BAINBRIDGE ISLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 303
K-6 Educational Programs and Innovations Committee
Meeting Minutes

Date: February 7, 2013

Place: Board Room – Commodore Campus

Time: 12:30 – 5:00 p.m.

Review of January 10th Meeting Minutes
Superintendent Faith Chapel opened the meeting and introduced Ordway Elementary Teacher Katie Smit as a new member of the committee. Ms. Chapel then distributed the minutes from the January 10th meeting and asked the committee to review them, noting any corrections or additions. Ms. Chapel reminded folks that the topic of differentiation had been tabled until this meeting, which is where the committee would begin its work today. In addition, a question was raised at the last meeting regarding the relationship of the K-6 Educational Programs & Innovations Committee (EPIC) to other district committees, such as in the area of highly capable, special education, world languages, mathematics, etc. Ms. Chapel noted there could be overlap, for example, with the world languages committee as their work applies to K-6 elementary programs. The EPIC committee has a broader mission that could run parallel with other committees. The 2002/04 High School Study was given as an example. This committee examined how the high school program was organized, but did not send specific recommendations to any other district committees.

Differentiation – Definitions & Current Status – K-6 Math Program
Ms. Chapel introduced Math TOSA Jennifer Ledbetter who would present information regarding the current status of the K-6 Math Program. Prior to that presentation, Associate Superintendent Julie Goldsmith distributed two documents that define the characteristics for differentiated instruction: *Definition and Characteristics of Differentiated Instruction*, and *Personalization vs Differentiation vs Individualization*. The importance of setting the stage for a conversation about differentiation with everyone having the same understanding of the terminology was emphasized.

Ms. Ledbetter began the presentation with a video of a variety of students explaining the different ways they learn today – using technology, far more interactive – and they "*are always learning*." Referencing the *Personalization vs Differentiation vs Individualization* document, Ms. Ledbetter noted one definition of differentiation – *"explicit instruction based upon the learning needs of groups of learners."* The word "group" distinguishes differentiation from *personalization* and *individualization*, and relates to the cognitive needs of students. Personalization and individualization are different from differentiation, with personalization taking into consideration a student's learning styles, personal interests, and personal behaviors, and individualization focusing on specific learning objectives, specific accommodations, and one-on-one needs. Ms. Ledbetter provided a quote from the *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics* (NCTM 2000) – "Imagine a classroom, a school, a school district where all students have access to high-quality mathematics instruction. There are ambitious expectations for all, with accommodations for those that need it." This indicates the classroom is the first step. Differentiation as it relates to the mathematics classroom was explained. In mathematics-related professional development this year, teachers learned about using slates in classrooms as a way to formatively assess student ability before each lesson. They also learned about using more open ended, flexible questioning strategies, and how to develop understanding of the Depth of Knowledge Matrix. Ms. Ledbetter gave a couple of

examples of the open-ended questions teachers can ask. Copies of the Smarter Balanced Cognitive Rigor Matrix/Depth of Knowledge was distributed to the group.

Ms. Ledbetter went on to explain that teachers are becoming more familiar with examining data. Teachers are examining the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) data to determine goals for students, and are using data to determine overall student needs and groupings of students. Ms. Ledbetter also spoke about ST Math (JIJI Math), which is currently being used by all three district elementary schools. ST Math is designed to be a "co-teacher," helping students to learn math concepts within their grade levels. This program aligns with the classroom instruction, with students having the ability to learn the same concept in a different way. This program was supported by the Bainbridge Schools Foundation, as well as the Technology Levy, which provided the infrastructure that makes it possible. Committee members asked about the "depth and breadth" of the different domains, and how the different grade levels get more challenges. Ms. Goldsmith responded the new K-5 math program being proposed by the District Mathematics Committee provides differentiation that will address the learning needs for students. It was noted an open house to review the proposed new math curriculum will be held in late February or early March.

