

## Ludlow Taylor LSAT Meeting

**Date:** 10/17/24

**Time:** 6:30 pm

**Location:** Zoom

**In Attendance:** Penelope Miller (Principal); Beth Ward-O'Connor (Parent Rep, Co-Chair); Channing Cooper (Teacher Rep, Co-Chair); Elisabeth Golub (Teacher Rep, Secretary); LaQuontinesha Atchinson (WTU Building Rep); Yakeema Blackstone (Teacher Rep); Chris Hanley (PTO Co-President); Michelle Lerner (Parent Rep). Approximately 16 other teachers/parents/community members present at any given time

### Planned Agenda

1. Arrivals, hellos + approval of old minutes **[5 minutes]**
2. \* Data Analysis **[40 minutes]**
  - DC CAPE [20 minutes]
  - iReady/DIBELS [20 minutes]
3. Staffing updates **[5 minutes]**
4. Ludlow-Taylor Addition Project **[5 minutes]**
5. Questions from non-LSAT members/AOB **[10 minutes]**
6. Device (i.e., tablet) shortages [5 minutes]

### Meeting Notes (**action items in red**)

#### 1. Arrivals, hellos

- LSAT members on the call introduced themselves

#### 2. \*Data Analysis

##### DC CAPE

- Dr Miller began talking about the data slides. She explained the test name changed from PARCC to DCCAPE. The main difference is that the written responses on the test are now scored by DC teachers. Dr. Miller noted that LT saw declines in ELA & Math. In ELA, the school's overall scores dropped 3 points. **Slide 4** broke down the ELA data by grade level and subclaim (Literary Text, Informational Text, Vocabulary, Written Expression, Use of Language). Written Expression and Vocabulary were pretty solid. A parent asked a question about Written Expression vs Use of Language. Dr. Miller responded that Written Expression was more about demonstrating comprehension of the text, while Use of Language was more like language conventions.
- Dr. Miller continued talking about the data presented on **Slide 5**, which broke the historical data down by cohort. She noted that there was

some variability across years & cohorts, and scores were stronger for ELA. In speaking about the discrepancy between Math & ELA, Dr. Miller speculated that the “3-classroom model” might be helpful; 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> grade students generally have a reading teacher, a writing teacher, and a math teacher, meaning they are getting more teaching time in ELA subject areas. Dr. Miller added that there was a dip in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade scores last year (2023-2024 school year), and that the school was looking into understanding this better.

- A parent rep asked if there was any data indicating if DCCAPE/PARCC scores were predictive of future success. Another parent rep responded that DCPS uses the language of test scores as an indicator of “college readiness.”
- A teacher rep asked whether school leadership has investigated whether access to 1:1 technology has impacted test scores. Dr. Miller noted that student technology was an upcoming agenda item. She said that there is data showing that time using the I-Ready lessons leads to higher i-ready scores at the end of the year. She added that the device ratio for the younger grades is 3:1, and the school is close to that. She stated that the school is currently trying to cycle out old devices to increase the number of devices for the upper grades.
- Parent co-Chair spoke about the data on **Slide 6**. The data comes from publicly available test data collected by the organization Empower Ed from all DCPS schools. She stated that the takeaway from this data is actually pretty promising—Ludlow is doing pretty well supporting ELA achievement compared with other schools.
- Dr. Miller continued to discuss **Slide 7**, which presented the ELA DCCAPE data by subgroup. Dr. Miller noted the school has a clear achievement gap when looking at the subgroup data. In thinking about this gap, her priority is ensuring that all students have access to great Tier 1 instruction. For students receiving special education services, she wants to make sure that they are getting intervention that is aligned to Tier 1 instruction. A parent rep asked if “Tier 1” refers to “normal school instruction.” Dr. Miller responded yes—Tier 1 refers to the utilizing curricula that we have to teach the content and the standards.

