CONTOOCOOK VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of the Superintendent of Schools
106 Hancock Road, Peterborough, NH 03458-1197
EDUCATION COMMITTEE
December 17, 2018
SAU Boardroom
5:30 PM

Minutes

Committee Members:

Richard Dunning, Bernd Foecking, Janine Lesser, Niki McGettigan, Linda Quintanilha, Crista Salamy (Chair)

Present: Crista Salamy, Dick Dunning, Bernd Foecking, Crista Salamy, Cari Christian-Coates, Nicole Pease, Larry Pimental, Ben Moenter, Dr. Ann Forrest, Kim Chandler, Amy Janoch

Crista Salamy called the meeting to order at 5:34 p.m.

Approval of November 19, 2018 Minutes
Dick Dunning moved to accept the minutes of November 19, 2019. Bernd Foecking second. Crista Salamy abstained. All others in favor. Motion carried.

Update on multiage at DCS

SP Action Step 3.1.2; make a determination on whether to pursue multiage/multigrade as a District practice

Nicole Pease reported that the main goal was to be able to develop a schedule where she and another teacher could work with grades 3, 4, and 5 students. After 3.5 months, reflection results in things that are going well. Co-planning is possible one hour each week. Collaborating and sharing ideas and concerns about what is and is not working well has been positive. Time to work together has allowed integration across curriculum areas. The ability to specialize in a particular curriculum has been great. Being able to look at learning progressions is more evident working across three grades. Time being pulled out of the classroom for professional development is now distributed between the two teachers, allowing for time in class. Looking at assessing the group as a whole and regrouping to meet learning needs is a goal.
Ms. Pease broke down what a typical day looks like.
Specializing in math and science across three grades has allowed a strong familiarity with the curriculum. It allows the ability to see how the grade levels come together.
Moving forward, focus on developing learning progressions and assessments is a goal.
Discussion took place about the ability or inability to move a child to a different group based on their level of learning.

What does inclusion look like in the ConVal School District?

Request made during the August School Board retreat. Also related to SP Focus Area 2.1e

Ben Moenter distributed information that detailed focus areas and action steps on this topic (see attached). Progress related to co-teaching; 11 classes at the high school are co-taught; at each level at the middle school; and a range of no co-teaching to all co-teaching at the elementary level.

The ability to co-teach at each grade level, grades K-4, is difficult. Planning time does not match up to allow for this possibility. It is impossible for one person. In part, this is one reason for the number of paraprofessionals in buildings.

Cari Christian-Coates reported that the district is headed in the right direction with co-teaching. We are currently at 60%.

ConVal 2025, formerly SWIFT, is focused on Domain II.

If the district is going to continue to do inclusion in the classroom, how many co-teachers do we need to be successful for that to happen? We likely cannot afford the numbers given the current configuration of the district. What are we going to do in the interim to meet the needs of these kids? Is there a plan to allow for regrouping?

The response was that we don't have a choice, it is the law. We are working toward it and have made many changes toward it. Classrooms look different today as a result.

Is it challenging at the high school to co-teach if a student is struggling to get them into a TASC spot? There are opportunities to meet with kids at TASC, but if there are a number of students who have a need, it is difficult to get one-on-one time.

Barriers to forcing co-teaching are the lack of training for staff.

Co-teaching is one way to support inclusion.

Has the co-teaching model improved learning outcomes? Has it had less stress on teachers? Are parents satisfied? How can we measure success? Changing the parameters for measurement and asking the right questions is important.

Inclusion is about the least restrictive educational setting for a student. The challenge is difficult to make sure there is balance in planning, scheduling and staff resources.

Update on SEL (Tier 1) at the Elementary-level

Social Emotional Learning (SEL) Curriculum update – implementation in schools. Amy Janoch surveyed K-4 teachers on this topic. 32 respondents or 63% of teachers completed the survey (see attached).

Regulation stations are in all classrooms and are used regularly. Teaching children to identify their emotional state and using strategies to get to the "green zone" i.e. ready to learn and calm.

