Chetek-Weyerhaeuser Area School District Board of Education

Work Session Meeting   **February 17, 2022**

Meeting called to order at 5:15 p.m.by vice-president, Janene Haselhuhn.

Roll Call: Goulette, Hamilton, Haselhuhn, Olson, Reisner, and Lentz were present. Traczyk absent

Others Present: Dr. Mark Johnson, Scott Kowalski, Larry Zeman

Motion by Lentz, seconded by Hamilton to approve the meeting agenda for February 17, 2022. Motion carried unanimously.

Information:

A.BOE Work Session on DPI Report Card Agenda

I.Discuss purpose and goal(s) of Work Session

II.Discuss Disclaimers regarding Report Cards and Work Session

  A.See DPI "caution" on report cards

  B.Scores Represent One Moment in Time

  C.Report Cards Address Potential Symptoms of Systems

  D.Work Session is High-Level and Not Granular

III.BOE Completes Work Session Guide in Groups

  A.Get to Know New Report Cards

    1.See Disclaimer about Report Card Scoring and Calculations

  B.Work through Factors that Affect Scoring

  C.CWASD Scores/What Do We See?

  D.CWASD Scores vs. Others With Higher Report Card Scores

IV.Causation Investigation

V.Actionable Report Card Data

VI.School Improvement Measures in Place (regardless of report card scores)

    A.PLC's

  B.Systems analysis and review

  C.Student data collection and review

        D.Multi-tiered interventions for behavior and academics

        E.Increased social-emotional support staffing

        F.Student-friendly grading practices which promote mastery

        G.Standards-based grading

        H.Elementary Literacy Initiative

        I.Addition staffing to support elementary literacy

        J.Curriculum Review Sessions for Math and English

        K.Increased reading and writing across content areas

        L.Test Prep strategy sessions for students

        M.Student-friendly acceleration policies/STELM programming

VII.Considerations/Thoughts

        A.What Does the Data Tell Us?

           1.Growth data calculation showed lower pre-test to post-test growth than predicted

        B.Report Cards heavily weigh growth over achievement; does that penalize districts with higher front-

         end student achievement? I.e. more significant growth potential lies with those with lower pre-test

         achievement.

        C.What level of emphasis should we place on once-a-year scores?

        D.What systems have we changed since the district had a "Significantly Exceeds Expectations"

         score?

        E.Does a report card score genuinely represent all that happens (or doesn't) in schools?

B.District Report Card Work Session

1.What changes has DPI made from the last release of report cards? (Hint:removed one priority area and replaced with another,) Removed closing the gap and added target group outcome

2.What are the four areas used for priority weighting on the report card? Achievement, Growth, Target Group Outcomes and On Track to Graduation

3.Which priority area has the most weight for CWASD? Growth

4.Which priority weight area did CWASD have the lowest score? What does that priority area measure, or how is it calculated? Target Group Outcome examined outcomes for students with the lowest test scores - the Target Group. It's to promote equity by helping districts focus on learners who need the most support while also improving outcomes for all students. The score combines scores for achievement, growth, chronic absenteeism, and attendance or graduation rate.

5.Why does DPI use the priority area to question #3 as our heaviest weighted area?A high value-added score means that on average students rather than the district are progressing more quickly than other similar students.It's value added model seeks to control for circumstances beyond influences of educators.

6.Which subject area did CWASD have a lower student group value-added growth score? Math at 2.4

7.What assessments does DPI use to develop the scores for the report cards? ACT Aspire, ACT with writing, Forward Exam

8.What grade levels are assessed for data for the report card?ACT Aspire grades 9 and 10. ACT with writing grade 11, Forward Exam grades 3-8

9.What test(school)years does this report card reflect? 2016-2017; 2017-2018; 2018-2019; 2020-2021

10. For report cards, DPI calculates participation in assessments into the scoring. If a student does not participate in testing, they are counted as a participant, but no score is counted. In other words, to figure out percent proficient, a non-participant is calculated in the denominator but not in the numerator. How might test participation rate negatively affect report card scoring? It would lower our report card score.

11.What do you notice about the differences in viewing other report cards and CWASD's report card? Target Group Outcomes and On Track to Graduation are consistent at 25%.

12.After reviewing the district report card, note any observations you have about the data within the report card. Disregard overall score because all overall scores are calculated differently. They are grading based on prior years that we cannot do anything about.

13.What limitations does the school report card data have on school improvement related to student assessment data? Only tests once a year so it's a long time before we can reevaluate if our improvement is helping or not. Cannot have the same people testing every year to make testing accurate.

14.After going through this exercise, what areas of the report card would the BOE view as valuable data for school improvement? Achievement, but once again once a year testing is not enough. Classroom assessments need to be looked at.

15.If someone were to ask you about our report card, what talking points can you speak to as a result of this work session?

Access to Report Cards

DPI Report Card Guide

Motion by Lentz, seconded by Olson to adjourn the meeting at 6:55 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Korie Lentz, Clerk