

Educational Leadership Team
August 17-18, 2005
Sugarbush
Minutes

August 17, 2005

Morning Session

Began at 9:00 a.m.

Reflecting and Revisiting

Priorities

1. Referred to the 2004-2005 Leadership Priorities Road Map
2. Discussion about what a priority is
3. The following are attributes of a priority:
 - Universality (connections)
 - Impact on students (“need”)
 - Unfinished business
 - Teacher work/impact
 - Consistency/practice
 - Inertia
 - Institutionalizing/systemic improvement
 - Criticality/capacity (sustainability)
 - Feasibility (learning community/do we have the capacity?)
 - “unified”
 - student-centered
4. Priority attributes to include in 2005
 - Unity (continuing the “we,” as in diverge and converge while staying connected)
 - Unity throughout CCSU
 - Time is needed as a resource
 - Alignment with vision/mission
 - Setting priority, assessing priorities
 - Assessing current status
 - Benchmarking success
 - Asking: is the priority S.M.A.R.T.?
 - Readiness
 - Continuum
 - Creating a structure for priorities
5. Discussion about keeping everyone together
 - Keeping the uniqueness of schools while maintaining unity throughout CCSU

6. Discussion about how to set priorities

The following is a list of what is necessary to set priorities:

- Design
- Structure
- Communication framework
- Managing change
- Recognizing skills
- Setting parameters for honesty/communication (community)
- Lead and connect
- “Rules of Engagement” for the team
- Team development, maintenance and sustainability

Communication

7. The possibility of starting a survey was discussed. This would be an internal team survey. Everyone would come up with a question/concern. The question would be pulled randomly and would be voluntarily answered. This is an idea of how to communicate certain topics to one another.

8. Following the theme of communication and being able to freely discuss any issues with each other, the issue of Paul O’Brian, Deb. Robbins and Brian Donahue not being able to vote last year was brought up as an example of a “team with lines.” This led into a discussion about “Challenging the Chain of Command” (i.e. crossing the team lines).

Topics brought up were:

- Who does the Chain of Command include?
- How does the team work with Chain?
- Who facilitates what?
- Establishing a resolution of issues brought up during meetings is necessary
- The team needs to acknowledge strengths and weaknesses
- The lines of dialogue need to open
- Team members need to establish their voice
- Intentionality needs to be created
- The issue of responsibility and relationship to one another was raised
- Team needs to freely communicate with one another
- Everyone needs to be present

Mid-morning Break

Session resumed at 11:00 a.m.

Rules of Engagement

Discussed team “Rules of Engagement”

1. The following were listed as basic rules the team should follow:

- Come welcomed
- Be present and participate

- Watch body language and pay attention
- Avoid multi-tasking at meetings
- Avoid emotionally-loaded e-mails when not at meetings
- Recognize what skills are lacking
- Have feedback after meetings
- Use the “Seven Principles of a Responsive Classroom”
- Start/stay on time
- Be efficient
- Respect and communicate with one another
- Have accountability
- Establish trust

2. A discussion about the CCSU as a team first and a group of individuals second occurred. It was stated that the feeling of being a “team player” needs to be established. It was also mentioned CCSU has an advantage in that all resources are readily available to CCSU administration, whereas principals are isolated/individualized. An example of principal isolation is when it appears decisions are made without any group discussions. There is a need to have standing decisions (i.e. decisions should not be changed once a meeting has ended). In addition to this, closure of meetings need to occur.

3. The need to form a structure for group decision-making led to a discussion, led by Kathy Finck, about the CTE decision making model. She outlined the CTE model as follows: several teams made up of all staff members (including support staff) are formed, each team works together on a specific topic (there is no duplication of any topic), each team has a representative to discuss any decisions the team made, these representatives speak with the CTE administration.

Trust

4. This led into a discussion about site-based management versus collaboration. There was a question about whose decision is what?

