

October 15, 2014
SCC Minutes

Started the meeting discussing the two videos that might need to be seen but it was determined that it was not for the SCC but for the principals and teachers.

Justin Heideman says this will be a less formal meeting because there is training that is necessary. We will be deviating a little from the agenda. Restates the email he sent out earlier in the month.

Justin begins by choosing an order to follow and suggests the formal procedures of Robert's Rules of Order. A motion is set by Justin and second by Richard Aragon. Justin makes a brief explanation of what the rules entail. The guidelines must be followed as stated by the state law to be eligible for the Trustlands' monetary distribution. There is a vote and it is unanimously accept.

He wants to make sure we have everyone's correct email address.

Item 2

Justin: Review of last year's funds and how it was implemented and checked. The target is education and it must be written like a grant. We need matrices to keep track. He is concerned about funding a teacher for one year because if the funding is not available the following year that teacher is out of a job. The focus should be more on augmenting and implementing programs for the students to be better in the classroom, not hiring a one-year teacher.

Lisa Thomas explains that helping in math was the huge emphasis for that funding last year but it was just temporary. We are looking for the best way to affect math education. It was an attempt to address a need but the sense was to help now but the monetary burden would need to shift almost immediately to the education funding pool. Marsha Judkins seconds what Lisa is saying and explains that the idea is that funding should come from another source if it is working, hopefully the principals can find funding somewhere else so it can continue. Donalee Penrod asks if the money can be set aside for a teacher for a few years but it is explained that all the money must be spent by the end of the year so that is not a possibility. Karen Brown says we don't know how much we will get year to year. It has to be decided each year. It is something to keep in mind and we do have one teacher now being funded in this way.

Justin suggests we need to look at what happened last year and what we want to happen this year. We might find that what we did last year was good but there might be something better. He encourages others to speak up and give our ideas.

Richard proposes that we get more teachers involved to see what they could use the funds for like books, seeds, or help in classrooms. Lisa talks about how in the past they did that but there were so many little requests that there was not enough money to do big things

like focus on math. She suggested that maybe parent involvement could help small things. Richards would like to see that the teachers feel that the SCC is supporting them and they can turn to it for help.

Justin says we need to decide if we will continue to fund a teacher and asks if there are any objections. Richard says he does object because we must leave ourselves open. There is a possibility that we continue or not continue what past councils have done but we must be open to it all.

Karen goes back to the agenda and begins her presentation of the final report from the 2013-2014 academic year that was sent to the state. She suggests that this is a good way to look at what was funded last year and the results, and what is being funded this year so we can better decide what we want to do for the 2015-2016 academic year. (Overview of what will be covered) There was no carry over. She explains that we have more funding now than last year. Last year \$71,000 went to salary, benefits, and aides. There were three math aides, one ESL aide and one math teacher on a contract with benefits. The aides are not on a contracts and do not have benefits. Most of the funding went to a teacher and we will see if it was effective. Another program that was funded was the Freshman Mentor Program and the materials that were needed in order to start it. Justin asked about the \$3000 at the bottom of the totals and Karen explains that it has all been used and we do not have any left over money. SMART goals are explained for each proposal. The SCC received a list of every proposal at the last meeting listing the SMART goals and the amounts used per proposal.

PROPOSALS:

- The additional math teacher and aides would help increase ACT scores and college and career ready. It was to increase from 32%-40% but the CCR in math increased by 1% to 33%. Overall ACT increased by 4% but we are fighting the increased number of students that took it that naturally brings the percentage down. 1% is good because it actually didn't go down and there was a 6% swing (Justin explains).
- Lissette Blanchard explains these results: ESL aides helped keep 38 of the 40 terms in the 75% or above passing rate for the ESL students. The testing was changed to the WIDA from the UALPA making it difficult to properly compare but these are the results: 10% of the ESL kids went down because the rating is done differently but 10% of kids increased by three level. There are Levels 1-6 on the WIDA before there were Levels 1-5. Best news was that 8 of the ESL levels 1-3 are now members of The National Honors Society. This is something that we did not expect to happen but we are pleased that the help they are obtaining is really touching aspects of their lives that we didn't imagine at first. Added 5 more core classes this year with the additional aide we received. Lisa points out how important it is to fund good educators yet we are asked not to but the aide here has made a much bigger difference than just buying text books. Donalee states how Richard also has a good point in showing the teachers support with the funding. Richard agrees that something like the ESL aides can help bring about

more productive citizens into our community and that is one thing we definitely want to do.

