APPROVED

Menlo Park Academy Governing Board

Minutes

Program Excellence Committee Meeting

Date and Time
Tuesday September 20, 2016 at 5:30 PM

Location
MPA

OUR MISSION: Menlo Park Academy is a public school that develops the potential of gifted learners through an exemplary program of rewarding experiences that nurtures the whole child.

Committee Members Present
Beverley Veccia, Carol Ryan, Doug Thompson, Susan Zambo, Suzanne McFarland, Tom Creamer

Committee Members Absent
Teri Harrison

Committee Members who arrived after the meeting opened
Tom Creamer

Guests Present
Cathy Aldrich, Jeff Jaroscak

I. Opening Items

A. Record Attendance and Guests

B. Call the Meeting to Order

Suzanne McFarland called a meeting of the Program Excellence Committee of Menlo Park Academy Governing Board to order on Tuesday Sep 20, 2016 at 5:37 PM.
B. Veccia reported that MPA was chosen to be a part of the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Mandatory by State of Ohio that we participate and requires that 4th graders take the National Assessment, some online and some via paper and pencil. J. Jaroscak says that if the kids opt out, then it will count against us as one of our allowed opt outs and could hurt us with reimbursment. Each student will only have to take one subject test, either in Math, Reading and Writing. Test date is March 1, 2017.
C. Ryan noted that we have never advertised (and should be careful not to) our excellent test scores as our students' achievements have never been reached by teaching to the tests. B. Veccia noted that we deliver our program differently; and S. McFarland added that our pacing is different as well. Discussion on how we achieve results without teaching to the test and our content covers the standards and enriches; content, pacing and delivery of educational program is what makes us successful.

B. Veccia reported on how scoring on the tests was calculated per the meeting she attended yesterday. Discussion on scoring of tests and the addition of creative thinking ability as a testing metric.

S. McFarland also mentioned that we can communicate to the parents about the MAP tests and why we will be implementing it.

C. Approve Minutes

These were already approved at a previous meeting.

D. Approve Minutes

These were already approved at a previous meeting.

II. Program Excellence

A. Summer Work and Assurances

S. McFarland says that we will not review tonight, but is asking us to look over it as a record of what still needs to be done.
Tom Creamer arrived.

B. Student Groupings

D. Thompson reported that Language Arts curriculum was aligned with the schedule regarding time to allow for students moving from class to class according to ability levels. Goal is for all subject areas to be similarly structured to allow students to move easily according to ability.

C. Rosetta Stone

D. Thompson presented the letter from our Rosetta Stone representative about implementing the program. D. Thompson met with the rep today about how to implement and how students will choose their languages to learn. If they don't respond, it will default to Latin American Spanish. Discussion of languages that will be available. Program is also structured to allow a Kindergarten student to take it each year and will be fluent in the language offered by graduation. D. Thompson will send out parent letter tomorrow 9/21 to be up and running by next week. Discussion of details of classroom implementation and use next summer. Students will be able to continue to work during summer. C. Ryan suggested putting an informational video in the newsletter.

D. Resident Educator Program-Mentors

D. Thompson shared the list of Resident Educators and assignments and the stipend amounts. Has until 11/15 to finalize. May be some additions. S. McFarland said the reading specialist hired for K-3 will also be added. B. Veccia reported on how the shifts in assignments for a new teacher. Discussion on reading intervention/support/enrichment for upper grade students as needed.
C. Ryan asked a clarification about how many mentees that a resident educator has; some have more than one and is reflected on the list of resident educators.

E. MAP

D. Thompson reported devices are nearly ready. Have one and half classes and devices left to set up for the test. Reported process of how to set up student profiles. Plan to have it all uploaded by end of the week. S. McFarland asked about how to use the data generated after the test; will have to wait and see what can be done with the data.
D. Thompson replayed a voice message from ODE about the third grade guarantee. The KRA tests are back ordered by ODE and will let us know when ready, but tests are due November 1.
D. Thompson reported about the compacting of the Science and Social Studies curriculum in 5th grade. So far so good.

