

## CSC Meeting Minutes

Date: September 21, 2017

Time: 4:00 pm

Location: Cory Elementary School Library

### Attendees

#### CSC committee members

- Bill Esbenshade, Co-Chair & Parent Rep
- Tyson Sollenberger, Co-Chair & Parent Rep
- Jennifer Daily, Secretary & Parent Rep
- Jennifer Grumman, PTA & Parent Rep
- Liz Tencate, Principal
- Patty Kozma, Primary Teacher Rep. (Regrets)
- Katie McOwen, 4/5 Teacher Rep
- Angela Alexander, Specials Teacher Rep

#### Additional

- Caleb Melamed, 4/5 teacher

### Discussion Items

Agenda Item #:1	Review of CSC Duties and Mission (Bill)
Options/Points Raised:	<p>Orientation: CSC role, primary duties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school develops a unified improvement plan (UIP) each year, per state requirements. Primary job of CSC is to focus on the UIP. Process starts in June when some of the testing data comes in, this data is used to make a roadmap for coming year (e.g. identify gaps and develop strategies to improve). Some teachers work on it in July, pick up again in September. It will come to the CSC once drafted, and CSC will give feedback. Inputs: PARCC, SPF (school performance framework) data. Whole child component was added to UIP last year.</li> <li>• Key points from the CSC guidelines/by laws: focused on big picture, not micromanager of operations and personnel; ultimately CSC acts in interest of students; representatives should be communicating back to respective constituencies; decisions made by consensus; at year end CSC does an evaluation of the principal.</li> <li>• Future: next year will need parents to join CSC, good to have multiple perspectives (upper lower, GT/intervention etc), the group should identify and encourage potential representatives to apply.</li> </ul>
Decision or Recommendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision taken by the CSC to adopt the latest version of the district by-laws and handbook.</li> <li>• CSC Positions were reviewed: Bill Esbenshade, Co-Chair and Parent Rep; Tyson Sollenberger, Co-Chair and Parent Rep (will be Chair in next school year as well); Jennifer Daily, Secretary and Parent Rep; Jennifer Grumman, PTA and Parent Rep; Liz Tencate, Principal; Patty Kozma, Primary Teacher Rep; Katie McOwen, 4/5 Teacher Rep; Angela Alexander, Specials Teacher Rep</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CSC communication process: Agenda items are proposed and submitted to the Chair at least 1 week before CSC meeting comments to chair; Principal has final edit. Posted on bulletin board at school and uploaded to CSC page of website. Minutes are taken and circulated within a week to community; as needed minutes will be circulated to CSC members w/24h turnaround.</li> </ul>
--	--

<b>Agenda Item #2:</b>	<b>Update on Principal Search Process (Liz)</b>
------------------------	---

Options/Points Raised:	<p>Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instructional Superintendent (Alona Hastings) will facilitate/lead the process at Cory.</li> <li>There is a Principal Candidate Pool maintained by DPS. The process of being admitted to this pool is rigorous. Includes having an administrator program qualification; being in good standing in district; doing a learning walk; interviews (group, one on one).</li> <li>The candidates then learn about openings at specific schools and can apply.</li> <li>The schools will form a committee of parents and staff (usually a large group, but may need to be a voting process to get on committee depending on interest). Committee develops qualities they want in principal, needs of the school.</li> <li>Narrow down to a few candidates who will come to community to provide intro/bio and answer questions.</li> <li>Finalists will go to the superintendent who makes decision taking school needs, IS, and selection committee's recommendations into account.</li> </ul> <p>Background:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DPS Org chart: Tom Boasberg (Superintendent); Instructional Superintendents for each network, Principals</li> <li>~4 year avg tenure of a principal, though lots of variation.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion on attributes of good principals. Principal keeps vision of school front and center –uses it to filter ideas.</p>
------------------------	---

Decision or Recommendations:	No immediate action; we are still early in process. More info later this fall/winter.
------------------------------	---

<b>Agenda Item #3:</b>	<b>Review of Cory's latest testing data (Caleb Melamed)</b>
------------------------	---