- Freshman mentor program: Karen explains that the freshmen are the highest drop out class and not the senior class. If they are not successful as freshmen they tend to drop out so this program is trying to keep them in school. Shelley says her daughter doesn't like the program and she wants to make it so the kids that don't need it shouldn't have to take it. Maybe just make the kids that have failed classes in 8th grade take the class but if not then they can just take a different elective. Karen says that is something we can look into. She also explains how it is a single semester peer program and how it is important to make a connection with someone at school and it is a life/study/social skills curriculum. Donalee can see how the transition can be hard. Shelley would like to have a survey before the end of the semester (sometime in January) to see if it is helpful or not. Justin wants to have data available before we approve the proposal for next year. Karen says that her worry is that it is only the first year of the program we need to decide how much time we need to allow to see if it works. It also gives the peer mentors an opportunity for a leadership role. Lillian Shaw says that they used the teachers that were already there instead of getting a new FTE to run the program. This makes it cheaper to run. Karen feels good about the program.

Justin wants to see how often we can keep track of the progress for each proposal. He would like Lissette to come up with a matrix so we can keep track of the progress of the proposals that were approved. So we can look at it as a reference.

Karen goes into this year's (2014-2015) proposals. Marsha explains how we had teachers come up with proposals for critical needs and we voted on which proposals would receive funding.

Karen explains how the testing changed from CRT to SAGE so we don't know how the kids did; it is like comparing apples to oranges. We have raw scores and parents are getting their scores at the end of November. Richard asks if the kids can opt out like they did last year and Karen says yes. She explains that there was only a hand full of them so it did not affect the scores and she is not too worried about it.

Karen continues to explain the new math aide and teacher that are part of the first approved proposal. Second proposal is the Freshman Mentor Program totaling of \$48,000. Shelley asks if this money went to pay for preps from teachers. Proposal three was used for the Chrome Books because they work best with the material needed for the SAGE testing. Justin asks if it was difficult to get that approved. Lissette explains that it was not difficult at all to get it passed through the SCC. He clarifies that he meant the state. Marsha says no that it is done all the time as long it is for the academic success of the students. Justin wants to know if we had any feedback from the state and Marsha says no. Karen explains that we did also buy the carts to house the Chrome Books, which is justified because it will be helpful for transport. Karen says that the only hurdle was that she had to work with the district because they were not on the approved list of purchases. Fourth proposal was the two ESL aides that we used to add 5 more support classes. The

fifth proposal was the poetry books that are available for purchase in hotel rooms around Provo. Donalee suggests that we should let the parents know so they can buy them as well so it can help fund the project next year.

Richard wants to know if the teacher that passed away can replace this math teacher that the SCC is funding. Karen explains that he has actually already been given a full time job with a contract and they just opened up the position for another teacher and says they can think about opening it as a one-year contract teacher position and they can explain it that way. Richard asks if it is true that we only have one math teacher who is qualified to teach AP Math. Karen says its actually the concurrent enrollment because there is only one teacher with a master's degree and UVU requires a master's to teach any concurrent enrollment classes so, the students can earn the college credit. For AP it does not matter because it depends on the student if they pass and get the college credits.

Donalee suggests that we poll honor students that are bright to see what they think is needed and take that into account. Lisa says that can be very helpful and not too expensive. It would be a good way to get a flow of information from both students and their parents. Lissette says that it should be channeled through the parents and not just be opened up to all the students because it could create an influx of non-essential comments. Donalee wants to open it up to bright students that are hand selected. Lissette says that channeling it through the parents would be great so they can advocate for their kids and it would be better controlled. We don't want to have to weed through hundreds of suggestion on longer passing time or something irrelevant to what we are trying to accomplish here. Parents can do the weeding out for us. Lisa suggests something more like an electronic feedback. She doesn't want to discount kids all together. Lissette agrees with Lisa and says they are welcome but it should be controlled. Marsha says she would like something a little more controlled as well.

Justin is afraid an hour may not be long enough. Lisa says that we should default at 60 minutes and know that sometimes, like this meeting for instance, it might go a little longer. Leslie Rife explains that last year we seemed to do just fine with one hour. Karen says we can always leave things to be addressed for the following meeting if we find that one hour is not enough instead of adding time to the meeting.

Karen reminds us that whatever the goals/ proposals are they must always affect student achievement.

Karen moves that Lissette puts in next meeting's agenda that we cover student and teacher input and how we want to do it. Shelley Beagley seconds it.

Justin explains how some years students are better at one subject as apposed to another. He was thinking we should look at school as classes of students and not just school. If a class is full of students that are good at something for instance like English then we should not focus on English. We need better data where we could look deeper into it for specific things. Lisa talks about how at Dixon they look at the bubble kids that they can help the most. Justin wants to embrace technology to get kids ahead. We are missing the

boat as far as technology is concerned. Lisa says we need kids to pull information instead of getting information. Justin wants to make Provo “that” school when it comes to technology.

Lisa says we are in a good spot since we have Dixon feeding us the kids that are working with technology. She will let us know about the concerns and cautions. The company she worked for found that it was hard to get all the teachers on board. There are a lot of nuances. Karen talks about the research base that has been done. How the findings aren't overly supportive of technology it doesn't moving our kids along like we think it should. Lisa agrees that the research is not very strong but the change is inevitable. Karen reiterates that our focus is student achievement.

Justin moves to adjourn and Julie Hoffman seconds the motion.