April DAC meeting
April 12, 2016
6:30-8:30
Wilcox Building BOE Room

Role Call/ Call to Order
Sandra Brownrigg (DAC Chair/ Voting Parent)
Brian Wetterling (DAC Vice Chair/ Voting Parent)
Barb Cousins(Voting Parent)
Brandi Butticaz(Voting Parent)
Heather Graves(Voting Community Member)
Chris Pratt (Voting Parent)
Mark Harrell(Voting Principal)
Matt Rogers (Voting Elementary Teacher)
Steven Cook (Assistant Superintendent Secondary Education)
Ted Knight (Assistant Superintendent Elementary Education)
Meghan Silverthorn (BOE Liaison)
Judi Reynolds (BOE Liaison)

Absent
Jean Medberry (Voting Parent)
Kim Kibort (Communications/ Voting Parent)
Melissa Bergfalk (Voting Secondary Teacher)

Acronyms
DAC - District Accountability Committee
BOE- Board of Education
FOC - Fiscal Oversight Committee
LRPC - Long Range Planning Committee
UIP - Unified Improvement Plan
CART - Charter Application Review Team
PE - Parent Engagement Committee
CITE - Continued Improvement for Teacher Effectiveness
LEAD - Leadership
HE, E, PE, I - Highly Effective, Effective, Partially Effective, Ineffective
FAQ - Frequently asked question

Meeting called to order at 6:37.

DAC March meeting minutes approved (Chris motioned, Brian seconded).   All in favor, no opposed - March meeting minutes - **APPROVED**

DAC member update - John Paull has resigned.   Because DAC petitioned for a second voting community member last fall, we are not filling the new vacancy (Heather Graves

is currentVoting Community member).   DAC motioned to delay filling the position until fall 2016 to allow members to review their current commitments and reconvene in August to see if there are other vacancies to fill. Sandra motioned, Matt seconded - all in favor, no opposed - **APPROVED**

Committee Update
BOE   (Meghann) -BOE held a work session on 4/5 - Next meeting is on 4/19.
FOC (Sandra) - FOC has held three meetings in past 2 weeks.   DAC budget discussion has been pushed back to May in light of FOC meetings and DAC has provided initial data to FOC regarding budget.   FOC representative will be at the May meeting.   FOC is looking at 1 and 5 years for budget recommendation issues.
LRPC (Chris) - Four new candidates are up for appointment.   Current issue is acute capacity issue at Clear Sky Elementary, and has been projected for 1 to 5 years. LRPC final presentation will be to BOE in May.   Also, Chris is new bylaw conduit for SAC's and DAC's.   Any questions please reach out to Chris surrounding those.
UIP (Brian) - Presentation this evening, no report.
CART (Barb) - 4/26 & 4/28 is the Q&A session for the school that is looking for CART approval.
PE (Brandi) - First meeting held in March.   Some ideas/goals that came out of the meeting were: identify a mission statement for committee, online SAC forum, elementary mixer, and a SAC directory.   The next meeting is in June.
DAC Chair report   (Sandra) - Color coding DAC agenda going forward based on level of engagement (Report, Update, Presentation, Guided Discussion, Open Discussion). If there are handouts, we will hand them out to everyone in the group, updates are FYI (strictly informal), we will take some questions and include them in minutes (in May).

DCSD UIP Update - Matt Reynolds (Chief System Performance Officer)

DCSD UIP 2015-16
*School plan types and district accreditation ratings will not be assigned in 2015.
*Each school and district shall continue to implement the plan type that was assigned for the preceding school year.
*State accountability clock is on one year hold.

UIP requires that we have state level data, which we don't have.   Assessment data is not available, which factors into our "accountability" area.   Whatever data was available (this current year) DCSD used it, which was not much.   No action required on this, merely informative.

CITE/LEAD Update - Ian Wells (Director of CITE)

Some members of CITE and LEAD Task Force in attendance.   DCSD Principals were asked to find volunteers for CITE/LEAD Focus Group to review the evaluation tool.

Panel represents a voice for the masses, belief in growth through feedback, user friendly and positive impact on system, desire for a more purposeful evaluation tool and process to lead towards growth, clarity within the system.

Defined mission: Make proposals to revise the CITE/LEAD documents into more user friendly and valuable tools to support teacher growth, improve climate and culture, and create a more effective and meaningful evaluation system.

Group worked to tackle a document that has had a lot of discussion surrounding it. Session 1:Identified needs for clarification, reviewed SB 191, brainstormed all topics. Session 2 identified the areas that were common themes, realistic to change,   and where group could do a "deeper dive".
Session 3 : Defined titles of 4 descriptors - HE, E, PE, and I
Session 4 & 5: Deconstructing the language of CITE standards, evaluating language choices, making recommendations for changes.

Challenges: Myth busting, SB191 (the weight of it's impact) and changes to evaluation practices and philosophy, alignment, understanding of language, differences between needs at different schools, levels, feeders, recognition of domino effect of change.

Priorities: Retitling ratings, Define/refine terminology (clarity), Reduce/Remove backward planning (change to purposeful planning), 4 to 5 categories shift (in final rating) i.e. Upper Effective/Lower Effective.

Next Steps:Present formalized proposal for systematic review to PK-12, continue conversation and work in Fall.

Recommendations: Consistent professional development around CITE tool (definition of terms), District initiated communication to dispel rumors and address FAQ.

Formalized proposal: Will ideally be written by the end of the week and highlight "big rocks" that were presented.