Options/Points Raised:	<p>Caleb reviewed testing data</p> <p>PARCC data (covers grades 3-5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Language arts: saw improvements; good growth as children moved up. Cory outperforms schools in network.</li> <li>Math: Cory has seen decrease in recent years.</li> </ul> <p>Early LIT data (an on-line assessment for grades 1-3<sup>rd</sup>)</p>
------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early lit data since fall 2016 shows increasing performance... 84% to 93.4% of kids grade level of above.</li> <li>• Denver 2020 goal is 80% 3<sup>rd</sup> graders above GL.</li> </ul> <p>Subgroups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Free and reduced lunch (FRL) kids... shows increasing performance in ELA and math, but still lots of work to be done. FRL students not making as much academic growth. FRL population at Cory ~ 13%.</li> <li>• Students of color (SOL). Students of color did better in some subjects</li> </ul> <p>Notes about data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District is very concerned with growth.</li> <li>• Network 5 (Cory's network) is best performing in DPS.</li> <li>• Any subgroup that is analyzed (SOL, FRL must have n&gt;16 kids)</li> </ul> <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Testing data → School's UIP: There was some discussion about empowering teachers to deliver the curriculum but to be more strategic about how to get kids to meet common core standards in a rigorous way, ensuring understanding and mastery of concepts; and that kids are engaged.</li> <li>• UIP will focus on Math, some work already underway (e.g.. grouping /math compacting). Additionally, UIP focus on empowering teachers to use curriculum but to teach concepts will help.</li> <li>• FRL also a UIP focus.</li> </ul>
Decision or Recommendations:	No immediate decision or recommendations; CSC will continue to engage re UIP.
<b>Agenda Item #4:</b>	<b>GT/HGT Program Update (Liz)</b>
Options/Points Raised:	<p><b>Review definitions of GT:</b> Cory has been a magnet site, with an integrated GT/HGT model. Students get designated GT/GHT after: Test + reading levels + math levels... GT: top 95<sup>th</sup> percentile. HGT: top 99<sup>th</sup> percentile. Kids can be designated in certain subjects.</p> <p><b>Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff trained before school started on GT strategies.</li> <li>• Teachers working to differentiate in classrooms.</li> </ul> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for more definition/vision around integrated GT offering.</li> <li>• Huge amount of parent variation on topic of GT.</li> <li>• Current Cory vision and mission statement, does not reflect integrated GT model. Generic, nothing is special about it. Cory creed would be better to work off if.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What might GT include: opportunities for student choice, inquiry, passion to look into something – opportunities. Depth and complexity for some kids where to build that in.</li> <li>• Suggestion to incorporate some projects, of the expeditionary type projects.</li> <li>• Suggestion to not recreate wheel, look at other models.</li> <li>• There are no GT standard (like common core).</li> <li>• Staff also needs to buy into it, what's possible. Question: Is there enough support for teachers to do the in-depth work... Teaching staff phenomenal – it may just be need to empower teachers to implement where they see fit...</li> </ul>
Decision or Recommendations:	<p>Identified various areas for additional work, however no actions/timelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to discuss and better articulate Cory's GT model over course of year; work with staff to better define what is the vision.</li> <li>• School mission and vision could use updating; Cory Creed would be a good place to start/build off of that.</li> </ul>
<b>Agenda Item #5:</b>	<b>Scheduling CSC meeting dates</b>
Options/Points Raised:	
Decision or Recommendations:	CSC meetings will occur 2 <sup>nd</sup> Thursday each month. 4-5:30 PM Next meeting is Oct 12 <sup>th</sup>
<b>Agenda Item #6:</b>	Time did not permit addressing other issues that were on the agenda including: fall forum agenda/date; swamp coolers and managing temperatures in the art room/ other rooms; making field trips more productive; psychology counselor budgeting and status of this position; para support; agenda items for next meeting)
Options/Points Raised:	
Decision or Recommendations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Move the art room/temperature discussion to next meeting</li> <li>• October meeting will be longer to address backlog of agenda items.</li> </ul>

<b>Action Items</b>		
<b>Task to be Done</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Due Date</b>
Encourage parents/teachers throughout the year to consider to applying to CSC next year.	All	Throughout year
Posting of CSC Agenda and minutes	Chair/Principal (agenda) Secretary/Alison (minutes)	Agenda: circulate a few days before meeting; minutes w/in one week

Input/comments on Agenda to CSC Chair

All

At least 1 week before meeting

## ELA PARCC % MET AND EXCEEDED

	2015	2016	2017	2017 Network 5	2015-2017 Diff	2016-2017 Diff	2016 3rd to 2017 4th Cohort Comparison	2016 4th to 2017 5th Cohort Comparison
<b>All</b>	79.6%	75.9%	83.3%	57.5%	3.7%	7.4%	17.1%	9.0%
<b>3rd</b>	73.8%	63.5%	82.3%	55.5%	8.5%	18.8%		
<b>4th</b>	76.3%	79.1%	80.6%	57.4%	4.3%	1.5%		
<b>5th</b>	87.5%	85.3%	88.1%	59.6%	0.6%	2.8%		

## MATH PARCC % MET AND EXCEEDED

	2015	2016	2017	2017 Network 5	2015-2017 Diff	2016-2017 Diff	2016 3rd to 2017 4th Cohort Comparison	2016 4th to 2017 5th Cohort Comparison
<b>All</b>	77.7%	76.0%	70.8%	48.9%	-6.9%	-5.2%	-5%	4%
<b>3rd</b>	81%	77%	72%	52.5%	-9%	-5%		
<b>4th</b>	74%	64%	72%	46.0%	-2%	8%		
<b>5th</b>	79%	85%	68%	47.8%	-11%	-18%		

## EARLY LIT DATA

Fall 2016				Midyear 2016-2017				Spring 2017			
Total N	SBGL %	BG %	GL & Above %	Total N	SBGL %	BG %	GL & Above %	Total N	SBGL %	BG %	GL & Above %
238	2.9%	13.0%	84.0%	242	2.1%	8.3%	89.7%	242	2.5%	4.1%	93.4%

## FRL DATA

PARCC ELA FRL Comparison			
	2015	2016	2017
FRL %ME	41.2%	53.8%	68.0%
Non-FRL %ME	86.40%	78.90%	85.40%
Gap	45.20%	25.10%	17.40%
PARCC Math FRL Comparison			
	2015	2016	2017
FRL %ME	48.5%	42.3%	45.8%
Non-FRL %ME	82.7%	80.6%	74.1%
Gap	34.2%	38.3%	28.3%

## STUDENTS OF COLOR

PARCC Math SOC Comparison			
	2015	2016	2017
SOC %ME	71.1%	65.3%	64.5%
Non-SOC %ME	79.0%	79.2%	72.6%
Gap	7.9%	13.9%	8.1%
PARCC ELA SOC Comparison			
	2015	2016	2017
SOC %ME	67.4%	67.3%	88.9%
Non-SOC %ME	82.4%	78.4%	81.8%
Gap	15.0%	11.1%	-7.1%