



**DOVER SCHOOL
DISTRICT**

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type:	Special Session #5
Meeting Location:	SAU-Conference Room
Meeting Date:	Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Meeting Time:	6:30 pm

A special session of the Dover School Board was called to order on Tuesday, July 27, 2010, at 6:30 p.m. in the SAU-Conference Room.

- A. ROLL CALL:** Present were Carolyn Mebert, Audra Lurvey, Beth Setear, Kenneth Appel, Audra Lurvey, Doris Grady, and Robert McCrory. Absent was Matt Mayberry.

Also present were; Superintendent Jean Briggs Badger; Deborah Migneault, Dover High School Principal; Kim Stephens, Dover High School Freshman Dean; and James Dupille, Dover High School Dean.

- B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Audra Lurvey led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

- C. CITIZENS' FORUM (LIMITED TO AGENDA ITEMS ONLY):** No one addressed the Board.

- D. SMALLER LEARNING COMMUNITIES CONSORTIUM GRANT:** Principal Migneault discussed the Smaller Learning Communities Consortium Grant to the School Board. Below is a summary of the grant.

Smaller Learning Communities Consortium Briefing

Overview of Proposed Application for Five Years of Funding from the U.S. Department of Education's Smaller Learning Communities Program

Participating Schools

Dover Senior High School (NH), Massabesic High School (ME), Portsmouth High School (NH), Sanford High School (ME), Windham High School (ME).

Applicant and Fiscal Intermediary

Only a single eligible school district can apply for the federal grant. RSU 57 (Massabesic) will be the primary applicant for the grant on behalf of the five-school consortium and will act as the grant's fiscal intermediary.

Potential Grant Award

The consortium will apply for 60 months of funding, and each school is eligible to receive between \$1,750,00–\$2,000,000 in support over the five-year period. The program will distribute \$32,674,540 in awards this year. If the grant is awarded, each school will receive up to \$800,000 for the initial two years of the grant period. After which, the schools can apply for up to three additional years of support at \$400,000 a year; continued funding will be based on progress made during the first two years of the grant.

Grant Administrator, Technical Assistance Provider, and Project Director

The Great Schools Partnership (greatschoolspartnership.org) will act as the grant administrator, overseeing all components of the project and its implementation. GSP is a nationally recognized nonprofit school-support organization that has been administering a five-school SLC consortium in Maine since 2006 and is currently one of three national technical-assistance



**DOVER SCHOOL
DISTRICT**

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type:	Special Session #5
Meeting Location:	SAU-Conference Room
Meeting Date:	Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Meeting Time:	6:30 pm

providers for the federal Smaller Learning Communities Program. In addition to overall coordination, GSP is helping the participating schools design an effective multiyear school-improvement program that is based on effective, research-based strategies. The grant requires that a fulltime project director be assigned to coordinate the implementation, support, grant reporting, and multi-school collaboration—an experienced GSP staff member will assume this role.

Grant Priorities

The Smaller Learning Communities Program has two overarching and non-negotiable priorities for the grant that must be directly addressed in the grant application: schools must (1) create or enhance personalized learning opportunities for all students as part of a comprehensive, school-wide effort to prepare all students to succeed in postsecondary education and careers without the need for remediation, and (2) increase the amount of time given to teachers for planning, collaboration, and professional development focused on improving instructional quality and student performance and outcomes. *Personalized learning* can be defined as any proven school practice that helps teachers know their students better, including identifying specific learning needs and providing specialized instruction to address those needs. In addition, research has shown that when teachers are given more time to plan lessons, work more collaboratively, and take part in high-quality professional learning, school-wide instructional quality improves and students perform better.

Equity and Student Access

Grant funds cannot be used to support learning programs that are based on ability grouping (tracking), placement testing, prerequisites, and/or other selective admissions/enrollment practices. The grant is intended to create equitable learning environments that increase student access to challenging college- and career-preparatory programs.

Target Student Populations

While the grant is focused on improving learning opportunities for all students, the funding will also support programs that will help to counteract the disadvantages of socioeconomic and family background for lower-income, minority, first-generation (no parent holds a college degree), English-language-learner, and special-needs students.

Common Goals

One of the characteristics that sets our five-school school proposal apart (and potentially increases our chances that the application will be awarded) is our multi-district, cross-state collaboration—it is highly likely that the five-school consortium will be the only applicant with these specific characteristics. Therefore, the strength of the proposal rests on the common performance targets we establish for the grant project and the program we design to achieve them. The consortium is proposing the following strategies for the program:

1. Develop and implement a comprehensive system of interventions and academic support designed to meet the learning needs of all students.
2. Create smaller learning community structures or strategies that can provide personalized learning opportunities to more effectively engage and motivate students to meet high standards and raise aspirations. This includes pairing all students with an



**DOVER SCHOOL
DISTRICT**

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type:	Special Session #5
Meeting Location:	SAU-Conference Room
Meeting Date:	Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Meeting Time:	6:30 pm

adult advocate who is actively engaged in helping the student develop a postsecondary plan and design an academic course of study that will lead to the achievement of standards and on-time graduation.