- A teacher rep asked Dr. Miller when the school was going to be acting on the achievement gap shown in this data. Dr. Miller replied that teachers should be implementing needs-based small groups, using the interventions that we have. She went on to say that school leadership and teachers need to look at data, not just curriculum. Dr. Miller described a new structure teachers & coaches are using this year of alternating between Data & Planning meetings. She stated that last year the school did a good job facilitating planning meetings, but that we didn't utilize data meetings as effectively as we could have.
- Parent co-chair moved on to **Slide 8**, which suggests LT is average or slightly below average when it comes to supporting ELA results for economically disadvantaged students.
- Dr. Miller moved on to discussing **Slide 9**, which presented math DCCAPE data by grade and subclaim. 5<sup>th</sup> grade was the one grade that saw an increase over previous scores. Dr. Miller reiterated that one of the factors the leadership team is looking into is how the 2-to-1 ELA-to-Math model might be affecting math scores. She added that we also have a part-time math interventionist this year as well as the Bridges math intervention, which is available to classroom teachers.
- Parent Co-Chair moved on to talk about **Slides 10 & 11**, which presented historical and cohort data for Math DCCAPE, and then shows how LT compares with other DCPS schools (the Empower Ed data). It's not a "great" story, though LT does better than DCPS schools overall. The subgroup data for math (**Slide 12**) is concerning. Dr. Miller noted that the school's I-ready data from last year was stronger. Usually I-ready MOY data is a fairly good predictor for DCCAPE math performance, and last year our I-Ready data suggested we would have done better on DC CAPE.
- Parent co-chair moved on to talk about **Slide 13**, which suggests that LT is doing considerably worse when it comes to supporting math achievement for economically disadvantaged students.
- There was a discussion about takeaways from the DCCAPE data. A teacher asked if it's possible to look more closely at the performance of Black students—for example, can we see how Black students new to LT performed vs students who have been at LT for a while. Dr. Miller

replied that it's a mixed bag. She also stressed the importance of ensuring that any kids who are new to LT get the level of support that they need as quickly as possible. A parent rep noted that this data bears out the focus areas outlined in the CSP.

- Parent co-chair underscored that that the data is not great for economically disadvantaged students. Dr. Miller added a complicating factor is that I-Ready doesn't allow you to sort student data by whether they are economically disadvantaged; we would have to create our out database to see that. A parent rep asked if that's something that a parent committee could help with.
- A teacher rep from a lower grade noted that this data made them think about the impact of missed services over time. For example, after covid, several cohorts of kids missed special education and behavior health services for extended periods of time. The school now has more sped teachers & mental health providers in place, but what is the impact of these missed services.

#### *iReady/DIBELS*

- Dr. Miller moved on to **Slide 15**, which shows K-5 overall ELA I-Ready data from beginning of this year. She explained that what we track in I-Ready data changes overtime. I-ready is a predictor for future success. Once it's the middle of the year, the only kids that we are considering on grade level are in the "slashy green" (green with diagonal black lines shows "on mid-grade level"). Dr. Miller explained that LTs beginning of the year data except K literacy & 1<sup>st</sup> grade math, we are above last year's of proficiency.
- Parent co-chair asked if I-Ready have a way of accounting for not capturing the writing component. Dr. Miller responded that it doesn't, but that the district is stressing Required Curricular Tasks (RCTs) this year, which are additional benchmark assessments with writing components.
- **Slide 16 & 17** show the I-Ready subgroup trends overtime. The dip shown on the slides shows the "switch" from the End of the Year (EOY) data from one school year to the Beginning of the Year (BOY) data from the next school year. The subgroup data for Sped students is lower than we would like, but there was an increase in our BOY data for this group this year.

- **Slides 18-22** show the Dibels data; due to time, Dr. Miller didn't discuss in detail but noted that there was a big jump in the data from first to second grade.
- Dr. Miller moved on to **Slides 23-25**, which display BOY I-Ready math data and subgroup trends over time. Dr Miller notes that BOY proficiency in math is above what we saw last year, but there's not a match with EOY last year and BOY this year for math (while kids seemed to "hold on" to their EOY proficiency levels over the summer, this wasn't the case for math. A parent shared that this trend made sense since kids may be more likely to read over the summer as opposed to work on math skills. **Heading into this summer (2025), how the school and parents support sustained attention to math skills over the summer?**
- A parent rep noted that this math data was also in line with national data showing that learning loss during the pandemic was more significant to math. The rep shared two questions/charges for the group. (1) for Dr. Miller: Given that the LSAT plays an advisory role, what are the systems that can be built so that data can be used efficiently by the school. (2) for the LSAT as a whole: since there is so much data, and that it can require a certain level of expertise to analyze, maybe we can pick one question/area to look at in the data throughout the year.
- Dr Miller replied that for the first of these questions, it's important that we understand what the gaps are and target those gaps. What has been proven to work, understanding what kids need and then utilizing the curriculum to meet those needs. When there are students who the data indicates are not proficient, what do we do?
- The parent co-chair raised the question: what if what the kids "in red" need is different than what the kids "in green" need. Dr. Miller gave an example of what that kind of differentiation/use of needs-based small groups might look like in a 3<sup>rd</sup> grade classroom working on beginning multiplication skills.

