

HYDE PARK SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES  
HYDE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LIBRARY  
MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2017

Board members present: Richard Bailey, Lisa Barry, Chasity Fagnant, Patti Hayford, Raven Walters.

Others: Diane Reilly, Deborah Clark, Jade Hazard, Donna Cullivan, Noreen Collyer

**Note: All votes taken are unanimous unless otherwise noted.**

**1. *Call to Order***

L. Barry called the meeting to order at 6:00.

**2. *Approval of Agenda***

**R. Walters moved to approve the agenda, C. Fagnant seconded and the motion was passed.**

**3. *Approve Consent Agenda (Minutes 5/1/17)***

**C. Fagnant moved to approve the minutes of May 1, 2017, P. Hayford seconded and the motion was passed.**

**4. *Assessment, Math and Literacy Presentation***

J. Hazard said she would share NECAP and SBAC data. She explained the difference between formative and summative data. Formative data informs instruction. Summative data shows what students have learned.

C. Fagnant asked if the SBAC took the place of the NECAP. J. Hazard said yes.

J. Hazard reviewed the board's outcomes policy. She said we should not rely solely on state mandated assessment data. It is only one snapshot in time. The state advised that until we have more Common Core instruction and practice with the test the results of the SBAC won't support reliable or valid inferences about student performance and thus should not be used as the basis for any consequential purpose.

L. Barry asked if our schools have looked at this year's SBAC data. J. Hazard said they just finished the testing. The guidance we got from AOE is that the results shouldn't be shared until June 16. L. Barry said teachers can look at the data now and she wonders if they have and if they have seen any trends. J. Hazard said she has not yet had time to sit down and analyze the results. L. Barry said in her district she has had teachers asking her how to look at the data. J. Hazard said no teachers have asked her about that.

J. Hazard said the Vermont NECAP was intended to measure how well students had learned Vermont Grade Level Expectations, which were the state standards before Common Core was adopted. The NECAP data doesn't reflect the standards we now follow.

J. Hazard showed NECAP English language arts results from 2007 to 2013. During that period the state as a whole did a little better than Hyde Park. But there was growth for Hyde Park in that period. The last year of NECAPs was 2013.

C. Fagnant asked about the difference between the NECAP and the SBAC. Why was the assessment changed? J. Hazard said because the NECAP was aligned with Vermont Grade Level Expectations and the SBAC is aligned with Common Core. Common Core is a little more rigorous than Vermont GLE's.

J. Hazard showed math NECAP results from 2007 to 2013. The percentage of students who were proficient went up and down but there was growth during that period.

J. Hazard showed the percentage of students proficient and above on the SBAC in 2015 compared to 2016.

R. Bailey asked why she only showed students proficient and above. P. Hayford asked, if you only use the students who are proficient, how do you know the students below the proficiency cut-off are making it? J. Hazard said principals don't just look at who is proficient. They also look at students who are not meeting the standard and see what areas they are having trouble with. They also look at local data for struggling students in order to help them.

R. Bailey asked why only 27 6<sup>th</sup> graders took the English language arts NECAP in 2013 and not the whole grade level. D. Reilly said that was the whole grade level. There are 33 6<sup>th</sup> graders this year.

R. Bailey said out of 27, 15 were below the standard and 12 met the standard. About 50% did not meet the standard. J. Hazard said D. Reilly and teachers look at NECAP data and local assessment data in order to provide supports for students. It would be interesting to look at cohorts of students. We could look at the cohort of students who are in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade now and see how they fare in each grade level and whether they are making progress.

In English language arts, Hyde Park students (all grade levels combined) went down a percentage from 2015 to 2016, while the state went up slightly.

L. Barry asked if we have those results broken down by grade level. J. Hazard said we can break it down.

These were the first two years students took the SBAC. N. Collyer said when SBACs first started we got a letter from Rebecca Holcombe saying some neighboring states were using data from Common Core testing to determine things like teacher evaluation, but R. Holcombe's message was that it takes at least 3 years for a new assessment to become usable. In the first year of a new assessment scores probably won't look that great. Instruction needs to be adjusted to the new test and students

have to adjust to the way the test is given. The SBAC is on the computer, while the NECAP was on paper. D. Reilly said students use Chromebooks to take the SBAC. Some students just got Chromebooks a couple of weeks before the test. Third graders hadn't had much experience with them before taking the test. N. Collyer said students have paper and pencil they can use and there are "thinking spaces" they can use on the screen. The test is adaptive, so problems can get more challenging or less challenging based on how the student is doing.