3. Engage all teachers and principals in high-quality job-embedded and cross-school professional development opportunities focused on improving student learning, instructional quality, and school governance. This will include common planning time, regular classroom observations, professional learning groups, and instructional-improvement seminars led by highly skilled practitioners.
4. Align all English, mathematics, social studies, and science courses, curricula, and assessments with the Common Core State Standards (which have been adopted by New Hampshire and will soon be approved by Maine). These standards reflect a challenging, college-preparatory course of study intended to prepare students for success in the 21st century.
5. Involvement of more students in early college and dual-enrollment programs, including Advance Placement and college course-taking as a way to foster a stronger college-going culture, increase college aspirations, and provide additional postsecondary incentives (by allowing students to earn college credits before graduation).
6. Provide technical support and “school coaching.” School coaches are experienced educators who are highly skilled in group facilitation, coordination, school improvement, and research-based instructional strategies. Each school will be assigned a school coach who will establish a knowledgeable, long-term relationship with the school and its faculty, and who will provide technical assistance intended to address the school’s specialized needs and achieve grant-related goals.
7. Strengthen data coordination and analysis as a way to identify student needs more precisely, track ongoing progress (including student outcomes such as college-going rates), and satisfy grant obligations.
8. Create a robust postsecondary planning and preparation program that will ensure students consider future goals when designing their high school course of study, that they have a postsecondary plan in place, and that their parents and teachers are involved in the postsecondary-planning process.
9. Implement redesigned governance structures that distribute grant-leadership responsibilities and increase student, parent, and community involvement in major school decisions. This also includes specialized leadership structures required to execute and satisfy grant obligations.
10. Other strategies being considered include: senior exhibitions and demonstrations of learning (to give students a variety of option for showing what they have learned).

Performance Targets

The grant-supported strategies above are intended to help the five schools achieve the following goals by the end of the grant period:



**DOVER SCHOOL
DISTRICT**

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type:	Special Session #5
Meeting Location:	SAU-Conference Room
Meeting Date:	Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Meeting Time:	6:30 pm

1. By 2015, 95% of first- and second-year students will demonstrate grade-level proficiency on the Common Core State Standards.
2. By 2015, the school will achieve a graduation rate of 90% or higher.
3. By 2015, at least 95% of 2014 graduates will be enrolled in a postsecondary learning experience, and ensure that all students graduate prepared to succeed in challenging postsecondary-degree programs and modern careers without the need for remediation.

Performance Tracking and Reporting

All five schools will track student outcomes in three primary areas: (1) the percentage of students scoring at proficient or above in reading, English language arts, and math as measured by state tests; (2) the percentage of students graduating on time; and (3) the percentage of students enrolling in a postsecondary-degree program in the semester following graduation. This data will be disaggregated by (1) race and ethnicity, (2) special needs, (3) English proficiency, and (4) socioeconomic status to determine learning and outcome gaps.

Consortium Goals

- 1. By September 2015 (the end of year three of funding), 95% of first and second year students will have demonstrated proficiency on the first two years of common core standards in English and math.**

Consortium Objectives

- a) By September 2011, each school will have developed and implemented a comprehensive intervention system to meet the learning needs of first and second year students.
- b) By September 2012, all identified first year students will have participated in the intervention system.
- c) By September 2011, all teachers will be engaged in high-quality, job-embedded professional learning groups focused on student learning and instructional practice including but not limited to differentiated instruction, literacy integration, numeracy integration, and assessment.
- d) By September 2012, all curriculum and classroom-based assessments for English and math courses involving first and second year students will be aligned with the Common Core State Standards.
- e) By September 2014, all curriculum and classroom-based assessments for all courses identified by the Common Core State Standards will be aligned with the Common Core State Standards.
- f) By January 2011, the principal, assistant principals, and at least five teachers in each school will have received training to implement the iWalkthrough system.



**DOVER SCHOOL
DISTRICT**

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type:	Special Session #5
Meeting Location:	SAU-Conference Room
Meeting Date:	Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Meeting Time:	6:30 pm

g) By June 2011, each school will have collected at least 400 iWalkthrough observations. Each school will average 75 iWalkthrough observations monthly September through May for the ensuing four years.

2. By September 2015, each consortium school will increase their graduation rate by 4% each year, beginning in year two, or exceed 90% by 2015.

