

## TAG Advisory Council

---

**Date:** 3/17/10 12:00-1:30pm Facilities Room BESC

**Next meeting:** May 19, 2010 12:00-1:30pm  
Mahonia Conference Room

**Attendance:** Craig Daniels, JaneAnne Peterson, Maria Inocencio, John McAllister, Tom Gauntt, Valerie Underwood, Alison Abell, Jeff Strange, Margaret DeLacy; PPS Staff: Pat Thompson, Jere Fitterman, Cheryl Ogburn.

**Minutes:** Jere Fitterman

<b>Introduction</b> <i>Who you are, why you are here (kids, school, job), anything to add to agenda?</i>	<b>Discussion Points</b>	<b>Decision or Action</b>
<b>Approve minutes</b>	Moved, seconded accept with changes	approved
<i>CMACC update</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 95 % school represented, parents from representative groups meet 1-2 times per week Dec-present. Review protocol group narrowed selected publications using consensus.</li> <li>• Question: What elements are included in a curriculum adoption? Instructional concepts, content standards, materials and assessment</li> <li>• Flux in standards in OR; still not decided (what standards will be tested) Currently, mismatched with National Stds. State says we will move to Nat'l standards which we will align OR and National standards.</li> <li>• OR has 9 choices. PPS has HS, MS now looking at K-5. Final four include:</li> <li>• Math In Focus-(Singapore) US version</li> <li>• Everyday Math (U of Chicago; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed)</li> <li>• Investigations (2<sup>nd</sup> edition)</li> <li>• Bridges in Mathematics- OR developed</li> <li>• Best practices of NCTM</li> <li>• Lens for acceleration included in all four options</li> <li>• All have scaffold for differentiation built in model</li> <li>• Decision due in Spring; roll out in Fall 2010</li> <li>• <i>Are there assessments available in each curriculum to show individual</i></li> </ul>	

## TAG Advisory Council

	<p><i>proficiency?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Are there supports for teachers to assess above grade level?</i></li> <li>• <i>Growth based state assessment neglects above grade level learner (top out, no targeting assessment).</i></li> <li>• <i>Do they have supports for moving to their level?</i></li> <li>• All have computational fluency, now</li> <li>• ODE assessment plan for changing stds will make assessment moves the mark each year.</li> <li>• Everyone of the programs has features in band 1st grade has more observations; core check in K.; pre and post in targets units; beginning end of year model of assessment; could use above grade assessments for looking at specific students.</li> <li>• Assessment is more developed in all programs than 12 years prior, mostly embedded in teaching assignments.</li> <li>• We respond when we hear about a student. How parents know of district resources is limited.</li>   <li>• <i>Mandate for instruction to match should be consistent</i></li> <li>• <i>Curriculum dept needs to make out of grade level curriculum can be in the classroom.</i></li> <li>• <i>Will there be policy for clear expectations for buildings to use assessment effectively to hold teachers accountable to find level?</i></li> <li>• Policy can only be enacted by board</li> <li>• Administrative directive needs to be at OTL level</li> <li>• We need to create a system for evaluation and accelerated curriculum</li> </ul>	<p>We need to create a system for evaluation and accelerated curriculum</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>TAGAC has a history of making recommendations that go nowhere...Is there one thing that will make an immediate improvement what would that be? Answer single subject acceleration.</i></li> </ul>	

## TAG Advisory Council

- *Reiterate from previous minutes:  
District will bring a plan by March 17 meeting for implementing process for students to demonstrate proficiency in math and in having done so will have the right to accelerate in math;  
“Students shall have the right to demonstrate proficiency in an individual subject and having done so will have the right to move to the next grade level in that subject” moved, seconded unanimous vote... We are interested in the timeline.*
- Pat outlined a framework for single subject acceleration (SSA)
  1. We must wait until K-5 adoption is completed.
  2. SSA must be addressed on a case-by-case basis
  3. Evidence must be substantial based upon consistent performance on grade level before moving to another grade level
  4. Multiple instruments must be used to assess student performance.
  5. Is SSA appropriate? Admin, TAG, teachers, district specialists etc review assessment.
  6. Acknowledgement that ‘walk to math’ successful to a degree, in some schools, but not answer in many schools
  7. As we look at SSA, we must include SE evaluation
  8. Fidelity of PD for teachers
  - 9.
- *Challenge #1 until we have adoptions. Why wait?*
- *We need the standards to set up assessments; and we need the entire package of curriculum*
- *It doesn’t matter what stds are for working on the process. We’d like to move to the process building phase and ensure the right for every student/parent*
- *We are asking for whole grade standards for acceleration that may be too high as research shows kids will fill in the gaps*
- *We aren’t saying 100%, we are saying performing consistent achievement*