5. A discussion about the issue of trust followed. It was established that trust is the foundation of decisions, relationships and everything else. The question about “whose decision is it?” once again surfaced. There is a need for communication to establish trust. There was also a question about how the team should discuss the “undiscussables.”

6. This led to a discussion regarding how a decision is to be made. There is a necessity to know at the beginning of a meeting that a decision has to be made and establish who is going to make said decision. Thus, a decision-making model needs to be established.

7. There was a discussion about what the role of the Central Office is. Does CCSU provide service to the principals or vice-versa? There was some discussion about how CCSU needs to manage rather than putting more work on schools.

8. There is a need to have more open discussions with one another. This led into a small discussion using an example about what principals are supposed to do with four hours of PowerPoint training with their staff.

9. This served as an example of the feeling of ownership of schools versus the feeling of community. It was a discussion using the terminology *my* school versus *our* school.

Mission and Vision

10. There is a need to refocus on the mission statement: what did everyone sign on to?

- Focused on the serve and support, collaboration/leadership model
- Visited the issue of communication among team members

11. The vision statement was a consent decision made on June 22, 2005. The changes were affirmed through a consent-decision-making process. Now, the team needs to revisit the vision and think about what it means to them and the supervisory union.

Lunch Break

Session resumed at 2:00 p.m.

Team Roles

1. Referred to “Managing Complex Change”

Questions raised were:

- What are the roles of CCSU and the schools?
- Who communicates?
- Who makes the decisions?
- How is a team made? (i.e. relationship dynamics among team members)

2. The role of CCSU

- CCSU plays a supervisory role. But, is CCSU role to serve the principal?
- Who is accountable?
- There is a need to have rules and roles for the team to function efficiently
- Everyone needs to have a share in the team

3. There was a discussion about responsibility. It was said that there are two forms of responsibility: team responsibility and individual responsibility. The question raised here was the question of “whose job is it?”

4. A discussion about using “The Seven Principles of a Responsive Classroom” as a framework for the team ensued.

5. A discussion referencing [Boldman and Dheil](#) followed. These are frames through which every employee in an organization views the organization. The frames include: political, structural, social and human. These frames can change and it is up to the organization to pay attention to the frames in order to increase communication and efficiency.

6. This led into a discussion about the [Meyers Briggs](#) test.
- Within the framework, where does the learning community fall?
 - The learning community may not necessarily fit into a frame
 - It may be an evolution of a frame.

Team Goal

GOAL: Have full collaboration with one another and embrace all frames. To reach the goal, the team needs to maintain consistency in both structure and meeting time.

7. Obstacles

- Everyone works hard to create a unified leadership team but CCSU seems to have more opportunity to work, research and focus on a decision than principals. Essentially, everyone goes back to their own “community.”
- There are presumptions made about the way issues should be handled, leading to decisions made without complete group consent.
- There are frustrations about leadership shown on site-based issues and not on a macro-level.

Communication Resources

8. There was a discussion about the variety of resources for various schools. Discussion points included:

- Different schools have slightly different decision-making rights for their own schools (there are different decision-making methods between schools)
- There is a need to be able to communicate issues quickly
 - Elementary and middle schools need more communication lines as they are part of a “system” of resources.
- There is an untimely response by CCSU to issues going on in the schools.
 - There is a concern that there are unrealistic expectations on the school level.
- There is a need to determine how to pursue relevant issues

The Vision Statement Revisited

9. There was a lengthy discussion about the SU’s vision statement. Discussion points included:

- The vision statement represents a lot of change for the entire district
- Implementing the vision requires the use of everyone
- The vision statement should be embraced by all schools (how should this be done?)
- What should the leadership team do with the vision statement?

