Coal Creek Accountability Team

September 26, 2019, Meeting Minutes

Attendees: Sara Remington, Brian Munoz, Susan Courson, Becky Swanstrom, Michele Hibl, Hannah Jones, Jennifer Gurney, Carrie Whalen (via phone), Sheridan Budin, Wendy Buffer, John Clasby, Ann Bruinsma, Deborah Snyder, Katie French

Next Meeting: October 24, 2019 at 7am

**Agenda:**

* Goal – Foundation Setting
* Welcome New Members
* Review Charter for CCAT roles and responsibilities
* UIP Development Meeting (review prior year UIP, review past year CCE results, if time permits review school survey results)
* Miscellaneous (study areas for consideration, open floor for parents)

**ACTION:** Ann to ensure webpage is updated with names of grade level reps and a photo from today’s meeting.

**ACTION:** Sara Remington to put CCAT link onto CCE webpage. Ann to send her the link. www.CoalCreekPTA.com/ccat

**ACTION:** John to include grade level reps on minutes from DAC meetings.

Sheridan shared the purpose of the CCAT. We are here to fulfil the state requirement of school accountability. Our goal is to improve the school by reviewing test scores, budget, and more. The CCAT gives voice to our community, helping families to be heard and gain understanding of school decisions. Each grade level lead is also joining our CCAT team to deepen the discussion. Our work in this committee is to identify root causes of the issues.

The team includes:

* Principal: Brian Munoz
* Administration: Sara Remington
* Chairperson: Sheridan Budin
* Vice Chairperson: Deborah Snyder
* Secretary: Ann Bruinsma
* DAC rep: John Clasby
* Community Rep: Judy Walden
* PTA Liaison: Carie Whalen
* Teacher rep & Kindergarten representative: Wendy Buffer
* 1st grade: Susan Courson
* 2nd grade: Becky Swanstrom
* 3rd grade: Hannah Jones
* 4th grade: Jennifer Gurney
* 5th grade: Michele Hibl

Today we are reviewing the Unified Improvement Plan from last school year 2018.

* School setting from last year’s UIP: 40 teachers and staff, 432 students, 82.8% Caucasian, 5.3% Hispanic/Latino, 3.5% Asian, 0.5% African American, 0.2% American Indian, 6% free and reduced lunch, 9% TAG, 8.4% Special Ed support.
* Major Improvement Strategy #1 (fed to schools from the district). Social Emotional Learning (SEL): At least one universal strategy that fosters school connectedness or positive relationships.

Associated Root Cause: decrease school barriers for Social Emotional and Academic Learning (SEAL). Not enough time to teach SEL and parents support academic more than SEL.

How we are addressing it: Monthly assemblies, teachers using classroom-based assessments to monitor academic growth, teachers/counselor/principal will regularly communicate with parents (conferences, phone calls, etc), teachers inform counselor of students in need of SEL support, teachers collect data to identify students of concern who need help with academic or emotional progress.

The addition of a full-time counselor at CCE this year is a big win. Mr. Dohr was handpicked for his strong involvement; we have already seen him engaging with kids during recess on the playground.

* Major Improvement Strategy #2. Data-based Problem Solving and Decision making: conduct data cycles using VizLab data to monitor student progress as part of MTSS process, preschool/kindergarten readiness indicators, professional continued learning on cultural proficient practices to support bilinguals.

Associated Root Causes: Reduced student growth profile for ELA, while there is a strong student achievement in reading.

How we are addressing it: Need more focus on ELA writing instruction.

Overall student growth raised from 30 to 50%, but this doesn’t tell us everything we need to know about what’s going on. John Clasby explained how the scores can be read. Each student is compared with other students who scored in the same range. Then next year they compare the growth for everyone in the original group. 50% is the median score, with half of the students scoring better.

* Major Improvement Strategy #3. Literacy: schools will participate in professional learning about how to use the new literacy framework.

Wendy Buffer shares that the jury is out as to whether the new literacy program is supportive. Kids who are good at reading, get the support and move forward. However, the literacy program doesn’t seem to make much difference as an intervention for those who are struggling.

John Clasby highlights that last year’s Unified Improvement plan states that 100% of kids are at grade level when they start Kindergarten, but only 20% are at grade level when they start 1st grade. Why? Wendy asks where they get that data? Is it from I-Ready? Are we grading what they know or how they use the computer?

* + - The bar goes up considerably in 1st grade. What kind of summer attrition do we have?
    - I-Ready tests are adaptable and get exponentially harder each time you use it; after summer break, kids are faced with a harder test than when they left the previous May.
    - In Kindergarten they take the test 1:1 with an adult, but in 1st grade they take the test by themselves in the classroom.
    - Fulltime kindergarten may be supportive. The kids will be able to handle the full day during 1st grade going forward.
    - Note: This year, kindergarten used a different approach. The first ½ of I-Ready testing was 1:1 with an adult, and the second ½ of the test was done as a full class. The scores will be lower this year. This may affect future growth scores.
    - Hibl says that I-ready is pretty good predictor of student ability; it is an industrial test on the computer. BAS is a test taken 1:1 with an adult, and is therefore relational and can have an elevated score. There is an endurance component. CMAS and BAS give us different views of our students and their growth.
    - Gurney shares that EDoctrina is a database used by teachers to track student achievement and growth question by question. This allows teachers, the school, and the district to know student needs. BAS is utilized for the kids who may not achieve grade level by the end of the year, so their growth is monitored.

Tests don’t necessarily give a view of reality. Some kids aren’t good at test taking. If the tests don’t tell us what we need to know, how can we collect the information we need to know? It would be nice to base our plans on reality instead of the state data points. Could we include all of that data in our UIP?

Mrs. Gurney states that some economically struggling kids don’t have any books at home. Could we do a CCAT book drive? Ascent Church likes to work with area schools to support kids with need a Thanksgiving meal or the Calwood trip, etc. We can consider how to utilize this relationship.

It is so helpful to have teachers at this meeting because we can answer questions real-time. We’d like more parents at these meetings. Should we request grade level parent reps? This could help families to be engaged in the learning process early in their kids’ academic careers so that they will continue to be more involved in middle and high school.

We may be able to affect the test scores by changing the test-taking culture of CCE. Let’s get kids pumped up about CMAS. Let’s make it exciting and a personal challenge to improve. Boulder county tends to have a hesitation with testing in general. But if we can get parents to understand that testing is important to make our school better, then they may be more supportive. To make CCE a better place for your student, have them take tests so we can support them more directly. There was a Culture and Climate survey last year, which we will use to make goals and compare to this year.

In the past under Bruce Messenger, the administration wasn’t allowed to tell kids that they had to take the test. At one point, test participation was as low as 60% at LMS. It became social to miss the testing. Thankfully test participation is rising up again. CCE was at 98% participation last year.

The attendees split into groups of 4 to review the academic and growth data from 2018. The data was reviewed individually, then shared as a group, identifying common trends.