness. We will be post assessing to determine the effectiveness of our intervention and adjust as necessary to ensure our students are benefiting from the additional instruction.

ORCHARD Math:

Goal:

All 6th grade: (08-09) 45.3% (+10% growth) = 55.3% of students will be at standard in 2009-2010
7th grade:(08-09) 48.6% (+10% growth) = 58.6% of students will be at standard in 2009-2010
8th grade: (08-09) 56.6% (+10% growth) = 66.6% of students will be at standard in 2009-2010

Strategy/ies: Students will be instructed, assessed, and re taught as necessary to demonstrate understanding and or mastery of Mathematics skills through implementation of CPM curriculum.

Results: 6th grade: 29.4% at standard = -15.9% decline

7th grade: 59.1% at standard = +10.5% Improvement

8th grade: 39.0% at standard = -17.6% decline

Explanation of Results:

The results experienced this year are what I would again classify as atypical. This last year all demographic cells experienced a drop in scores in 6th and 8th grade mathematics. On the other hand, 7th grade scores increased in all cells.

In mathematics we also had: Newly adopted curriculum (CPM), State Testing redesign of content/scoring, and technology as a mode of testing. It's possible, but unlikely that differing cohort groups would significantly contribute to all cells dropping.

We provided practice and training for all students on the new testing format. We experienced minimal difficulties with the technology aspect of testing. Sixth grade tested mathematics via computer online, whereas 7th and 8th tested via paper and pencil.

We provided mathematics interventions during and after school for struggling students per our normal practice. We offered a variety of interventions for all grade levels but a particular combination could possibly have proven more effective at the 7th grade level.

Staff adhered to CPM pacing calendars per implementation expectations. It is possible that the pacing of CPM may need to be adjusted to allow greater focus on the state standards. This will be determined as the implementation process moves into our second year.

Explanation of Results:

The results experienced this year are what I would again classify as atypical. This last year all demographic cells experienced a drop in scores in 6th and 8th grade mathematics. On the other hand, 7th grade scores increased in all cells.

In mathematics we also had: Newly adopted curriculum (CPM), State Testing redesign of content/scoring, and technology as a mode of testing. It's possible, but unlikely that differing cohort groups would significantly contribute to all cells dropping.

We provided practice and training for all students on the new testing format. We experienced minimal difficulties with the technology aspect of testing. Sixth grade tested mathematics via computer online, whereas 7th and 8th tested via paper and pencil.

We provided mathematics interventions during and after school for struggling

Strategies/Action Steps 2010-11:

Students will be instructed, assessed, and re taught as necessary to demonstrate proficiency in Mathematical skills as outlined in the Washington State Mathematics Standards. Our adopted CPM Curriculum will be our foundational curriculum. If needed, standards based supplemental materials/activities will be utilized to promote student mastery of the state standards.

We will focus on identifying and aligning the standards that will drive our instruction within a quarterly or agreed upon pacing calendar per like CPM mathematical courses. CPM assessments / district / team assessments will be administered to determine progress towards meeting the agreed upon state standards.

Teams will analyze class data and collaborate regarding instructional needs based upon assessments. Data Director will be utilized as a progress monitoring / assessment tool.

The following questions will be addressed as data is examined by our collaborative teams in both Reading and Mathematics:

- Which students did not demonstrate mastery of identified standards?
- Which instructional practices/materials proved to be most effective?
- What patterns can we identify from the student mistakes?
- How can we improve this assessment?
- What interventions or adjustments are needed to provide failed or struggling students additional time and support?

Our current 7th & 8th grade mathematics intervention addresses adding, subtracting, multiplying and dividing of fractions. Our 6th grade intervention focuses on basic facts. All of our interventions are directed towards the understanding of the skills or standards necessary for incremental growth in mathematics. We currently have ninety students in grades 6-7-8 in mathematics intervention this quarter with more due to enter at 2nd quarter. With the implementation of Data Director, I believe we have a firmer foundation upon which to stand, as we make decisions, regarding our instruction and the mastery of state standards.

ORCHARD Writing

Goal: 7th grade: (08-09) 78.8% (+5% growth) = 83.8% of students will be at standard in 2009 2010

Strategy/ies: Students will be instructed, assessed, and re taught as necessary to demonstrate understanding and or mastery of Reading and Writing skills through implementation of Spring Board Curriculum at grades 6,7, and 8. (Spring Board curriculum adoption implemented Fall of 2009-2010.)

