

**Missouri School Improvement Program
Resource and Process Advisory Committee
Webinar Chat
Meeting #4**

2. are there any half day Kindergartens now?

3.c. drop "EOC" from after Algebra 1

I am concerned that English language arts does not fully explain the importance of reading---by that I mean clarity. Am I wrong?

I got on line late. but are you only talking about the standards headings or does it go to the sub items?

I like the change from reading listed separate from English Language Arts. Reading needs to be integrated into all subjects

So the document sent this morning is just a checklist. I was confused.

Due to all the information regarding physical education and improved health outcomes, why does it still remain at 50 minutes?

Many items that are struckthrough in indicator 1 are statutory. Are you going to make those specific requirements known for districts in another document?

Where will CCSS be included? or the new term Core Academic Standards?

- same question as on the previous standard in reference to Indicator 2 and the struckthrough items.

#6 "post elementary preparation"--- does this only refer to the area of mathematics since Algebra I is listed as an example?

Our approval includes all 7 points?

I think revision is necessary on point 6

I agree on point 6. Needs to be better defined.

Then should the standard say "in the area of mathematics" and take out the example thing out?

point 6: Students will have access to high school level courses. ???

I do not have a great suggestion at this time; I just feel it is vague and the term "post-elementary" is not very clear to me. Probably just me...HA

I agree the term post-elementary is unclear

I agree with _____. It doesn't "look" or "sound" correct. What's post-elementary?

What about "secondary curriculum"?

Revise #6 to say " Students will have access to post-elementary preparation in the area of mathematics."

7th and 8th grade are generally considered secondary curriculums

I like _____ suggestion and then include Algebra or World Language as an example should the half unit of Personal Finance also appear in the desirable standard?

Should Dual Enrollment be added to #6

Why were the names of the CTE courses struck through?

Are all the items in #6 in all schools?

Should embedded credits be addressed here?

I think the personal finance requirement needs to be in the desired column as well
Will students have to take more than one math class in one semester to graduate?
Maybe you addressed this earlier. Is it assumed under "health" that it includes tobacco, alcohol, etc
as to why it is crossed out?

I worry about the type of virtual courses accepted does the language allow students to take multiple
courses in the arts , music and physical education.

on #4 is that one course offering, one credit per year, or what does this mean?

I am struggling with the 35 limit in PE; you have probably sent it, but I would like to see the
research that you addressed.

Are you still going to count courses that are offered every other year for small schools that cannot
afford to offer every advanced course every year? If so, should that be included in the Standard
instead of being an unwritten rule?

Should Dual Enrollment be added to #6

I don't have a problem with the 35 limit in PE, but I question what was different about the research
that supports it and the research that supports class size of 13 to 17 in K-3

I agree with _____ on Dual Enrollment

Is dual enrollment the same as dual credit?

I would like included somewhere the following: "After 2013, if the foundation formula is not fully
funded, it is at the discretion of the district whether the resource and process standards are
followed.

Now may not be the time to submit this request.

There is plenty of research to support the 35 in PE. How do you ensure quality Physical education
and improved health outcomes with moderate to vigorous activity. I do not have a problem with it.

I have not seen research that supports using a paraprofessional to increase class size- the research
I've seen does not support this. Can you share the research base for this?

- does current legislation cover your suggestion or does that provision end in 2012?

Absent supporting research, I request removal of option 1

I am voting to include, but really would like reconsideration of the K-4 class size standards to lower
those numbers. The research is there to support it.

On number 6 forty-five is written out but 35 has been the change in the parenthesis.

I think removal of option 1 could have a huge financial impact on school districts.

I believe it ends after 2013.

What about the reason for reducing PE numbers (which I am fine with) but not reducing desired for
K-3?

The standard numbers seem to be high if we want to achieve what we all say we want to achieve
with our students

With the department focus on increasing preschool, shouldn't pre-school be added to class size
recommendations

Guidance/counseling numbers would go up to what, specifically?

Clean up looks good on standard 7

missing from resource and process standards draft: old process 6.4, instructional resources and
equipment- this should be added as resource standard 12

basically to meet desirable standard you would need to double the number of counseling FTEs -
correct?

Could school psychologist or social worker positions count toward meeting the desirable standard?

In the draft of today is there any change in the standard for #6 counselors?

I am referring to what was "minimum standard"

I have to leave, so here are process standard comments: 7. add systems so it says "inform and adjust
systems, curriculum and instructional practices." 24. "add that meets the seven critical elements
identified by DESE." Missing, should be added: district provides mentoring program Thanks

I understand; however I think we should change to what should be so that when resource standards are again in effect we have the new desired numbers.'

I agree with ____ but apply it to the lower desirable class sizes

I agree with _____ regarding 6.4

I recommend the same changes as I did on counselors

I also support improved standards for reduced class sizes, counselor-student ratios, and building administrator- student ratios.

Does standard 11 need to include "including kindergarten"?

I support reduced class sizes as well but realize reduced state funding makes this difficult.

How about planning time for principals to re-store their sanity? _____, would you vote for that?

Does standard 11 need to also include therapists?

During April and May, yes.

