

**Northshore School District
Curriculum Materials Adoption Committee Minutes
June 3, 2019
3:30 PM
Administrative Center Room 208**

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the CMAC, Curriculum Materials Adoption Committee, was held on Monday, June 3, 2019 at the Administrative Center in Bothell, Washington. Chairperson Obadiah Dunham called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Obadiah Dunham, Tracy Patterson, Niki Arnold-Smith, Adra Davy, Shelby Reynolds, Bill Bagnall, Rebecca Nielsen, Shannon Colley, Nancy Dodson, Kelly Griffin, Carlos Lazo, Kim Osgood, Janice Rendahl, Angie Maynard, and Sarah Takayoshi

Absent: Tiffany Rodriguez

OLD BUSINESS

Review and Approval of Minutes

Obadiah asked committee members to review the minutes from the May 20, 2019 CMAC meeting.

It was MOVED by Niki Arnold-Smith and SECONDED by Adra Davy to approve the May 20, 2019 CMAC minutes as written.

Obadiah called for the question. Motion carried.

Northshore School District 2019-2020 Assessment Plan

Obadiah reminded the members that the only item on the agenda today is the 2019-20 Assessment Plan, introduced at the last meeting in May. Obadiah provided background information on the CMAC role with regard to assessments and assessment plans, as defined in Board Procedure 2020P:

Assessments will be presented to CMAC for review and recommendation. Examples include, but are not limited to, the following:

- *An assessment component of a core curriculum under consideration by CMAC for recommendation and approval.*
- *A **comprehensive assessment plan** covering multiple grade levels in specific content areas.*
- *College Readiness Assessments*

Questions/ Discussion:

- **Q:** Would *iReady* be considered an interim assessment, or a formative assessment? Teachers would likely be using the data for report card or progress report preparation. **A:** Obadiah answered that it could fall in different categories, depending on how the data is being used. It isn't important to tie it to a specific category, it's just important to know that 2020P defines assessments as part of CMAC's scope of responsibilities. It was also clarified that CMAC will need to approve the assessment plan annually.

- **Q:** Where would the data be input, who is responsible to do that input, and who will it be accessible to? That information isn't addressed in the plan. **A:** The teacher "in the moment" can see that information in their *iReady* dashboard. The three data points will be uploaded into Synergy, that will be done at the district level. It will carry forward year to year and follow the student as historical data. It was agreed that the plan should be updated to address the input expectations.
- **Q:** What about Individual Running Records (IRRs)? Will that data still need to be input by teachers? **A:** Yes, and it will be entered into Synergy (not CAP).

Some suggestions were made for changes to the formatting of the information in the plan, as well as some additional information, to add clarity to the document. Discussion ensued regarding the difference in workload between IRRs and *iReady* and what time of year the assessments should be given for different grade levels. Main points of discussion included:

- Per the proposed plan, students in grades K-5 who are one or more grade levels below standard based on the *iReady* assessment would then be administered IRRs to further diagnose needed interventions. This would take place three times per year: September/October, January/February, and May/June.
- Currently, all students in grades K-2 are administered IRRs, which are labor-intensive. The proposed plan will be a significant reduction in workload for those teachers, as only students who score a grade level or more below standard will be given the IRRs.
- Will teachers be given release time to give and score the IRRs, as they currently are? That's not something that CMAC decides, but is something that will need to be addressed.
- Do kindergarteners also need to be given the *iReady* assessment in the fall since they all get the WaKIDS assessment? Would it make more sense to start the *iReady* assessment for kindergarteners in January/February rather than in the fall?
- WaKIDS consists of parent interview and observation, so that doesn't cover what *iReady* does. Also, the dyslexia screener that will be required soon by the State will include kindergarteners, so they will need to be screened in the fall anyway. *iReady* covers some of the dyslexia screener requirements, but not all, according to what we know so far. It is possible that once the State releases the requirements that the publishers of *iReady* will update the assessment to address those requirements.
- Since this plan will be reviewed annually, we could decide not to test kindergarteners on *iReady* in the fall, then review the following year whether that should be adjusted.
- Are we diminishing the role of IRRs now? Yes, instead of all K-2 students being given the IRRs, now it would be given only to students in grades K-5 who are one or more grade level below standard.

There was some additional discussion regarding the usefulness of the IRRs data, based on the experiences of the few teachers on the committee who have used them.

Niki noted that when the Assessment Team surveyed staff for their needs assessment, one of the questions was: "To what extent do you use each of these current assessments to inform your classroom instruction?" IRRs rated "often" significantly more than any other assessment listed (SBA, STAR, WaKIDS).

Obadiah again reminded the committee that we're looking at this as a one year plan, we can modify the plan as needed going forward.

One member noted that it would be helpful to know what some of these assessments look like and what they entail. Since not all members are familiar with all assessments on the plan, it's difficult to make a decision without understanding the impact of all the assessments listed. Obadiah stated that we do need to rely on the Assessment Work Team, as those things should have been considered when developing a plan. Going forward, that would be something that the team could address when they present their plan to CMAC.