Results: 7th grade: 72.6% at standard = -6.2% decline

Explanation of Results: Literacy (Reading & Writing) is instructed within our core classrooms. The Spring Board curriculum was utilized for writing as well as reading instruction. Spring Board incorporates a great deal of writing within its curriculum. The MSP tests Expository and Persuasive writing, Content, Organization, style, and conventions. A major component within our writing has been a continual focus on conventions. The 7th grade team continued its emphasis as a best practice. Thus Eighty two percent of our students exhibited competency on the MSP within that category of writing. The other modes or standards tested ranged from 58% to 66%.

Strategies/Action Steps 09-10: As we move into our second year of implementation, we will continue with our emphasis on conventions, as well as strengthen our focus on expository and persuasive writing, content, organization, and style, within the Spring Board curriculum.

We will use data and common team assessments to ascertain our instructional focus.

PIONEER Reading:

Goal: To improve our MSP Reading score by 5% by improving the reading comprehension of ALL of our identified reading intervention students by at least 1+ grade levels within the school calendar year, as measured by the Oral Reading Fluency Screening Tool (DIBELS, SRI, Levels).

Strategy/ies: 1) Create an intervention diagnostic screening process for student identification, 2) Identify, purchase and train staff with the intervention programs to be used, 3) Implement a progress monitoring system for on-going assessment and fluidity.

Results: Our MSP Reading scores went down 14.6% - 6th, 13.1% - 7th, and 3.4% - 8th

Explanation of Results: We focused on reading fluency and phonics in our intervention classes. We moved away from direct instruction around Reading Targets with MSP Question Stems, and focused on implementing Springboard with fidelity in our Core classes. However, we did not see that work result in MSP growth

Strategies/Action Steps 10-11: Prioritized, differentiated interventions (Tier One and Tier Two) for students based on their performance on Dibels, Lexile, and/or the NWEA Levels Test. This includes re-incorporating Reading Targets and Question Stems as they fit into the Springboard curriculum.

PIONEER Math:

Goal: To improve our Math MSP score by 10% by improving the Math – Number Sense of ALL of our identified math intervention students by at least 1+ grade levels within the school calendar year, as measured by the MBSP.

Strategy/ies: 1) Create an intervention diagnostic screening process for student identification, 2) Identify, purchase and train staff with the intervention programs to be used, 3) Implement a progress monitoring system for on-going assessment and fluidity.

Results: Our MSP scores went down 7.7% - 6th, 1.7% - 7th and 4.3% - 8th.

Explanation of Results: Similar results as Reading – CPM was our curriculum, we had math interventions going, but they did not translate into passage of the Math MSP. However, we did see some good growth numbers. Teachers created a “Watch List” of students that they wanted to monitor throughout the year. Of those students 52% met their growth goals

Strategies/Action Steps 10-11: Prioritized, differentiated interventions (Tier One and Tier Two) for students based on their performance on the Math Screening Tool and/or the NWEA Levels Test.

PIONEER Writing:

Goal: The number of Pioneer students meeting standard on the 3rd Writing DBA will be 70% at each grade level.

Strategy/ies: Teachers will use the Springboard curriculum with integrity in developing students’ writing skills.

Results: Our MSP Writing score went up 4% - 74.9%.

Explanation of Results: Springboard is a strong thinking/writing program and I believe that is one reason why we saw the increase we did.

Strategies/Action Steps 10-11: A focus on Conventions by the entire staff with any writing that students do in class.

Discussion points during forum between Principals and Board Members & Questions/Answers:

- Clarifying some of the percentages in the reports for the individual WSD middle schools followed
- Gear-up program clarification – timeline on the grants and duration
- “No doubt” that AVID & Gear-Up programs helped OMS scores – Mr. Hopkins pointed out.
- Staff training is importance by using pro-development/growth in making these programs effective.
- How much parent involvement is incorporated into the Gear-up and AVID programs? – Just field trips and normal connections with parents from teachers in parent/teacher communications.
- Lack of staffing is a frustration for some principals because they can see the areas that need to be addressed and the staff is already stretched thin.
- Idea of taking the AVID principles and teaching them to parents to teach their children was discussed.
- Commitment & investment to take AVID to high school level to continue student success at that level is seen as important.
- Utilizing grants in ways that best help students become successful in school.
- Possible ways to put resources into place that will help the kids at home do their work, and get parent involvement & commitment to assist their students at home.
- WSD is putting those programs into place at all the schools in order to follow through with that support on our end.
- Gear UP doesn’t directly involve parent participation, but we touch that area in other areas in school with conferences, invitations to parents to attend programs, volunteer etc.
- Safety net in place for the kids by using intervention programs at Pioneer, watching the students closely has worked well.
- Lack of personnel to cover the classroom due to cutting back in staffing has been a challenge.
- Finding a way to get parents to pickup the areas that we cannot reach and sustain their involvement year after year is a challenge, they fall off as the students get older, staying consistent can be an issue.
- Extensive discussion on parent involvement and developing a bond and commitment from parents to help their students at home to succeed at school is a real issue the board would like to stay focused on.
- Discussion on test scores going down:
 - Surprise at scores made us look at big picture, what is going on with the testing means and individual student.

