

## **District Data Team Meeting Minutes**

Thursday, January 19, 2012

9:00 – 11:00 a.m., Conference Room A

Central Administrative Offices

### **Data Team Members Present:**

*Freeman Burr, Lorraine Rossner, Kathy Bender, Tina Henckel, Kristen DiPalma, Karen Crosby, Anne Hamilton, Dana Urban, Faylynn Haight, and Eileen Zavaluk(Roben). Ken Saranich arrived shortly after the meeting started. Beth Smith and Carolyn Ivanoff were absent.*

### **Revisit the SRBI Model Rubrics for Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 – T. Henckel**

Review of the revisions to the SRBI System Model – discussion of changes in “red” were made to the draft with additional revisions to clarify information and explanation of Tier 1, 2 & 3 interventions and evidence.

Draft of the revision will follow.

### **Review Discussion of the Mission and Goal of the DTT – Team**

The mission statement from the state website was downloaded and shared with the team. Time was taken to review the general mission statement in order to glean portions in whole or parts to bring forward to Shelton DDT mission statement.

A small team of: T. Henckel, D. Urban, L. Rossner, and B. Smith will reconvene to complete a “draft” of a “mission statement” to present to the team at the next meeting.

### **Complete Review of *Language Arts Assessment K-12 Chart***

It is important to compile this information on a district level to review assessment gaps in order to accurately assess student achievement and the instructional and remedial needs of individual schools.

Discussion Points and Questions –

Currently we have a K-6 common core collection in Reading. (Report card – reading assessment collections). What other collections are taken across the district at what level? Outcome measures: 3, 8, & 10 – look for predictors? Should they be collected or analyzed in grades prior to the testing year. Would outcome indicators be 3 & 8 along with subgroup performance? This is all speculation but we have to decide what we believe will be indicators of student performance and achievement with what we have as data collection points. Do we choose predictors that reflect standardized test performance or collect data assessments that reflect instructional outcomes?

Revise the chart to add a column reflecting whether or not the assessment listed will be a predictor of a standardized testing outcome.

**Review “talking points” on ETR document – What is the purpose of ETR data and the purpose of this data collection tool – Central Leadership responsibility?**

ETR data should not be an action step in the District Improvement Plan – move it from an action step to a measure. Therefore what would the ETR information evaluate?

**Review possible revision of the district improvement plan re: Science, STEM, and School Climate – DDT**

T. Henckel, K. Bender, K. DiPalma, and L. Rossner will revisit the SIP re: the items listed above and share with the DDT at the next meeting.

**Action Item** - K. Saranich and K. Crosby will investigate a school climate goal for DIP.

**Next DDT Meeting:**

- Thursday, February 16, 2012
- 9:00 – 11:00 a.m.
- Conference Room A
- Central Administrative Offices

***Tentative Agenda Items for the next DDT meeting:***

“Draft Mission Statement” for DDT presentation - T. Henckel, D. Urban, L. Rossner, & B. Smith

CMT Reading Data (overtime) will be presented – district change over time of student goal level measures – disaggregate by grade level – D. Urban

This will help us identify what assessments may support the “predictor” purposes of assessment and data collection – real historical data

Continue to construct *District Data Analysis* components – Team

Revision of the SIP re: Science, STEM, and School Climate - T. Henckel, K. Bender, K. DiPalma, and L. Rossner

K. Saranich and K. Crosby will report back on a school climate goal for DIP.