Consortium Objectives

- a) By September 2011, each school will have designed or refined and implemented small learning community structures that enroll at least 95% of eligible first year students.
- b) By September 2012, each school will have designed or refined and implemented small learning community structures that enrolls at least 95% of eligible 2nd year students.
- c) By September 2014, each school will have designed or refined and implemented smaller learning community structures for third, fourth, and fifth year students that enrolls at least 95% of all eligible third year students.
- d) By September 2015, 100% of all students in each school will be enrolled in a smaller learning community.
- e) By June 2012, each school will experience at least a two percentage point increase in the 4 year graduation rate or have at least a 90% graduation rate.
- f) By June 2013, each school will experience at least a four percentage point increase in the 4 year graduation rate or have at least a 90% graduation rate.
- g) By June 2014, each school experience at least a six percentage point increase in the 4 year graduation rate or have at least a 90% graduation rate.
- h) By June 2015, each school will meet or exceed a 90% graduation rate.
- i) By September 2013, each student will have an adult advocate who is actively engaged in the student's post-secondary plan and necessary plans to graduate.
- j) By September 2012, each school will have reviewed their internal governance structure and added a clear component to increase student voice in school-wide decision-making.
- k) By September 2012, each school will have developed a series of learning options that enable students to engage in credit recovery. In systems employing standards-based graduation requirements, the system will enable students to demonstrate achievement of standards.
- l) By September 2012, 75% of teachers will have participated in at least one cross-school instructional seminar.
- m) By September 2013, 100% of teachers will have participated in at least one cross-school seminar.



**DOVER SCHOOL
DISTRICT**

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type:	Special Session #5
Meeting Location:	SAU-Conference Room
Meeting Date:	Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Meeting Time:	6:30 pm

n) By September 2015, 100% of teachers will have participated in at least two cross-school seminars.

3. By September 2015, at least 90% of graduates from the class of 2014 will have enrolled in a post-secondary experience.

Consortium Objectives

- a) By September 2012, all first and second year students will have created a post-secondary plan.
- b) All students graduating in June 2014 will have completed a post-secondary plan
- c) By September 2013, all third year students will have completed a post-secondary assessment (SAT, Accuplacer, ACT, ASFB, or other appropriate assessment).
- d) All students who graduate in June 2015 will have completed an early college experience.
- e) All students who graduate in June 2015 will have completed a career exploration experience.

Common Strategies

I. Development of smaller learning communities:

At 9th and 10th grades, all schools will establish teams that include the core subject areas of English, math, science, and social studies with 75 – 100 students on each team. Special education teachers, guidance counselors, administrators and other support staff will be integrated onto the team. In 11th and 12th grades, each school will create either themed or non-themed SLC's. Both strategies will equitably distribute students, resources, and support structures. Non-themed SLC's will place students randomly but with assurance to equitable distribution. Themed SLC's are distributed equitably as described above, but will have students grouped by student/parent choice based on common interests and/or ways of learning. These themes may be based on "content" or pedagogy, such as learning through the arts, science and health, technology and engineering, or place-based learning. Regardless of the organizational structure of SLC's in 11th and 12th grade, all students must graduate prepared for post-secondary learning. All first year students will be on teams at the start of year 2 of the grant, all first and second year students will be on teams by the start of year 3, and all students will be on SLC's by the start of year 5. Finally, all schools will create a Memorandum of Understanding to define the autonomy of each SLC.

II. Instructional Seminars

The biggest influence on the learning of students is personalizing the daily quality of instruction in the classroom. We believe the development of SLC's will enable us to ensure the quality of this instruction for every student. To raise this quality, we will use



**DOVER SCHOOL
DISTRICT**

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type:	Special Session #5
Meeting Location:	SAU-Conference Room
Meeting Date:	Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Meeting Time:	6:30 pm

three integrated strategies: 1) three-day, cross-school, content-based, instructional seminars; 2) school-based, site-specific professional development; and 3) professional learning groups (PLG's) for every teacher.

The cross-school seminars and school-based professional development will introduce teachers to new skills and strategies regarding instruction, data-analysis, and organizational design, while the PLG's will support implementation and sharing of these skills and ideas with fellow colleagues. The cross-school seminars will include but not be limited to such strategies as literacy, numeracy, differentiation, and technology integration within specific content areas, and will be co-led by GSP coaches and practicing content area teachers. At least 30% of the members of each school's faculty will participate each year. By September of year 3, 75% of the teachers from each school will have participated in at least one cross-school seminar, and by September of year 5, 100% of the teachers from each school will have participated in at least two seminars. Each school will ensure teacher involvement in these seminars by providing participation time during the teacher day and/or by connecting this process to the teacher goal-setting and evaluation process.

