

District Accountability Committee (DAC) Meeting

Date: 1/10/12

Location: Admin. Bldg. - Boardroom

Time: 6:00-8:00pm

Attendees: Nathan Balasubramanian, Vicki Ebell, Rob Eberle, Dawn Fertitta, Kodi Fidler, Erin Frisch, Lanny Hass, Kirsten Lew, Michelle Malvey, Dylan McNally, Sharon Olson, Courtney Peters, Liz Rayment, Kathie Rechkemmer, Heather Rowan, Anne Marie Sanchez, Jody Shadduck-McNally, Brenda Shelton, Larry Shores, Judy Skupa, Michelle Trapnell, Julie Nanez, Scott Manley, Sandra McClure (recorder)

Topic / Time	Information, Input or Decision	Purpose	Outcome / Action / Notes	Status
Process Rules of Order 6:00 – 6:03pm	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Input <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Decision	Approve minutes of last meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was moved, seconded, and passed, to approve the minutes of 12/8/11. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete <input type="checkbox"/> Carryover <input type="checkbox"/> Table
Welcome/Brief Questionnaire: 6:03 – 6:10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Input <input type="checkbox"/> Decision	Reflect on DAC Charge #1: Continuous improvement of SAC and DAC capacity to provide school and district accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A questionnaire/survey to poll the group on effectiveness of DAC meetings so far this year was distributed. Results were tallied and shared at the end of meeting. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete <input type="checkbox"/> Carryover <input type="checkbox"/> Table
Understanding the 2011-12 District Improvement Plan (Sections I-V) and Vision 2020: 6:10 – 7:50pm	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Input <input type="checkbox"/> Decision	Stakeholder involvement in District Improvement Planning and Vision 2020 (district strategic plan) implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dr. Skupa provided a power point presentation to include a nine (9) step process for completing the Unified Improvement Plans as well as a document of key questions. <i>Both these items can be found on the district website.</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Gather and Organize Data Performance Categories 2) Review Current Performance 3) Describe Significant Trends 4) Prioritize Performance Challenges 5) Root Cause Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why are we getting these results? 6) Set Performance Targets 7) Set Interim Measures 8) Major Improvement Strategies 9) Action Plan The district team began work on the District Unified Improvement Plan (DUIP) back in July to assess accomplishments and areas to improve for initial submission to CDE on January 17, 2012; final submission to CDE in March. Feedback from DAC, BOE members, teachers, administrators, and the Colorado Department of Education will be incorporated. CDE may provide feedback and final version of our DUIP will be available on the web through SchoolView. Step #1 - data sources – as seen on the power point, this list is significant. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete <input type="checkbox"/> Carryover <input type="checkbox"/> Table