### **Single Subject Acceleration Framework for Mathematics Talking Points for PPS TAG Advisory Council March 17, 2010**

1. We will need to wait until the K-5 adoption is officially completed (including the adoption of new core standards in mathematics, selection of materials, plan for teacher professional development, etc.) before we can finalize a process where an individual student's plan for single subject acceleration in mathematics would be created.
2. Single subject acceleration in mathematics must be addressed on a case-by-case basis.

## TAG Advisory Council

---

		<p>3. Single subject acceleration must be determined on the basis of substantiated evidence that a student is <u>consistently performing</u> above the grade level standards as determined by the core standards within a given grade.</p> <p>4. Multiple assessments must be used to determine a student's mastery of skills and appropriate level of mathematics.</p> <p>5. In addressing the question of 'is single subject acceleration appropriate?' - A review team consisting of building level teachers &amp; administrator(s) and central team specialists in mathematics would meet with the student and parents to discuss the possible creation of a customized plan which includes skills based assessments, classroom observations, teacher, parent and student recommendations. The PPS TAG Office will provide support as needed throughout this process.</p> <p>6. We can also discuss at least one case study where this is currently happening in a PPS school right now along with existing options such as 'walk to math' that are also happening in many of schools right now with various degrees of success.</p>
--	--	--

## TAG Advisory Council

		<p>7. Issues of social-emotional maturity and familiarity with group process are critically important to the decision about single subject acceleration as well as the HS math curriculum relies heavily on group problem solving as an essential component within the CPM curriculum</p> <p><i>We want method for next steps:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <i>Team, we want to be on it.</i> Definition of team Algebra team, research by Cheryl,</li><li>2. <i>Assessment?</i></li><li>3. <i>Infrastructure</i></li></ol> <p>We don't want to create gaps. Algebra project eminent. CMAcc is eminent. What are other schools are <i>Look at IOWA state acceleration policy.</i></p> <p><i>We want a meeting for input in building this plan for implementation..</i></p> <p><i>Suggest PPS looks at places that know how to teach math to gifted students. Cheryl will continue to research single subject acceleration in mathematics with members of the PPS Central Team. Jeff suggested that PPS also research State of Ohio Acceleration Policy and Iowa Acceleration Scale. Craig will call Pat the week of April 5<sup>th</sup> to set up an</i></p>
--	--	---

## TAG Advisory Council

		<i>ongoing 'work group' conversation to create a project plan and timeline before the May 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.</i>
<i>HS redesign.</i>	<p><i>John Wilhelmi said we would have input on HSSD in Jan-Dec. Zeke stated the district's intention that PPS could use TAG parents to be involved in design process for engagement on HSSD. How do we get into the process?</i></p> <p>Superintendent has 45 days (APRIL 25) to propose design officially to the Board and the greater community. Pat reported PPS's intention to engage the TAG community after April 25<sup>th</sup> per CIPA. Pat is working with the Communication Department concerning a format for engagement. Pat encouraged TAGAC to continue communication with Jenni Villano re their questions relating to ACCESS. Members expressed frustration that the recommendations made by TAG parents in December 2009 did not appear to be acted upon in the current HSSD design relating to curriculum and support for TAG students.</p>	<p>Craig will communicate to Zeke, John, Jenni and Xavier about PPS TAGAC's ongoing interest to stay engaged during the next steps of the HSSD process.</p>
<b>Summary</b>		Craig and Pat will work jointly to present a project plan for SSA at the May 19 <sup>th</sup> TAGAC meeting.