DAC questions
Barb - What is the historical piece to help us understand why there is a new panel? - Ian - To be frank, I'm brand new to this role.   I wanted to get a sampling of people to hear different voices.   We didn't have as many volunteers at the secondary level as we did at Elementary. Moving forward this group asked if they could continue the work on this panel.   Ideally we want to start working on CITE in September. Brian - I have been working with this on the DAC level, Ian came on and everything came together with CITE.

Ted - 2010/2011- Initial committee came together to reevaluate the CITE tool.   There are threads of people who have remained consistent with this committee, but over the years, some people have changed.   As life happens we will continue to add members

to the group, but it's great to have a consistent group that works together.

Mark - We have 25 different rubrics.   What was the discussion around expectation between a 5 year old classroom teacher and a 17 year old classroom teacher? - Answer: There are some bullet points (on the state rubric) that highlight age appropriate discussions.   We know that it's something that may need to be done.   We decided to make the tool more "user friendly" but long term it would be a 2-3 year process to make the change.   We leaned towards developing PD to lend clarity to rubrics making more sense (defining and honing the system).

Steve- Regarding SB 191 - Why not just use the same rubrics that other districts use? Answer: We didn't spend much time discussion state tool (cumbersome) and DCSD is different.   We want our tool to capture what we do in DCSD.   State tool seems more flawed and less likely to help build a growth model for teachers.   We ultimately map to the state model, but have built onto that.   We did ask ourselves "Does the state model fit our district?"

Barb - I think it's worthwhile to address the cost/benefit analysis regarding the time CITE takes.   Brian - that is addressed in the rumor/myth busting piece.   Those are issues and conversations that will be addressed.

Brian - This was a really productive focus group and committee.   It was very open discussion.

Community questions
When you look at the state tool, why not refine the state tool vs. creating a new tool? Answer - It's done and at this point we would be going backwards if we changed paths.
I don't hear support for the teachers in CITE   Answer: There were more teachers on this panel than administrators.   The teacher voice was really valued in this process.
Does data need to be uploaded into the system? SB191 - Old system (judgement based evaluator/evaluee) - Behooves everyone involved to upload evidence.
What is proposed timeline for changes? - Timeline of submission has passed for DAC. There are six rubrics to change, we want to write them this week, and submit them for changes. Some revised rubrics are ready to change, but we want to submit changes all at once.
Our goal is to make sure everything is finalized by June.

Final word: The changes being made by this group are highly impactful.

Parent Engagement Task Force - Kathy Brown (DCSD Parent/ Community liaison)

The Parent Engagement group met for the first time in March 2016.

I (Kathy) personally chose these community members based on their community

involvement within DCSD.   This is an inclusive group that is meant to be productive and encourage positive change within the district.   Diverse group of parents who may not share common views.

DAC members and audience members worked in small groups to discuss challenges to SAC recruitment within DCSD schools and identified possible solutions to those challenges.   Collected feedback is below…

Challenges

    Finding community members and interested parents
    Lack of awareness of what SAC is or does
    Time of day for meetings
    Representing the school community on the SAC
    Brand new school, recruiting new parents
    When to do elections
    Community member on committee
    Should meeting times fluctuate for better attendance
    Lack of understanding of the purpose of SAC
    Awareness that SAC exists
    Lack of procedure and protocol
    Lack of education
    Transparency
    Parents don't feel heard, SAC is an update
    Time Commitment
    Receive information, do not provide information
    Cant get people there
    Finding a time that works/child care
    Don't know what SAC is and don't make a difference
    Things have already been decided so why need a committee?
    How does SAC Chair learn what to do?
    School board influences SAC chairs and do not seem to want parent involvement
    Parents are busy
    Parents can't make meeting times
    Parents don't think it applies to them
    Attracting enough people we need small group of active parents
    Communication of purpose to attract new people
    Working relationship with principal, varies by school
    Principal's sense of value and purpose
    At one school, too many parents want to be voting members
    Information overload/people tune out

Solutions:
    Why do we limit in DCSD to only 3 parents
    Representation of special interest

Has to be a reason, what's in it for me (parent)?
DAC Orientation – forum in the fall
Talking points created for schools to disseminate about the role/reason for being on the SAC
Open up new communication channels from SAC
Define the roles and importance at the school level
SAC quarterly newsletter
Post meeting minutes day of or just timely
Publicize agendas a month in advance for parents
Add a parent open forum at beginning of meeting
HS 7am, MS 4pm, Elem 5:30pm
SAC meeting off campus, serve food and drinks
Principal training
Would be nice for feeders to get together
Each parent bring a parent focusing on the younger grades
Principal can make the ask of parents to attend
Booths/tables at back to school night
Take the evaluation to assess if we are using our SACs effectively
Reach out to parents who work to let them know this is a meaningful way to participate
Have a monthly update on the SAC
Fluctuate meeting times
Serve Food
SAC booth at Back to School night or meet n greet
Focus more on article 3, #4
More detail about impact SAC can have
Education for chair and principal
Post information correctly and email links
Attend a functional, well run SAC
Following an agenda, having a purpose
SAC should be a conversation
Action based
Be respectful of time of parents

Open Forum Community questions
Will bylaw changes for DAC liaison role will the updated bylaws be posted on DAC?
Yes - it was unintentional and a website issue.

Meeting adjourned at 8:27

Presentations links from DAC meeting

https://www.dcsdk12.org/sites/default/files/boardofeducation/districtaccountabilit

ycommittee/Presentations/DAC%20%28UIP%20Update%204-12-2016%29.pdf

https://www.dcsdk12.org/sites/default/files/boardofeducation/districtaccountabilitycommittee/Presentations/CITE%20Focus%20Group%20DAC%20Presentation%204.12.16.pdf