Beyond the seminars, each school will devote at least three, school-wide, professional development days to instructional improvement and the development of SLC's. All teachers will participate in these events. This will provide time and support for teachers to continue improving instructional practice, to adequately learn about and plan for the implementation of SLC's, and to undertake all implementation strategies described in this proposal.

Professional learning experiences for principals will involve cross-school Principals Seminars that meet every 6 weeks for at least 2 hours and are focused on equity, rigor and personalization. GSP school coaches will plan and facilitate these seminars.

All professional learning experiences will be job-embedded – tightly connected to the daily work educators do with students and colleagues, and will be aligned with the Global Best Practices Toolkit from the GSP. All professional learning will use our data-driven Cycle of Action, and will be planned, reflected upon, evaluated, and refined to move our collective efforts forward.¹

III. Professional Learning Groups

Through the creation of PLG's for every teacher, teachers will be able to deeply embed learning from the cross-school seminars directly into actual classroom practice. PLG's will provide the space for teachers to share new learning, find support to implement new ideas, and deepen their practice. We believe the PLG's will enable us to quickly reach a "tipping point" regarding these practices whereby the new ideas become accepted as the way learning happens in each school. Structurally, PLG's will consist of 4-10 teachers and will meet to engage in PLG activities 1-2 times per month for at least 90 minutes each time. All facilitators of these PLG's will receive substantial up-front training and will participate in a Facilitators' Seminar that will provide support and continuous

¹ T. Wagner. "Change as Collaborative Inquiry; A Constructivist Methodology for Reinventing Schools," *Phi Delta Kappan*, March 1998.



**DOVER SCHOOL
DISTRICT**

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type:	Special Session #5
Meeting Location:	SAU-Conference Room
Meeting Date:	Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Meeting Time:	6:30 pm

learning. Facilitators' Seminars will meet monthly at each school and will be co-led by the school coach and the principal. Given the challenges these facilitators are likely to face while facilitating PLG meetings, these monthly Facilitators Seminars will be critical to developing and sustaining high functioning PLG's. To focus our work, each PLG will use a simple action research model focused on personal change in instructional practice. Finally, PLG's will be embedded within existing meeting structures whenever possible, such as team or content area meetings, although they may also meet at other times during the school day. All teachers will be participants in a PLG by the start of year 2.

IV. iWalkthrough

To gauge the impact of this work and further enhance it, each school will monthly conduct at least 75 classroom observations using the iWalkthrough process. Data from these observations will be collected using a web-based database and will be shared regularly with the faculty. The iWalkthrough categories were developed to identify several observable, high-leverage teaching and learning characteristics that cross all grades and content areas. Although the process is simple, the data profile generated over time provides a wealth of information that schools can use to strengthen instruction. See Appendix ### for instructional categories used.

V. School Coach

Each school will have a school coach from the GSP. Recently highlighted in a report² from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Partnership has developed a national reputation over the past 14 years for providing high quality professional development within their school coaching model. The school coach will serve three basic roles: 1) collaborating with the leadership team, principal and school-based project coordinator to oversee, coordinate and implement all aspects of the project; 2) collaborating with school-based and/or outside educators in supporting, planning and facilitating cross-school, content-based instructional seminars; and 3) supporting the development and implementation of multiple PLG's at each school. All school coaches (from across the project) will meet together on a regular basis to facilitate the "cross-pollination" of ideas from schools and coaches. This model will identify needed support across the schools, and is nimble enough to allow for quick response if adjustments are needed regarding professional learning.

VI. COT/Group Leadership Team

The Consortium Oversight Team (explained in Section ###) will be responsible for oversight of project-wide professional learning plans. School leadership teams will create a school professional learning plan coordinated with the project-wide professional learning plan. The leadership team will assist the principal, school-based project

² C. J. Brown et al. Learning to Change: School Coaching for Systemic Reform. Seattle: The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2005.



**DOVER SCHOOL
DISTRICT**

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type:	Special Session #5
Meeting Location:	SAU-Conference Room
Meeting Date:	Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Meeting Time:	6:30 pm

coordinator and school coach, who will have joint responsibility for day-to-day oversight and coordination of this plan.

VII. Data Coordinator

Each school will identify a teacher to serve as a data coordinator for the SLC efforts. The data coordinator will be the school's chief liaison with our evaluator (the Donahue Institute) and coordinate data collection and analysis at the school level. The data coordinator will be a stipended position and will participate as a member on the school leadership team, and as necessary, participate in meetings of the Consortium Oversight Team.

VIII. Evaluation

The University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute (the Institute) will serve as the external third-party evaluator for the project. The Institute collaborated closely with us developing the proposal to ensure that: 1) the goals, objectives, strategies, and outcome measures are appropriate to the project and aligned with the U.S. DOE's grant performance indicators; and, 2) the evaluation is integrated into and responsive to the project plan. The evaluation will be structured to support timely and regular dissemination of project results to diverse SLC stakeholders in the schools and their surrounding communities. The program evaluation will include the collection and analysis of a range of data sources to develop findings regarding each of the project's objectives, and will address the following broad research questions.

