

## **IPAT Minutes**

**October 11, 2016**

Those present were Pat Barber, Kara Carney, Jennifer Gilray, Randy Petrilla, Mike Rio, Ryan Saxe and Dawn Walker. Also present were Evan McCarthy and Sandra Riley-Hawkins.

The meeting was called to order at 9:06 a.m.

**I. Welcome, introductions and review of minutes** –The minutes of 9/23/16 were moved by Kara and seconded by Mike. Motion carried.

### **II. MCTES 2016-2017**

**A. Attendance** – For evaluation purposes we have been working with daily attendance. 10% or 15% absent for excused/unexcused last year. The district policy is that a student is considered present if he/she is in school for 10 minutes. All roster verification is done through the state system for VAM and student growth but that is only for enrollment in surveys 2 and 3. A list of instructional periods would be needed. There are codes in FOCUS that attendance clerks input to track student attendance for each reason he/she is not present in a class (present, testing, field trip, unexcused, excused, religious holidays, tardy, school business, TO for discipline, illness, personal reason unexcused, ATOSS, etc.). Ryan asked for data so we can see some options that are available for addressing attendance by period.

**B. Update on training videos** – The release is pending until final decision on '15-'16 teacher evaluation has been made.

**C. Proposed changes for VAM/Student Growth for 2016-2017** – percentages of total attendance, ELL, 504, ESE, free and reduced lunch

Pat asked what it would look if we used a predictive rather than a growth or performance model like we are using now. Regression approach. Sandra and Evan will provide the data. Deadline for submission to the state is 12/31/16. Pat proposed submitting the plan as submitted in '15-'16.

Pat will send out chart of what is currently in the system as it has been amended to IPAT members. Bring suggested changes or items to address to next meeting. Pat asked how we can look at dual enrollment courses and how dual enrollment data can be incorporated.

Mike asked for breakdown of student growth scores and rankings by grade level and by school.

Confidence intervals vs. confidence bands.

FSA AA data – use pass rate if we can. Many ESE not rated and this would help. A complication is that ESE teachers at the secondary level are not the teachers of record because they are resource teachers and they are in a push in model. Those teachers would have a caseload, however, so assessment may be able to capture that data.

iReady 'rush' flags – Evan proposed using the spring administration from the previous school year to the current school year instead of using data from the fall to the spring administration. This would not work for kindergarten and new students. Kindergarten and any new student would be assessed fall to spring administrations. Ryan moved and Mike seconded to accept this recommendation. Motion carried.

This would not work for kindergarten or new students where we do not have iReady data. 1<sup>st</sup> administration would not be used in the calculation. Kara brought up concerns about looking at student's growth when he or she was under the instruction of one teacher one year versus another. Also, there is a concern about the fact that there is not standardized use of iReady.

The chart needs to be sent out after the next IPAT meeting.

Across the board, teachers who had more students were getting higher scores. Suggestion to use confidence intervals at 68% and 95% thresholds instead of confidence bands. State uses confidence intervals. The way the state does it is that to be HE you have to be 95% sure you're greater than state average. Evan proposed that the district uses the following:

- Unsatisfactory - 99.9% confidence interval less than district average
- Needs Improvement - 99% confidence interval less than district average & some of 99.9% confidence interval greater than district average
- Highly Effective - 50% confidence interval greater than district average
- Effective - Those who do not fit in the above categories.

This is a proposal to make it a district standard instead of a test standard.

Ryan moved to transition to confidence intervals per Evan's recommendation and Randy seconded. Motion carried.

**III. Finalization of 2015-2016 teacher evaluation** – MEA has to decide whether to agree to a one-year resolution or to challenge the decision of the district to renege on the MOU. Ryan proposed that if the district can upload the agreed upon scores, verify that scores are correct, communicate to principals to finalize and acknowledge then that can be done in two weeks. Pat said that she would inform Ryan early on Thursday, October 13, 2016. MEA's ratification process will be set up for the week of 10/24/16. It is unknown when the school board will act. Performance pay cannot be figured out until both parties ratify.

If agreeable to teacher and administrator, review of PDP can be extended by a few days.

**IV. Other Business** – None.

**V. Future Agenda Items** – attendance, options for student growth/VAM, review draft teacher evaluation plan (send out prior to meeting) and bring ideas to meeting to discuss.

**VI. Future dates** – Tuesday, November 8, 2016. 9 a.m. SSC. Room TBD.

Meeting adjourned at 11:11 a.m.