

| Type of Meeting | Curriculum and Assessment Committee |
|-----------------|--|
| Date | 1/4/2022 |
| Facilitator | Sandy Allaire |
| Attendees | Sandy Allaire, Mark Pederson, Lucy Canotas, Ken Henderson, Amy Gentile, Barbara Kiszka, Ashley Harbel, Tim Guanci, Jennifer Puchlopek, Sarah Galligher Mitch Mencis - presenting Dan Woodworth - presenting |
| Agenda | Previously disseminated and posted online. |
| Notetaker | Ashley Harbel |

Approval of minutes from November 2, 2021

Notes: Meeting called to order at 4:04 PM

Motion to Approve by: B. Kiszka

Seconded by: A. Harbel

10 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions

| TOPIC: | TRMS | Schedule |
|--------|-------------|----------|
|--------|-------------|----------|

Discussion:

Mitch Mencis (TRMS Principal), Dan Woodworth (TRMS Assistant Principal)

- TRMS has been working on updating their schedule (see handout)
- Pros/cons of schedule as it has changed over time (see handout).
- 4 years ago, MS changed to a block schedule at the time, they felt it was the best option.
- Current schedule issues feedback from students and staff
- Proposed schedule getting the building on one schedule and making it more equitable across the board for teachers and content areas.
- B. Kiszka what is the opportunity block?
 - o 55 minutes of enrichment, extra help, time to work, etc... Not being used as effectively and does not look the same across the board.
- Process involved staff, students, and admin every step of the way. Brainstormed ideas, shared with staff, got feedback multiple times. Driven a lot by teacher feedback.
- Increase time for core classes, take out opportunity block, add a WIN (what I need) block for students, unified arts gains time, and world language becomes more equitable. Every teacher will have five graded periods (equalizes class sizes).



- Goal: Get feedback from parents via Thought Exchange, get final decision by end of February.
- S. Allaire will you put together an informational video for parents before Thought Exchange?
 - o Digital format of presentation to parents.
- A. Gentile as a parent of a current MS student love this schedule and appreciate the amount of time that has been invested. Doesn't love that students don't have core content every day, sitting in a classroom for 90 minutes is a long time for a MS student.
- A. Gentile wondering for the history what was the schedule before block scheduling?
 - O Was similar to this 45 minute classes. Building was never on a one schedule
- Exact times may change slightly as worked with shared staff and passing times.
- K. Henderson periods 4 and 5 are different in grades (due to lunch). Will have to look at Powerschool to see how to do this. Will work with the MS to manipulate schedule and Powerschool.
- K. Henderson will you be keeping attendance in Powerschool?
 - o Yes was a switch that happened during Covid. Will keep taking attendance each period.
- S. Gallagher potentially at some point of the process, will students be involved in the scheduling process?
 - o Some conversations already happened with kids, brought in student senate members to give feedback.
- S. Allaire one of the benefits of block was that homework decreased from a day to day perspective (no longer four core classes of HW every day). It will be important to talk to teachers about thinking about HW expectations and putting together parameters as a school and a team.
- M. Pederson one of the advantages of block is that you have longer periods to do science labs, STEAM, etc...

 But as a team, you could maneuver time in the schedule to combine classes to complete larger projects, etc...
 - o Could potentially do a periodic "block" day if needed cores are paired with each other.
- A. Gentile lunch and HW seem to be challenges to look at. What other challenges will there be?
 - $\circ\quad$ Powerschool need to play around with scheduling aspects.
 - UA sections that are available
 - o Maybe waterfall or flip cores for lunches to change up the schedule if needed.
 - o This schedule gives the greatest amount of flexibility
- B. Kiszka what can we do at the next school board meeting to help with the communication?
 - o Chris may put it in his school board update
 - Would be great to have the board share that this is coming and that TRMS is looking for feedback on this from the community.
- A. Gentile does the high school have a 7 period or a block schedule?
 - o HS is on block scheduling not looking at the moment to change.
 - One suggestion that is being thought about is having the 8th grade have more "block" days towards the end of the year to get the students ready for 9th grade.