Mike’s Report Card for the Leadership Team

Frequency in meetings	A
Attendance/punctuality	B+
Respect for perspectives	A
Use of task teams	C-/D+

Availability of agendas/materials	A+
Commitment to agendas for meetings	A
Use of decision-making models	A
Accountability of the group	B

10. Items to be added to the report card should include (but not limited to) the following:

- Communications outreach to the field (would receive a low score)
- Loyalty
- Working together
- Keeping sight of the vision statement

11. The report card led into a discussion about the need to use available tools to maximize the team's efficiency and effectiveness. In addition, it was stated there is a need to benchmark a decision-making model identifying decision points on agendas and stating who needs to make decisions.

12. **SUGGESTION:** Whenever a principal makes an announcement to the school, a CCSU administrator should be present as a partner. This will reinforce the theme of teamwork and making connections.

PowerPoint Presentation: "The Role of the Central Office"

13. A discussion about what the cultural "norms" between CCSU and the schools. A list of cultural "norms" was thought up and is as follows:

- School calendar
- Budget
- Vision statement
- Community support
- Professionalism within the system
- Recognition of the importance of transition for children
- Adult-centered
- An over-expectation that all students will progress to college
- Sports
- Arts
- High achievement
- Sense of school identity
- An assumption that more money exists
- Abundant in resources
- An assumption that everyone is white and middle-class
- Know the students
- Veteran staff

14. From this list, the group decided there needs to be tight leadership. In addition, carefully defined parameters and policy governance must be established.

15. Discussion about developing a learning culture. Decisions made must be measured against impact on student learning (how is this intended to improve/support learning?) In order for things to be meaningful, context and priorities need to be established. There needs to be a point where everyone uses the same language and resources.

Collaboration

16. Collaboration versus cooperation. There was a discussion about the idea of releasing teachers from being in the school classrooms to collaborate to forward learning organization. Collaboration is the sharing of work with active participation while cooperation is passive compliance. Is there a one-team approach?

17. Products of collaboration thus far:

- Design of in-service
- School calendar
- Monday meeting schedule

18. How can the leadership team make all their discussions meaningful for teachers in the classroom?

- Create leadership roles for teachers
- Set guidelines and establish expectations
- Tighten rules, roles and responsibilities
- Create time to team
- Maintain consistency

19. Improvements need to be measured in results.

- Develop S.M.A.R.T. goals
- Develop goals on individual needs

Dinner Break

Session resumed at 8:15 p.m.

Evening Agenda Items:

- “Seven Principles of a Responsive Classroom”
- Review 2004-2005 priority status
- Review the process for those wanting to work on core, contributing, complimentary

1. Principles of Engagement

- Use the “Seven Principles of a Responsive Classroom” as a measure of the teams own dynamics
- The principles are not personal, unique or discrete
- Hold the team and everyone in it to the principles
- Make the principles/practices explicitly acknowledged

2. 2004-2005 Priorities Achieved

Strands

Positive Learning Environment

- SAP Task Team identify PLE data services
- New FEST process and improvement to survey results
- 35 teachers participated in responsive classroom training
- R.E.S.P.E.C.T (ADL)
- School-wide meetings established
- Levels of behavior (Summit)
- Environmental scan of student support services
- Nightingale program established at Fleming
- Pilot curriculum (ADL)
- Parent and student surveys (ADL)

Literacy

- Writing notebook of strategies (CTE)
- Fluency project (ADL)
- Read and grow classes (EHS)
- Painted essay II training
- Literacy assessments (k-8)
- Writing course participation
- Strand team identified (PD road map)
- Five people in LLI
- Project Vermont Reads

Math

- Explicit expectations
- Journals used and implemented
- Units tracked
- Strand team identified/road map PD
- Pre/post accuplacer math testing (10 programs CTE)

Enterprise Project

- Sunguard went live July 1, 2005
- School trainings
- HR payroll in process for Jan. 1, 2006 implementation
- All Fleming staff used Sunguard for all ordering for '05-'06

Content, Context and Process

Danielson Framework

- Goals for all teachers, end-of-year report for each teacher (CTE)
- Administration consultation (evaluations completed at high school)
- CC/SD requirements melded with mentoring (reducing burden)
- S&E evaluation audit-reconciliation with rosters (developed database tracking system)
- Pathwise training/collaboration