### 3. Staffing updates (Slide 29-32)

- Dr. Miller stated that the school is still looking to hire an additional inclusion sped teacher. She said that all students who have IEPs are getting services, but not necessarily what level of services (ie what % of their service hours). She can't speak to what percentage of services are being met. She stated that Ms. Watson had reached out to all the families of students who are not getting their full services hours to let them know the situation and alert them to the possibility of seeking compensatory hours for missed services.
- For the first-grade support teacher, Dr. Miller stated that the Instructional Superintendent had approved their funding for that position but they are still hiring for it. In the meantime, Ms. Truss (part-time math interventionist) and Ms. Bowlding (K aide) will be available to support. **Dr. Miller will work to develop a schedule for Ms. Truss & Ms. Bowlding to share with the 1<sup>st</sup> grade team.**
- A parent rep asked a question relating to the large size of the 1<sup>st</sup> grade classes. OSSE released some information indicating LT accepted 1<sup>st</sup> grade students off the lottery waitlist. Dr. Miller stated that this doesn't match what she sees on her end. **Dr. Miller will look into whether lottery spots were opened for 1<sup>st</sup> grade and circle back.** [Update 10/24/24: Per Dr. Miller: "No one enrolled from the lottery after 7/24/2024. I think the interpretation of the website was incorrect noting that we made offers in Oct"]
- Dr. Miller added that the school is still looking to hire a pre-K Aide, as one of the aides (who was actually a long-term sub) has been pulled to sup for a pre-K teacher who is out on parental leave. The school is actively trying to hire but it has been challenging. The school has hired a CES ECE aide; that person is onboarding and should start soon.
- A parent rep noted that the PTO found out Mr. Levy is planning to retire in January, and asked Dr. Miller what the plan was to replace him. Dr. Miller replied that the school has reached out to the hiring specialist & the music department.

#### 4. Ludlow-Taylor Addition Project

- The parent liaison wasn't able to join the meeting tonight, but the information is shown on **Slides 34 & 35**

## 5. Questions from non-LSAT members

- The meeting was overtime, but the parent co-chair noted that they have received multiple questions related to shortages in student devices.
- Dr. Miller stated that K-2 devices should all be in compliance (3:1). A first grade teacher said that this was not the case for their grade level.
- Dr. Miller stated that when devices go out of circulation (ie stop working or break) we need to 525 them (ie fill out a form, return to the warehouse, and request a replacement).
- A 4<sup>th</sup> grade teacher stated that they still don't have enough computers, so what is the plan? Dr. Miller replied that Mr. Barnes, the Manager of Strategy and logistics, has 525ed all non-functioning devices teachers have turned into him, and he has been following up daily. Dr. Miller wasn't sure how many devices Mr. Barnes has 525ed.
- A parent rep asked if this is a problem with central office, and if there is anything parents can do to move it along. Dr. Miller replied that one of the things the school has been told is that it's just taking longer. In the meantime, the school will need to come up with a plan to share devices and make the most of what we have. A teacher asked who's coming up with the plan for sharing computers?
- A parent rep asked if the PTO can purchase additional devices for the school, for example with an earmarked donation to the DC Ed fund. DCPS could give computers to somebody else. The parent stated that they were able to purchase some devices for one of the Kindergarten classes last year.
- One of the PTO co-presidents stated that the PTO was ready to purchase needed devices, but it would be easier to do that as part of Donor's Choose project. **If a teacher writes a Donor's Choose project for the needed, approved computers, the PTO can look for matching offers/circulate among parents/fund.**
- September meeting meetings approved. Meeting Adjourned.