| Conclusions: | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Action Items | Person Responsible / Deadline |
| Once MS has gotten feedback, would like to come back to give additional feedback (Feb. 1st Meeting) | Mitch Mencis/Sandy Allaire |



| TOPIC : Summer Learning Policy/Procedure | |
|---|---------------|
| Discussion: | Sandy Allaire |

- In drive uploaded school board policies (see handouts)
- Past three years committee has discussed school board policy on summer learning.
 - Model policy from NH promotes summer learning but does not require summer work.
 - TRSD policy wording says "There will be required summer work"
- In procedure (2018) different expectations at each level.
 - o Summer assignments required at the secondary level English, Math, and Science
 - O Summer work is graded at the secondary level (3% of grade for 1st trimester/quarter)
 - o AP courses separate from this procedure due to different requirements by the College Board
- Problems
 - O Differences on how it is being graded
 - Many students rush to get it done or don't do it at all.
 - 2019 -2020 20-30% of students at the HS level received a zero.
 - o Inequity with semester classes S1 classes have summer work, S2 classes do not have this same work.
 - Elementary would like some more specific expectations (specifically looking around reading)
- Mark, Jen, and other admins looked at other districts and their expectations for summer work we are one of very few districts in the region that require summer work (many promote but do not require).
- Summer 2021 recommended to school board to wave this policy
- Made a commitment to revisit the policy/procedure
 - o Options
 - Look at revising the procedure to clarify (flexibility in elementary, back off grading requirements)
 - Bring to policy and revise wording to recommend change
- A. Gentile predecessor revise the policy and remove the requirement and the procedure.
- B. Kiszka maybe keep the procedure as guidelines.
- M. Pederson take some of the verbiage about promoting and put it back in the policy.
- T. Guanci teachers could have Google Classrooms
- J. Puchlopek worked with MS teachers to build recommended text list and menu they could use as a scavenger hunt to promote reading. Allowed positivity to come back into reading.
- S. Allaire always was inequity within teachers how many students they have (100 essays vs. no summer work).
- A. Gentile time is a big factor as well time can be spent somewhere else as well.
- B. Kiszka can we gamify this at all? Peer pressure, positives
- L. Canotas as a district we might be able to put things together by authors and grade levels.
- M. Pederson want to make sure this does not get confused with making up credit for courses at the HS level.

| Conclusions: | Recommend to send back to policy to look at taking out the required summer work language. | |
|--------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Action Items | | Person Responsible / Deadline |



Sandy Allaire will speak with the policy committee to put on their agenda.

Sandy Allaire

Motion to recommend to the Policy Committee to remove language about requiring summer work by: B. Kiszka Seconded by: A. Gentile

10 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions

TOPIC: NH DOE i-Platform - overview

Discussion:

S. Allaire

- State assessments results (SAT and NH SAS) were embargoed at the state level just released
 - Overview of assessment results will be looked at to look at trends, etc....
- i-Platform introduction and drive through of platform from NH from 2018
 - o NH DOE iPlatform
 - iReport school report card
 - When looking at graphs and data, be cautious about what the data is showing you
 - Data looks different at the individual student level than at the district level (ex: score out of 3 versus score out of 4).
 - Schools must have 95% participation. If participation is under this, the % needed to make up are counted as scores of 0.
 - From now on, we will use both sets of data
 - iExplore
 - Explore, compare to other districts (and within district schools), scatterplots
 - iDefine
 - Results from 603 Bright Future Surveys

| Conclusions: | N/A | |
|---|-----|-------------------------------|
| Action Items | | Person Responsible / Deadline |
| Sandy Allaire and Lucy Canotas will put together data for the next meeting. | | |

| Observers | N/A |
|------------------|--|
| Resource Persons | |
| Special Notes | Second Read of Emerging Technology will occur at the next meeting. |
| | Meeting adjourned at 5:33 PM |