N. Collyer showed math SBAC results for 2015 compared to 2016. The state made 4 growth points from 2015 to 2016, as did LNSU. The percentage of HPES students proficient and above increased from 23% to 36%. That is 13 growth points. That speaks to the work teachers and students in this building are doing.

N. Collyer introduced herself. She said she started her career at Hyde Park, then was a math interventionist at CES and now is a math coach for LNSU.

N. Collyer discussed proficiency scores vs. growth scores. A proficiency score is a target score for all students to achieve – for example, all students will score at least 70% correct on the end of unit assessment. Growth is a measure of how much improvement students made from pre assessment to post assessment. An example growth goal would be a 40% increase from pre to post assessment. She showed example data for two students. The story is different depending how you look at the data. Student A went from 68% to 72% correct. They met the proficiency goal but not the growth goal. They only had 6% growth. Student B went from 35% to 68%. They didn't meet the proficiency goal but did meet the growth goal. They had a 49% increase.

R. Bailey asked for an example of why student B might have started at only at 35% while student A started at 68%. N. Collyer gave a different example to help answer that question. In this example, there are 4 teams from 4 different companies fundraising for charity. Each team asks its company for a donation and then fundraises to reach a goal. Team 1 fundraised \$105, Team 2 raised \$80, Team 3 raised \$65, and Team 4 raised \$50. Team 1 got an \$85 dollar donation from its company and only fundraised \$20. Team 4 only got \$5 donated and raised \$45. If all are trying to get to the same goal, is that fair?

J. Hazard said students have different backgrounds. Some have parents who have more resources to help them and come to school better prepared. Others have struggling parents who can't offer them the same opportunities. Students come to school with different background knowledge and opportunities. N. Collyer said they come with different levels of hunger. Some may not have had breakfast that morning. D. Reilly said we have noticed that kids who attend the summer program don't decline over the summer. Other students regress when they are not at school during the summer.

N. Collyer showed how looking at the amount fundraised paints a different picture of the teams. She showed the percent increase from the starting amount for each team. Team 1 had a 31% increase and Team 4 had a 900% increase.

N. Collyer said we can give an assessment without worrying about previous knowledge and look at how many classes have an average score meeting or exceeding the standard. We can also look at the results by growth, comparing pre and post assessment data. We can see which classes met the standard or which classes made the most growth. Which story do you value most?

N. Collyer showed K-6 data from the LNSU math benchmark assessment, a local assessment we give to students K-12. The data is organized by domain. She showed the different domain categories. For each domain, she showed the percentage of students (in all grades that are assessed on that domain) meeting or exceeding the standard in fall and in spring. Then she showed the average score for each domain (for all students who were assessed on that domain.).

J. Hazard said although she and N. Collyer are showing students meeting or exceeding the standard, that doesn't mean we are discarding those who aren't. That is where we do deep analysis for support.

N. Collyer showed percent growth from winter to spring for each domain. J. Hazard said there will be discussions with principals about the results. For instance, there was only 34% growth in number systems. What do we need to do to support students in that area?

C. Fagnant asked, do you look at specific children? D. Reilly said we look at every single child.

N. Collyer said some of the most exciting data she sees shows kids who are not meeting the standard but have high growth. They are doing tremendous learning even though they are not meeting the standard.

N. Collyer showed data from Reflex Math, which tests math fact fluency. She showed the percent fluent in fall and spring for LNSU and HPES. In fall 25% of LNSU students and 14% of HPES students were fluent. In spring, HPES had increased to 76%, surpassing the rest of the LNSU schools with 71%. (HPES data was not included in the LNSU data.)

R. Walters asked if HPES's gains can be attributed to anything. Are we the only school using Reflex Math? N. Collyer said no, all are using it. D. Reilly said we had found this area was a weakness and so we implemented Reflex Math with fidelity. J. Hazard said the implementation with fidelity may be the answer. It has to be used at least 3 times a week to get good results. Other schools may not have been doing that.

C. Fagnant asked about math coaches. D. Reilly said we have had two in the past. This year we had one. Next year we won't have a math coach.

R. Bailey asked how we know one grade didn't have very high scores that skewed the numbers. N. Collyer said there are grades that are higher or lower than others, but she can say from reviewing the data that there is not one class that is skewing the results. All grades made growth. J. Hazard said she can share data from each grade level. R. Bailey said he would like that.

