

**Quality Initiatives and Curriculum**  
**March 15, 2004**  
**First Presbyterian Church, Charleston**

**Present:** Jackie Thompson, Ginger Huffman, Karen Duckworth, Joan Adkins, Cherise Starcher, Cathy Stout, Mimi Davis, Erin Deitzler and Ann Nutt

<b>KEY DISCUSSION POINTS</b>	<b>KEY DECISIONS MADE</b>
<p><b>Curriculum Modules</b>  Discussion of response to task team to develop curriculum modules and design training plan. Good response to the inquiry, several individuals cannot attend both the 29<sup>th</sup> and the 30<sup>th</sup>. Have option to meet at Flatwoods DHHR or Fairmont State College.</p>	<p>Recommendation made to meet only on April 30 this time, perhaps make assignments and set another date to meet.  Flatwoods preferred location.</p>
<p><b>Updates</b>  County plan reviews complete, approval list distributed and discussed.  Karen discussed site visits and draft report distributed for the group's information.</p>	
<p><b>Curriculum Publisher Feedback</b>  Two publishers that submitted curricula for "approved" curricula and were not identified as comprehensive curricula have requested additional feedback from the committee:  <b>Pebble Soup</b> seeks information on how to insure that they appropriately support policy as a supplement. Pebble Soup could be adapted to support comprehensive curricula and used as a supplement of a county would so choose.</p> <p><b>High Reach</b> submitted two potential prototypes to redesign their curricula in response to prescriptive issue. Curricula offers activities that are sent on a monthly basis. The dates or days have been removed. Requested completion of a survey on the prototypes.</p>	<p><b>Pebble Soup Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Black line masters – worksheets</li> <li>• Scheduling conflicts on length of free play</li> <li>• Use of centers – unclear if information on centers is intended as the "only" part of a center or as "add-ons" to fully developed center</li> <li>• Amount of teacher direction / child initiated exploration in centers is unclear</li> <li>• Absence of block center</li> <li>• Assessment appears to be individual testing</li> <li>• Integration of literacy into all centers</li> </ul> <p><b>High Reach Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly predetermination of themes/ skills- suggest a purchase of full year at one time for resources</li> <li>• Activity driven vs more in-depth on the foundations of a curriculum</li> <li>• Teacher script is questionable</li> <li>• Information on setting up centers; routines weak</li> <li>• Curriculum topics/ selection not driven by children in the class leads to less meaningful content- out of context</li> </ul>
<p><b>Assessment</b>  Reconsider selection of one assessment for all WV Pre-k classrooms.</p>	

KEY DISCUSSION POINTS	KEY DECISIONS MADE
<p>Two primary purposes of assessment we must consider are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing assessment of children for adaptation of instruction- show progress on the WV ELSF</li> <li>• Program evaluation and accountability</li> </ul> <p>Group will need to gather information on the assessment systems that are a part of approved curricula as well as others that should be reviewed.</p> <p>Issues to gather information and provide guidance to counties around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Philosophy</li> <li>• Methods</li> <li>• How WV ELSF measured – alignment</li> <li>• How information is communicated to parents</li> <li>• Opportunity to aggregate information on groups of children for total program report</li> <li>• Ease of use</li> <li>• Training</li> <li>• Cost/ Cost per child</li> <li>• Technology</li> </ul> <p>Consider also how children with IEP individually fit within ongoing assessment and identify assessment systems that have support to a larger range of developmental levels.</p>	<p>Ann will pursue further direction on specific charge of this group in relation to program evaluation.</p> <p>Begin with designing an evaluation/ information tool to summarize the assessment systems</p> <p>Evaluation tool should consider identified areas. Draft tool at next meeting.</p> <p>Ask publishers to provide correlations and information on tool.</p> <p>Primarily will develop guidance for counties to use in selecting assessment system.</p>
<p><b>Next meeting to draft tool</b>  <b>Meeting date changed so that more of the group can participate.</b>  <b>Date changed to April 2; 10-3 at the First Presbyterian Church</b></p>	