

## SCC Meeting

Thurs. April 27<sup>th</sup> 2017

### \*Supplemental meeting to review Academic Plan

## APPROVED MINUTES

**I. Introductions-** Attending: Nancy Matsukawa, (principal); Drake Neff (parent); Toni Reynolds (teacher) Jeannie Hart (teacher) Carnel Lyman (parent); Jade Chang (parent); Marsha Eckert (parent/community); Pohai Kirkland (non-certificated) ; Natalie Lalagos TFA rep, community)

**II. Review of Academic Plan--** Nancy- reviews outline of the elements of the Academic plan & the intent/purposes of the Academic Plan. Continued review of previous discussion, highlights, concerns, areas of improvement. Parent asks: “What would happen if the plan is not followed?” No official ‘punitive action’ if this plan is not followed. It is a “living document”, additions and changes continue to be made.

Discussion of areas of concern and next steps. Discussion of Desired Outcomes—GLAD strategies, implementing GLAD in classroom, addressing the needs of all students; GLO’s, and how to get kids to understand and demonstrate the GLO’s; rubrics exist for all grade levels (1-5); Discussion of ways to implement the GLO’s (get more student buy-in—ie: student selection vs. teacher “mandated” GLO’s;). Pohai also points out that we may need to look at a more year-long GLO goal (focusing on skills that get developed and worked on throughout the year.) GLO’s in actuality look different for different grade levels. *\*Suggestion that the Data to monitor progress in GLO’s- could we include the GLO’s rubrics? (include this in the Academic Plan.)*

Discussion: How do we make the GLO’s “LIFE LONG” skills?

**Pg. 7—“Whole Child”**—PBIS discussion, and various activities we have been developing. PBIS handbook- review of the basics of the PBIS teacher handbook (expectations for rituals - ie: morning greeting, “check-in”, strengthening community ties) Behavior supports—discussion of Tier 1, Tier 2 behavior plans (see Jeannie’s ‘pyramid’ diagram—approx. 10-15% ideally should be in the Tier 2, 5% is the most intensive). Socio/Emotional support plan—“Mind Up” (now being piloted by 1 teacher from each grade level.) Once they give their input, counselors and those on PBIS cadre will look at data and discuss how to proceed with ‘Mind Up’ next year. *Goal is gradual implementation of ‘Mind Up’ in coming years. \*add this to pg. 8 implementation*

Pg. 9—attendance issue—chronic absenteeism, how to encourage kids to attend more regularly. (State target is @15% average rate of absenteeism for the year) The issue is kids with 15-16 or more days per year. **Discussion of “excused” vs. not excused. No such thing as an “excused” absence.** We are planning a concerted effort to see how we address chronic absenteeism. \*especially among the ELL population. *Things we might like to consider: disaggregated data on absenteeism. (break it down by sub groups— socio-economic, race, sped/ELL); perhaps solutions could include ‘robo calls, or face-to face visits, etc.)*

*Academic Plan Discussion- cont'd*

**Pg. 10—Well Rounded Education**—(obj. 3a)-overview of various programs in place for supporting teachers and students—delivering differentiated instructional strategies for all (in the least restrictive environment.). Testing and assessments in various areas—  
***Teachers had voted in an earlier AC/FIN staff meeting, if fund allow for additional staff (if needed—or assign duties to current staff) to assign (hire) a “Testing Coordinator” to help coordinate (align, help train others to carry out, print up documents/passcodes, etc. to help lighten the burden of testing on classroom teachers.)***

**Pg. 11--Alignment of curriculum and collaboration**—review and revise assessment practices in grades K-5 to align with the SBA format for grades 305.

ILT – Instructional Leadership Team— 1 member from each grade level is represented on the ILT—to work for common goals and improvement strategies. ILT’s current PIP focus is Speaking/Listening—our goals is to help students develop language skills to “construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others (all subjects, applies to listening, speaking, writing and reading.) School Complex Goal: 5<sup>th</sup> grade exit target Lexile 830-1010 (these Lexile levels are aligned to the CCSS.)

**Pg. 12- Data collection-** use of data and collection of it – SCC members discussed possible revisions- to include in the ‘enabling activities’ on pg. 12- ***“data is disaggregated to analyze the needs of specific sub groups (ie: ELL, SPED, GT and low-socio economic kids).”***

Pg 12. Natalie suggests adding notes for cross referencing enabling activities (ie: ***“See WASC report”***)

Pg. 13-helping students transition into early elementary grades ready to learn (***perhaps add specifics here—“community outreach programs—homework help @ Ulu Wini?”***)

\*Can we amend enabling activity: add to final statement: ***\*that is to be shared with parents. Also include: “ communicate grade level expectations to parents as students enter the next grade.”***)

Pg. 15-16 Professional development plan with focus on the high priority areas—new curriculum, community outreach, using universal screener data to inform instruction (addresses Tier 1 needs); Continuous PD- GLAD implement strategies school-wide, with the focus on addressing the needs of ELL.

Continuous PD on Wonders Integration with Science, Social Science & Health.

\*Also request to give more opportunities for teachers to give feedback about PD opportunities-- to include in AC Plan (see measures for progress—final column add: ***“Staff Surveys”***)

Pg. 20- Effective communication...cohesive school culture.—Increase time for teacher collaboration (improve/change bell schedule to allow for more teacher planning time.)

**Pg. 21 \*see various ELL add to 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph : “eg: add newcomers class”**)

Members vote to adopt AC/FIN, with amendments and extra examples.

Copies will be sent via Google Docs.

**Adjournment 5:20 P.M.** Next Meeting May 11<sup>th</sup>, KES Office, 3:30 – 5:00