

Thursday, December 13, 2012
9:00 p.m. – 11:00 a.m.
Conference Room A
Central Offices

Members in Attendance: Ken Saranich, Dana Urban, Faylynn Haight, Eileen Roben, Beth Smith, Lorraine Rossner, Kathy Bender, & Tina Henckel

Agenda for DDT Meeting:

- **Meeting Minutes Review** – T. Henckel – 10 min
 - **Table Meeting Minutes**
- **Self-Evaluation** – T. Henckel – 15 min

Last year's Self-Evaluation was collated into one document in order to review outcomes as a whole. If we finalize the DIP then we can create subcommittees to focus on data collection or item of focus. In addition – a central team can supervise that work. DIP must be finalized and published

Items to clarify:

- Publish agenda
- Data collection procedure (document must be created)
 - Dana will accept the job to construct a process for data acquisition, analysis and follow-up activity
- Sub-Committee work vs. system process or needs
- Follow the Norms
 - including the cancellations of meetings 48 hours ahead of time
 - as well as committee members present
- **ELL Revision to District Improvement Plan** – K. Bender/All – 20 min

The district did not meet CMT and CAPT targets for ELL students. DIP must include the data collection, PD and instructional strategies for ELL. May use the crosswalk provided by the State which will lead to improvement. Resource handbook can also be shared with district members as well as including reference materials in the process would lead to satisfying the requirements.

ELL student population has many constraints that have an impact on improvement. Transiency of the ELL population, numbers of students, diversity of student group, variety of levels that ELL students “test” in on as well as progress of a very diverse group of relatively small numbers of students. Focus on resources, strategies, and programs for ELL students.

Draft DIP reviewed and ELL indicators were be added to meet state compliance.

- **Data Visualization** – Dana Urban/All – 20 min

SRI data from last year reviewed to possibly use a predictor. Using Lexiles as a predictor – there is definitely a relationship if applied to an algorithm however it would be a better predictor if we had another year of data sampling in order to strengthen relationship to predictability. The relationship is there but there is not enough data in the system to be able to confidently assure that the predictability is stable for a student's individual growth. So performance 3 an up is predictable but 2 and down is not so reliable. Predictors for 5 may be reliable but we would like to be able to predict 3s and 4s to a better degree of reliability.

It is important to note that the visualizations that do exist can still be used to analyze student performance and screen for intervention and support. Data can be drilled down to school and individual students. The data can be filtered by ELL and SPED.

We will add more data samples with the next round of CMT/CAPT results as well as additional SRI samples. Looks like Lexile is a better predictor of scores rather than DRA scores. Next year we will have SMI scores for Math.

Meeting adjourned 9:58 a.m.

Next District Data Team

Thursday, January 17, 2013
1:00 – 3:00
Conference Room A
Central Administrative Offices

Tentative Agenda Items for next meeting:

- Meeting Minute Review 11/15 & 12/13 - ALL
- Data Collection Procedure – D. Urban/T. Henckel
- Discussion around ELL programing and instruction - ALL
- How will we publish Final DIP to school community? – send suggestions to T. Henckel
- Identify priority strategies & develop subcommittees to begin the work - ALL