

SLT Minutes

January 24, 2017, 4:15pm

In Attendance: Emily Balmuth-Loris, Eileen Goldberg, Iuliia Stozub, Debra Mastriano, Max Alvarez, Catherine Box, Nina Collmer, Pam Korson, Julie Norwell, Rachel Polimeni, Rachelle King, Deborah Middleton

- I. **Approval of Minutes:** The December 20th, 2016 SLT Minutes were approved unanimously pending one small revision.

- II. **Superintendent Visit:** Deputy Superintendent Dixon was present at the meeting. She introduced herself to the SLT board. Part of the superintendent's role is to evaluate the principal. Each member of superintendent's team visits 4-5 school SLT meetings and discusses expectations.

- III. **CEP goal review**
 - a. **CEP Goal 3:** Emma discussed the third goal of the CEP: Collaborative Teaching using assessment-based data. Since our last meeting, Emma visited all teachers to make sure they were aware of the goal and that they were using ECAM assessments three times per year. The bottom third of students are tested more often. For example, the first grade ICT class has tested bottom third of the class 10 times this year so far. In addition to the official testing three times per year, informally teachers can move students up if they observe that they are ready. For counting, numeration, and other math areas, teachers look at class data to decide which games to implement with the class.
 - b. **CEP Goal 1:** Rachel discussed analysis that was done for the first goal of the CEP: Rigorous instruction. Since the last meeting, Eileen and Rachel analyzed running records data and test score data for the third, fourth, and fifth grades.
 - i. Comparing results, it was not clear how running records data (i.e., reading levels) were correlated to test scores data. One reason is that even if 100% of the class scores is at a level 4 reading level (i.e., above grade level), it is not clear that this would or should necessarily translate to a 4 on the state test.
 - ii. We concluded as a group that running records are not a good way to assess progress in January towards our goal of higher state test scores by the end of the year.
 - iii. We need to be thoughtful about identifying the goal. Currently our end of year goal is a percentage of students scoring 3s or 4s on the ELA exam, and our mid-year assessment goal is that all teachers will have engaged in 4 cycles of running records assessments by February.
 1. If our end of year goal is based on ELA exam, perhaps instead we need to change our mid-year goal to a percentage of kids who get a certain grade on the mock assessment. This measure would only be relevant for third, fourth and fifth graders.
 2. Alternatively, we can list our end of year as a certain percentage of students at or above reading level by running records data. In that

case, the mid-year assessment can be based on mid-year running records data. This goal would be relevant for all grades.

3. Note that if we use running records data, we should be listing 2 cycles by February, not 4.
- iv. Emma noted that looking at mock test data, teachers can see what questions a lot of kids got wrong and work on those questions. Mock test would be a better January goal for CEP. We have raw scores, we can figure out how to translate into 3s and 4s, and set a mid-year goal as a percentage of 3s/4s on the mock test.
- c. **Careful examination of mid-year assessment goals needed:** We need to make sure our mid-year assessment ties to our end of year assessment in all categories. *For example, for CEP Goal 2 (Supportive Environment):*
 - i. Our end of year goal is that 100% of students are familiar w. RULER, and 40% or less of ORS reports are categorized as level 3 compared to 49% from last year.
 - ii. Our mid-year goal states that by Jan. 2017, implementation of RULER will be in all classrooms. But how does that lead us to know that we are getting closer to our end of year goal?
 - iii. We need to change our mid-year goal. For example, we can review ORS data and show that reports categorized as level 3 has decreased by at least 4.5 percentage points.

IV. **Capital Grants:**

- a. We have \$310K for an auditorium renovation from Helen Rosenthal and Gale Brewer's offices. SCA visited and will give us a quote to re-do auditorium.
- b. This year we are applying for a library grant via Helen Rosenthal's participatory grant and through Helen Rosenthal and Gale Brewer's capital funding grants.
- c. Grants: OASP – maybe they will have a library grant we can apply for

V. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 5:45pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rachel Polimeni
Co-Recording Secretary