Ms. Chapel explained the topic of differentiation has been debated, with mathematics being the key area. Using the two documents that provide definitions of differentiation, committee members were asked to engage in a brief dialogue with their table partners using the following questions as a discussion guide: *What are some of the key elements of the definition of differentiation. What are some of the strategies that are currently in use? Are there strategies that have not been talked about in the district?* When the whole group came back together, Ms. Chapel asked folks to share their thoughts about the key elements related to differentiation. Group comments included: a) The "ah-ha" came with the document that noted the difference between personalization, differentiation, and individualization, particularly which differentiation starts with groups of learners. It is more about understanding the classroom, understanding the learner, and understanding the groups of learners, then putting forward the best instruction for that classroom. b) With the description of characteristics, the idea of proactive is taken to mean formative assessment – understanding what the needs of students are, then using that understanding to drive instruction for an individual student or groups of students. Multi-approached means multi-intelligences. Thinking about the term - student-centered – what does that mean, what does that look like in our district? c) How much MAP is helping to look at students, and how important assessment is. d) Assessment is important to effectively differentiate. e) There is a baseline for requirements not just toward graduation, but to support the aspirations of the community, which go beyond graduation. f) Regarding growth, how to partner effectively with the students' learning continuum, both in school and out of school. g) Related to assessment, teacher feedback may be different for different groups of students. h) The role of the teacher is different in a differentiated classroom than in a traditional classroom. They are teaching students how to interact and teach each other. Students become responsible for their own learning. Students are able to explain their learning and get to a deeper level of knowledge. i) There is a need to continually reassess and maintain flexibility in student groupings.

Next, folks shared comments regarding the strategies currently in use in the district, and strategies that have not been discussed. Comments included: a) Small groups are already being used, with parent support or with the support of technology. b) Suggested in-service for parent volunteers in the use of such things as ST Math. c) Utilize teacher specialists, similar to Sakai. d) Multidisciplinary approach such as math/science specialists. e) Questioning strategies are being used in the classroom. Also, some students use technology to solve problems, some use white boards. f) Groups of students working on specific tasks, working at their particular ability level. g) Example of Sakai – 7th grade math available to 6th grade students. h) Implementation of the "daily five." i) Important to communicate to parents and the community about the strategies already being used in the district. j) Informal education is valuable (presentations at assemblies, etc.) k) More project-based learning strategies. l) Make use of "choice

boards" that allow students to choose their own learning strand with guidance from the teacher. Ms. Chapel asked if any of the groups had talked about the use of technology to support differentiation. Several people talked about the use of ST Math, and the use of technology to support individual learning. It was suggested the Committee should be looking at ways technology can be introduced into the learning environment, and how to create the conditions that allow the teachers and the instructional leaders to experiment with technology tools and implement them in the classroom. Further comments indicated technology needed to be as current as possible and as sustainable as possible.

Differentiation – Data Analysis

Ms. Goldsmith noted discussion at the EPI meetings had fostered the idea of analyzing data to support district and committee work. Through conversations with committee member Ali Krug, it was discovered Ms. Krug was highly skilled in the area of data analysis, and she was engaged to provide analysis of the MAP data. Ms. Goldsmith noted last year was the first year teachers used the MAP assessment. In addition, last year the assessment was based on the state standards, and this year the assessment was based on the new Common Core standards. The data used in Ms. Krug's presentation was based on last year's Fall 2011 MAP assessment, and included data for grades 1 – 4 in math. Highlights from the presentation included: 1) Fall Math RITs were shown by grade and school, with District medians higher than National norms and continue to pull away with advancement in grade. 2) Regarding growth, all grades and schools are growing in math proficiency at or above the National median by grade, except for grade 2 (possible testing environment issues). 3) In the area of growth and ethnicity, there is good growth across the data, however coding issues are being reviewed. 4) In the area of growth and gender, good growth was observed. 5) A scatter graph of the data indicated higher median growth among those who are behind at the start of the year. Ms. Krug's final remarks included: 1) A uniquely challenging situation was noted with a large proportion of advanced students – nearly 1-in-5 exceed the 95th percentile. 2) Nearly 1-in-5 are two grade levels ahead in the Fall. 3) 60 – 70% of students are ahead of the National median in the Fall. 4) There is little state funding (2.314%) available to support differentiated learning at the higher end of the learning continuum, which in this District is 40% of students. At the conclusion of Ms. Krug's presentation, Blakely Principal Reese Ande stated he would like to have his staff see the data analysis. Having a deeper understanding of the data would be appreciated.