Data Analysis/Embedded Technology

- POA and Gates test data

- Technical audit at the high school
- Safe Schools data collection
- SASI/Crystal Report format for aggregate/disaggregate
- S.M.A.R.T. Board training
- How-to-Master available on-line
- CTE/EHS joint in-service April 28, 2005
- SAP team using data to guide improvement plan areas for action plans

Budget Development

- New process emerging (Board-Community-Schools)
- Defined core, contributing and complementary and began process with the Ed. Leadership Team and SU Board collaboration
- IEP Service Page audit (partial) for para-educator resource allocation
- Defined expectations and guidance for consolidated grants
- Continuous improvement plan to identify seven connected resources to action steps to CFG investment strategies
- New software allows administrators to view the budget in real time in Sunguard

Additional Major Accomplishments

- Breakfast
- Full-day kindergarten
- Pre-school
- Common calendar
- CCSU technology team/plan
- CCSU student handbook
- May 23, 2005 Pillars of Planning
- CCSU staff PD Development Plan
- Identified Educational Leadership Meeting Structure
- Task teams: SAP, S&E
- Mandatory training materials
- \$450,000 construction projects (EJ)
- RTA, UUSC, ONECampus Plan
- OnePlan Plan
- Science curriculum
- SS cast reuse L.A. curriculum
- Hiring
- Leadership management calendar

Comment about priorities

Student-impact on learning needs to be substantiated on each item for the list above

3. Two handouts: “The Fork Debate” and “Future Framing: Core, Contributing and Complimentary”

4. “Future Framing” discussion. Future framing establishes a structure for all schools to better understand how to allocate time, how many students are impacted and everything needed to know to establish core, contributing and complimentary. There is a need to

establish what topic goes into what category (i.e. is it core, contributing or complimentary?). Teachers should be invited to comment on this at the community meeting.

5. Governance discussed.

- Calendar items
 - Preliminary draft to go to the SU Board, then to the local board, then the Pillars of Planning, then to the public
 - What does organizational interface look like?
- GE-driven curricular pieces
 - Core areas of academic study for all students (all students have access to core classes)
 - Students can revisit elective courses
 - GE's are a metamodel for teachers to help students reach a certain level of proficiency in a subject

Break until August 18, 2005

August 18, 2005

Session began at 8:00 a.m.

1. Read "The Dot" and [poetry \("Giraffes Can't Dance"\)](#).
2. "The Fork Debate" discussion. Learn and identify the "little things" before they turn into the "big things."

**"Seven Principles of a Responsive Classroom"

3. "Seven Principles of a Responsive Classroom": using this as a framework for the educational leadership team.

**Mike made a motion to adopt the "Seven Principles of a Responsive Classroom" with Linda Keating adopting them in a format applicable to the Educational Leadership Team. In the meantime, the team will use their understanding of the "Seven Principles" from discussions on 8-17-05.

(Principles of Engagement as discussed 8-17-05)

- Use the "Seven Principles of a Responsive Classroom" as a measure of the team's own dynamics
- The principles are not personal, unique or discrete
- Hold the team and everyone in it to the principles
- Make the principles/practices explicitly acknowledged

Ed Wilkins seconded the motion.

Point of clarification: "make explicit" means the principles apply to the current team. In re-writing the principles, Linda would use language from the PLC. She can make changes without losing the responsive classroom and its approach to working with each other.

**Dan Ryan made a motion to make the amendment to rewrite the principles. Mike stated Linda will already do this.

**Judy Prince asked the team to vote in favor of the redrafting of the “Seven Principles of a Responsive Classroom” as principles of operation.