There was more discussion about revising the timeline chart to provide better clarity and display at a glance the the assessment plan per grade level. The timeline document could be adjusted to better reflect by grade level how

much time is spent testing, not just the tests themselves. The committee requested a more in-depth timeline chart, grade level by grade level, with all the required and optional tests represented, including IRRs, HiCap tests, and WA-AIM tests that affect just certain special education students. Members want a document that reflects each student's testing experience over the course of the year.

Concern was expressed that the Learning Center teachers in elementary schools have to provide accommodations for students who are testing, which then affects the availability of those staff to service their other students who aren't testing. These are the students who are most vulnerable, and they are being asked to be the most flexible. This happens not just in elementary, but in some middle schools. Adra said that IEP teams could review *iReady* to determine whether a separate setting would still be necessary for affected students when taking that assessment.

There was additional discussion regarding the amount of assessing done of kindergarten students. Currently they are administered the WaKIDS assessment, IRRs, and also a HiCap screener in the fall, with additional IRRs mid-and end of year. The Assessment Plan would replace the IRRs three times per year with *iReady*, with only the students scoring one or more grade level below standard then receiving the IRRs assessment. Members discussed whether administering *iReady* in the fall to kindergartners is really necessary, suggesting waiting until mid-year (January/February), and then repeating in May/June. Members also discussed whether it is beneficial to administer the IRRs to students scoring below standard after the end of year *iReady* assessment. Would that timing really inform instruction that late in the year, or be beneficial to teachers the following fall?

It was MOVED by Bill Bagnall to approve the NSD Assessment Plan for Kindergarten students as follows:

- January/February: *iReady* screening assessment, with students scoring one grade level or more below standard on *iReady* administered Individual Running Records (IRRs)
- May/June: *iReady* benchmark assessment, with students scoring one grade level or more below standard on *iReady* administered IRRs

The motion was SECONDED by Kelly Griffin.

It was MOVED by Kim Osgood to amend the motion on the table to require that IRRs be given only to students one or more grade levels below standard after the January/February *iReady* assessment, striking the IRRs in May/June. The motion was SECONDED by Shannon Colley.

Discussion:

Are we crossing into the work of the Assessment Work Team? We want to honor the work of the Assessment Work Team, while giving constructive feedback to address the questions and concerns that came up in the CMAC discussion. Niki commented that she feels comfortable sharing the discussion and thought process of the committee with the Assessment Team. Knowing that the plan will be reviewed every year will be helpful.

Obadiah called for the question on the amendment to the motion on the table. The amendment passed.

Obadiah called for the question on the amended motion to approve the NSD Assessment Plan for Kindergarten students as follows:

- January/February: *iReady* screening assessment, with students scoring one grade level or more below standard on *iReady* administered Individual Running Records (IRRs)
- May/June: *iReady* benchmark assessment

The motion passed.

There was discussion about whether grades 1-5 should also need the IRRs after the May/June *iReady* assessment. Should that be dropped from the plan, similar to the kindergarten plan? Is the May/June IRRs for those students testing one or more grade levels below standard beneficial enough at the end of the year to warrant the significant time it takes teachers to administer? Niki thinks that there are people on the Assessment Work Team who feel

strongly that data from the IRRs at the end of the year has value. It was also noted that IRRs data may be used for qualifying purposes for other services as well, although it is unclear at this time whether *iReady* might meet those needs.

It was MOVED by Kelly Griffin to follow the NSD Assessment Plan for Grades 1-5 as recommended:

- September: *iReady* screening assessment, with students scoring one grade level or more below standard on *iReady* administered Individual Running Records (IRRs)
- January/February: *iReady* benchmark assessment, with students scoring one grade level or more below standard on *iReady* administered Individual Running Records (IRRs)
- May/June: *iReady* benchmark assessment, with students scoring one grade level or more below standard on *iReady* administered IRRs

The motion was SECONDED by Bill Bagnall.

There was discussion about whether the IRRs in May/June is really valuable enough to warrant the workload aspect, taking into consideration that SBA testing is also taking place in May.

It was MOVED by Kim Osgood to amend the motion to strike the May/June IRRs for students in Grades 1-5 scoring one grade level or more below standard on *iReady*. The motion was SECONDED by Shannon Colley.

Obadiah called for the question on the amendment to the motion on the table. The amendment passed.

Obadiah called for the question on the amended motion to approve the NSD Assessment Plan for Grades 1-5 as follows:

- September: *iReady* screening assessment, with students scoring one grade level or more below standard on *iReady* administered Individual Running Records (IRRs)
- January/February: *iReady* benchmark assessment, with students scoring one grade level or more below standard on *iReady* administered Individual Running Records (IRRs)
- May/June: *iReady* benchmark assessment

The motion passed.

It was MOVED by Rebecca Nielsen to follow the NSD Assessment Plan for Grades 6-8 as recommended:

- September: *iReady* screening assessment
- January/February: *iReady* benchmark assessment
- May/June: *iReady* benchmark assessment

The motion was SECONDED by Adra Davy.

This adds assessments to middle school, so that's an increase, correct? Yes, that is true, as middle school has not had an assessment other than state testing. However, *iReady* will provide important data that teachers don't get from the state tests.

Obadiah called for the question. The motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

It was MOVED by Niki Arnold-Smith to adjourn the meeting. Motion was SECONDED by Rebecca Nielsen.

Obadiah called for the question. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 5:13 PM.