N. Collyer said each class is a unique collection of kids. Differences in their assessment results may not have to do with the teacher or program. P. Hayford asked, what if over a span of time one teacher's classes consistently have low scores, with different kids? How do we interpret that? D. Reilly said there are grades where the bar is raised significantly and students in those grades may always tend to have scores that level off. N. Collyer said 3<sup>rd</sup> grade and 6<sup>th</sup> grade are notoriously difficult for kids because they have to learn a significant amount of new information in those grades. J. Hazard said she thinks in the past as a system we haven't really looked at things like that. We want to look at trends and how to alleviate issues. Now we are looking more deeply at the data. N. Collyer said we don't want to put blame on a person. Hyde Park is lucky to have a high caliber of teachers. J. Hazard agreed. HPES has some hardworking teachers. D. Reilly said with our coaches we are getting much better at looking at data and looking at it more deeply. L. Barry said it is important for the community to understand factors that might be responsible for students coming in with low initial assessment results.

R. Bailey asked, if we find Reflex Math works well, will we stick with it? D. Reilly said as long as it is working well. R. Bailey said he doesn't want a salesman to come in and try to sell something else. J. Hazard said she does a lot of research before deciding to use anything. She did research and found that game-based web based products came out on top for fact fluency. We will stick with Reflex Math for some time. As new technologies come out we will vet them closely before moving on. D. Reilly said we use a workshop model for math. The teacher does instruction, then each child goes to a workplace. This is one station. It is one piece of the instruction.

D. Reilly presented Fountas & Pinnell benchmark assessment data. This assessment is used to identify instructional and independent reading levels and to document progress. The levels stop at Z, so there is only so much room for growth in the higher grades. Kindergarteners are not assessed for the first time until winter. Kindergarteners improved from 34% in the winter to 63% in the spring. The target is about 80%. First grade improved from 64% in fall to 77% in spring. Second grade went from 36% to 55%. Third grade went from 59% to 69%. Richard said in the future it would be helpful to give the number of students. D. Reilly listed the approximate numbers of students for each grade. Fourth grade went from 55% to 72%. Fifth grade went from 57% to 62%. Sixth grade went from 56% to 46%. D. Reilly was surprised by that.

D. Reilly said we want to see at least a year's growth during the year. Some kids made over 2 ½ years growth. The percentage of students who made at least a year's growth was 25% in kindergarten (but they only needed half a year's growth because the first assessment was in winter), 100% in 1<sup>st</sup> grade, 82% in 2<sup>nd</sup> grade, 86% in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, 56% in 4<sup>th</sup> grade, 50% in 5<sup>th</sup> grade, and 40% in 6<sup>th</sup> grade.

D. Cullivan said when we administer the Fountas & Pinnell assessment we stop a year and a half above grade level. Beyond that, the texts may not be age appropriate. We know if a child reaches that point that the child needs to be challenged and that is what we need to know. If a student was already a year and a half above grade level in fall, the student may have made some growth but the assessment would be stopped so growth would not be shown. That is something to keep in mind for the upper grades.

D. Reilly said the data show how hard the students and teachers at HPES have worked to grow and learn. She asked board members please to remember to take into consideration that there are many external influences that can affect a child's day and availability to show what they have learned. J. Hazard said it is important to think about how we can support all our students. N. Collyer said one thing that impresses her about HPES is that all this is happening while teachers have to pack up their school. Their resilience is mind-blowing. D. Reilly said she is happy and excited to be here every day and work with these wonderful people.

5. ***Superintendent's Monitoring Report (May and June)***

L. Barry explained that C. Gallagher was unable to come tonight because her daughter was in an accident today.

**R. Bailey moved and C. Fagnant seconded to accept the superintendent's monitoring report for May and June as presented.**

R. Walters said it would have been easy for a superintendent working with a board that will expire in a few weeks not to take this responsibility seriously, but C. Gallagher gave this report her usual full level of attention. That impresses her. L. Barry agreed.

**The motion was passed.**

6. ***Principal's Report***

D. Reilly said Robin Bryce has been hired as librarian. She is currently working at Waterville and Montgomery. She is phenomenal – very techy. She will work 3 days a week. Amy Olsen will come in and bring books to our students from the public library. Our kids will visit the public library.