**Motion passes 14-0.

On today’s agenda:

- Brainstorming and mapping priorities
- Align those priorities with the board presentation
- Future framing: next steps
- Collaborating leadership in the learning community to prepare ESS

Priority Mapping

4. There was a lengthy discussion about priorities

- Using charts: looking at past priorities to establish new ones
- Looking at priorities in the action plan
- Looking toward continual improvement at curricula
- Need to prioritize data and use it in classrooms
- The Strands
 - The role of the Educational Leadership Team may be to influence teacher leadership
 - A S.M.A.R.T. goal could be that each administrator would work with a particular strand and brainstorm with a particular group about data sources
- Recognize how long change takes to occur
 - Data source and communication about the work: connecting to the strands are important
- Comprehensive plan is the framework for setting priorities
 - Priorities need to be around how to use the administrators leadership skills

5. Reviewed Erin’s ven diagram

- What are the areas to be focused on?
- Everyone may have a role in deciding what overlaps
- Diagram shows what OnePlan Plan means for people in the schools and schools themselves (making connections)

6. OnePlan Plan/Action Plan

- Who is the audience of OnePlan Plan?
- How is OnePlan Plan accessible to everyone?
- There is concern about showing the plan without strong representation of the “big picture”
- There needs to be consensus about the big picture before OnePlan Plan is presented to a larger audience
- The mission and vision may be the only statements to articulate to an audience
- The leadership team needs to fully understand the plan
- The leadership team is still using 2004-2005 plan which has not been revisited or replaced

- The action plan binder can serve as a framework for a current action plan
- There is a need to use more data in informing the action plan
- Being without an action plan has a trickle-down effect as the staff used the action plan to frame and guide their professional goals for the year
- There is a need to take individual school action plans, look at a comprehensive action plan and fit schools into the comprehensive plan
- Current school action plans may be dated
- There is concern about the need to make a connection between school action plans and a comprehensive plan
- It has been recommended that those who do the comprehensive plan collect and review data for a year as to establish goal development
 - It already took one year to identify data sources without prioritization
 - The next step is to use technology to better understand the data
 - Data analysis must be school-led
 - For teachers to establish goals, there is a need for a local school action plan as the comprehensive plan is not yet finished

7. Comprehensive Action Plan

- The area missing is the integration of technology
- It may be beneficial to begin with aggregate data
- Constructing/deconstructing data using school data
- Use SmartMonkey for each school to collect data
- Collaborative responsibility column shows the bigger picture and is a refinement of curricula

8. Federal/Local Money

- Consolidated government investment: the federal money Linda is using is to ensure everything is happening within a strand institute
- There is a need to look at the declining trend in federal money and how to plan for the long-term (strand institutes)
- Resource allocation: how to allocate resources for core, contributing and complimentary
- Local money: personnel, how much of the money is already spent

9. Action Plan

- Things not yet included the action plan: board goals, technical plan, Title 3, ESL piece
- The action plan shows how everything is all connected (i.e. auditing)
- Internal assertion of priorities (issues raised earlier)
 - What to do around the action plan
 - Closure and communication (connectivity)
 - How can the leadership team ensure equity among teachers in terms of dissemination of the action plan?
- Leadership priorities should connect with the action plan

- Would it be beneficial to put out OnePlan Plan without its title to serve as an entry point for OnePlan Plan?

ADL Example and How it can Apply to the Educational Leadership Team

10. This item was brought up by Ed. Wilkins showing how ADL functions. It could possibly be applied to the Educational Leadership Team:

Leadership team

- CCSU mission/vision/definitions
- 10 areas, NCLB, CCSU, CIP (can talk about the leadership team's focus and enterprise)
- Use the 2004-2005 action plan, ADL, SAP (review assessment data)
- Teacher goals for the evaluation process

Structure

- S.M.A.R.T.
- Danielson Domain
- New content strands
- "Seven Principles of a Responsive Classroom"
- SAP-content (have goals set to these structures)

This example shows the fundamental commonalities to bring about a certain discourse and impact on practice

Is it possible to establish educational leadership priorities using the ADL framework?

- The CCSU mission and vision statements need to be incorporated as well as representation of the 10 areas (NCLB)

CCSU Mission and Vision, Connecting

11. There was discussion in regards to the readiness of the educational leadership team following the mission and vision statement.