Project Implementation Outcomes

- Are all students experiencing a high quality and rigorous college-ready curriculum as a result of the project?
- Are schools utilizing informal and formal data to strengthen those areas of success and make project improvements where necessary?

Intermediary Student Outcomes:

- Are students exhibiting the expected changes in attendance and behavior?
- Are students indicating a greater sense of belonging, autonomy, and engagement?

Academic Student Outcomes:

- Has academic achievement improved for students as a result of the project?

Post-graduation Student Outcomes:

- Are students better prepared for post-secondary education, careers, and life after high school as a result of the project?

The Institute will assume a major role in the analysis of data collected for the Annual Performance Report (APR). These data will be integrated with additional information



**DOVER SCHOOL
DISTRICT**

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type:	Special Session #5
Meeting Location:	SAU-Conference Room
Meeting Date:	Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Meeting Time:	6:30 pm

collected through a range of activities and methods including but not limited to the following:

1. *Classroom Observation Data* – Each school will compile classroom observation data from an ongoing process conducted by each school's leaders, monthly during the Monthly Review Visits conducted by the School Coach and Project Director, and annually during the Annual Review Visit conducted by the Project Oversight Team. In all three cases, these data will be collected through the iWalkthrough process.

2. *Staff and Student Surveys* – Building off existing electronic survey instruments administered by the GSP, evaluators will supplement these surveys with new questions targeting areas related to the impact of program implementation on students and staff. The Institute will work with the Consortium Oversight Team to examine respondent data and assist with the development and dissemination/sharing of findings with individual School Leadership Teams.

3. *High School Alumni Feedback* – The Institute will utilize their web-based High School Alumni Survey to collect and analyze data related to post high school preparation and outcomes of high school graduates. Information collected will address questions such as:

- How informed and prepared were students regarding education and career options?
- What percentage of graduates actually enrolls in postsecondary education, apprenticeships, or advanced training during the semester following graduation?
- What percentage of graduates not pursuing higher education is employed by the end of the first quarter after they graduate?
- What are the major factors in graduates' decisions to continue or drop out of college?
- What suggestions do graduates have for improving education for current HS students?

The data will be collected at the beginning of the project to establish baseline and to help inform the development of 11th and 12th grade SLC's and early college programs, and then annually to compare with baseline.

4. *Longitudinal Study* – A representative sample of approximately 500 students across the 5 schools will be chosen to participate in a longitudinal study over the course of 5 years – beginning in 9th grade and continuing until one year after HS graduation. The goal will be to collect data which can reveal changes in student attitudes, school behaviors, or postsecondary plans that might best be recognized by tracking the same students at different points in time.

5. *Evaluation Visits and Focused In-depth Studies* – Evaluation team members will initiate annual site visits to each high school throughout the grant period and conduct a series of focus groups, individual interviews, document collection and review, or other formal and informal data collection activities. Part of this field research will be to investigate in greater depth areas arising from the APR and on-going data analysis. The Consortium Oversight Team will decide each summer what areas may benefit from further evaluation so that the Institute can develop data collection methods ready to be employed during the following school year.



**DOVER SCHOOL
DISTRICT**

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type:	Special Session #5
Meeting Location:	SAU-Conference Room
Meeting Date:	Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Meeting Time:	6:30 pm

IX. Early College

Many of our current graduates who aspire to college and seem “academically-ready” drop out of college within the first year. First generation students attending college often lack the academic, social, and emotional support structures needed to succeed in college.³ To help address this, by the fourth year of this grant, all students will participate in early college coursework (college courses, AP classes, CLEP classes) while in high school. This will enable the students’ current teachers to support the initial college experience, deal with normal and expected fears and confusion, and better prepare our students for college success, both academically and emotionally. These experiences will enable our students to gain “credit momentum,” having already earned college credits prior to entering college.⁴ College courses will be provided on-site, on-line, using video technology, and/or at a local community college or university that may lead to dual enrollment. Each school has established initial early college connections with multiple institutions of higher education including the University of New Hampshire, Great Bay Community College, the University of Southern Maine, Bates College, York County Community College, and Southern Maine Community Colleges. All of this aligns with previous efforts by the GSP to form state-wide alliances to promote programs that offer college courses to at-risk high school students.

X. Post Secondary Plans

Each student will develop a post secondary learning plan that will coordinate the student’s learning while in the high school in preparation for learning after high school. All students will be adequately prepared to choose to attend college without the need for remedial courses upon graduation from high school. The post secondary plan will start in the first year at the school and continue for the ensuing three to five years until graduation.

