

Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment (CIAC)
April 15, 2008 Committee Meeting
6:00 to 8:00 p.m.
District Administration Office, Conference Room A

Members Present: Meg Ohrlein, Discovery, Lori Lee Chlan, Kennedy; Bob Huot, North; Nikki Knisley, North; Sharon Misuraco, Oak Hill; Linda Carr, Talahi; Noel Shughart, Apollo, Nancy Farb, Tech; Karen Hommerding, Curriculum and Dr. Julia Espe, Curriculum
Guests: Chris Ann Johnson, Beth Lovdahl, Diane Moeller and Jerry Von Korff

Grades 5 & 6 Science Curriculum/Resources

Beth Lovdahl & Diane Moeller

- The MCA II Computerized Science Test is administered in an April 28 to May 23, 2008 window
 - Spring 2008 is the first administration of the MCA II Grade 5 Science Test; the 2007 Science test, in which North participated, was a Field Test for some districts in the state
- Distributed Grades 5 and 6 Science Curriculum/Resources handout:
 - Grade 6 teachers decided, for continuity, to purchase same text as Grade 5 had previously
 - Leveled Readers are an integral part of science resources
 - Also purchased some additional needed Physical Science resources for grade 6
- Resources are aligned with science standards/benchmarks to prepare students for the MCA IIs and each grade level has identified the content which addresses the standards and benchmarks; this document is available on the web site under Curriculum and also is on teacher computer desktops

Grades 6-12 Science Curriculum

Chris Ann Johnson and Bob Huot

- Following College Board Vertical Team training in 2004, science teachers developed '742's Big 7 Science Skills' for Grades 6-12 in Problem Solving/Reasoning Skills, Reading in Science, Math Skills, Lab and Field Skills, Writing in Science/Six Traits, Experiment (Inquiry) Skills and Listening & Notetaking Skills, with Sub-Skills under each of those categories
 - Science teachers would now like, through the establishment of Pre K-12 Vertical Teaming, to expand this document of the 'Big 7 Science Skills' to include all Pre K-12 Grade Levels
- Chris Ann Johnson shared how science courses needed to be switched between grade 8 and 9 to meet state standards
 - Earth Science moved to grade 8; Physical Science moved to grade 9
 - 2007-2008 is the transition year for this change
 - This change precipitated the need to redo Science labs, which are now movable labs, in case, the soon to be released, revised science standards have changed again
 - New *Physical Science and Earth Science* texts were purchased for students; the text can reviewed at www.glencoe.com
- Spring 2008 is the first year all grade 5, 8 and 10 (in District 742) students will take the MCA II Science test; baseline information will be available Summer 08 after which teachers will evaluate the test performance of students with the alignment of curriculum to standards; all test data will be available on ViewPoint to facilitate teacher data analysis at Data Retreats in Summer of 08
- The Science MCA II test is a very interactive computerized test administration; principals and teachers are impressed with the quality of the test

Pre K - Grade 12 Vertical Teaming in 2008-2009**Julia Espe**

- The hope is to have 2 or 3 half days of professional development, in 2008-2009, for Pre K-12 teachers to meet as whole groups within content areas; this would be in conjunction with the current monthly meeting model of content area Vertical Team administrator and teacher Leadership Teams

Comprehensive Needs Assessment**Julia Espe/Karen Hommerding**

- It was suggested that future parent/community input, needed for the Title Program Comprehensive Needs Assessment, might be gathered more successfully through the distribution of Parent Surveys given out at Open Houses in the fall
- Kennedy Report – Site Council parents feel that teachers go beyond the curriculum to meet the needs of all students, Kennedy has a successful Parent Meeting Night which the school hopes to continue to grow and they would like to see the school web site utilized more to provide information to parents
- Oak Hill provided Parent Climate Survey Responses
- Talahi provided a written summary of parent responses to four of the Focus Discussion Questions
- North had very few parents in attendance at their meeting and will attempt to gather parent input at their next Site Council meeting
- The question was asked as to whether the district has made attempts to reach non-English speaking parents; responses to the question included:
 - That the district currently has processes in place to make available, in four languages, vital information for students and their families
 - That District 742 and Holdingford, in partnership, have received Integration Funds to build Cultural Competencies in our students and community
 - Foley also qualifies to be in partnership with 742 for revenue streaming
 - Talahi qualifies the district for intra-district funding
 - Cultural Navigators have been a tremendous asset at North this year; Part of writing the plan for next year includes providing a Cultural Navigator, in 2008-2009, at each school
 - Parents are willing to help in this area and would welcome direction as to how to proceed

**Next CIAC Meeting is on Tuesday, May 20
District Administration Office, Conference Room A
6:00 to 7:30 p.m.**

Julia is to send Climate Survey Questions to CIAC Members

**EXPLORATORY VISITS FOR POSSIBLE 2008 OPERATIONS LEVY
BOARD OF EDUCATION LISTENING SESSIONS**

**Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment (CIAC) April 15, 2008 Committee Meeting
District Administration Office, Conference Room A
7:00 to 8:00 p.m.**

