
CURRICULUM OFFICE

To: Holly Arroyo, Kelly Beuten, Kristine Bushman, Lori DeRaedt, Jeff Gorman, Laurie Kling, Theresa Kolkebeck, Joanne Lund, Kathy McCoy, Cathy Mullahy, Lynette Niequist, Dave Oleson, Donna Roark, Todd Stirn, Nancy Straub, Carie Walter, Rita Weber, Cheryl Wessels, Betsy Cappas, Janet Krambeer, Noelle Carani

From: Esther Martin

Subject: Minutes of November 16, 2009

Date: 11/17/09

cc: Jan Harnish, Trent Lange, Dann Schuth, Lloyd Stover, Greg Rabenhorst, George Gouriotis

MEMBERS PRESENT: Holly Arroyo, Kelly Beuten, Lori DeRaedt, Jeff Gorman, Theresa Kolkebeck, Joanne Lund, Cathy Mullahy, Dave Oleson, Donna Roark, Todd Stirn, Nancy Straub, Carie Walter, Rita Weber, Cheryl Wessels, Betsy Cappas, Janet Krambeer, Noelle Carani

Guests: Greg Rabenhorst, George Gouriotis

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kristine Bushman, Laurie Kling

Meeting began at 3:47 p.m.

1. Motion to approve minutes from 10/19/09 CCC meeting, Noelle approved, Janet seconds the motion. Motion to approve the 11/2/09 CCC meeting; Betsy approved, Lynette seconds the motion.
2. Language Arts Writing Curriculum – Curriculum going to the board, no questions or comments; motion to approve the new curriculum, Todd approved, Kathy seconds the motion. It was stated the committee needed to vote on the curriculum; committee voted fist-to-five:

Passed – 100%

3. Common Assessments – It was stated that PKMS (Social Studies) would like to try to complete their assessments; maybe individual SAC's come-up with the assessments since each subject is different. A concern with the Social Studies group regarding the question bank was that there could be up to 150 questions; not a common assessment with that many questions. It was mentioned that one of the 6th grade teachers at CMS would like teachers to be held accountable.

There was concern regarding the lower level (K-1) and common assessments; wanted to know if they had to be in the same format for lower levels. Primary level is usually a one-on-one.

Lily Lake is in favor of using a pool of 5-10 essential questions for assessments; teachers have a concern with first graders using scantron testing for assessment; too young to fill in bubbles.

Non-core teachers felt scantron was not feasible for non-core classes; there was no common consensus at their meeting on 11/6/09; each class is so different.

Country Trails likes the test bank idea; common rubric. There is a concern that different grade levels are assessing without checking to see what the previous and next grade levels are doing; this needs to be streamlined.

HBT was unanimous regarding using a test bank to pull from. It was suggested that maybe individual teachers could submit questions to the SAC members so they are not solely responsible for preparing the assessments.

Intermediate grades are concerned with how they would narrow down their broad subjects (e.g., Social Studies) to a few questions. It was stated that the “key” components should be included in their assessment piece. The goal of these assessments is not to monitor teachers, but to watch the students’ growth or lack of. The more data extracted from these assessments, the better idea we will have of where these students are and if the curriculum needs to be adjusted accordingly. The students have to have core base knowledge to move on. Was asked if the individual SAC groups could come-up with the essential questions.

The thought is to have 2-3 questions integrated within other tests; assessments should not be a separate test. The tests should be multiple choice questions and should not take the place of a unit test. It was asked if it could be a pass or fail for lower levels. Some individuals felt this was too subjective; this is a different way of thinking. Individuals asked if the common assessments could take place at the end of the year. It was stated that it could be anytime, high school is by semester (exams); middle school could be by semester or by unit. Pass/fail, yes/no, or multiple choice could be used for each objective.

It was decided that the individual SAC’s would develop the key essential questions, approximately 3. It was stated they would not know how many questions would be needed for each objective until they started working on them. This could vary by objective. SAC facilitators will report back to the CCC at the March 15th meeting to update the committee on where they are at with the common assessment questions.