XI. College readiness/entry exams (SAT, ACT, Accuplacer, ASFAB)

XII. Internships, Apprenticeships, Job shadowing

XIII. Exhibitions

All students will engage in an in-depth research, investigation, and learning experience during either their third or fourth year in the school. This effort will specifically address research on learning that identifies the need for “expertise” in some area, not to become and expert in that area, but to understand the notion of expertise. These experiences could be melded with early college experiences as well as internships.

XIV. Academic Intervention and Support

Our classroom efforts with differentiation, literacy, numeracy, and technology integration

³ D.Conley. College Knowledge What it Really Takes for Students to Succeed and What We Can Do to Get Them Ready. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005. 113 – 153.

⁴ Lynne Miller. “College Readiness in Writing,” presentation to University of Maine System Trustees, May 28, 2005.



DOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type:	Special Session #5
Meeting Location:	SAU-Conference Room
Meeting Date:	Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Meeting Time:	6:30 pm

will help many more students excel, but where instruction and support alone are not enough, each school will create support structures that will meet student needs and enable them to succeed in their academic courses.⁵ Each school will implement or refine the following strategies: 1) *Academic Support* for all first and/or second year students using team teachers; 2) *Companion Classes* or *Double Classes* in math and/or literacy in the first and second year); 3) *Special Education Integration* (each SLC has special education staff assigned to it); 4) *After-Hours Academic Support* (usually after the school day and/or in the summer); and 5) *Tutors* in English, math, science, and social studies – either students or adults. All of these strategies are currently being used sporadically in one or more schools, but not fully or cohesively in any of them. Our acceleration and intervention strategies will not stop with struggling students. To support students who enter our schools ready to excel academically, each school will implement several acceleration plans including: 1) appropriate *Honors Challenge* options; 2) options to enroll in advanced courses “off-team” while staying within the SLC; and 3) open access to Advanced Placement and other early college learning experiences for each student.⁶

Things to think about:

- Student voice and involvement
- Standards-based Teaching, learning and reporting?

2010/2011	2011/2012	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
Develop Intervention system PLG facilitator training iWalkthrough training 400 obs	All 9 th grade students involved in intervention PLG 75 monthly	All 10 th grade involved In interventions PLG 75 monthly	All 9, 10, 11 PLG 75 monthly	All students PLG 75 monthly

Ms. Migneault explained that the District will know in October if the Dover High School has been awarded the grant. The preparation for the grant would begin in the 2010-2011 school year, with the actual start being the 2011-2012 school year. The program does not need to be administered by a local person. A staff member from Massabesic will be the representative for the five schools.

⁵ William Dagget. 2.

⁶ L. Darling- Hammond. The Right to Learn: A Blueprint for Creating Schools that Work. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997. 96 – 148.



**DOVER SCHOOL
DISTRICT**

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type:	Special Session #5
Meeting Location:	SAU-Conference Room
Meeting Date:	Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Meeting Time:	6:30 pm

Mrs. Grady asked who will pay the administrative fee. Ms. Migneault responded that the fees are deducted from the 1.7-2.0 million that is received over the course of five years. Progress must be made in the program in order to get money in the third year. The standards set in this program are very high, but Ms. Stephens stated that this is a good thing, because that is what the Dover School District is striving for anyway.

Ms. Migneault continued to explain the program stating the administrator for the program will write the grants and annual reports. There will also be a school coach who will serve as a liaison. All expenses including professional development will be paid for out of the grant. Mrs. Grady asked if these workshops would take place during the school day. Ms. Migneault responded that they would be during the school day, as well as other times.

Ms. Stephens stated the program is a good fit for us because we have similar goals, including post secondary success, literacy, standards based assessments, and personalization. She is hopeful this program would help decrease the drop out rate.

Dr. Mebert liked the concept of this program because it aligns well with Dover goals.

Ms. Migneault said that letters of support are needed from the Superintendent of Schools, School Board Chairperson, parents and the leadership team.

Ms. Setear asked if teachers are on board with the program. Ms. Migneault stated that she hadn't spoken with many since it is summer vacation, but the ones to whom she has spoken, have been excited. Peter Driscoll, DHS Social Studies teacher, will be the DHS Coordinator for the program and Gayle Osburn, will be the data support person. They will both do work on this program outside of their work day and will be paid stipends from the grant.

Mrs. Grady asked when Dover High School received news of this program. Ms. Migneault responded that they had heard about it on July 23rd.

Mrs. Grady was concerned that DHS would not be able to back out of the program after being accepted. Ms. Migneault assured her that we would be able to back out if necessary. Mrs. Grady responded that this is a similar program to the Lesley Program from a few years ago and we were unable to get out of that program.

