

Instructional Services

Vision in Action (VIA)

Minutes
Tuesday, December 2, 2014



Meeting Conductors: Peggy Johnson, Dr. Charla Rudd and Linda Volz.

Members Present: Lyndsie Davis, Cynthia Denmark, Lisa Drafahl, Ginny Ellis, Ann Garrett, Jeremy Gilbert, Leslie Harris, Brittany Hartley, Allison Hughes, Peggy Johnson, Aaron King, Joanna Maloney, Joanie Moody, Dr. Terri Patterson, Jennifer Pharris, Michelle Ramos, Kristi Rizo, Candice Ross, Dr. Charla Rudd, Lisa Seawright, Dr. Sharon Shields, Shasta Sneed, Shaunte' Stewart, Linda Volz, Ashley Wilton, and Jennifer Wright.

Members Absent: Beth Aldridge, Dr. Valerie Baxter, Ashley Brittain, Kristen Chamblee, Amanda Endsley, and Marilyn Wilson.

Other(s) Present: Lori Lang, Recorder of Minutes.

WELCOME

Ms. Johnson called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. The committee was grouped by campus.

Review of SMART Goals

Ms. Volz reviewed the SMART goals for LEP Performance, Science Performance, and Writing Performance which were printed on the agenda.

- The data from 2012-13 and 2013-14 from DMAC has been provided for the committee to review in determining if we are reaching our goals for 2014-15.
- Each campus group was assigned one core subject for all student groups for both years: Reading/ELA, Mathematics, Social Studies, Science, and Writing.
- Reading for LEP students – Ms. Stewart reported that student performance decreased by 2%.
 - There needs to be a 17% increase in order to meet the goal.
 - We need to look at current benchmarks to see if we are on target.
- Math for LEP students – Ms. Sneed reported that students maintained the passing rate so it is doubtful there will be an increase because Math is one of the areas of concern.
- Social Studies for LEP students – Ms. Ross reported that performance increased 10% but needs to increase by another 5% to meet the goal.
 - Overall percentage passing increased from 17% to 27%.
- Writing for LEP students – Ms. Ramos reported that performance increased by 20%.
 - There is an increase of 6%-7% for each sub-population group.
 - Close to being on track.
- Science for LEP students – Ms. Davis reported a decrease of 10% for student performance.
 - There was a 2% decrease for all other sub groups except for a 4% increase for white students and an increase for SPED students.
 - Looking for extreme gains across the board in order to meet our goals.
- Professional Development – Which core subject areas per campus do you think PD is needed the most?
 - Math because of the new TEKS.
 - Every teacher needs at least 15 CPE per school year.
 - Expository writing because this is an area students struggle during assessment.
 - Writing and cultural responsive teaching targeting predominantly African American students.
 - Lesson plans and how to analyze TEKS.
 - Mr. King stated that Ms. Krumnow is presenting a number of effective PD at the high school campus.

- Ms. Krumnow presented a training using Cornell Notes which was highly effective.
- Ms. Seawright stated there is a differentiating and writing instruction training scheduled for December 18. Staff will come back and turn it around on campus.
- Ms. Garrett stated there are webinars nationally with known instruction over the internet.
 - Make a data base as an option for teachers to receive CPE credit.
 - These can be done at any time and at the convenience of home because they are recorded sessions.
- Ms. Johnson asked how we plan to monitor implementation of PD and its effectiveness. How does it impact instruction?
 - High school has a method in place.
 - Ms. Rizo stated that reviewing journals and files to see if staff is doing what they say they are doing; a spot check.
 - Ms. Harris stated that writing and reading are monitored through GIT. Coaches can work with teachers having problems with implementation.
- Ms. Volz stated that a lot of growth is needed in order to meet goals in last year's TAIS process.
- Dr. Rudd asked to have access to training materials from campus PDs to scan and/or post to the Z drive so everyone can have access.

Continuous Improvement Review by VIA

Dr. Rudd provided a review of and explained the process/activity of the continuous improvement continuums.