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each school has a Performance Framework to inform them on each indicator. • The district works from a four page document: cover page, data for high school, middle school and elementary; to document whether they exceeded, met, approaching, and did not meet the performance indicator rating. • There are six (6) areas in which the district and school is held accountable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Academic achievement 2) Academic growth - using the Colorado Growth Model 3) Academic Growth Gaps 4) Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness 5) English Language Development and Attainment 6) Teacher Qualifications. <p>Key Question: Are students growing in these content areas - reading, writing & math in 4th – 10th grade in comparison to peers across the state?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Academic growth gaps</i> are where the district looks at subpopulations in these same content areas. • The fourth area is <i>Post Secondary Workforce Readiness</i> for high schools. Elementary and middle schools were encouraged to look at a high school since CO-ACT is reported, as well as graduation rates. The district meets the state targets in just about every area. • The district has not made AYP which leaves work that must be done around Title I. • Conversations about highly qualified teachers will take place because the district does not meet the 100% mark. This refers to teachers who have degrees in an area or at least 24 credit hours in a particular content. Percentages now are at 99.5-99.8% which can qualify the district for a grant of \$50,000. • Last is Title III for English Language Learners (ELLs). Did they make the three Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) demonstrating proficient growth in language development? We met AMAO 1 and AMAO 2, but not AMAO 3 because we did not meet the ELL AYP target for this disaggregated group. • Go through data sets, pre-populated tables first. The state provides the table with pre-populated data. • For students with disabilities on Individualized Education Plans (IEPs), the district met federal and state expectations in reading, but not in math. • The next category is <i>Academic Growth</i>. Did the student make a year's growth in a year's time? Yes, the district met this at every level (elementary, middle, and high) and subject (reading, mathematics, and writing) except for middle and high school math. • Each group will go deeper into this data as they continue to work on 	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>School Improvement Plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The district is above the state average of 80% for <i>Graduation Rates</i> and <i>Postsecondary Workforce Readiness</i>. • District drop-out rate is below the state average overall and the four special populations, except English Language Learners (ELLs), which is 3/10's over the state average. • The district is accredited by the state because we meet or exceed state expectations for attainment on the performance indicators; we are not turnaround and not priority improvement but will adopt and implement a Performance Plan. We missed AYP targets in the same content area and level for at least two consecutive years and are in Corrective Action – Year 6. Therefore we are required to include an addendum for Title IA. • A lesson learned from last year about setting unrealistic targets has led us to implement SMART goals (strategic, measurable, attainable, research-based, time-bound) this year. <p>Question - Why are the IEP expectations higher?</p> <p>There are two (2) big elements that contribute to differing expectations. 1) How high are you from the floor, on the floor to ceiling continuum? Unfortunately for Colorado, the bar is not as high as we'd like it to be, but this is our current standard. 2) How many students are you serving in the group?</p> <p>Question - Is 2-3% growth good?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When you move a large number of students, it is a significant trend. We saw some schools make double digit percentage gains last year. <p>Question - Parents would like to know if there's alignment between the district and school improvement plans?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, because the targets are being looked at, particularly for any that have not been met. The goals are aligned, the actions will get better. The hope is that there's been good modeling through Vision 2020 for how these fit together. • The <i>Worksheet: Data Analysis</i> section is new this year. Additionally, there is a difference on this between the district and schools. For the district, the <i>Priority Performance Challenges</i> are pre-determined by the state. • The data will point the state and district to reasons why specific targets are not being met. This is where the alignment of the plan comes in. At the school level there's a choice to identify a limited number, say two (2) or three (3) specific <i>Challenges</i>. • The district has to analyze and make inferences from the data. The plan has to stand alone and we must make sure we include data 	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>tables for every area in which the district did not meet state expectations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In AYP, all means all. If a school or district does not make AYP in one category, they do not make AYP. The goal had been set in 2001 (<i>No Child Left Behind</i>) for every public school student, regardless of their subgroup, needing to be 100% AYP proficient in reading and math by 2014. The target is increased every three (3) years. It was increased in 2011. • Step 5 is to get to the <i>Root Cause</i>, brainstorm and prioritize. • Three groups in DAC then reflected on the major improvement strategies and action plan described in the District Unified Improvement Plan (pp. 25-36) 	
<p>Questionnaire Summary and Implications for our Work 7:50 – 7:55pm</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Input <input type="checkbox"/> Decision	Dialogue and Reflection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jody wrapped up with many thanks to everyone for the deep conversations and work taking place tonight and throughout the district. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete <input type="checkbox"/> Carryover <input type="checkbox"/> Table
<p>Wrap up/Questions/Next meeting 7:55 –8:00pm</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Input <input type="checkbox"/> Decision	Any questions/concerns that have not been addressed? Wrap Up of Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • She shared a sketch of circles, individual and overlapping, as an illustration of how we might prioritize. This provided a visual for managing overlapping activities, goals, and visions. • Professionally and personally we find ourselves in a time and place of continual self-assessment. It's become so important to ask, "What can we <i>stop doing</i> to ensure the important things are being accomplished rather than just a lot of busy work?" • Time to ask what am I passionate about? What am I innately geared to do? Where am I going to be the most effective? Am I doing things within or outside of my circles? • Example - DAC charges within this framework places the culture of excellence at the center point with intersecting circles to include budget and accreditation - these two being non-negotiable per SB 09-163, and Vision 2020 being the third circle as our district focus. • Another example – Robust Learning, Equity in Access, and Educator Effectiveness as the three major improvement strategies in the 2011-12 District Unified Improvement Plan. • Next meeting Tuesday, February 7th 6:00-8:00 p.m. Administration Building in the Boardroom 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Complete <input type="checkbox"/> Carryover <input type="checkbox"/> Table