- Made teachers more determined to find answers and help students be successful.
- Testing method was not smooth and added to the problem. WSD was pilot in testing areas.
- Sometimes there are other factors like health or physical needs of a student that can cause learning disabilities or stumbling blocks.
- Find particular problem that relates to learning challenges, can we look at the individual student for these problems – look at the student differently, through a different set of glasses, outside the box.
- We test in three different ways to help identify the problems the student is dealing with.
- Contact time with teachers and parents are the ones who succeed the best. Caring teachers make a difference.
- There is an increase with parent involvement especially Hispanic population, deliberate communication has helped in this area.
- “Hit List” of what students are struggling, personal phone calls to parents have helped.
- Research shows relationship between teachers and students have an impact, but our numbers are so high, not enough of us to reach them all in the way that we would like.
- Caring teacher makes a difference, if the students feels the teacher really cares about kids, they, in turn, will care and try harder.
- Discussion about alignment of Middle School and High School math programs continued.
- We are currently, this week, having math meeting with all the math teachers in the district getting all on the same program and aligning the programs and standards, we are more together than ever now.
- WSD has made it the objective to provide well rounded education in several areas:
 - Music enhancements
 - Art enhancements
 - Athletic programs
 - Enrichment
 - Many add-ons to enlighten our students’ success and overall quality of education
- We can eliminate some of those programs in order to bring more rigor to the academics and bring up MSP scores, it’s just where we want to put the focus, we will need more discussion in these areas if that’s what the board wants to do. Some board members are satisfied with the current curriculum but want to help in students’ success.
- Students are currently being taken out of enrichment programs and put into intervention when they fall behind. Enrichment programs are offered for the successful students.
- A board member is concerned that by the “end of day” the students are not ready for college.
- Principals pointed out at the MS level their concern is to make sure that they all graduate from high school and that they are prepared for high school after leaving the middle schools.
- Some concern about the students we are missing by not having the “key” that will unlock the “door” for them to learn and succeed in school.
- It was also discussed that we are doing well in comparisons with our co-horts. WSD students are more successful when compared to other districts with our same demographics.
- Staff morale has been good, the staff is more motivated to find a solution when seeing these tests results.
- Discussion about the success and rigor of AP Springboard and possibilities of having leverage for AVID and Gear-UP programs to reach more students
- Consider looking at our resources and how we may better utilize them.
- Self-Improvement Teams looking at the gaps:
 - Benchmark other district’s successes
 - Build a Model

- Spend time with principals
- Identify what we have to do
- Possibly have to let some things go in order to improve others areas
- Network outside of district
- Bring back best practices
- Share Passion for Literacy
- Complexities of the high school culture can contribute to root cause of some of the issues.
- The feeling that we are trying to “Do It All”, maybe we should get back to basics and go from there.
- Core Cause; Evaluate Data/Trust changes will work
- People hopeful that the new changes will be the answer, willing to be a part of the solution
- Discussion about the Common Core Standards, has changed 4 times in 5 years, making it difficult to keep changing curriculum to meet the standards – federal replacing the state. Standard targets concerning math the biggest issue.
- Challenges in the testing issues should be fixed by next year allowing for the scores to be more accurate no matter whether they are up or down.
- Testing environment is important for the students’ success and that should be better.

Board members all stated that they see how hard the staff is working at each of the middle schools and they asked that the principals take it back to their staff that the board sees and they hear what is happening in the schools. The board is grateful for the quality of the teachers and building staff. They know that they have the students’ best interest and the students’ success is the utmost concern of all. The board thanked the principals and staff for their hard work.

Meeting adjourned 7:35 p.m.

President

Superintendent