Was asked what happens with the data after the assessments are given? It was stated that the scores will be compiled, grade by grade, by using a spreadsheet. This information will be used to determine if there is a problem with the curriculum. The process is strictly about curriculum, not each individual student. SAC’s need to discuss how they will submit their test scores to the district office; they also need to decide how to test K-2 since most will have difficulty with scantron. This information should be shared with all teachers; this is why we have grade level reps. We need their input and key questions. There may be a grade level meeting in December or January so this can be discussed further.

4. November 2nd Meeting/Fist-to-Five – At the November 2nd meeting, it was stated that the high school department chairs that presented their course proposals felt uncomfortable by the CCC’s responses to their proposals. They now have a negative feeling about the CCC process; they felt that they were not respected. They go through High School and SAC committees, get approval and spend a lot of time and effort to go in front of the CCC to get voted down. They want to know if this is the right process. The CCC needs to make the teachers feel heard, not attacked. The teachers also need to know that the CCC’s goal is to make right choices and that there needs to be solid criteria when proposing a new course.

It was stated that 80% of students should fall in the Tier I section of the “triangle”. Courses need to be put in place to pull-up students, not implement more “safety nets”. The message that needs to be sent is “mutual respect”. High school curriculum is a different bird; curriculum has to be handled totally different from K-8. High school teachers asked CCC that if they have concerns when attending SAC meetings, to state those concerns then, not wait until the CCC meeting to voice concerns. CCC has to be held accountable to the district’s goals.

Motion to approve pass/fail percentage (80%) for fist-to-five; Betsy approved, Kelly seconds the motion. The committee was then asked to vote (fist-to-five) to approve the change:

Passed – 98%

Fist-to-Five – It was stated that members were voting with a conscience; yes or no vote doesn’t give you that right. Members were asked if we should keep the old process as stated in the original by-laws. The members were reminded that the CCC is the highest critical review group; we set a high bar for the district. It was discussed that when a proposal is brought to the CCC there is no written curriculum for that course; should we expect more information from the department/group when presenting to the CCC? Should SAC facilitators be at that meeting to present course proposals since they are at those SAC discussions/meetings? It was stated that SAC facilitators are not a good representation since they do not know every aspect of every grade level. Timeline for the high school course proposal process needs to be looked at. One member stated that they felt uncomfortable voting fist-to-five with the department chairs sitting there, but liked the fist-to-five process over the yes or no vote. Motion to vote to keep “fist-to-five” process; Betsy approved, Holly seconds the motion. Members voted to keep the “fist-to-five” process:

Passed – 88%

5. By-Laws – Will have to bring back next month; Literacy Coordinator needs to be added in lieu of Curriculum Director as a voting member. Was voted on last year, but wasn’t changed in the by-laws. Motion to make changes and bring back next month; Todd approved and Lynette seconds the motion.
6. Elementary Technology – Recommendation was made that since the district is in such a financial crunch, we should put this on hold again next year. A member asked if the technology aides had training; they have not. Buildings were asked what they needed; CT – Keyboarding and MAP testing going alright; PV – Keyboarding going well, main concern is how to grade the students. LL – Start-up was difficult, no information was given, could use help; needs to be trained. HBT – Teachers are working with the students and are doing okay, no special training for aides; grading is a concern.

Is this person more of a supervisor? Someone is needed to make sure the kids are doing what they’re supposed to be doing (e.g., hand placement on keyboard, etc.). Will discuss further at the next meeting.
7. Grades – Committee has been formed and is scheduled to meet the week after Thanksgiving.
8. Other – No other questions or comments made. Committee was asked if they want to meet on December 14th or hold off until January 11, 2010. Motion to wait until January 11th made, Carie approved, Janet seconds the motion.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Next meeting will be on January 11, 2010 from 3:45 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. in the CHS LMC