

---

**Mansfield High School**

School Council

May 26, 2010

2:10 pm, Room 185

Meeting Minutes

---

**Attendees:**

Heather Burgess (student)

AJ Calvario (student)

Nathaniel Michener (student)

Mitch Negus (student)

Amanda Zieselman (student)

Nancy Breef-Pilz (parent)

Vicky Burgess (parent)

Deborah Snyder (parent)

Sheila Newton (teacher – music)

John Pontes (teacher - English)

Joanne Vacirca (teacher – math)

Mary Watkins (teacher – social studies)

Tina Karidoyanes (guidance counselor)

Catherine Capolupo (intern)

Dr. Joe Maruszczak (principal)

**Not Present:** Julia Ready (student), Julie Cline (parent), Jennifer Dempsey (parent)**Agenda:**

- MHS School Improvement Plan: What have we accomplished this year and what should our priorities be next year?
- Brainstorming/Suggestions

**Distributed:**

- 2009/2010 MHS School Improvement Plan
- MHS School Improvement Plan 2010/2011 Exercise Sheet

Dr. Joe Maruszczak welcomed the attendees (listed above) and reviewed the previously established agenda. The committee approved the minutes of the 4/28/10 meeting. He then introduced a discussion on the progress of the School Improvement Plan, which was distributed to committee members. After looking over the document several committee members posed questions to Dr. Maruszczak.

One committee member asked about the differences between Homellogic and Naviance and wondered if Homellogic could be used instead of Naviance. Dr. Maruszczak and committee members clarified that the products serve different functions. Additionally, he also noted that between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> trimester of the 2010-2011 school year the district will move to X2, a new student information system. Other clarifying questions on the plan covered such topics as the content of the US/World History curriculum and the definition of the status “not completed” versus “ongoing. It was noted that some of the items that were not completed on the current plan would be moved to next years plan for completion while others may be re-evaluated and possibly abandoned.

It was noted that some project begun this year will be further applied or integrated in the coming year. One such example is 2.6 "Offer training in Rtl (Response to Intervention) and inclusion practices." This year the goal of offering training was met through attendance at ACCEPT Collaborative and MSSAA workshops. In the coming year the staff will begin implementation.

Dr. Maruszczak noted that goals 3, 4 and 5 will most likely stay the same in the coming year. Goal 2, driven by NEASC, will need attention and additional progress. One particular area of discussion is common curriculum formats (currently, each department uses a different curriculum format).

At this time Dr. Maruszczak introduced and exercise for the committee members. He distributed a worksheet with 13 items that reflect a level of importance. Many of the items need to be address prior to the accreditation visit in March of 2013. He requested that committee members numerically prioritized the items they perceive to be the top 6 items and return the form to him. The assignment was also distributed to the committee members email addresses via Survey Monkey following the meeting. The survey may be found at <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/XTWQGVS>.

The discussion then returned to the current school improvement plan, with clarification requested on regarding the professional development days offered currently. It was noted that Election Day and September 6<sup>th</sup> were full professional development days in addition to ½ days. Tina noted that there were a similar number of hours offered this year and last. Professional development is currently being used for common planning time and to develop courses and rubrics.

Staff noted that there is a need for common planning time embedded in the week-to-week schedule of the school. Examples of common planning time in other school systems were discussed (Sharon, Wellesley) and additional clarification on the benefits of common planning time were illustrated. It was noted that cutting teaching staff often directly impacts such "luxuries."

One committee member questioned why Mansfield had not established common planning time in the schedule of its teachers. It was noted this would require significant changes and need to be implemented district wide. Concepts such as these would need to be presented with a broader vision for the district and greater education on the benefits of such changes.

Another committee member reflected that one benefit of the current budget crisis was the new support of the School Committee members and other town committee members to take on strategic planning. The superintendant is likely to develop a committee to participate in the process, and Dr. Maruszczak noted that there might be opportunities for participation. Some exasperation was expressed at this point, that the 2006 Strategic Plan had to be entirely abandoned due to budget challenges.

It was noted, by those who had read the plan, that there were items that required little or not funding which could have been pursued.

This was supported by one committee member who noted that more could be done with the existing technology (such as Google docs and smartboards). She expressed that professional development on the use of the existing technology would motivate and assist teachers in implementing its use. Several other committee members supported this with examples, while another noted that there is a need for additional technical support for the existing technology.

Dr. Maruszczak offered that he intends to establish a committee to develop goals for professional development (such as the development of technology skills). He noted that in the past, many of the decisions such as professional development needs were made at the department level, which allowed different departments to have different goals and different expectations. In the coming year, he would like to examine the need for common goals and expectations across departments.

The committee then discussed some of the benefits of the X2 student information system software. It was noted that it too, offers tools to teachers, student and parents. For example, a student can upload a completed assignment to the database, which is assessed by the teacher, which is then graded by the teacher, the grade finally being seen by both the parent and the student. Teachers and students offered feedback on the need for training and the maintenance of the technology. Students clarified that training is not effective in a large auditorium setting and one student illustrated the challenges which took place when his class attempted to upload completed assignments (including a lack of knowledge about how to upload a document, blocked websites on school property and the requirement to submit a paper copy in addition to the online copy).

The discussion then moved on to the science MCAS, prompted by a question from the committee on the number of students who would not graduate because they failed to pass the science MCAS test. Of the 6 students who were required to retest, all passed and are slated to graduate. It was noted though, that Mansfield continues to be “dinged” on AYP as measured by MCAS scores. However, as a state that has joined others in committing to common core assessments, the MCAS tests are likely to be eliminated in favor of the new assessments. Tina shared that Massachusetts was also the only state to incorporate career skill building in its Race to the Top application and legislation is currently being developed to mandated funded initiatives in grades 6-12.

The meeting concluded with congratulations to the graduating seniors and an invitation for committee members to return to serve on the committee again in the 2010-2011 school year.

**Upcoming School Committee Meeting:**

[http://www.mansfieldschools.com/central/school\\_committee.htm](http://www.mansfieldschools.com/central/school_committee.htm)

*7:30 PM Town Hall Rooms 3 B & C*

*Please note that the agendas for previous meetings are also posted on this site.*

June 15, 2010