



Program Evaluation Committee

Thursday, September 3, 2009

Minutes (Adopted)

District Office Board Room

In attendance:

Members: Andi Story, chairperson; Destiny Sargeant, Ed Flanagan

Staff: Laury Scandling, Phil Loseby, Linda Frame, Susan Arnold

Principals: Angie Lunda, Gastineau; Patty Newman, Mendenhall River; Dave Stoltenburg, Harborview; Ted Wilson, Glacier Valley

Literacy Leaders: Kelly Harvey, MRCS, LuAnn McVey, Gastineau; Missy McMillan, GV;

Riverbend; Kathy Nielson, Gastineau; Karen Doxey, Riverbend; Margie Beedle, Harborview,

Public: Laurie Berg, Margo Waring

Convenes: 12:00 p.m.

Agenda Review

Approved

Public Comment

None

Approval of Minutes

Minutes from June 16, 2009, adopted.

Assistant Superintendent Laury Scandling gave a brief update and gratitude for the work over the summer on programs, meetings, and directions for the upcoming year, noting a memo on Assessments and the (Measuring Academic Progress) MAP Implementation. The August 14, 2009 memo, attached as reference, was distributed.

Andi Story, chair, noted the schedule and number of school personnel in attendance and asked for presentations on limited timing.

Luanne McVey highlighted a Comprehensive Intervention Model training in Arkansas which was attended by seven (7) reading and literacy teachers from Juneau. A power point outline is attached to the minutes. Ms. McVey noted that the constant conferencing impressed the Juneau teachers. Overall the program uses Response to Intervention, Instructional Support Teams, targeted intervention, and collaboration. Gastineau, Harborview and Riverbend would like to apply this program over a three-year period of time, utilizing some assessments that are in place. Coaching will be necessary; peers and specialists given time in classrooms as models to teachers working with groups or the whole classrooms; after school time for collaboration; planning for teaching; and unit planning.

Kelly Harvey, MRCS, and Missy McMillan, GV, highlighted traits of the programs they were applying. Rachel Brown-Chidsey had been to the District in 2008 and 2009 with information and training on Response to Intervention (RTI) which is intended to avoid the over-identification of students as Learning Disabled, matching strugglers to appropriate interventions and using frequent monitoring. The DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) assessment and creative progress monitoring tools were noted. Glacier Valley uses Ed. Check as a progress monitoring tool and also applies very targeted interventions in the "Big Five" on a

weekly/biweekly model. MRCS has data meetings weekly and meetings with special education and literacy leaders on a five-week schedule. Sharing data and discussions in collaboration have set up a common language. Glacier Valley uses Project Kids model in which specialists partner with classroom teachers. Students stay on campus on Fridays with access to clubs in lieu of the early release time that MRCS uses.

A grid of services has been suggested as a tool for the committee to compare school programs and methodology. Gleaning from information at the meeting, this grid is a start and will be vetted with school literacy teams.

School	Literacy Blocks Average Time	Intervention Average Time	Target grade / student	Number of students Reached	Models applied
Auke Bay	90 minutes	60 minutes	Primary		Fontas and Pinell, CIP
Gastineau	90 minutes	90 minutes	All		CIM
Glacier Valley					Project Kids
Harborview	90 minutes	60 minutes	Primary		CIM
Mendenhall River					DIBELS
Riverbend	85 minutes		Combined reading and writing		CIM

Ideas for Criteria to evaluate the proposals of potential contractors were solicited. A list of ideas and topics for evaluation follows:

- Independent from particular program
- Breadth of experience
- Ability to provide on site visits and periodic re-visits over two years
- Quick turn around
- Ability to discern existing benefits and practices, giving specific feedback
- Consideration of practices for accelerated students
- How are we teaching; how are kids learning
- Demographics, multiple markers, sub-groups, transients as a sub group
- Evaluation tools
- Is there fidelity to models in the classrooms
- Parents – how informed are they, process for parents to stay informed, will they help at home, clarity of communication with home
- Learners, differences in language modalities
- Curriculum
- Invitation to recommend Literacy model(s)
- Three years of data will be available next year, what growth should we look for, criteria, definitions, benchmarks for success
- How is the District assessment guiding instruction?
- What are literacy practices in the content areas?

- Look at research — we are not offering a controlled study, so solicit national research rather than internal comparisons of school to school
- Perspective — How do we measure growth of all students (NCLB 90%), as opposed to the individual progress at the level where the learner shows significant growth.

Superintendent Glenn Gelbrich suggested the external review include:

- Description of our program for us . . . What do they see?
- Progress, not just performance . . . a report on both.
- Practices, look at it, is it happening in our classrooms?
- Professional Development, when they look at it, what do they see, what do we need?
- Communication Venues . . . what are we presenting about the programs, what roles are we playing, what roles are we offering to parents?

Next meeting: Thursday, October 8, noon-1:15, District Board Room

Meetings occur on the second Thursday of the month.

Agenda: Discuss presentations of September 3, questions and answer period on matrix, proposals to review district literacy practices and programs, MAP update, and updates on Literacy Leaders.

Adjourned at 1:18