



## **Program Evaluation Committee**

**Thursday, September 9, 2010**

**Minutes (Adopted November 18, 2010)**

### **Department of Education and Early Development Conference Room**

#### **In Attendance:**

Members: Andi Story, Destiny Sargeant

Absent: Ed Flanagan, member

Staff: Laury Scandling, Barbara Cadiente-Nelson, Susan Arnold, Jessica Chester, Jennifer Scott, Michelle Martin

Public: Atricia Makailey, Libby Watanabe, Barbara Thurston, Margo Waring, Laurie Berg

**Convened:** 12:01 p.m.

**August 26, 2010, minutes: approved**

**Today's agenda approved**

#### **Public Testimony on Non-Agenda Items**

None

#### **Determining Scope of Review**

Chairwoman Andi Story began with a statement of gratitude to grant partners. She then explained that Program Evaluation Committee meets monthly for an internal review. Staff presents research on questions or topics from committee members and brings information forward to the committee. She presented the example of last year's topic – literacy program review. She invited public testimony or comments on agenda items after the review is done between the two board committee members, who are present, and Ms. Scandling.

A draft list of guiding questions for determining the scope of review was presented. She suggested that informing families was an important process. In the further development of the review, inquiry into the frequency or content of information would be important. Other questions would include "What happens at each school?" "Do the programs collaborate, work together?" Staff should be asked about their challenges and their needs.

Destiny Sargeant was asked for input, as she was absent from the last meeting. She mentioned the criteria to measure effectiveness of culturally focused curriculum as a very broad overview, difficult to define as it could range from graduation to hard to measure feelings of self-competencies and esteem-based questions. She pointed out that when it comes to relating programs to the budget, the board needs some measurement comparisons. As an example she asked if there were increases in the number of ELL children (English language learners). Ms. Scandling noted that there were five categories of students from Recent Immigrants to Heritage Language, who are assessed by testing on four subjects, speaking, listening, reading and writing. Ms. Story noted it was not a cultural program. Ms. Sargeant corrected her question and said she was referring to EL – Extended Learning, which she thought might show increases in identification, having been historically under-identified. Ms. Scandling noted a 4% national identification. In Juneau all elementary Kindergarten through second grade students participate in programs to identify at the third grade level. Ms. Story

thought this could be looked at as a measurement. Ms. Sargeant noted that it is important to look when a child “shines”, asking if there was a cultural difference when the brilliance shows. “Is there a formal way to catch the brilliance in certain kids?” Ms. Scandling noted that the Extended Learning Program was reviewed in 2008 when the plan was updated. She also pointed out that the Board would review the equity in ELL and the EL programs.

Ms. Story pointed to another question and asked how much time is cultural versus academic in the programs. Ms. Scandling noted a fractured focus — activity versus program, suggesting looking at what is systemic and what is a miscellaneous classroom activity. Surveys may be a good tool and may provide a baseline for practice, professional development needs in cultural terms. Language will need to be specific in definition. Definitions will be important in the district-wide programmatic review.

**Public Comment** was invited by Ms. Story.

Margo Waring: Specific definition is important. Does cultural programming mean additional academic help, not necessarily cultural education or activities. Strive for regularity and proficiency, need numbers. What is the single vision? Do not know that the district has one. What are the criteria to be used? Nebulous items like self-esteem? Review absenteeism, punctuality, discipline, participation rates—that will show how welcome students feel. Ms. Scandling suggested that the disaggregated Climate Survey may be a tool to look at. Ms. Waring suggested a grid of existing tools.

Laurie Berg: brought up Transitions program at middle school. Questioned changes in grant. Commented that there was no data, nor communication to families. Ms. Scandling pointed out that Transitions funds were designated for use at Yaakoosge Daakahidi. Nothing was started in Dzantik'i Heeni from that grant. There is confused information. Expanding on Excellence funding, which is in its final carryover, had been used at middle school level.

Barbara Cadiente-Nelson: Encouraged by the process of questioning. This is similar to what the Native community asks — questions are good. This is an opportunity to reform the system. As an example the Indian studies program is on a different course than when it started. Some directions come from the funding source – federal government. Topics for review should be integrated. Suggested that we should constantly be looking to refine or practice “Best Practices”. Dr. Demmert gathered research materials on best practices of Native education, which are used for curriculum development. We should keep in mind our standards are high. Expect challenge and success for all. This is an avenue to support and reform for all kids. Andi Story asked for questions to be sent to Laury Scandling that will be added to our work.

### **Program Status**

Ms. Scandling noted that she had been in contact with Sitka, which she considers a “sister” district. The key contact notes that they are using AVID, and having great success. She brought attention to the resolutions from ANB/ANS Grand Camp, provided as a hand out. She also made reference to the Board Retreat in December and the work of the Equity Committee, presenting a revised draft handout from that group – Equity Timeline. A grid of programs and the funding sources was also presented. It is intended to be a representational starting point for comparison and discussion. There are personnel funded by general funds – cultural paras. Elders are present in the schools and facilitated by JSD and Native organizations. There is a mix of support from the district. As an example Laury is the administrator for AVID and is funded from general funds; notes information

on a few other programs with support personnel funded by district, such as Early Scholars and Tlingit Culture and Language Literacy program.

She asks the committee for comment or questions on the grid. Ms. Sargeant likes the layout and mentions that numbers are needed for reference so we can capitalize on how money and effort is spent. Ms. Scandling notes that there are 1,197 students with complete federal forms "506" which are considered in the formula funding for the Indian Studies Program. Ms. Story requests "in-kind" or "Embedded" as a separate column or key. And questions programmatically how often Indian studies is delivered at each school. Ms. Scandling suggests that a comparative data analysis can be presented to the Board. Ms. Story also suggests an evaluation column. Ms. Scandling suggests that the grant objectives could be listed, as each grant is evaluated on meeting the grant objectives. Ms. Sargeant notes the difference in the Tlingit programs between Gastineau and Harborview and wonders if student numbers could also be noted on the charts, by school. Ms. Makaily asks for the program coordinator's name on the list. Ms. Chester highlights the differing percent used or FTE of the personnel listed. She believes the positions' FTE should increase and hopes the Board will look at that. Ms. Berg questions the inclusion of pre-school in the data – "Does the number of 1,197 Native students include preschool? Ms. Scandling tells about the Preschool Pilot Project, funded by the legislature and in cooperation with Head Start. Ms. Waring comments that the preschool project should be brought up as an extension of JSD support, noting the work with the partner. Ms. Scott questions whether the staff development has been set for this year. Ms. Scandling mentions the plan for this year includes data analysis, horizontal teaming, and vertical teaming; regrets the lack of time for more training; and recalls the emphasis on "place-based" learning last year.

Chairwoman Andi Story thanked Ms. Sargeant for her service on the Board and thanked all at the meeting for their participation and testimony.

**Adjournment:** 1:10 p.m.

**Next Meeting:** October 14, 2010, noon-1 p.m., DEED Conference Room (same location)