



# MOTHER LODGE UNION *School District*

3783 Forni Road \* Placerville CA 95667 \* (530) 622-6464 \* Fax (530) 622-6163

Marcy M. Guthrie Ed.D., Superintendent

## **Board of Trustees**

John Parker, President

Gene Bist Sr., Clerk

Janet VanderLinden, Member

Cathy Wilson, Member

Chuck Wolfe, Member

## **2016-17 MLUSD LCAP-BACT TEAM Meeting #2 NOTES Amended 2-26-17**

**February 23, 2017      MERC 4-6 PM**

### **I. Welcome Team:**

**Present:** Arlynn Ward (ICES Teacher), David Tucker (HGMS Head Custodian & CSEA President), Rich Findley (ICES & HGMS Parent), Renee Smith (ICES & HGMS Parent), Danielle Peterson (Coordinator of Special Programs), Lisa Donaldson (Chief Business Official), Rhonda White (ICES Principal), Leslie Redkey (HGMS Principal), Marcy Guthrie (Superintendent), Mary Beal (HGMS Teacher & MLTA President), Barbara Grover (HGMS SPED IA & CSEA Secretary)

**Absent:** Ashley Bose (ICES Admin. Assistant to the Principal), Carrie Heilman (ICES Teacher) Sunny Lofton (Director of Special Education)

- II. Homework from Meeting #1:** The Team was asked to ponder the trimester 1 math data, progress on the Actions and come prepared to the next meeting with questions, recommendations for current year or next year. There was discussion about: 1) the math curriculum adoptions-they were spread out across 3 years, starting with grade 4-5 (2014-15), then 6-8 (2015-16) and TK-3 (2014-15 pilot Go Math & 2015-16 pilot My Math and 2016-17 adopted My Math), 2) the change in the standards, 4) the 2016-17 Action item to pilot summer school targeting at-risk students in math as it was a need identified last year during this process, and 5) how reading may be impacting math performance.

- III. Vision Statement Development:** *Mother Lode USD: The successful education of every student. Or Mother Lode Union School District ~ The successful education of every student. Now we need a Mission Statement.*

### **IV. CA School Dashboard “The California Model” Information & Overview:**

- a. Key Points: 1) More than a single number-A quality education is defined by more than a single number; 2) Equity-Increased focus on addressing disparities among student groups and 3) Supports local decision making- More information to support the local strategic planning process (much like what we have been doing all along as an LCAP-BACT Team- we review our data, needs and resources to build our “plan”).
- b. The LCAP and the CA School Dashboard are connected.
- c. There are 4 Local Indicators to “self-report” on: 1) Basic Conditions at School (i.e., Williams’ Act-Facilities/Teacher Credentials/Sufficiency of Instructional Materials), 2) Implementation of State Academic Standards, 3) Parent Engagement, and 4) Local Climate Survey.
- d. There are 6 State Indicators that will be reported about us via Aeries/CALPADS: 1) Academic Indicator (i.e., SBAC in ELA & Math), 2) English Learner Indicator, 3) Chronic Absence Indicator (this Fall), 4) Suspension Rate Indicator and 5 & 6) College/Career Indicators (does not apply to us at this time).
- e. This data is currently embargoed; we’ve had an opportunity to check our data for accuracy prior to it going live to the public in March.

V. LCAP Goal 5 Parent Engagement: Parent Survey Data comparing 2016 to 2017.

		Question	2016 n=90	2017 n=123	Increase over 5%	Any Decrease
Ext. High Priority + High Priority	+	Inc. Stu Ach.	75%	80%		
		Inc. Stu Attend.	50%	74%		
		Inc. Parent Inv./Part.	64%	69%		
		PSC	84%	80%		
		Teachers Qualified	79%	88%		
		Stu Access to Instr. Mat.	90%	91%		
		Facil. Good Repair	82%	89%		
		Imp. State Standards	60%	77%		
		Stu. Access Core Subj	86%	93%		
			IC n=26 HG n=54	IC n=60 HG n=60		
Strongly Agree + Agree		Child Safe/Secure	85%	91%		
		Ongoing harassment (Strongly Disagree/Disagree)	72%	53% 25% Don't Know/Not Applicable		
		Child knows what to do in emergency	81%	79%		
		Child posit. attitude Twds Sch	76%	87%		
		Reading	80%	90%		
		Writing	78%	83%		
		Math	73%	88%		
		Science	85%	80%		
		History/SS	80%	82%		
		Technology	64%	71%		
		PE	78%	80%		
		Academic support if needed	51%	66%		
		Teachers are knowledgeable	77%	91%		
		School clean/well maint.	84%	87%		
		Library	73%	76%		
		Parents informed of learning standard	66%	87%		
		Sch Communication	92%	91%		
		Timely Comm. Btwn Home & Sch	79%	86%		
		Admin/Office staff friendly/helpful	85%	89%		
		Aware of Parent Inv. Opps.	79%	80%		
		Sch Website	82%	84%		
		High Quality Fac.	92%	96%		
					IC=33% HG = 67%	IC=50% HG=50%