After the presentation, Ms. Chapel asked committee members to work in small groups to review the data considering these questions: *Are there any comments or recommendations that could be forwarded to the District Math Committee? What are the instructional implications for elementary schools?* Following the small group discussions, comments included: a) With students above grade level, what kind of "gatekeeping" is in place? With students below grade level but show growth, why are they still behind at the end? b) Does this data offer an understanding of competency and/or depth? Does the data demonstrate "critical thinking?" c) At what point is there confidence that the growth shown in the data is actually growth in math. (Students more adapt with computer testing, paper/pencil testing?) d) A recommendation to the math committee related to formalized pullouts. e) ST Math only goes to the 4th grade level; what happens after that (5th, 6th, etc.). What programs are available? f) What is the partnership between parents and teachers related to math support? g) Look at problem-based learning assemblies – capitalizing on the concept of Zeno Math and a mathematical culture. h) How do you address the needs of the top performers and those who need support? One of the comments noted the Smarter Balanced assessment may address the "depth" question. Ms. Goldsmith provided a brief overview of this assessment tool, which is based on the Common Core State Standards.

Elementary World Language

Ms. Goldsmith distributed an updated timeline for the Spanish Immersion Pilot Project Feasibility Study and Action Plan. She noted the registration for full-day Kindergarten needed to be in alignment with the timeline for the Spanish Immersion interest forms. Previously, the timeline had the feasibility study going to the school board in April, with a board decision at the end of April. The timeline update moves the

submission of the feasibility study and a board decision into March. Ms. Goldsmith noted the Kindergarten Orientation meeting was held the night before, with information about all the district's Kindergarten programs, including Spanish Immersion and the Mosaic Home Education Partnership, being available. The Commodore Options Open House will be held February 12th, with the Spanish Immersion Pilot Project for 2013-14 being represented to determine the level of parent interest in that program. Spanish Immersion interest forms need to be submitted no later than March 1. The Spanish Immersion Pilot Project Feasibility Study and Action Plan will be presented to the Board of Directors on March 14, and will provide information and possible options for the Board to consider for the next phase of the Spanish Immersion Pilot Project.

Ms. Chapel noted the data from the K-6 Programs & Innovation Committee World Language Survey that indicated that while there were folks interested in a total immersion language program, almost twice as many indicated an interest in a Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) model. At the January meeting, it was suggested information about these models be researched. Committee member Ali Krug volunteered to do the research, and Faith distributed the articles: *Model Early Foreign Language Programs: Key Elements* (ERIC Digest – December 2002), and *Establishing High-Quality Foreign Language Programs in Elementary Schools* (LAB – December 2000). Ms. Chapel asked committee members to read the two articles, along with the BISD Program Review – World Languages 2007-2009, prior to the next EPIC meeting scheduled for March 7th. In addition, Ms. Chapel indicated there would be internal discussions with staff around world language – where the district is, what was discussed as a committee, and what will move forward with the feasibility study. It was suggested a subcommittee to continue the gathering of data, etc., related to world languages could be formed. A description of the subcommittee responsibilities and meeting schedule will be sent out to the larger committee. At the next meeting there will be further discussion regarding the top priorities identified by the committee, and the group will begin delineating some of the key components of what the committee wants as deliverables. There were a couple of other items talked about at the December meeting, such as critical thinking, and those items will be reviewed.

<u>Next Meeting</u>:

March 7
April 18
May 9