

# COMMUNITY COUNCIL MINUTES

**Date:** 2/13/23

**Time:** 3:45 - 5:05 pm

**Place of Meeting:** Zoom, link sent by Principal King prior to meeting

**Council Members Present:** Mike Johnson (Chair), Dan Cramer (Secretary), Brittany Hughes, Michelle Mattson, Tara Minert, Tiffany Rowberry, April Johnson, Mallory Poole, Vangee Watts, Jennifer King (Principal)

**Council Members Absent:** Sarah Chatterton (Vice-Chair)

**Guests Present:** Kelly Taeoalii

## **Agenda items:**

1. The meeting was called to order by Mike Johnson, SCC Chair, at 3:49 pm. A motion to approve the minutes from the meeting on 1/9/23 was made by Mike Johnson. The motion was seconded by Tara Minert. The motion passed unanimously.
2. Principal King explained TSI status to the members of SCC and what it means for Viewmont.
  - a. TSI - Target System Improvement. Designated status a number of schools are in. Some subgroups in the RISE categories aren't making the status they should in two consecutive years.
  - b. Viewmont needed to show more progress in growth for its small ELL population and in the growth of the lowest 25%.
    - i. RISE scores on [Data Gateway](#) as of last spring, very good compared to 2021. First time taking the RISE questions on the more successful and safer platform.
    - ii. As of last week, Viewmont still shows that it has a letter grade score of B based on legislative criteria established for school grading.
    - iii. In late November Principal King received a notice that Viewmont was under warning of TSI status. She learned that there were a couple of other MCSD schools in this same position.
    - iv. Confounding issue, a small number of students that are ELL at Viewmont, but if you are low performing (lowest 5%) two years in a row you enter official TSI status.

- v. ELL score is not an official part of the RISE calculation. It is assessed via World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) in January/February timeline and the scoring is based upon a calculation established by the Federal Government. Figured into this scoring system is where the student begins the year in the 4 Domains tested (Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening in English) as well as the number of years they have been in the country.
  - vi. The TSI warning was not received until late in this school year, after curriculum already set up so heightened attention coming now at the end of 2022, going into 2023.
- c. TSI Designation
  - i. Elementary: Proficiency, Growth, English Learner, Growth of lowest 25%. Have to show lowest in two sections VMT hit on ELL and growth of lowest 25 percent.
  - ii. Data Gateway advises against comparing 2021 scores to previous years, and yet, they used it in the comparison for TSI status
    - 1. Every school in Murray in warning of TSI or full TSI
    - 2. 450+ Schools across Utah in warning or full TSI
  - iii. ELL - Speak, Listen, Read, Write used to assess the expected growth of English Learners for Federal standards. All made growth, but not enough made growth to avoid hit in WIDA
  - iv. Lowest 25% small dips (<2% over two years)
- d. Asked as a school what will be done. 90 day plan, long term plan. The Building Leadership Team met on this topic and to help develop the plan.
  - i. Every PLC starting with a discussion of the Growth of the Lowest 25% and how can check-ins can be done to help all students achieve at the level they are capable of.
  - ii. What opportunities are available to help our achievement scores and growth of the lowest 25%?
- e. Mr. Johnson asks, “what are the next steps on moving forward towards the State level?”

- i. Develop a plan for the School Board and they approve for sharing with teachers and SCC
    - ii. Continue to operate on school plan
    - iii. Benchmarks to be met, according to the goals in the plan and land trust
    - iv. Members from the office of the State Boards of Education met with district's administrative team last week to talk TSI, pieces of the puzzle to consider when meeting goals
      - 1. Only 5 team members at USBE who support TSI. There could be potential for lag and communication so we anticipate they will do more with the district and then filter it to schools.
    - v. Need to meet goals 2 years in a row to be off of TSI
  - f. Mr. Cramer asks, "did the state acknowledge the discrepancy between the wording on the data page vs the assessment?"
    - i. Nothing was mentioned, not sure where that wording came from
  - g. Mrs. Minert asks, "what are the negative parts of being in TSI and how does it affect our Land Trust Plan?"
    - i. It could give the appearance that a school isn't meeting a student's needs in the right way.
    - ii. It can influence how we allocate funds to make sure we're supporting our goals appropriately and how that plan is approved.
3. Principal King presented some potential Academic Goals for the 2023-2024 Land Trust Plan to the members of the SCC.
- a. Goals focused on proficiency pieces
  - b. Show growth across the spectrum, but really big bang for buck for ESL students
  - c. Brittany asks, "how does this longevity affect goals (turnover, retention)?"
    - i. Principal King, very low turnover in Viewmont, pretty stable with lots of veteran teachers

- d. Mike asks, with aggressive goals, is the thinking this will raise up all groups including ELL and lower 25%?
  - i. Principal King stated these goals are a stretch but are also achievable and more tools are becoming available to better understand where students are experiencing gaps.
  - ii. Vangee Watts told SCC how teams do Data Diving to understand ways to go deeper on the subjects that the kids need to
- 4. Principal King shared that Viewmont has been allocated \$80,395 for the 2023-2024 school year. Potential expenditures linked to academic goals for the 2023-2024 Land Trust Plan were discussed by members of the SCC.
- 5. A final *draft* of the proposed 2023-2024 Land Trust plan was approved and voted upon by the members of the SCC to be posted on the school's website for comments. Comments will be discussed at the next meeting and the plan will be voted upon at the March meeting.
  - a. Dan proposed, Vangee seconded to have the draft posted so it can be voted on at the next meeting.
  - b. [Draft Land Trust Plan](#)
- 6. Concerns with regard to the parking lot were discussed.
  - a. Michelle asks about parking lot safety, Principal King has been diligent in posting reminders and asking kids to not walk through cards.
  - b. Brainstorming on ideas for getting people in the right spot and what can be done to help people move the right direction
  - c. Potential to ask kids to come up with a solution as well
- 7. The format for our March 13, 2023 meeting was determined to be in person at Viewmont (in the library).
- 8. A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Principal King . The motion was seconded by Mallory. The motion passed unanimously at 5:05 pm .

**Our next meeting will be held on March 13, 2023.**