- Is the mission and vision ready to be brought to the public?
- Is the educational leadership team ready to follow the mission and vision?
- The plan is connecting leadership and connecting the SU to schools
- The vision is embedded throughout the entire plan
- It seems as if most teachers are connecting on their own
- What is connect and lead?
 - Is there a shift from serve and support to connect and lead?
- The Educational Leadership Team can expand by modeling, over time, the shift from serve and support to connect and lead
- The CCSU needs to commit to be a part of the work at the school level
- The school administrators can invite various members of the CCSU to their schools in an effort to bridge the gap between the leadership team
- There is a need to improve feedback between the action plan team and CCSU
- Incorporate a walk-through to go through the action plan
- There should be a standing task of when the school action plan team will meet
- Form training models around S.M.A.R.T. goals and walk-throughs
 - Establish a S.M.A.R.T. goal training and a series of training days for walk-throughs

12. Needs in Regard to Accomplishing the Action Plan

- Administrative training
- Establish training topics
- Learn facilitation skills

**Decision Points

1. Mission/vision identified as things truly embraced
 - By the end of the in-service cycle, teachers will have been shown this
 - Talk about the mission/vision with staff
 - Have definitions/examples of how the mission statement works
2. Identify areas connecting teachers to work
 - The principals will talk about the 10 areas without identifying them on the comprehensive continuous improvement plan
 - Integration of educational technology needs to be established by the team (the “11th point”)
3. Use the 2004-2005 plans to be integrated as action steps toward the 2005-2006 plans
 - Needs to be aligned with the 10 areas
4. Teacher Evaluation Goals
 - S.M.A.R.T. goal (training): using S.M.A.R.T. goal framework
 - Danielson work
 - Show how the strands connect to the action plan
5. “Seven Principles)
 - Begin to use these principles among the educational leadership team

Need Closure

- Is there a way to memorialize what has been done?

**Pat Hartnett and Erin Maguire will help memorialize the decisions and five points

Break

Session resumed at 11:10 a.m.

13. Erin’s Presentation

- Work around student support services, the pyramid of intervention and work of schools in terms of student support
- Refer to the ven diagram
 - This represents the way to make connections between the continual improvement plan and professional development to leadership at work

Slide 2:

- A conversation regarding LRE needs to occur

Slide 3:

- These items are things to look at to make decisions for the future of the schools/SU
- There are two sections: measurable (capacity, audit) and non-measurable/hard to measure

- Add these items to the measurable list:
 - Checklist/audit of evaluation done on children and selection of assessments accessed
 - Evaluation planning team
 - Support for professional conducting evaluations to verify appropriate evaluations are being selected and are getting to the heart of the student's needs
 - Most current tools/research

Slide 4:

- Building a resource allocation model
- History versus needs assessment

Slide 5:

- Important to define standing educational support system
- This is the driver behind the pyramid of intervention

Slide 6:

- The Pyramid of Intervention is introduced

Slide 7-9:

- Components of concern:
 - LEA: concern about the ability to establish a common decision-making process within the IEP system developing into support systems for students
 - There may be inconsistent decisions about student support
 - There needs to be consistency and better understanding about 504
 - Curriculum: could there be a life skills curriculum? Maybe take existing curriculum/standards and craft it toward student needs
 - Case load: preK-8 versus high school numbers (preK-8 has nine cases while high school has 31)
 - Inclusion: push-in model of delivery
- Recommend the book "Creating an Inclusive School" second edition
- Outside placements: numbers of outside placements
 - Some feel there is a need to be more (others feel less) access to outside placements
- FITP: Judy, Mary, Tom and Erin need to have a conversation regarding FITP
- CORE staff time: time schools have allocated to them to count as reimbursable time to support student development
 - Maybe create an intentionality of CORE time
- Need to be intentional about how administration is using people for accountability and sustainability
- Service plans need to evolve
- Unanticipated costs need to be planned for
 - Insurance policy
- Have a reserve fund

