1. Professional Development Plan-Becky
Becky presented a historical look at the past PD offered to staff to set context for PD for summer 2016 and SY 16-17

Summer 2013  10 field test teachers(25 hours)
She met weekly and on early release days
MS content met to calibrate rigor
HS met to work on ELTs
Lessons learned-teachers needed more time on formative assessment
JumpRope was not the stumbling block

Summer 2014
All teachers grade 5-8 paid for up to 6 hours
Sessions on assessment
  Summative
  Formative
  Student self-assessment
  JumpRope

School year 2014-15
Monthly meeting sat MS
MS early release days to work on rigor, calibration
HS worked on content
Lessons learned- 2nd year is easier
Planning ahead is important
Rigor level verbs were using to literally
JumpRope was not a stumbling block
You don’t know what you need until you are into it

Summer 2015
Teachers K-5 up to 6 hours paid
  Assessment work
  JumpRope
MS up to 6 hours paid
  Backward design
  Support work sessions
12 HS teachers up to 15 hours of paid time
  First hour was about design/revision
  13 hours to work, 1 hour summary meeting
School year 2015-16

K-5 grade level leaders have worked with staff on early release days
Office hours at each elem. Building
6-8 content areas have met on early release days
12 HS teachers have met on early release days together
HS other teachers have worked on ALTs, final ELTs
Becky has been at the high school every Thursday
Lessons Learned-year 3 is even easier
Planning ahead about objectives
What do you assess formatively and summatively
Starting fresh with new units is easier that the retro-fit
Rigor levels are where the rich discussions happen
JumpRope is not the stumbling block

Planning process 2016
Met with the curriculum leaders
Met with outside consultant who met with departments
Collecting data through a survey

Survey got 93 responses in less than 24 hours
  Backward design +shift
  Time, models and processes, talk with colleagues

  Rigor +shift
  More examples, how do you assess an activity, looking at student work

  Summative evidence +shift
  Time, colleagues, examples

  Formative assessment as feedback + shift
  People feel good about formative assessment

Distribution of feedback
  36 HS
  25 MS
  30 Elem
Summer 2016-draft (see documents)

Offered for all teachers already in PbL
Defining objectives and formative feedback
Rigor and summative evidence
Backward planning
Jump rope refresher

HS teachers that are new in 2016-17
Same offerings
New Jump rope

Current people in PbL will get up to 6 hours of paid work

HS teachers new to PbL - from lessons learned group sessions important to build foundation for work and make the planning more specific and directed to PbL approach for teachers, so...
2 sessions (4 hours) plus 6 hours work time = 10 total
3 sessions (6 hours) plus 9 hours of work time = 15 total
4 sessions (8 hours) plus 12 hours of work time = 20 total

Sessions will be plugged into PD Express for people to sign up - lots of time options
This will help with planning
There also will be a deadline for submission of units for review
Sessions will be held at the high school

Question:
1. What type of training has been done for support staff
   All HS ed techs have participated in sessions
   District wide special ed meetings had information presented by Becky
   All ed techs had an intro session during early release

2. What was the stumbling block if it was not JumpRope?
   Trying to retro-fit what we have always done into the PbL approach
   Looking at feedback, but not always as a data point

3. Should you look at August sessions for parents?
   We would be open to hosting sessions for parents - possible questions:
   What types of things should parents be looking for?
   What types of questions should parents be asking?
   How about a short overview?
   (maybe link to welcome sessions, open house when parents come anyway
What has changed in Jumprope?

There are changes specific to the things that teachers have asked for
?? - How about having sessions about the parent portal?
They used the portal as a discussion point when they did the preview
The portal helps you talk about formative and summative

A version of the PD plan maybe with more sessions will be shared with staff over the next few weeks

2. Conversion Update from SPHS
Ryan shared the conversion with the Leadership Team. Asked LT to share with their teams.
Feedback was “this makes sense”. Enduring question is “how will let students in the proficiency graduation group know they are on the right track towards proficiency without the use of credits. Once we start looking at ELTs combining how can students keep track to see if they are moving in the right direction.

Teachers are ready to share this with kids. The question is “are we going to open up the back of the transcript earlier so kids know where they are?” Now it is not open to the kids until grade 11. Teachers would like a number that they can give to kids so they know they are on track. Currently the conversations with kids are all about credits and whether they have attained them.

Thoughts:
• we need to be clear when there are standards that only occur in one or two spots
• we have started to look at the strands to see where the standards fall. Which electives fall where.
• we are looking at “Guaranteed and Viable” being 3 years with the 4th year being for remediation or extension. We need to set benchmarks along the way that let kids know they are ‘getting there’. Some things will factor into endorsements.
• We will be able to look in year and say where kids are deficient. This gives much more information. How do we let know when they are on their way?
• where are we with this map?
• staff has been working on where things fall. They are determining where the ELTs fit. Science is more difficult because of the course offerings. This may have 2 pathways.
• Current thinking is that we should end Guaranteed and Viable after 3 years. The 4th year might be AP classes, internships, projects and of course remediation.
• Teachers still want a number.

3. Newsletter
We introduced the development of the newsletter. It includes the definitions of the terms, outlines the work of the committee, and sets the path.
Should there be a comparison of the current system and the new system? Here is the difference between the 2 systems. It might be helpful for parents.

We aimed for 1 page, down and dirty to be ready for next year.

Question about the Latin Honors system. This was revised.

Are we using the conversion and averaging them with the proficiency? What makes the most sense is to only recognize kids at the end of the year. It should be trending upwards. This is the only thing that makes sense.

Definitions are good but maybe we cut back on these.

Too much information on one page even if they are familiar. Should tie together with the graduation requirements. Can we do a visual chart about what high school looks like in a proficiency system? We need to see that there are truly pathways to get to graduation.

Things on the back are what people will be interested in. Can we do a graphic? Here is what is the same for... What is the same and what is different.

How does it affect each class should be highlighted so that folks can quickly see how it impacts them.

What is somewhat the same.

Is the purpose of this newsletter is to go out at the beginning of the year? If so maybe it does not outline student recognition (to go at a later date). Others thought student recognition should be there.

Comment about switching the student summary to the front and not the back. Another piece that is missing is Co-curricular participation.

You need to make note that those scores will be converted. Current sophomores think they will not be in the system which is not correct.

How do you let those parents know that it will affect them in grade 12?

Are we planning on a public forum before the year ends? No, we are looking to the fall.

Next steps:
Admissions rep would be helpful because we could have them talk about Merit Scholarships. It would also allow us to ask questions about dual enrollment.

Review final draft of the newsletter

Next Meeting: Tuesday, June 7, 2:30-4:00 p.m., rm 204, SPHS