Joyce Cormier and Bill Trainor are retiring and will be celebrated at the awards ceremony. On the last day of school there will be a voluntary luncheon. The last Newsflash will be on Wednesday. It might not come out on paper because copiers will be gone after tomorrow. Report cards will be handed out on Friday. On Monday students will be at JSC for the day. They will see a movie there instead of at a theater. Then the rest of the day JSC students will run activities. On Tuesday students will be

at HPES. Teachers will plan something for each grade level. That will be a half day. At 10:30 on Tuesday there will be a ground breaking ceremony for the school. Some former Academy students will be invited. Board members will be invited. A whole school picture will be taken in front of the building. There will be cake for everyone. D. Reilly will plan on a barbecue when we come back to this building after the renovation. Tuesday afternoon staff will get the last stuff organized and later in the week things will be taken away for storage.

A lot of people showed up for the open house at the Plaza. School will be starting at 8:15 next year. D. Reilly hopes to have a place where parents can drive their kids to get the bus instead of driving to the school. If they need their kids out of the house earlier they can put them on the bus. C. Fagnant said many have to leave for work before the bus comes to their house. L. Barry said she understands the struggle. C. Fagnant asked why there is no supervision at the school so kids can be dropped off earlier. D. Reilly said there is no place to put kids other than their classrooms with their teachers. Teachers have a contracted start time before the start of the school day. That is time for them to do planning and meet. If they have students in their classrooms it is harder for them to do their work. It is not our job to entertain students. P. Hayford asked what time parents can drop students off now at HPES. C. Fagnant said 7:15. That is the problem. D. Reilly said allowing that was a gift to parents. We have staff available here to supervise children and we have the gym for them to be in. L. Barry said most schools do not allow drop off before a certain time, usually about 15 minutes before students have to be in classrooms. D. Reilly said this year was sort of a pilot to see if parents were interested in dropping kids off early. At her previous school she used 21<sup>st</sup> Century grant funds to support a before school program. In the future her goal is to do that here now she has seen there is interest.

D. Clark asked if parents will get an explanation of why there is going to be a change to the drop off time. R. Walters suggested maybe we could say that this year we were fortunate to have flexibility to offer an early drop off time to see if there was interest and that we regret that given the circumstances we can't offer it in the coming year but we will seek grant funding to offer it in the future. L. Barry suggested that we explain what the circumstances are that prevent it.

J. Hazard said we could think about offering breakfast and also academic support for struggling students before school. D. Reilly said currently we are offering interventions to some students before school.

C. Fagnant said she has heard from some people that the bus doesn't go on their road. Who do they complain to? D. Reilly said we should get a list of places people are concerned about. L. Barry asked, isn't it the SU that deals with busing and not us? D. Clark said when the bus company asks to cut a route she will go out and look at it and either agree or not. She said people can call the school or the SU if they want to talk about bus route issues.

D. Reilly said we need to let the community know there will be a bus stop here in the village next year.

**7. *Building/Construction Update***

D. Clark said the grass has not been mowed because D. Laflam felt it was not worth the money to renew the mowing contract given that the grass will all be trampled down once construction starts. D. Reilly said the grass in front of the building will be mowed for the picture.

D. Clark said construction meetings have started every Wednesday. The contract with Wright and Morrissey is being drafted. Asbestos abatement starts June 14. Demolition of the '51 wing will start June 26. March 8 is the substantial completion date, when we can reoccupy the building. August 18, 2018 is the total closeout date. Next week Action Moving will be coming Thursday and Friday to move stuff. Teachers have been moving stuff to the Plaza, GMTCC, and storage almost daily.

P. Hayford said there are two suites at the Plaza with gas stoves. Are the stoves being disconnected? D. Reilly said the knobs will be taken off but we will use the stoves. We may also shut the valves off on the back. There has been a lot of discussion about the stoves.

**8. *Set Future Meeting Locations***

L. Barry said this is the last regular school board meeting. The only reason the board might need to meet after this is if there is a construction-related issue.

D. Clark said she has told the LNMUUSD board that she thinks it is important for existing boards or board committees to continue to deal with bond work because they know the plans and projects better. She thinks the LNMUUSD board is very amenable to that. So there may be times the board is called together for advice or decisions.

R. Walters asked if there is a quick summary of the major add or delete decisions in case community members have questions. D. Clark said she will ask about that.

L. Barry said she thinks the location for any future meetings should be in Hyde Park.

P. Hayford got information on what dates the town hall is available. C. Gallagher had mentioned GMTCC as well.

**C. Fagnant moved to use either the town clerk's office or GMTCC for future meetings and the motion was seconded and passed.**

**9. *Adjourn***

**R. Bailey moved to adjourn at 8:10, R. Walters seconded, and the motion was passed.**

*Minutes submitted by Donna Griffiths*