

Quality Assurance Committee
January 31, 2008
5:30 p.m.
Conference Room 3A
MINUTES

Attendance: Chairman White, Commissioners Campos, Williams and Elliott (not a committee member), Board Staff H. Washington, District Staff Marilyn Patterson-Grant, Cheryl Holloway, Michele Hancock, Connie Leech, Jeanette Silvers, Gloria Sullivan, Sue Kaufmann, Brandon Keaveny, Principals A. Abdulmateen, Vicky Ramos and Mary Andrecolich-Diaz.

Chairman White called the meeting to order at 5:37 p.m. Commissioner White noted that Commissioner Campos may be running late due to work commitments.

Agenda Items:

I. Minutes

Motion to approve the December Minutes was made by Commissioner Williams (not a member of the Board in December). Seconded by Commissioner White (not present at the December meeting). **Adopted 2-0**

II. Review Mission, Vision and Duties of QA Committee

The Committee reviewed the mission statement, the vision and the duties of the Quality Assurance Committee. Commissioner White recommended that the Committee review the documents and noted that there will be opportunities to make changes in the future, if necessary. No changes were made to either of the documents.

Commissioner Elliott recommended that resolutions that involve programs be considered by the QA Committee before advancing to the Board. Commissioner White compared the review of resolutions by the QA Committee to that of the Finance Committee review of resolutions prior to Board meetings. Commissioner White noted that one of his goals for the Committee is for them to review programs in advance; to receive a presentation in advance and advise Board members when resolutions come to the Board.

According to the duties of QA; the Committee has responsibility for reviewing Quarterly Academic Reports. Commissioner White noted that he did not recall receiving quarterly reports to review. J. Silvers noted that the quarterly reports are not ready and that it takes a while to receive data from the State. Commissioner White noted that he would like to receive real-time data, even if it means that data may change later. Commissioner Williams noted that should be a benchmark to indicate whether a child is having a problem in real-time and not a year later. C. Holloway pointed out that the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) provides real-time data, which is a one-on-one with assessments with the teacher and is given at least 4 times a year in grades P – 6. The District wanted the information to be posted online 4 times a year. The data is not put

into the system until the end of the year, per contract negotiations with RTA. Commissioner Elliott noted that our system is not configured to give the Board the data that is needed. School principals are able to provide reading levels for each child in the school.

Commissioner Campos arrived at 5:55 p.m.

Commissioners Campos stated that there is a lack of data provided and not a centralized system; she would like the District to be proactive with obtaining real-time data. Commissioners recommended that the Superintendent have a discussion with the unions regarding the data that is needed. School #30 is working on a pilot program that provides information on DRA data that the Principal has requested. C. Holloway would like that to be a basis for the system-wide piece. M. Patterson-Grant noted that obtaining real-time data is a priority of Superintendent Brizard. A group of key stakeholders, guidance counselors, Research & Evaluation, and Placement have been troubleshooting the Chancery system. The District is exploring the possibility of creating a data dashboard to access information on students at the push of a button.

III. Review and Approve SURR

Sue Kaufmann summarized the Schools Under Registration Review (SURR) as the State's Accountability System. It was around before No Child Left Behind came into fruition. The Commissioner ranks schools from the highest achieving to the lowest and draws an arbitrary line. Schools that are below standards are considered to be SURR. A school can end up on the SURR list if it falls below the standards for one year. The District does have an opportunity to write a rebuttal. State liaisons do presentations to parents, staff and Administrators to explain process, how the school got there and what to target to get off the list. The SURR Review Teams from outside the District spend 3 to 4 days reviewing schools; everything from lighting in buildings, instruction in the classroom and the leadership and write a SURR Review; which includes good things that exist at the school and areas in need of improvement. The District has 90 days to write a school SURR plan, which includes two parts; one at the building level (replaces school improvement plan) and the District writes a reflective plan about how they are going to support the plan, resources provided and monitoring of the plan. Schools have 3 years to meet the set targets to get off the list. Schools can get off the SURR list if targets are met in one year. If schools do meet targets at the end of one year, they can get off of the list. A plan redesign is offered after the second year and an extension may be granted. If the school does not improve in the allotted timeframe, then the school closes.

The District currently has 3 schools on the SURR list; they are Jefferson, Franklin International Finance and Economics and Monroe. The Principals of the schools were present at the meeting and were offered an opportunity to briefly discuss their corrective plans.

A. Abdulmateen, Franklin's International Finance and Economics Principal, was cited for 7th grade math performance. The school has made changes in scheduling, review of 6th grade data of incoming students, double periods of English, double periods of Math,

extended day program to assist students with competencies; and established a program with Nazareth.

Vicky Ramos, Principal of Monroe stated that Monroe was declared a SURR, because 4% of the 8th grades met state requirements. The school has narrowed its focus to the 3 r's; rigor, relevance and relationships, improving instructional framework, aligning curriculum and common assets in ELA, Math & Science. Monroe has established relationships with Red Cross and the Hispanic Leadership Development Program. Monroe is over-crowded and is the only Limited English Proficiency School.

Mary Andrecolich-Diaz, Principal of Jefferson, stated that Jefferson is on the SURR list for the 8th grade Math. Jefferson has students that speak 37 languages and also has a LEP population. Teachers do not speak in the 37 languages and students only have a year to adapt before taking exams. Students are not on grade level when they come to Jefferson. A couple of math teachers were removed and only 15% of teachers were tenured during the year that they were added to the SURR list.

M. Patterson-Grant pointed out the challenges at the middle school level was one of the reasons for the restructuring to 7- 12 grade model. M. Patterson-Grant stated that you have to be prepared to add on different age groups, including having the right faculty and professional development.

M. Hancock noted that there were some Principals that were building managers and some were instructional leaders under the redesign of high schools. In some high schools Academy Directors were responsible for instructional support.

Motion made by Commissioner Campos to approve the SURR Plan. Seconded by Commissioner Williams. **Adopted 3-0**

IV. Goals for 2008

Commissioner White requested this item be adjourned until the next QA meeting.

Action Items:

District will provide a presentation on improvements on accessing real-time data.

Commissioners will e-mail H.Washington goals for QA in 2008.

Next meeting date: February 20th @ 5:30 p.m.

Adjournment

Motion made by Commissioner Campos at 7:22 p.m. Seconded by Commissioner Williams. **Adopted 3-0**

Prepared by H. Washington