Superintendent Briggs Badger and Dr. Mebert both explained that the Lesley program was a different situation.

Ms. Briggs Badger also asked if Ms. Migneault thought that teachers would be excited. Ms. Migneault responded that she thought they would be and it would be part of Mr. Driscoll's job to excite them. He will be the one to "lead the charge". She also said that she had spoken with the Union representative for Dover High School, who did not give negative feedback.

Mrs. Grady asked if it would be a better situation if we waited a year to start the program. Ms. Migneault responded that the actual program wouldn't start for another year, only the planning period would start this year. Mrs. Grady responded that we have tried program like this before,



**DOVER SCHOOL
DISTRICT**

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type:	Special Session #5
Meeting Location:	SAU-Conference Room
Meeting Date:	Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Meeting Time:	6:30 pm

using different names such as signs of the zodiac to distinguish each group, and it doesn't always work.

Dr. Mebert stated that Noble High School has done a similar program on their own and it has worked well for them. Ms. Stephens noted that she worked with the Noble program and loved it.

Mrs. Grady stated that most reports show that programs like this, do not show much growth. Ms. Migneault said that success will depend on our goals. Mrs. Grady also asked if planning time would need to be increased. Ms. Migneault responded that the planning time amount would remain the same, but there would be more common planning time.

Mrs. Grady asked what would happen if teachers don't cooperate with the implementation of the new program. How will their attitudes be changed? How will oversee the meetings to verify that goals are being worked on?

Ms. Migneault responded that 1/3 will be excited, 1/3 will be okay with it, and 1/3 will be opposed to the program. Ms. Setear stated that if 2/3's of the staff is on board with the program, it will be difficult for the other 1/3 not to participate. She added that Portsmouth High School requires notes to be submitted to administration to verify that the work has been completed. The school and administration will need to create momentum among students and staff members for the program to be successful. If teachers do not participate enough for the school to make progress, DHS will not receive the funding again.

Ms. Lurvey said that there is "train going forward, you can either jump on it or not. There will always be 1/3 who is not excited about a new program. The students should be the first priority for all teachers.

Mr. Dupille stated that DHS is focusing on student outcomes. Mr. McCrory asked is there is a program at DHS to help struggling reader. Mr. Dupille responded NECAP scores have been below proficient and they are evaluated for reading ability. Read 180 will help to raise scores and can even increase a student between 2-4 grades within a year so that the student will get back to grade level. Ms. Migneault added that English seems to be where most students are struggling, especially 9th grade students. Books with a higher level of interest for students are trying to be used.

Mr. Appel stated that this all sounds good, but if students are entering 9th grade at a 4th grade level, shouldn't something have been done earlier?

Ms. Migneault responded that they are doing what they can and Ms. Briggs Badger also commented that she met with Barrington administrators to see what they are doing, as well.

Mrs. Grady asked if the local budget would need to supplement this program, if the amount the District received was decreased. Ms. Migneault responded that the local budget would not be affected at all by this program. After the first year, fewer supplies need to be purchased and Professional Development will decrease.



DOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type: Special Session #5
 Meeting Location: SAU-Conference Room
 Meeting Date: **Tuesday, July 27, 2010**
 Meeting Time: **6:30 pm**

Mrs. Grady commented that she has done a great deal of research on the subject and teacher burnout seems to be a strong factor in the success of the program.

Mr. McCrory stated that he would support this program because of its ability to excite teachers and if 1/3 of the teachers are not enthusiastic about this program, we can't let them ruin it for everyone.

Ms. Migneault stated that there is a possibility that local funds could be saved through this program since the grant may pay for Smart Boards and other supplies that the District would normally need to purchase. However, restrictions for this program include not being able to use grant money to support programs already in service.

Ms. Briggs Badger inquired about indirect costs of this grant. 3.9% would need to be added to the tentative budget to estimate total costs.

Ken Appel moved, Audra Lurvey seconded that Dr. Mebert write a letter of support, on behalf of the School Board to support this program. The oral **VOTE PASSED 5/1(Grady opposed)**.

E: SECRETARIAL RESTRUCTURING: Superintendent Briggs Badger discussed the changes proposed concerning the secretarial staff.

Restructuring of SAU office

- Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent-Donna Ashman (To be nominated at 7/12 School Board Meeting)
 - Costs to the District for this position will decrease by \$3,785.60.
 - Additional duties that will be added to this position include, but not limited to, Data Analysis and Reporting on the local and state levels, Performance Plus reporting, New Teacher Breakfast Organization
- After approval of Donna Ashman nomination, Curriculum Administrative Assistant position to be posted as Curriculum/Federal Projects Administrative Assistant
 - Ann Marie Hinz will be probable candidate for this position.
 - 40% of the cost of this position would become federally funded creating a savings to the District of approximately \$14,158.40
- After approval of nomination for this position, current Federal Projects Administrative Assistant will be posted as Federal Projects/Curriculum Secretary
 - This position will be changed to a Classification 3, 5.5 hour/day, school year secretary, saving the District approximately \$680.00.
- Savings from this restructuring plan will total approximately \$18,624.00.