Board of Education Levy Question Listening Session Board Member Jerry Von Korff

- Jerry shared he is in attendance at this meeting to gather confidential information from CIAC members, since the November 2007 levy failed, for the Board of Education's decision-making process to possibly ask voters for a levy in November 2008; Jerry reviewed that the current levy is expiring at the end of this school year

- **Question #2: Tell us about the people in your neighborhood – what do you think they find as most important? What are their values?**
 - North St. Cloud bordering Sartell School District – Community members are concerned about taxes, one challenge is to inform older residents of the need for this levy
 - Tech area – An even balance exists between public & parochial school families so the district is not getting the parochial parent vote in this area of the city
 - Waite Park area – Has many rental areas and second language families; the district needs to provide a vehicle to promote positive sharing within parenting networks in this area
 - Northwest St. Cloud – Parents feel they can't support a levy with the increases in health care and gasoline costs, in conjunction with wages at a flat line
 - St. Joseph area – Is largely an agricultural area where the community feels that it is the state that should provide for education, not the local tax base
 - South St. Cloud – This is a more affluent side of town; But even so, with rising costs, the feeling is that another levy would be difficult to support

- **Question #3: What would people in your area like to see from public schools in the St. Cloud Area School District? What would people really be excited about?**
 - Waite Park area – Strengthen business partnerships
 - St. Joe area – Share with the community that District 742 has one of the largest lobbying groups at the state level
 - South St. Cloud area – Show the community where the money goes and how the budget benefits everyone; put this information in words the community understands; share the differences between the Operations and General Fund expenditures
 - Southeast St. Cloud area – Have students do Service Learning projects for community members
 - Northside St. Cloud – Have solid, structured student-student and student-adult mentoring programs for elementary and junior high youth
 - Northwest St. Cloud – Share district and school goals and site plans on the web site; understand that the community looks for good leadership in the superintendency position

- **Question #4: Last year, our public school levy proposal was defeated. Some people say it is unfair to our kids and to our community that 300 out of 362 school districts have levies in**

their communities which offer their children more opportunities than we can for a better education. Other people say that taking care of public schools is the responsibility of the state legislature – not the local community. What advice would you give us to deal with these concerns?

- Create different funding sources, such as the Local Options Sales Tax in Iowa
 - Allow liquor sales on Sundays
 - Break down, by school, where the money from a levy will go; this was done for science and it worked
 - Give control of a portion of the levy money to each school to determine specific uses of funds
- **Question #5: Our last levy attempt in 2007 failed by about 160 votes out of 15,000. If the Board decides to propose a levy, and recognizing that the turnout in the fall of 08 will be high, what do you think we should change to make the levy successful? How would you frame the questions? Does the amount of increase in property tax affect people's support?**
 - Teachers and the district need to negotiate contracts, before fall, without blood letting
 - Want good and realistic student-teacher ratios, as well as good teachers
- **Question #6: If the Board did not go out for a levy or if another levy failed and more severe cuts had to be made (after many years of previous cuts) so that the quality in our schools deteriorates, what will happen to the community? Can you think of ways we might help the people in your area understand this?**
 - Jerry shared that \$6-7 million cuts are on the table for 09-10 if the levy does not pass
 - Programs become elitist in that only families who can afford to pay will be able to participate
 - Is the board concerned about the parent/community outrage if the above were to happen?
 - Would it help if the district/board would state that, for "X" number of dollars, this is what can be retained. Another member stated that the community response would be "But that is what the state should be providing."
 - Maybe it is feasible to have smaller pictures of the schools sharing how their allotment of levy funds would affect their school – Would it be more energizing to the community for schools to say how they will use the monies?
 - Community must know how the district will use funds from a passed levy
 - Closing of one or two schools might be necessary but this issue carries a lot of emotion
- **Question #7: Is there anything else you would like to say/add?**
 - Investigate the personal investment of parents and students going door to door to deliver information; parents feel this has a high payback
 - Jerry shared that superintendents and school boards have the highest level of concern for how education funding will remain functional now and in the future
 - The last levy failed when money would have been status quo; now the district would be asking for couple of hundred dollars more each year; CIAC members shared that families just do not have the money to support a levy with other increasing costs in today's world
 - Jerry shared that the Face of Poverty in the 60s & 70s was a widow with children; today the Face of Poverty is children – at a time when the road out of poverty is education; The

trend is that taxes have been cut at the upper end of the spectrum and that taxes have increased for the lower income levels of the population

- **Questions #8 and 9: Is there anything else you would like to add? Whom else would you recommend that we talk to?**
 - Sharing with retired citizens? Nursing homes? Chamber of Commerce? (Chamber of Commerce supports the levy)
 - Provide information at Open Houses this spring; invite in a board member to listen to community input regarding asking for a levy in November
 - Provide, for the 20% of minority families in the district, information about the levy (we recognize that not all adults in this population are eligible to vote)
 - Talk to Taryl Clark and Steve Gottwald – tell them they are in a position of power, they need to make this happen; Effort at the legislative level is very, very important