I completely agree with Standard 11 (wish it could be more than 250), but I wonder if we might add the wording "...a minimum average of 250 minutes of scheduled planning..." my thoughts are we see a great deal of "out of the box" ideas in scheduling coming down the pipe...if a teacher had 200 minutes week A and 300 week B (for example). Just a thought...

Our approval includes the bullets under each standard from our last meeting, or from the middle column on our handout? These points are not included in today's attachment.

I am meaning the middle column that was not crossed out.

I am temporarily back, and also need to hear the answer to _____ question

Revise Standard #2 to say . . . "inform and adjust systems, curriculum, and instructional practices."

Is there a need for the word, "guaranteed"?

in standard one?

I agree with _____ idea and I also think guaranteed could be removed

Is "and other tests" necessary in Standard 2?

I agree Guaranteed should be removed- no one can do that!

I feel some of the indicators need some revision in 2009. For the future work of the process standards, I am hoping representation for all school services is included in this process.

"guaranteed and viable" comes DuFour

Sometimes even DuFour is overly optimistic

I agree with _____ and _____---- take out guaranteed in Standard #1

on 6, learning can replace development- you don't need both

I agree with _____, the phrasing now is Professional Learning...I would recommend removing development

Are the proposed process standards from 2009 (middle column from last meeting) that are not included now covered elsewhere?

Do you mean 6 instead of 16 on the third poll

you posted poll question for process standard 16 not 6

I agree....Professional Learning

Yet in most of our districts the term professional development is used most often. It may be helpful to have both for clarity.

I assume if we want a change in wording we should vote Revise on the poll, correct?

Missouri principals, via MASSP, made some specific suggestions regarding some of the sub points.

Where do those proposed edits stand?

Correct. I should have said indicators versus sub points.

Is it not assumed that it is "high quality" on #7?

these are really 7,8, 9 right

Gifted students are at risk of dropping out

I am concerned that "all" will not be quite specific enough for Process Standard 12

agree that more description needs to be included in the descriptors for targeted groups of students
Identifying specific groups of students? (SPED, gifted, etc.)

I meant indicators.

13....change "children" to "students."

I think 13 says children because it includes babies who are not yet students

They may not be the districts students that are in early child hood or PAT programs. for example

15 How about . . . The district complies with all provisions, regulations, adn administrative rules
applicable to each state and or federal program/service implemented.

They have to be "resident" students of the district to participate.

I meant "and"

I agree with _____, those district children become students as they move through the system.

Minor edit - either "all state and federal programs" or "service".

Could wording be cleaned up on #15? The "and services" does not seem to fit as worded.

I think the specific parts of the public will have difficulty applying the word student to babies and
preschoolers, however correct it may be

it is not allowing me to vote

I can't vote on 26

on #13 would "the youth of the district" fit better

Do we need to include "qualitative and/or quantitative" data versus "collect data"?

could that be included in the indicators?

Minor edit - change the "&" to "and" in 17.

I understand the conversations about using the term "children", but the word "youth" conjures up
an older child in my mind...I think "children" is still better

I agree with _____ on the use of children vs. youth

I am happy with children or youth, just think using student would create some barriers we don't
want to create

On #19, does the BofE "manage" the organizational system?

, depends what district you are in? :)

Is the state going to define "ethical"???

#13.. The district's "birth-PK" polpulation will have access.....

Should define "fairness and integrity" too.

I like _____ thoughtful suggestion for #13, it is very clear to all

Back on 18, 19, and 20...I realize as educators what our overarching mission is; however, I struggle
with the phrasing "...ensures achievement and success.." can we really ensure success; I think we
ensure access and availability...just a thought

has a good idea for describing the population that "children" is referring to in Standard 13

Standard 22 either has a typo or "the" before students in the last line needs to be removed. Is it
supposed to say "their"?

22 - Not sure how to change the wording but I don't like it.

Maybe take out "the" at the end and just say "welfare of students"??

, on a seperate note with the r

-- would be better to move organization to the front of the list--- "with organizations, state and
local agencies that have responsibility..."

#23..... delete "for all students."

I think to protect the special populations that we have that are taught by specialists (special
education, gifted, ELL, etc.) the term "for all students" should be maintained in #23.

Sorry, I accidentally hit enter before I finished typing: _____, on a seperate note with
regards to the resource standards...I would like the State to develop a committee to review the
concept of seat-time with the awarding of credits and would be willing to sit on that committee

Suggestion to add a standard: District provides a mentoring program for all new teachers. I know this was previously an indicator, but it is important enough to be a stand alone
MASSP would join Justin on that committee about seat time
Wh regard to seat time, I would love for that committee to be formed as well
... did a great job. I would like to send some recommendations for the indicators that will follow the process standards. Can I e-mail these? Would they be added for review and feedback?
I also would be very interested to be a part of that seat time committee if it can be formed. Great idea!
and all...please feel free to continue to send us your recommendations and we will share them with the smaller committee!
Thanks for involving me in this process. I would love to be a part of the seat time committee.
I like the idea of adding the mentoring program as a stand alone. It's too easy to ignore the qualitative value of mentoring if not stressed
Are we talking about mentoring for teachers alone or for others including administrative staff?
I was specifically thinking about mentoring for teachers but also like the others including admin staff.
my thoughts were of particularly the first year admin
It looks like that most of the conversation has ended. Again thank you for participating.
