

**DAC / District Accountability Committee
Meeting Minutes**

Date: August 11, 2015

Wilcox Building, Board of Education Room
6:30 PM – 8:30 PM

Call to Order and Roll Call:

- Chris Cingrani, Chair/Parent Member (via Skype)
- Barb Cousins, Vice-Chair/Parent Member
- Sandra Brownrigg, Recorder/ Parent Member
- Mark Harrell, Franktown Elementary school principal
- Michael Holmes, Parent Member
- Kim Kibort, Parent Member
- Deborah Lynch , Voting Teacher Member
- Jean Medberry, Parent Member
- Brandy Nath, Voting Teacher Member
- Amy Pfister, Parent Member
- Brian Wetterling, Parent Member

DCSD Staff and Board Members

- Kathy Brown, Parent Liaison
- Steve Cook, DCSD Assistant Superintendent, Secondary Education
- Ted Knight, DCSD Assistant Superintendent, Elementary Education
- Ian Wells, Director of CITE
- Judi Reynolds, DCSD Board of Education Representative

General Meeting:

1. **Roll call by recorder and confirmation of quorum.** The April and June 2015 meeting minutes were approved with no changes. They will be posted onto the DCSD DAC website page by Dorinda within a day or two of the meeting.
2. **Committee updates**
 - a. **Fiscal Oversight Committee:** we are looking for a liaison to replace Brian Wetterling, who has served in this capacity since 2014.
 - b. **Long Range Planning Committee:** no updates
 - c. **Charter review process:** no updates
 - d. **System Performance Update (UIP and Evaluations):** Chris says Matt Reynolds is looking for feedback on assessment guidance. The state has tasked us on interest or wants related to testing, such as whether we would like paper and pencil exams, or focus solely on computerized tests, for example. Judi, Mike, Brian, Jean and Sandra expressed interested in attending a meeting.

- e. Chair update: Chris

3. DAC Chair Update

- a. Open DAC positions: there are three terms which have expired or the individual has stepped down: a community member, a secondary teacher position and a parent.
- b. DAC bylaws
 - i. The only change is the term beginning and end on June 1 of each year. Chris is talking to Rob Ross re this and will have language to vote on in October.
- c. SAC bylaws
 - i. Chris is talking to Rob about the specific language for the role of the DAC liaison.
- d. Budget priorities
 - i. Chris expressed the desire to get these earlier, presenting to the DAC, the Board and making sure we circle back to the SACs.

4. DAC Planning for Upcoming Meetings

- a. Ideas raised for consideration for future DAC meetings include:
 - i. US capitals
 - ii. Curriculum – where curricula is consistent, where it varies
 - iii. Sex Ed
 - iv. Information for parents
 - v. Gifted and talented
 - vi. Special Ed – before, we focused on budget. What about curriculum?
 - vii. Parental info – how to smooth the transition between elementary to middle to high
 - viii. Safety is required by statute to be discussed. Particular emphasis on transportation and school bus safety
 - ix. Transportation:
 - 1. School bus fees
 - 2. Rural challenges vis-à-vis stranger danger in town
 - x. Panel discussion for CITE and LEAD
 - 1. We need to include the voices of people who are directly affected by the assessment tools.

5. Parent liaison/Parent U update:

- a. Kathy Brown provided an update on Parent U scheduling. She spent the summer getting the schedule squared away. It is about to go up in InspirED. Her blog, called Parent Link, will keep parents informed about and involved in all these things. She is providing laminated posters in each school so we can put the DAC, SAC and Parent U meetings up. They are partnering with Sky Ridge for classes related to health. There are also many options for gifted and talented, SPED, and other wide-ranging topics. Some are widely attended, some are not. We are going to try to stream the courses so people can go online to watch them as well. Kathy did a presentation for SACs and principals to use for back to school night, should they so choose. For example, parents don't even know how to use IC, which is vital.
- b. Making the SACs stronger within the schools, what is SAC, SAC 101 SAC 102,

making sure all SAC info is published. We want to publish all SAC info on the DAC website to make sure each SAC can contact other SACs if they so wish.

6. CITE and LEAD presentation by Ian Wells, Director of Continuous Improvement of Teacher Effectiveness
 - a. CITE is for teachers, LEAD is for administrators
 - b. CITE: Of the 11 rubrics, four are new
 - c. LEAD was revised in only minor ways.
 - d. CITE rubric revision process
 - i. User groups were brought together to discuss adjusting or aligning rubrics – teachers or staff members create these for teachers or administrators, with oversight by academic cabinet members. Several checks and balances were in place to ensure they were being fair in the implementation. They then “cross walked” the proposed rubric to the state and the CITE document we reviewed last year.
 1. Several were aligned to meet the generalist document we reviewed last year.
 2. Four were realigned to meet needs of students. mostly language modification.
 - ii. Completely new rubrics were created for three roles. These include access providers.
 - iii. Library and Technology Teacher rubrics were also revisited. The “Librarian” rubric was revised. The technology teacher’s rubric is completely new. Tech instruction is no longer a “specials” teaching role. Libraries are more a place to turn for resources. On tech, they very much are focused on learning technology.
 - e. Questions and Answers
 - i. You’re not suggesting tech class is going away, right? You’re just suggesting a merging of the librarian role and the tech teacher? A. Some schools still have a tech teacher and they use the generalist rubric. But this is more of what we are seeing, so the communities are the ones who are saying this is what we are doing – teaching kids how to get the resources, the technology into the kid’s hands.
 - ii. Then how do we evaluate the person who teaches the teachers how to use that technology? Answer: Each different role fills a different need and requires a different evaluation.
 - f. LEAD
 - i. LEAD team – 20-plus principals who cleaned up the copy and proposed edits.
 - ii. Unlike last year, there was not a major change to LEAD.
 - iii. Questions, answers and feedback
 1. We [in the DAC] would like to see how the changes were made and what the input was prior to approving this. A: There is a document that shows the input.
 2. DAC: We do not have access to that. DCSD: There was some coaching required on how to figure out evaluations based on outcomes vs. student goals.
 3. DAC: Once we approve it can we change it? DCSD: No.
 4. DAC: We want to have a process to get input from the participants. We need to make our role in this more substantive.