Some Parent Survey highlights:

- Increased participation from 90 to 123
- Increased participation of Spanish speaking parents from 1 to 32
- Increase in Student Attendance went from 50% to 74% as an extremely high/high priority
- Facilities in good repair went from 82% to 89% as an extremely high/high priority (possibly due to our heaters and leaks)
- Importance of teachers are qualified went from 79% to 88% as an extremely high/high priority
- Implementing State Standards went from 60% to 77% as an extremely high/high priority
- Informed of grade level learning standards went from 66% to 87%

*Perhaps these two are connected and may relate to our emphasis on Parent Conferences TK-5.*

*Mother Lode Union School District ~ The successful education of every student.*

- Student Access to core subjects and high school prep went from 86% to 93% as an extremely high/high priority
- Reading went from 80% to 90%
- Math went from 73% to 88%
- Technology went from 64% to 71%
- Student gets academic support if they need it went from 51% to 66%
- *Could be related to the fact that 27 parents of 5<sup>th</sup> graders took the survey & 60 ICES parents participated in the survey this year up from 33 last year*
- Teachers are knowledgeable went from 77% to 91%
- Timely communication between School and Home went from 79% to 85%

#### 2017 MLUSD Parent Survey the First 5 questions

- When it comes to getting information about school activities or events, what communication methods do you prefer? Select the best methods below:
 

54% Automated phone calls	Only 26% selected the school website as a preferred method
46% Automated emails	
43% School Newsletter	
40% Notes from Teacher(s)	
- When it comes to getting information from the school district, what communication methods do you prefer? Select the best methods below:
 

53% Automated phone calls	Only 18% selected the district website as a preferred method
51% Automated emails	
34% District Newsletter	
All "other comments" were Board Meeting Notes	
- As you know, each year we review our progress in implementing our Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP). When it comes to getting your ideas for the next year's LCAP, what is the preferred or best way for you to provide your ideas to the LCAP Team? Select all that apply:
  - 58% Prefer sharing their ideas using technology (i.e., electronic survey, email, etc.)
  - 21% LCAP Meetings for Parents at school sites in the evening
  - 18% would need childcare
  - 17% Add "LCAP Input" to the PTO/PTC Agenda
- This year we have been using Accelerated Reader (AR) at both school sites to support reading fluency and practice for all students. Feedback during the LCAP process last year indicated that our school libraries needed to 1) increase the number of books in their collections, 2) expand the range of reading levels of books at both school libraries and 3) broaden the types and variety of books at both libraries. Have you and/or your child(ren) noticed any changes or improvements in these areas? Please select all that apply:
  - 43% have seen some improvement
  - 23% need more for books with broader variety and type
  - 21% had not noticed – however 10% commented that they were "New" this year
- What types of programs would you like to see expanded and or offered in our schools? Select rank your top 3.
  - 63 Sports
  - 46 Technology
  - 45 Visual and Performing Arts
  - 34 Environmental/Outdoor Education
  - 33 Study Skills

## VI. LCAP Goal 1 Reading:

Below is the preliminary Reading Data from Trimester 2. The CARE class and one 5<sup>th</sup> grade class data are not included. The STAR Reading Assessment Instructional Reading Level scores were used to compile this data. The “grade level ranges” are moving targets. For example, in order for a 2<sup>nd</sup> grade student to be “at grade level” by the end of trimester 2, the students would need a reading score of 2.4-2.6; this means second grade fourth/fifth/sixth month. To be at grade level at trimester 3 would be 2.7-2.9.

The data are compelling: Many of our students are not reading at grade level. There was a lot of discussion, below are some highlights:

- The data as presented does not show the growth that teachers and principals use to inform their instruction/monitor: And is not organized such that the “unduplicated” (ELL/Low Income/FosterYouth) students’ reading scores are separated from the “All Students” scores. While we have been looking at our data for ELLs, Low Income and Foster Youth separate and apart from “All Students”, we know that many of these students are counted in more than one of these groups. The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) generates Supplemental and Concentration funds to target programs to support the number of “unduplicated” (ELL/Low Income/FosterYouth) students above 50%. *(added after the meeting: Mother Lode’s “unduplicated” percentage is 57.90% or 623 of 1,076 LCFF Unduplicated Count).*
- A question was asked if students grades reflected their “lower reading level”. Answers offered were: 1) in some cases yes and in others no. Sometimes students do not take the STAR Reading Assessment seriously and “blow it off”. 2) The STAR Reading Assessments are not necessarily included in student grades. 3) If students program/class placement were based upon performance (i.e., a true reflection of student ability) on these and other assessments (i.e., SBAC), students might take them more seriously, but at this time, this is not occurring.
- As we are looking to provide summer school in 2017, the data that will be used to identify the content and students to be taught is currently under consideration. The current Local Control Accountability Plan has a small amount of funds budgeted for a “Pilot Math Summer School” as mentioned above as may need to be increased.
- ICES is currently offering their “morning reading intervention”. The 50 participating 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade students were identified by their CAASPP and Trimester 1 reading scores. Principal White filled the spots from the neediest to the least needy. They are using the ReadLive program.
- HGMS is starting a 3<sup>rd</sup> trimester reading and math intervention for at-risk 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> graders. Staff was careful to not include students who already receiving support from another program (i.e., special education) They will also be using the ReadLive program for the reading intervention.
- A question about a late bus for middle school at-risk students was asked so students could have afterschool intervention(s). While we acknowledged that we have done this in the past and ICES is currently doing their reading intervention before school, this is not a best practice because it is not “mandatory”. If it is not mandatory, the parents of the students and who need it can opt out. Also, afterschool interventions keep students from participating in afterschool sports, often the motivation and incentive to stay in school and keep trying. **Bottom Line:** Interventions are most effective if they match student need with program during the school day AND are implemented with urgency and fluidity. The goal must be to intervene, assess progress and adjust. Intervention cannot be a “life sentence”.
- There was discussion about the proficiency of the ICES Team in implementing the SIPPS (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words) program. Learning how to decode words is fundamental and is followed by reading comprehension and vocabulary development. This is accomplished during leveled small group differentiated reading instruction. ICES is experienced with the Walk to Learn model and is a best practice to provide leveled small group differentiated reading instruction. At HGMS, students have a 2 period ELA class. There was discussion about implementing a Walk to Learn-type model acknowledging that due to single subject credentialing, teachers weren’t trained to teach reading, even English teachers.

