



Program Evaluation Committee

Thursday, October 8, 2009

Minutes (Adopted November 12, 2009)

District Office Board Room

In attendance:

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

Staff: Laury Scandling, Glenn Gelbrich, 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, Brenda Weaver, Riverbend

Public: Laurie Berg, Margo Waring

Convenes: 12:00 p.m.

Agenda Review

Approved

Public Comment

Laurie Berg recommended that the Program Evaluation Committee next evaluate math support. Anchorage has such a program.

Margo Waring thanks the committee for posting agenda on website; asks for greater detail.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes from September 3, 2009, adopted.

Discussion on presentations from meeting of Sept. 3, 2009

Ms. Story asks about what should be listed on the grid of literacy practices at each elementary school. Ms Scandling asks the committee as to what degree of detail members wish to see on the chart, inasmuch as some references to specific programs or interventions are not clear to lay persons.

Ms. Sargeant compliments chart and wonders about the degree to which collaboration occurs amongst specialists and teachers at each campus: what is the model, how much time, and who participates – and measure if it's working. She asks that this information be added to the grid.

Ms. Story asks "why" there are differences amongst schools.

She asks if all literacy leaders have read "90% Reading Goal" and "Delivering on the Promise" (they have not). She shares that letter and sound recognition is the greatest predictor of success of on-grade level reading by third grade and phonemic awareness competency is the greatest predictor from second grade.

Ms. Story says it's confusing to try to figure out the effectiveness of a program or an intervention if we don't know exactly how much time each of those strategies and/or assessments is being used in each school. The chart will be revised to indicate shared assessments, which currently are: PALS, DRAII, and MAP.

Why the differences?

Gastineau: LuAnn McVey explained that the availability of external specialists limited collaboration time to only primary. That has been expanded this year to allow collaboration for teachers in 4th and 5th grade. In addition, four-five times a week Instructional Support Teams (IST) members (special educators and literacy leaders) go into primary classrooms a half-hour daily to observe and coach. She explains that about 34 students received intervention services during the 2008-2009 school year which usually was 30 minutes 3-4 times per week in addition to the literacy instruction in the class.

Laury adds that the role of literacy leader has changed dramatically in recent years. Not only do they provide direct instruction to students in a pull-out model, they are expected to convene Instructional Support Teams, interpret data, coordinate and assist with assessments, and coach peers in the classroom.

Riverbend: Brenda Weaver, primary literacy leader, explains that “literacy” may have different definitions amongst different people. She and her partner, Karen Doxey, consider literacy to mean reading, writing, and oral language. Those activities would be more like 100 minutes a day (as opposed to 90 minutes mostly for reading). She explains that intervention at Riverbend is also about 30 minutes per students. We combine the number of students we reach to include special education and English language learners. Sometimes she leading small groups in another teacher’s classroom during literacy instruction, as well as providing additional support outside of the classroom.

Harborview: Margie Beedle says that the average intervention time is between 30-40 minutes of supplemental time.

MRCs: 120 minutes reading-only K-2; 90 minute reading for intermediate (plus a 45-minute writing block), plus an additional 30-minute intervention time, serving about 75 students.

GV: About 120 students last year received intervention of about 30 minutes 4 days a week.

Ms. Berg suggests that FastForWord column be included: minutes and numbers of kids served.

Gastineau principal Angie Lunda references Imagination intervention resources for ELL and that those should be referenced.

Update on vendors’ proposals for literacy review: Ms. Scandling reports that two proposals have been submitted (CORE and Laura Benson) and two individuals who have been solicited have been non-responsive. She does not want to choose a vendor until one that is considered neutral and acceptable by the group is identified and submits a proposal.

Update on Measured Academic Progress: Patty Newman reports that they are administering the computer-based test amongst the 17 classes at about three classes at a time. It has gone very “smoothly” and the information seems to sync with other data points and measurements. She likes the function that allows the questions to fit the students’ abilities.

Ms. Story says that MAP will be a helpful tool in measuring growth over this year in literacy and asks if literacy leaders have set a target for growth. Ms. Newman explains that the MAP data will recommend a growth target for each child.

Each school explains briefly the status of the administration of MAP.

Ms. Scandling suggests a MAP demo for the committee; Mr. Flanagan suggests a demo for the whole board during a work session.

Ms. Story suggests that the committee next begin the math review. Ms. Scandling shares that the interim during which the literacy review will occur and until spring data are gathered, that there will be time to review the status of math. She shares that one of the strategies included in the District Improvement Plan (submitted to the state Oct. 1) includes the re-establishment of the elementary math cadres.

Next meeting: Thursday, November 12, noon-1:00, District Board Room

Meetings occur on the second Thursday of the month.

Agenda: Updates on proposals for external evaluation of literacy. Planning for next topic of review.

Adjourned at 1:18