

**The School District of University City  
Academic Reform Committee  
Minutes  
November 17, 2009**

**Introduction: Academic Reform Committee**

The meeting began at 6:00 P.M. in the Brittany Woods Library.

Dr. Chauna Williams, the assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction, asked participants to sign-in before the meeting started. Then Dr. Williams greeted participants and explained the committee's purpose and the agenda. She reviewed the purpose for the first Academic Reform meeting in July 2009. Then she explained that the impetus for the reform effort evolved from both the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) Report, issued in January 2009 and recommendations from Destination U-City. She explained that the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) Focus/Accountability Plan was designed to respond to both the MSIP Report and the Destination U-City recommendations for reform. She then reviewed a CSIP Focus power point which provided the rationale for the reform effort and explanation of the reform model. She further explained that the School Improvement Planning (SIP) process would be the mechanism for the proposed reform. She concluded the introduction with the next steps in the reform process:

- Revise CSIP to reflect CSIP Focus
- Continue School Improvement Planning and Monitoring
- 2010-2011 District Professional Development Plan Development
- January and May 2010 Academic Reform Committee Meeting (Accountability)

**I. SIP Reporting Format**

Next, principals were asked to consult with the 2-3 members from their leadership Teams/SIP teams (teachers, parents, and community members). First-time committee volunteers were assigned to work with the school of their choice. Principals and their team members posted their four academic goals from their SIP and at least two critical needs areas along with structural strategies, using the SIP reporting document, a summary of their SIP, tied to the CSIP Focus. Principals defended their plans and answered questions while school teams rotated through all of the school plans using the *Academic Reform Discussion Tool*. In addition, school teams asked and posted questions on each plan.

**II. Small Group Discussion**

School teams regrouped to discuss their responses to the *Academic Reform Discussion Tool* and addressed the following questions regarding the ten school plans:

1. What are the common priorities?
2. What are the common structures?
3. How do the priorities align with the CSIP Focus: (Collaboration around essential learning, formative assessment, student engagement, and instructional leadership)?

4. How will goals be measured? Explain.

### **III. Individual Team Observations**

After small group discussion about the questions outlined above, school teams shared one observation per discussion question with the whole group. The following were some of the conclusions drawn by the participants:

#### Common Priorities

- Collaboration around the instructional core (essential learning, student engagement, formative assessment, and instructional leadership) and responding to student data
- Time for collaboration
- Evidence of student learning
- Learning for all students, not just those who need support
- Adult learning to support student learning
- Administrative and teacher accountability
- Measurable and obtainable goals
- School plans designed to respond to the MSIP Report

#### Common Structures

- Leadership teams
- PBIS teams
- Schedules designed for teacher collaboration
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Data reporting tools

#### Priority Alignment

- Around CSIP Focus: essential learning, student engagement, formative assessment, and instructional leadership

#### Measurable Goals

- All schools included goals that were measurable and obtainable

### **IV. Team Action Steps and Report**

Based on the input from all school teams, individual school teams developed action steps to revise their SIPS. Teams reported that they would take the following actions:

#### **Barbara Jordan**

1. Analyze the level of specificity as it relates to the alignment of cooperative learning/...and what that looks like in the classroom. What are we doing differently in the classroom?

#### **Delmar Harvard**

1. Communicate SIP to community
2. Analysis of PBIS data: classrooms, repeat offenders
3. Communicate importance of attendance to community (implication to school/District)
4. Plan to keep student informed and engaged in SIP process

**Flynn Park**

1. Spell out assessment
2. Spell our instructional core
3. Tutoring – Be Smart
4. Before school computer lab-math games.
5. 2010-2011 focus on specific standard
6. R1H (a high priority Grade Level Expectation)

**Jackson Park**

1. Ensure that procedures for measuring goals are effective and appropriate.
2. Add assessment column to SIP reporting form (?)
3. Inform parents
4. Inform students (student council, class meetings, etc)

**Nathaniel Hawthorne**

1. Define more clearly bullet points.
2. Make connection to instructional core
3. Make sure we don't confuse resources as strategies

**Pershing**

1. Increase incentives for PBIS for students and teachers
2. Increase student engagement with Socratic learning, differentiated instruction, cooperative learning, multiple intelligence

**Brittany Woods**

1. Publicize plan to teachers, parents, PTO, students
2. Post it in hallway for all to see
3. Measure data for progress to each goal
4. BLT meeting-develop consensus and process systematic involvement of engagement

**LLC**

1. Write in more detail and in layman's terms
2. Include collaboration & Professional Learning Communities
3. Build strategies for next steps and goals beyond
4. Also include more about PD and strategies

**High School**

1. Rewrite academic goal #1 (from negative orientation to a positive orientation)
2. Schedule a meeting for parents to review UCHS SIP
3. Include two parents to invite to future SIP meetings
4. Engage UCHS students in this process

**Julia Goldstein**

1. Provide more explanation regarding early childhood assessments and terms
2. Sharing school improvement plan with community
3. Create data boards to help monitor
4. Develop uniform assessments – alternative to the DIAL screening tool
5. Complete our alignment of all Comprehensive sections to Missouri Pre-K Standards and Project Construct

After confirming that action steps would be sent to building principals, Dr. Williams summarized the meeting outcomes and concluded the meeting at 8:00 P.M.