F. Special Education

Discussion on IEP request process. Topic will be on agenda for the next meeting.

G. Ninth Grade

Sponsor Document Review:

S. McFarland reported that the Board approved a pilot 9th grade program for Menlo students. Next year's 9th grade would be served by current staff. The current (charter) contract covers 9th grade and would have to make some minor changes to 11.6 goals. J. Jaroscak, Sponsor rep, updated us on how the contract is structured and that any

modifications to program would engender new negotiations. He reported on what the sponsor looks for in meeting our program. He suggests we rewrite our 6.3 goals for our educational program as the sponsors are under review, as things may change next year. Also, we will be asking for a contract extension of our contract to outlive our mortgage, so they will be looking at what our program will be. Recommends a more accurate/comprehensive description of our educational program in the contract.
Explained how the contract process works. S. McFarland clarified that we need to ask permission for the substance of the 9th grade program and not to actually add the 9th grade. Sponsor would need to assure the state that we are giving a viable 9th grade program. Also, 2014 added a requirement for a separate modification for a blended learning program, which includes online. J. Jaroscak recommends that whatever proposal we send to MPA Board send to the sponsor. Recommends not changing the 11.6 goals yet and involve the sponsor as we work through this program. Discussion of what the plan may look like.
Literature Review (Tom Creamer):

Need to define what 9th grade would include in addition to what we are already teaching, such as online, college plus, and AP. Discussion of what can be implemented with current staff and resources and what is needed to get the program started. Tom reported on the "early college" programs found at the local colleges. Also looking at feasibility of collaboration with Tri-C; also may be possible to collaborate with Case (difficulty here is our students would be "last in line" to sign up for courses, but Tri-C would be different. Also looked at options to work with College Credit Plus which might include proctored online learning. Need to be concerned about deceleration at local high schools; but there is a program that works with high schools for experiential learning. In such a program, student would get a plan and advisor; assessed on ability and suitability to get an internship with volunteer companies. Such internships might be a complementary fit with our students and they have great facilities; might be a good alliance. Looking for flexibility and lower costs for classes to supplement core classes; is it college? what else
Discussion of younger and non-traditional students and participation in higher level classes. Value would be in the MPA Cohort doing this together. Aligning under-utilized resources at colleges with students - would MPA cohort be separate? T. Creamer reports yes that is the plan based on conversations with current Tri-C leadership. This plan will fit with their goals.
Discussion on cost of cohort. Also, may have to have program ready for those students who would not be candidates for a college credit plus program. Need to consider that kids might come from other schools and not necessarily Menlo. Should we start only with Menlo kids? Concerns about delegation of resources. Program could be a draw for additional students. How many kids can we service in a 9th grade?
Further conversations needed with Tri-C and get updates on College Credit Plus from ODE such as criteria for signing up to participate and the process and timelines.

Logistics

Need two subcommittees: one to write the 9th grade proposal to present to the Board in October and a second to continue to look at possibilities for grades 10 to 12 for the future.

Need to meet with Tri-C leaders and campus Presidents with regard to alliance for forming a cohort.
Need to consider Transportation. Teachers from Tri-C too? Consider ability to manage outside educator.
Need to consider criteria for students that enter MPA for the first time for 9th grade.

9th Grade Proposal Committee to be headed up by S. McFarland; staff member(s) (Dr. Klipfell?), Susan Zambo, Cathy Aldrich. Will need an idea and a skeleton.
Long-Term HS Proposal Committee: Tom Creamer, Bev Veccia, Suzanne McFarland, Teri Harrison

Other subcommittee members may be added as needed.

Courses, Options, Sketch proposal to be delegated to subcommittee.

H. Policies

S. McFarland will work with Carol Ryan to assess policies and determine if they reflect what we are doing per the mandates of the school.

III. Closing Items

A. Adjourn Meeting

Cathy Aldrich made a motion to adjourn the meeting.
Susan Zambo seconded the motion.
The committee **VOTED** unanimously to approve the motion.
There being no further business to be transacted, and upon motion duly made, seconded and approved, the meeting was adjourned at 8:17 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Cathy Aldrich