What works well? Happy to have a common language to identify what is helping or interfering with the ability to learn. Teachers were eager to learn more strategies in this area.

In Antrim, it is working for a lot of the kids. Kids need more Tier 2 and 3 assistance.

At PES, most teachers have regulation stations. Challenges include professional development and training for all staff. Consistency is important. Time to assess if the

curriculum delivered and training is effective is needed. Not all staff have been trained in Zones of Regulation. Giving kids time to get ready to learn might be an emphasis.

Review Director of School Counseling Job Description.

Cari Christian-Coates said that there is a hope to make a shift in this position to a K-12 focus as opposed to a grade 9-12 focus. This will provide an opportunity to spend more time with people at all levels and provide counselors support. This is viewed as a phase in process. District and high school responsibilities were broken out.

Looking at a total redistribution of responsibilities is a goal. This would allow the counselors that travel additional support.

In terms of evaluation; whose evaluation is brought forward should there be a disagreement between the primary and secondary evaluator? It is a collaborative process; not one or the other but an evaluation of input together. The principal is the primary evaluator and would be contributing more to the conversation.

Should this move forward, when would it be effective? Not a current expectation.

How will the workload at the high school be addressed? This will be revisited. Redistribution of workload would allow for this to occur potentially.

Is there a financial impact? Currently unknown.

While reviewing the job description, it was noted that "Compile, generate, and interpret all data related to student achievement K-12" is a responsibility of the Assistant Superintendent.

Looking at 504's K-12 are being reviewed in terms of focus on the process; this position change will benefit the process.

Discussion took place about support at the high school. Further discussion took place about what the position would look like.

Workload for this position was asked for more information.

Policy
Review language in Policies IHBH and IMBC (attached)

Policy language was said to be redundant in places. It is difficult to eliminate some of the language. Ann Forrest said that she does not see the policies as limiting. She was open to postponing this conversation so more information could be gained.

A smaller subcommittee to review policies in more detail to bring the information back to the Education Committee was suggested.

Limiting the number of credits that could be used toward a ConVal Diploma prompted this discussion.

Ann Forrest cited differences in the ConVal policy against the NH School Board policy.

Crista Salamy and Dick Dunning agreed to meet in advance of Education Committee meetings to look at policy.

Other

Dick Dunning motioned to adjourn at 7:23 p.m. Crista Salamy second. Unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Marschok

Summary of SEL Curriculum Survey
12/10/18
32 respondents - 63% of teachers completed the survey

95% of the respondents are implementing morning meeting 4 - 5 times a week.
53% of respondents are implementing closing circle 4 - 5 times a week.

Regulation stations are in all classrooms and used on a regular basis. Respondents are teaching children to identify their emotional state and using strategies to get to the "green zone" ready to learn/calm.

52% of the teachers report that the regulation station works for 80% or more of the students in the classroom. Another 11% said that it works for 40% of the students.

51% of teachers work with children to set goals for behavior for the day and 27% of the teachers check in at the end of the day to see how the children did with meeting their goals.

When asked **what works well**, teachers reported the following:
- Dedicated time to teach strategies for managing behavior
- Incorporate the strategies in the moment to help students get to "calm"
- Common language for managing emotions and behavior
- Use of Zones to help students understand how they are feeling and how that affects learning.
- Concrete strategies for getting managing disregulated behavior
- Consistent structure across school

What are **roadblocks** for implementing the social emotional curriculum?
- Time
- Lessons are too long. Need to be broken down more and extended longer
- Lack of training
- Adjusting the curriculum for younger students - language like regulated and disregulated
- Need for more resources