Lunch Break

1. Continuing Erin's Presentation

- There is a need for comprehensive intervention lists
- Who can go into the schools to gather information?
- Is it possible to audit every plan to avoid duplication?
- Develop a pyramid for the SU and for schools
- Develop a plan on what to do with failure
- Who watches the data?
- What is the structure to review data?
- Need to systematize and assess intervention

2. Core, Contributing and Complimentary

The following are T-Charts done by the educational leadership affirming and raising concern about core, contributing and complimentary:

The Excel Page

Affirm

- Safe and positive environment
- Equity piece as tied into our world view
- Frequency and duration
- Achievement

Concern

- Limited system span
- Incomplete
- Including “Content (knowledge/skill) GCEs” is premature
- “Assess” is duplicative
- Class size: “optimal serviced”
- SQS requirements and class size are not defined
- Large level of detail (at the educational leadership level)—maybe two tables should exist
- Detail to grade—maybe have grade ranges instead

The Blocks

Affirm

- Reference to NCLB, SQS, Framework, GE’s, CCSU design

Concern

- Instrumental music at EJ is non-core complementary and at Westford it is non-core contributing
- The first section does not have a heading
- Non-core contributing—family and consumer for Westford Middle School is not offered
- Is this listing what is currently offered or sought?
- Health education is not currently offered at EJ (k-5)

- How can tech. and library science/media not be listed under core?
- Concern non-core may be eliminated
- Second language (foreign language) is not included
- It is difficult to have two non-core groups
- Sports is everything for some students
- Should library/media be moved to core?
- Should art and music be moved to core?

Tenants Page

Affirm

- Perspective of full program focus (preK-12/tech)
- Core academic program targets the “What”
- All the students achieve core (the Who)
- The tenants have been thought through
- Technical education is identified

Concern

- Core is prioritized over non-core (conflicts with principle #1 of the “Responsive Classroom”)
- What are the definitions of rigorous and regulatory?
- Rigorous implies that not all courses are rigorous
- There is no evidence of division between regulatory and rigorous
- Core on tenants contradict core on chart
- The term “non-core” should just be “core”
- Not all are tenants, some are definitions
- “How” needs vision-based heading
- Concern over the word “academic” in “core academic contact time” (this could maybe be “core contact time” or “contact time”)
- Need to identify that family involvement is essential to children’s education (this could be made a tenant under

- “maximize our available resources...”)
- Need to identify collaborative network of teachers, mentoring modeling (principle #7); this should be included in “continuously improve...”
- The tenants should cross-reference the “7 Principles,” High Schools That Work, Principles for H.S. (crosswalk all documents)

3. Comments on T-Charts:

After reviewing the three T-charts, several discussion points occurred regarding how the future framing could be improved:

- The T-charts should focus on purposes and non-purposes
- Delta calculation needs to be documented
- Define how the excel spreadsheet applies to all grades
- Apply core, complimentary and contributing by percentages for each class
- Where are electives (H.S.) benchmarked?
- Define core in comparisons between grade and equity of classes (if they cannot always be available)
- Elementary schools will struggle in assigning time and categorizing classes
- Should time be allocated based on what elementary/middle school students will be expected to know in high school?
- Would having block classes per semester be beneficial?

4. The Next Step

- The next step is to update the task team: what are/aren't the deliverables
- The leadership team and other teams need to connect with each other on several issues
- Revise the future framing and use the concerns/questions to reform it
- The task team will develop goals and the goals will be reflected in Pillars of Planning on September 29, 2005
- Need to establish what will be completed by September 29, 2005
- What will be made available to the public?
- Future framing can be contained as a goal going out to the public
- The hope is to fund all of future framing (passing a budget can support this program)
- Look for common language to completely understand the program and what drives it
- How should the public be engaged during the process
 - Does the public need something to respond to?

END