

Present: Luke Coufal, Mike Miller, Kurt Altig, Brandon Myer, Rachelle Haines, Tara Williams, Lonnie Koepke, Amy Taylor, Shelly Scott, Angie Miller, Erica Scheideler, Mary Jane Garner, Kim Jonas, Nikki Altig, Melvina Bundy, Stefanie Edwards, Lisa Phillips

Not Present: Ed Schaaf, Ryan Hogue (both at leadership conference in Kearney), Mr. Bailey (State School Board Conference), Harley Mohlman (NMEA) Mr. Kluender (Tri-M)

- A. Each School Improvement (SI) Committee Chairs reported on the Continuous School Improvement Rubric. One suggestion from the Chairs was to have a session at the next SI day to explain the purpose and how all of these activities fit together.
- Some of the factors that made a difference on how teachers rated the school district were new staff vs seasoned staff, specific words, building levels, specials not trained in programs, communication between steering/data team or administration and rest of staff.
 - It was also felt that we try a lot of new things and more time is needed so we can implement these new things
 - Professional Learning Approach was rated a 2 by one committee & 3 by six committees
 - Professional Learning Implementation was rated a 2 by two committees & 3 by five committees
 - Professional Learning Outcome was rated a 2 by two committees & 3 by five committees
 - Quality Planning Approach was rated a 2 by three committees, 3 by three committees & 4 by one committee
 - Quality Planning Implementation was rated a 2 by three committees & 3 by four committees
 - Quality Planning Outcome was rated a 3 by six committees & 4 by one committee
- B. SI Committee Chairs reported on the AQuESTT activity - a couple of the committees got through their list because either their list was short or they divided into building level groups. 4 of the groups got through 7 items on their list because they worked as a whole group and the amount of discussion that went on. Some of the programs listed could not be worked on due to the fact no one present in the group knew what they were. It was decided that we need to seek out a staff member who could tell us what the program is and its purpose. We also talked about that we never get rid of programs only add programs ("it looks like we are education hoarders") The committee decided it is time to clean house, once the AQuESTT activity has been completed we will look at the data gathered from this exercise especially how we measure it, have building level discussions on the program and make recommendations to the Administration on programs we could let go.

C. SI Committee Chairs shared the list of items already done in the district that addresses our SI goal on comprehension. Some of the items we already do to help with comprehension were on several of the committees list.

Suggestions of what we still need to do to meet our comprehension goal are:

1. Programs that are implemented need to be a K-12 so there is consistency
2. Identify what data we need to look at that will show comprehension
3. Professional development is needed on comprehension strategies and time given to implement them correctly
4. Look at Accelerated Reader usage across the district and ways to monitor it
5. Challenge Higher level students
6. Reading support at High School level
7. Provided differentiated instruction for comprehension (is Professional Development needed)
8. Text Dependant Analysis and Cross-curricular support
9. Additional Write tools training
10. Bring back programs -SRA, Read Naturally,
11. Look into getting IXL for 7-12 we currently have it for K-6
12. Specific written plan with proper and complete training plus time to implement the written plan
13. Move SI full days to Monday so students have consistent instruction the other 4 days of that week. I guess it was also discussed in a SI committee to have full SI days on a Friday.

D. A copy of the Data Plan (plan stating what we have done to implement a systematic procedure for collecting, analyzing, and disseminating data) was handed out to the Steering/Data Committee for them to look at and let Mary Jane know any changes or additions to the plan. We are to have this plan submitted to the Accreditation Office by May 1, 2016. This plan was necessary as a result of our last SI cycle area of needed improvement.