Herbert Green Preliminary STAR Reading Assessment Data Trimester #2  
2-23-17

Grade	All Students (107 tested)	English Language Learners (15 tested)	RFEP (12 students tested)	Low Income (72 students tested)	Special ED (all services 12 students tested)
5 <sup>th</sup> Below	69%	93%	83%	79%	75%
5 <sup>th</sup> At	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%
5 <sup>th</sup> Above	29%	7%	17%	21%	25%

Grade	All Students (115 tested)	English Language Learners (12 tested)	RFEP (10 students tested)	Low Income (67 students tested)	Special ED (all services 10 students tested)
6 <sup>th</sup> Below	60%	92%	70%	67%	90%
6 <sup>th</sup> At	11%	8%	0%	8%	0%
6 <sup>th</sup> Above	29%	0%	30%	25%	10%

Grade	All Students (104 tested)	English Language Learners (7 tested)	RFEP (10 students tested)	Low Income (56 students tested)	Special ED (all services 16 students tested)
7 <sup>th</sup> Below	70%	100%	90%	80%	88%
7 <sup>th</sup> At	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
7 <sup>th</sup> Above	30%	0%	10%	20%	12%

Grade	All Students (109 tested)	English Language Learners (5 tested)	RFEP (17 students tested)	Low Income (52 students tested)	Special ED (all services 8 students tested)
8 <sup>th</sup> Below	64%	100%	76%	77%	100%
8 <sup>th</sup> At	1%	0%	0%	2%	0%
8 <sup>th</sup> Above	35%	0%	24%	21%	0%

Below	At	Above
<5.3	5.4 to 5.6	>5.7
<6.3	6.4 to 6.6	>6.7
<7.3	7.4 to 7.6	>7.7
<8.3	8.4 to 8.6	>8.7

Indian Creek Preliminary STAR Data Trimester #2  
2.23.17

Grade	All Students (108 tested)	English Language Learners (21 tested)	RFEP (0 students tested)	Low Income (75 students tested)	Special ED (all services 10 students tested)
2 <sup>nd</sup> Below	43%	66%	n/a	51%	60%
2 <sup>nd</sup> At	8%	10%	n/a	4%	0%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Above	49%	24%	n/a	45%	40%

Grade	All Students (102 tested)	English Language Learners (22 tested)	RFEP (6 students tested)	Low Income (67 students tested)	Special ED (all services 10 students tested)
3 <sup>rd</sup> Below	59%	86%	33%	67%	90%
3 <sup>rd</sup> At	7%	5%	0%	8%	0%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Above	34%	9%	67%	25%	10%

Grade	All Students (113 tested)	English Language Learners (19 tested)	RFEP (6 students tested)	Low Income (81 students tested)	Special ED (all services 14 students tested)
4 <sup>th</sup> Below	62%	95%	50%	69%	86%
4 <sup>th</sup> At	15%	0%	33%	15%	0%
4 <sup>th</sup> Above	23%	5%	17%	16%	14%

Below	At	Above
<2.3	2.4 to 2.6	>2.7
<3.3	3.4 to 3.6	>3.7
<4.3	4.4 to 4.6	>4.7

- VII. Homework: The District will bring back reading data analyzed and presented by: Trimester 2 “unduplicated” separate and apart from All Students; students 2 and 3 years below grade level without names by grade level; explore a way to analyze and share “reading growth “from Trimester 1 and 2.
- VIII. LCAP-BACT Meeting Notes: For Team, Staff and Community input and comment via email ParentLink District website on or before February 28, 2017
- IX. Next Meeting: March 9, 2017 Goal 4 Student Engagement & 2<sup>nd</sup> Interim Budget