



## Program Evaluation Committee

Thursday, November 18, 2010

Minutes (Adopted December 9, 2010)

### Department of Education and Early Development Conference Room

#### In Attendance:

Members: Andi Story, Kim Poole

Absent: Mark Choate, chair

Staff: Laury Scandling, Barbara Cadiente-Nelson, Ryan Alsup, Haifa Sadighi, Phil Loseby, Susan Arnold

Public: Ed Hotch, Jasmine Jackson, Joe Nelson, Dionne Cadiente-Laiti, Atricia Makailey, Libby Watanabe, Barbara Thurston, Margo Waring, Laurie Berg, Mariana Moreno Goodwin, YashKanduet's, Marsha Hotch

**Convened:** 12:15 p.m.

**September 9, 2010, minutes:** approved with name spelling correction.

**Today's agenda approved**

#### Introductions

Former committee chairwoman Andi Story began by introducing and welcoming the new members on the committee: Kim Poole, newly elected Board member and Mark Choate, who will chair this committee.

#### Public Testimony on Non-Agenda Items

Mariana Moreno Goodwin, parent of two children in the District, and ANS member requested to amend minutes from August 26, 2010 to reflect the testimony that she presented and documented in an email for clarification of the summarized testimony. For various reasons, including change of membership, previous approval of the August minutes and time passed, it was agreed to include the email statement in the minutes of November 18, 2010.

Please correct your minutes regarding my testimony as they are misleading due to the omitted information. I have included in *Italics type* the corrected information to maintain the authenticity and meaning of the testimony:

Appreciate reference to vision and forward thinking *as this is what we have planned for with regards to the Transitions grant in securing a classroom/resources for staff and acknowledging the increase of families relocating from rural communities into the district.* We're not asking about excluding any particular **students** from a grant. We are concerned (ANS *Camp 70*), and our formal complaint is about *addressing the responsibilities of the LEA when they apply for a grant with a specific population intended to be served (Alaska Native) and specific content or curriculum,* that it's hard to monitor the implementation *when the District changes the focus to the general population without a public process. The District solicited the grant with the intent to address the disparity w/Alaska Native students.* We are *volunteers, parents and community member that have to monitor the services to make sure those students are now directly served through AVID.*

It's a very different dynamic when a Native program opens itself up to mainstream children, as opposed to a mainstream opening up to Native children. There's a differential of power and Native students must make dramatic adjustments within their communication/learning style and values to fit in.

Ms. Goodwin also asked about MAP testing. She said there was a request and concern from parents wanting data analyzed and communication made to parents on the relevance of the testing, the time it takes to test and the use of the data. She questioned if MAP was being used by teachers in the broader matrix of analysis for assessment, or if it was being used in the early release process. She suggested a return to the topic of differentiation, recognizing all learners' abilities and styles to enhance learning for all students.

### **Introductions**

Introductions from the large audience were made in turn.

Ms. Scandling introduced the topics and noted the data to be presented on programs where Native students comprise 50-60% of the population.

### **Presentation** by Phil Loseby

Typically reports are made on what was done, number of students, whereas we might look at the outcomes — “what we see”. We do programs because we believe there will be positive outcomes. What are we seeing as a result of interventions or actions.

Indian studies includes students with a completed federal “506” form. There are many similarities in Native Students and peers in some categories. He pointed out significant differences which began to show up in absences, identification as qualified for poverty status, English Language Learners, or Special Education.

(Handouts of the slide presentation were distributed and will be attached to these minutes.)

Mr. Loseby showed data on assessments and academic progress and noted that disparity begins to show in these categories. The SBA tests were developed in the state of Alaska. The assessment items were developed and tested in the state. Questions were reviewed for bias and other problems. Further discussion of bias, challenges and accommodations ensued. Mr. Loseby introduces a study by Hart and Risley, on the topic of poverty and its impact on learning. Findings showed that financially challenged children grew up with significantly impoverished language exposure as well constrained ability for neurological growth in early childhood. Consider that our education system's ability to meet the needs of impoverished or English Language Learners is a challenge that we are learning and striving to address. Looking at Native students, who are removed from the factor of poverty, we see a proficiency level in the 90-96%, a significant difference.

Barbara Cadiente-Nelson spoke to how the Indian Studies program is funded by the federal Department of Education in response to the population identified by the “506” forms. The modest budget funds provide staffing at the K-8 level of schools. The mission of the staff is to provide culturally relevant curriculum by the way of presentations. Students meeting the core curriculum are supported, they are getting it, whereas students not meeting the core curriculum need other district-wide supports as well. She brings up the concept of poverty in relationship to the Native families and asks that we also question in depth and sensitivity the connections and distinctions. The Indian Studies program cannot meet the needs of the poverty issues alone. She presents a document which lists six critical elements of culturally based education programs: recognition and use of Native languages; pedagogy that stresses traditional cultural characteristics and adult-child

relationships; teaching strategies congruent with Native ways of knowing and learning; importance of Native spirituality; community participation in educating children and planning of activities; and knowledge and use of the social and political mores of the community. Ms. Cadiente-Nelson states that we have not found a model program, but challenges the role of parents is to define and implement a Native program. What do we define as successful, what will we define as world class for our children?

A question about the three categories that show the greatest inability in learning growth, poverty, ELL and special education is posed. Mr. Loseby points out that a look at the Native and non-Native groupings, without the three special populations, shows there is a greater capacity of success on the state tests. There is still a difference in ability but not as great: achievement is in the 90-95% level. Our capacity as a system in meeting the needs of the three special populations needs time and attention.

Clarification of misprint, next meeting is December 9. We will continue the presentation at hand and look at the other programs that were not addressed: Early Scholars and Alaska Native Students in High School Option programs.

Ms. Goodwin suggests that site councils do not have a grasp of what the data shows or how it helps assess the work in their schools. She asks how the District disseminates the information and how is the narrative provided that shows that it is not just stated repeatedly that Alaska Natives are failing but note that other groups show failure. We must identify the variables that create or show the deficiency so that we can analyze whether the program is at fault as opposed to the students. Mr. Loseby notes that the achievement gaps have persisted for decades. Ms. Scandling suggests that principals and administrators must look at the systemic problems and acknowledges that training for site council members may be warranted. Mr. Loseby notes that this is scratching the surface and represents only a few aspects (assessment) of the work of the program —it takes far more information to evaluate. If you as a program working to create a culturally responsible program, what evidence do you see when you are in the classroom?

The TLL program was mentioned. Parents gravitate towards the cultural part of the program, are the strategies effective?

Ms. Story notes that the conversation will be continued and expanded with the energy of the participating audience members. This topic, of cultural programs, will be addressed by the committee throughout the year. Gratitude is given for the input today.

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

**Next Meeting:** December 9, 2010, noon-1 p.m., DEED Conference Room (same location)