- iv. Judi suggests a summary after each meeting, ongoing involvement, so when we bring this up for approval, we are more familiar. DCSD: Be careful what you wish for – generalist and the core lead doc are the most important. Maybe take one specialist role and see how that goes.
- v. DAC: Many members express interest in hearing from people who are going through the evaluation process. One example: Brandi’s multifaceted role. Has the evaluation process has changed to accommodate her? Brandi: No changes at this time. Wells answers this with an asterisk: Brandi is not an anomaly. Many people will meet this multitasking role. The state asks you to take the higher level position and evaluate on that, but incorporate both duties as you can. There’s a lot of opportunity for the District to make a determination on which to use, whether we create a hybrid position and how we define it. With budgets shrinking, you use a talented person in all the capacities you can, but the state frowns upon using multiple evaluations. Ted: some positions are not assessed. You stipend them, but don’t evaluate them. The Site Assistant Coordinator is never evaluated, for example. Say Brandi was .5 reading coordinator and .5 something else, how do you evaluate her? The best outcome right now is for the principal to say your main role is <fill in the blank> and you will be evaluated on that. We can work on that.
- vi. DAC: CITE standards I, II and II are based on backwards planning. Mental health specialist are not going to backwards plan for small groups. Does it have to be backwards planning? DCSD: What is the definition of backwards planning? You’re talking about a very literal approach. If your administrator is asking for written backwards planning evidence in every case, that is a process issue so we need to discuss that with your evaluator.
 - 1. Wells: if you look at the Mental Health Provider rubric, the language has changed to “allow students access” rather than “provide access.” That should also help.
- vii. DCSD: We need to accept or not accept. DAC: Practitioners need to see this. How many high school principals were involved? Wells: Four., along with several middle school principals. Half were elementary. Participation was “come if you want.”
- viii. DAC approved the rubrics as presented.
- ix. Two follow up action items:
 - 1. Major topic on retreat – how we integrated into the process.
 - 2. Follow up with Mr. Wells to discuss.
- x. DAC: What about a fifth category? You could have someone who is at the bottom of a range and the top of that same range. The range is too wide. Morale issue and accuracy issue.
- xi. DAC: When you get labeled as only “partially effective,” and you’re a first year teacher, you may be doing great but the language does not convey that. How about “approaching,” for example, instead of “partially effective?” Or, could you have two categories – trending up and trending down? DCSD: We talked at the cabinet level about changing the language. When you have a five point rubric, people choose safe and pick the middle. Judi agrees the language is problematic morale-wise. DCSD: says the high effective and low effective teacher gets the same raise. If you’re an effective third grade teacher, there’s a \$10,000 range. The change if you squeak in is greater than if you move from low

effective to high. Could your score reflect your raise? Some of the language is one of the frustrations: the rubrics seem to be much better. What we call those categories? DCSD: this is an ongoing HR discussion.

- xii. DAC: in Larkspur, we've got a lot of new principals – how are we fostering the coaching, train the trainer for new principals to use the terminology and system effectively? There's a lot of grey – how can it be communicated in a positive way? DCSD: At all our monthly meetings, there's constant conversation. Mentor programs where veterans work with new ones. Not a one shot. It's almost half of the monthly level meeting. Structured level meetings one a month. Principals get together informally. Go for a walk around the school and ask for feedback about what their colleague saw. Calibrate what they share for the teacher and also for the principals.
- xiii. **Open Discussion:**
 - 1. Q. Are principals held accountable for how well they communicate? A. it's a HUGE part of the LEAD doc. We try and set up the formal stuff but the principals do more of this informally than we do formally. If teachers feel it was not fair they can appeal. Another principal, a director – you have multiple steps to ensure your evaluation is fair.
 - 2. Question for Barb and Chris: what is the takeaway for the building reps for this meeting? A. The main emphasis is on the CITE and the LEAD. We had to approve things going forward. We're looking at this from a long term approach not just a one time vote. We're looking at a variety of topics and we're looking at clarifying the connectivity – how the DAC and the Board and the administration work together.
 - a. Chris: one way –if a SAC member is not at the DAC meeting, we try to summarize the meeting within a week after the meeting. So, that info can go back to the rep if they miss the meeting.
 - b. Barb two more ideas for future topics:
 - i. Consideration of after school programs – lot of barriers as to why schools don't do them at the school level.
 - ii. Lot of alternative programs – like apprentice programs. Not every student goes to college.
 - c. Steve: if anyone has a question or comment, fill out the form and we will get it to the right people.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 pm.

Sandra Brownrigg Recorder.

Handouts at meeting (available online):

- ✓ Agenda
- ✓ Minutes
- ✓ Handouts
- ✓ 9/8/15