**ZHS Continuous School Improvement Leadership Team Meeting-March 27, 2012**

The ZHS Continuous School Improvement Leadership Team formed on Monday, March 12. This group consists of staff members from each curriculum department, the counselor and educational technologist.

We identified that we needed assistance with understanding our school data (PSAT, Terra Nova, and local assessments), developing school-wide interventions and creating and using a local assessment. We requested a team from the DSO, including Jason Debus and the core subject ISS’, to provide a one-day workshop on March 27, 2012.

**We met on March 27th**: Those in attendance included L. J. Corr, Tae Murakoshi, Camilla Hudson, Roger Weinert, Todd Carver, Daisy Fulford, Lee Caroll, Michelle Simmer, Alethea Daniels, Catherine Russell, and Lee Rabine from ZHS. DSO representatives were Jason Debus, Lee Corey, Karen Lund, Clark Ruby

**Part 1**: Determine where we are, how we got here, and whether we should keep the reading goal

1. The question was posed: Where did the goal for improving critical reading come from? How did we arrive at that goal? We discussed using Terra Nova and PSAT scores, initially, to come up with the goals. Next, we looked at the PSAT and Terra Nova scores. The question was posed, How do you know if your intervention strategies are working?
2. Lee Corey stated that our intervention, Word Wall, was more appropriate for reading comprehension that for critical reading. Word walls address vocabulary, supporting reading comprehension, but do little for analysis and synthesis. We discussed whether we really meant our goal to address reading comprehension or critical reading. We looked, again, at the data for the last 4 years and decided that critical reading is what we meant and that the goal is still appropriate, but that we should consider an intervention that more appropriately addresses this. It was noted that we were commended for our Word Wall use, and should not abandon it. Word Walls are effective for vocabulary, but we need to add interventions that more appropriately address critical reading.
3. We spent some time defining data and describing how we can show evidence that our data drives our instruction. We found that data is not only standardized test and school-wide local assessment results, but also includes classroom observations, quizzes, portfolios, etc, that a teacher can point to as a way he/she determines mastery and the direction and pace of instruction. It was important to note that teachers should be able to address how they look at school data, utilize the school-wide interventions within their classrooms and can show student progress.

**Part 2**: Define what we mean by critical reading and how we would assess it

1. We looked at the PSAT definition of critical reading and decided that we liked it, but wanted to use a visual icon that shows the elements of critical reading as they progress toward synthesis and inferences, such as on the Bloom’s Taxonomy scaffold. We arrived at this definition:

Critical reading means that students will be able to understand vocabulary as it is used in context, distinguish between main and supporting ideas, synthesize information, and draw inferences.

The visual Icon might look something like this:

Synthesize information and draw inferences

Distinguish between main and supporting ideas

Students will be able to understand vocabulary as it is used in context

1. Next, we looked at how the Critical Reading elements are assessed on the PSAT. The areas assessed are:

* Determining the meaning of words
* author’s craft
* reasoning and inferencing
* organization of ideas
* understanding literary elements.

We decided that we should use old Terra Nova tests to develop our local assessment for critical reading skills. We set this aside because we needed the old tests in order to pull questions and develop the test. Jason debus will provide us the tests. L.J and Lee will work together to create the test database on exam view.

**Part 3**: Discuss and choose critical reading interventions to recommend to the staff

1. We talked about the fact that we have three experienced AVID teachers who have strategies and skills that would likely address our needs. We decided to look at the AVID resources in the L drive that address critical reading. Our goal was to come up with a list of strategies to present to the staff and have them vote to adopt three as school-wide interventions. Through brainstorming and looking at AVID strategies, we came up with twelve strategies. Upon analysis of these strategies, we narrowed them down to seven. (We spent a lot of time on Socratic Seminar)
2. We decided that we should pair up to present the seven strategies to the staff for vote

Tae and Michelle-One Pager

Alethea and Daisy-Socratic Seminar

Lee R. and Camilla-Big Six

Roger and Catherine-SQ3R

Lee C. and Todd-Problem-Solution Journal

Alethea and Catherine-Chalk Talk

Todd and Michelle-Synthesis Journal

1. We expect the staff to vote today on the top three interventions they would like to use.

**Part 4**: Next steps:

1. Based on our faculty feedback, ID the three school-wide interventions to address critical reading
2. Provide professional development on how to utilize the strategies in each curriculum area
3. Share strategy use and results within departments and the rest of the faculty
4. To ensure appropriate growth of student learning toward our critical reading goal, it is highly encouraged that every teacher use the three school-wide reading strategies more than once per year, but could utilize other strategies (like others from AVID) that they deem appropriate as often as they like. In order to show student growth, teachers should create a classroom portfolio showing how the strategies were used along with examples of student work.
5. Develop a school-wide local assessment (from old PSAT) to address critical reading, to be given in May, 2012
6. At some point, begin work on our writing goal