Focus Areas	Action Steps
2.1 Students with special educational and behavioral needs will be integrated into the general education classroom to the maximum extent appropriate to meet their needs.	• **2.1.1** The School District will implement co-teaching models at all levels. • **2.1.2** The School District will train staff to provide interventions that address behavior concerns. • **2.1.3** The School District will implement the use of instructional strategies that positively impact all learners. • **2.1.4** The School District will apply to become a SWIFT district. • **2.1.5** The School District will train applicable personnel in SWIFT practices. • **2.1.6** The School District will begin implementation process for SWIFT. • **2.1.7** The School District will promote and support collaboration between parents or guardians, staff, and outside agencies. • **2.1.8** The School District will partner with behavioral health and substance abuse task force.
2.2 The School District will promote collaboration between students, staff, and community by demonstrating respect for self, peers, adults, and the facility. *SEL Responsive classroom. Zones of Social Emotional learning regulation* *all kinds of Minds* *PBIS Positive behavior Intervention*	• 2.2.1 The School District will train students to create personalized Plans for Success (document that outlines their goals and how to attain them). • 2.2.2 The School District will implement community/school recognition programs. • 2.2.3 The School District will create local internships related to Applied Technology career paths. • 2.2.4 The School District will establish service learning opportunities that require interaction with area service agencies.
2.3 The School District will provide enhanced *support* curricular opportunities through community partnerships.	• 2.3.1 The School District will expand middle/high school summer opportunities. • 2.3.2 The School District will create partnerships with local businesses. • 2.3.3 The School District will establish articulation agreements with other local institutions. • 2.3.4 The School District will expand partnerships with Harris Center, Cornucopia Project, and ConVal Youth Sports Association.
2.4 The School District will showcase student activity and achievement to increase school visibility in community.	• 2.4.1 The School District will create District-wide Arts and Science/Tech Days in conjunction with local events.
2.5 The School District will provide clear communication tools for use by students, staff, and community.	• 2.5.1 The School District will update District website. • 2.5.2 The School District will create a social media presence where appropriate.

School Improvement through Inclusive Education
Wayne Sailor, Allyson Satter, Kari Woods, James McLeskey, Nancy Waldron

25 OCTOBER 2017

Inclusive educational practices have recently become a driving force for school improvement. These practices are rooted in a body of research which indicates that when students with disabilities are meaningfully included in general education classrooms and schools, academic and social outcomes improve for students with and without disabilities."

General Overview and Advances in Inclusive School Improvement

Ainscow 2005 argues that inclusive school improvement needs to extend beyond individual schools, and that it includes systemic change that challenges views of disability—not as inherent problems within a student, but as a process for identifying and removing barriers to improve participation and achievement of all students.

Artiles and Kozleski 2007 and Artiles and Kozleski 2016 view inclusive education as the cornerstone of education reform, asserting that an inclusive education should not just be about students with disabilities, but also about increasing access, participation, and outcomes for all students who are marginalized.

McLeskey, et al. 2014 defines inclusive practices and makes the case that inclusive schools require schoolwide systemic change that is focused on teacher practice and capacity building in areas teachers are motivated to improve. Furthermore, the authors agree with Liasidou 2015 that such a change requires time for planning before systemic changes are implemented.

Waldron and McLeskey 2010 describes how comprehensive school reform can be used to focus on the development of inclusive schools.

Sailor and McCart 2014 and Sailor 2015define and outline current advances in inclusive school improvement and provide some suggested next steps for developing inclusive systems.

In Sailor 2016, the problem is further described as framing education in terms of categorical, specialized services. Sailor argues for using a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) as a way to equitably distribute resources; that is, by matching resources to measured student needs.

Choi, et al. 2016 statistically demonstrates the positive effects of an equity-based inclusive education model on student reading and math achievement.

30 Years of Research =
Benefits of Inclusive Education

Hunt, Farron-Davis, Beckstead, Curtis, Goetz, 1995; Ryndak, Morrison, & Sommerstein, 1999; Fisher & Meyer, 2002; Jorgensen, McSheehan 2005; Hunt, Farron-Davis, Beckstead, Curtis, Goetz,1996;Fryxell & Kennedy,1995;Schnorr, 1990, 1997 and more.... Swiftschools.org

- Higher expectations for ALL students
- Better performance for ALL students in academic areas (reading and math)
- Increased communication skills
- Decrease in challenging behaviors
- Fewer days missed from school
- Fewer suspensions and expulsions
- Opportunities to develop social relationships
- Students and teachers report increased "kindness"
- Promotes the value of diversity for ALL students
- Improved post school options