- We will monitor by checking each semester on the continuous improvement planning process.
- Using notecards, place your personal determination as to where you think the district is for each chart/page.
- To evaluate the district in the seven areas (*listed below*), place dots on each of the seven charts posted on the walls. Ratings of 1 to 5 with one being low and five high are used.
 - Our goal is to be on the other side of five, which means we are perfect.
 - Yellow dot labels have been placed on each table. A total of 21 dots are needed per person. Each sheet has 24 dots.
 - We will consider if the dots are moving to areas of improvement.
 - Blue dots are from the previous process.
 - The seven charts will need three dots each, one for each of the three areas:
 - Approach, Implementation, and Outcome.
- **1 - Quality Planning** – Results are evident of working toward the quality improvement goals.
 - Approach (4) – Growth was shown. Moved from 3 to 4.
 - Implementation (3) – No growth shown.
 - Outcome (3) – There are more dots in the same area of 3, with a few in 2 and 4.
- **2 - Leadership** – Study teams are district and campus committees. The Superintendent's Advisory Council (SAC) team is elected and members bring specific issues to district-wide PLCs. There are many structures in place: A-Team, BOT, VIA.
 - Approach (4) – There is a 1, some 2s, and similar amounts of 3s and 4s, and one 5.
 - Implementation (5) – The CNA process plans the DIP which flows down to the CIPs. The budget process is included.
 - Outcome (3) – Not quite ready to move to a four.
- **3 - Professional Development (PD)** – The district is using support systems of coaching models like TLI.
 - Approach (3) – To become a 4, it says that *all teachers and administrator are using the PD they received*. Although PD is provided to all teachers, not all teachers may be using it.
 - Implementation (3) – Remains a 3.
 - Outcome (3) – How to become 4? Reflective PD aimed at classroom strategies.
- **4 - Student Achievement** – Reading and Writing through TLI grant is good. It would be great if efforts can be duplicated in Math.
 - Approach (3) – Rating remains the same.
 - Implementation (3) – The district will need systematic focus on implementing student learning standards to be able to move to a 4.
 - Outcome (3) – How to move to 4? Increase student achievement by systematic conversations between teachers; help students have positive view of themselves.
 - Morale, attendance and behavior are good.

- **5 - Information and Analysis**
 - Approach (3) – Systematic reliance on hard data (some campuses use); line of communication between campuses is not established. We need a systematic process.
 - Implementation (3) – There is an effort to collect information on former students.
 - Outcome - (3) – Rating remains the same.
- **6 - Partnership Development** – We have the Pirate Foundation and other businesses are getting involved. HEB makes donations. Retired teachers come in and L3 come to LVI. The feeling is we are doing a better job than the chart is showing.
 - Approach (3) – Rating remains the same.
 - Partnership related to student achievement. We need to measure how student achievement is impacted.
 - Gap in language between 3 and 4. Agree to score a 3 but will revisit.
 - Implementation (3) – Rating remains the same.
 - Outcome (3) – Rating remains the same.
- **7 - Continuous Improvement and Evaluation**
 - Approach (3) – One dot in 2, the remaining dots are 3s.
 - Implementation a (3) – Develop a comprehensive learning continuum for students (*to move to a 4*).
 - There is evidence but not district-wide.
 - Instructional strategies are rigorously intertwined but not reinforced.
 - Specific next steps at another meeting
 - Outcome (3) – To move to a 4, sustainable improvement in student achievement needs to be evident at all grade levels (*happening in elementary levels but not higher up*).
 - Ms. Stewart – Differentiation in outcome is because everyone evaluates from a campus prospective and do not have data from other campuses.
 - Dr. Shields – Input is valuable and information is used to help guide us for the next steps.
 - Information is used in CIPs and when making budget decisions.
 - Information influences the path taken and how funds are targeted in the future.
 - Determine as a district what we can do to move to the next levels on the chart.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting ended at 3:00 pm. The next meeting is scheduled for February 3, 2015.