Restructuring of DEOP Positions for 2010-2011

Position	2010-2011 Budgeted Total Compensation	Actual Cost
----------	---------------------------------------	-------------



DOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type:	Special Session #5
Meeting Location:	SAU-Conference Room
Meeting Date:	Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Meeting Time:	6:30 pm

DHS Dean’s Secretary	\$48,917	
\$34,324		
(change in Health costs)		
DMS Dean’s Secretary	\$18,268	
\$18,268		
Food Service Acct. Mgr*	\$27,284 (not locally funded)	\$16,773
Special Education Secretary*	\$18,779 (not locally funded)	\$16,773

*Positions re-classified to Classification 3, 3.5 hrs/day, School-year positions. Food Service Accounting Manager would be renamed Food Service Secretary and Special Education Secretary would be renamed Special Education Data Assistant.

- Total locally funded savings for 2010-2011 from restructuring of DEOP positions listed above will be approximately \$33,217

If the Dover High School Dean’s Secretary were reduced from 8 hrs/day to 7 hrs/day and the Dover Middle School Dean’s Secretary were reduced from 5.5 hrs/day to 4 hrs/day, the savings would be an additional savings of \$8,412. The total reduced from DEOP would increase to \$41,629.

If the DMS Dean’s Secretary were reduced to 3 hrs per day, the savings would be approximately \$45,000.

Mrs. Grady stated that the total cut from the budget \$113,248 and it would not be legal to reinstate these positions without approval from the School Board. She also questioned the cost of benefits in the restructure. She stated that they needed to be added into the equations so that an accurate cost of compensation could be established. Ms. Briggs Badger commented that we do not take that into account because insurances always change regardless of changes in personnel.

Robin LaFleur, Human Resources Coordinator, also discussed the restructure and what positions had been eliminated from the budget. She stated that in March, the School Board approved a \$45,000 budget cut from secretarial staff. Other cuts included Food Service secretary and a Special Education Secretary. However, these eliminations did not affect the local budget. Ms. Briggs Badger also stated that she believed Dr. O’Connor’s intentions were to add hours back into the two locally funded positions when the school year began. He felt he would be able to do this and still keep the \$45,000 budget cut.

Dr. Mebert questioned whether Ms. Briggs Badger was requesting money. Ms. Briggs Badger replied that she was just looking to reinstate positions. Mr. Appel stated the District attorney’s should be consulted, but was reminded that this would involve an expense, so he amended his motion stating that the School Board should have the city attorney review the request for legality. Dr. Mebert asked if there was a Board policy recalling and reinstating positions. Ken Appel moved, Audra Lurvey seconded approving the restructuring plan pending policy review and review by the city attorney. An oral vote **PASSED 6/0**.

F:SCHOOL BOARD MATTERS OF INTEREST: Mr. McCrory inquired about the year of implementation for redistricting. Ms. Briggs Badger responded that September of 2011 was the



**DOVER SCHOOL
DISTRICT**

DOVER SCHOOL BOARD – MINUTES

Meeting Type:	Special Session #5
Meeting Location:	SAU-Conference Room
Meeting Date:	Tuesday, July 27, 2010
Meeting Time:	6:30 pm

goal. Ms. Setear said that the vote would be in January of 2011. The options being explored were change of borders and different grades in different buildings. Ms. Briggs Badger commented that she was not sure at this time if there would be enough support for the redistricting.

Mr. McCrory commented that he would not be in favor of this since there would be no more neighborhood schools. He said that he assumed busing costs would be increased and there is already a drop in performance for student once they move up to Dover Middle School. He didn't feel that a change such as this, would help to lessen that drop and could increase it. Dr. Mebert stated that other factors, including puberty, are also responsible for the drop in student performance. Ms. Setear said that reviewing 4th and 5th grade NECAP scores will show if there is a drop in student performance. Dr. Mebert confirmed there was a drop between the two grades. Ms. Briggs Badger said that a redistricting plan would equalize services and opportunities within the District. Mr. McCrory stated that he would like the 5th grade pulled from Dover Middle School and given back to elementary schools.

G. ADJOURNMENT: At 7:50 p.m., Audra Lurvey moved, Beth Setear seconded a motion to adjourn. An oral **VOTE PASSED 6/0.**

Respectfully submitted,
Beth Setear, Secretary