

Type of Meeting	Curriculum and Assessment Committee
Date	1/24/2023
Facilitator	Sandy Allaire
Attendees	Sandy Allaire, Mark Pederson, Lucy Canotas, Ken Henderson , Ashley Harbel, Tim Guanci , Jennifer Puchlopek, Kim McCormick, Michael Boucher, Mark Sherwood , Kelley Brooks, Chris Snyder, Sarah Galligher
Agenda	Previously disseminated and posted online.
Notetaker	Ashley Harbel

Approval of minutes from 12/6/2023

Notes: Meeting called to order at 4:10PM

Motion to *Approve* by: Michael Boucher Seconded by: Ashley Harbel

6 in favor; 0 opposed; 2 abstentions

TOPIC : Policy IIB Class Size – Referred to C & A from Policy Committee		
TOPIC. Folicy	Ind Class Size – Referred to C & A from Foncy Committee	
Discussion:	Sandy Allaire	
• SA - L	ast meeting - we were going to pull some more numbers.	
0	Mark pulled numbers and did not see much impact at the HS level	
о	Lucy pulled some more numbers	
о	Based on research - didn't see much impact on students within a certain threshold.	
• SA - question to group - we can continue to look at information, numbers, etc		
0	We can always ask board members to waive policy if we need to	
о	Given where we are with the budget and the potential impact on staffing numbers, we would need	
	up to 14.5 positions if we were to adjust this at this time. Need to talk about this with what is best	
	for students in conjunction with budget constraints.	
0	Where are we at?	
	e looked at the numbers back in Dec and Lucy then collected information on room size We can go	

• LC - we looked at the numbers back in Dec. and Lucy then collected information on room size. We can go through each if we want to go room by room to see what is the best number to recommend.

• LC - Chris was looped in - Chris felt we would get more bang for their buck with full day K

- KM at this point, looking at the budget numbers, we cannot make this happen this year. If we are going to shift and talk about full day K, she would like to talk about that more.
 - o SA It hasn't been off the table. It was part of our last strategic plan. In the midst of Covid, etc... was brought to the board, but wasn't the right time. It was put to the side, but people are still looking at research, best practices, etc...
 - LC they don't have to be mutually exclusive. We did start an early childhood feasibility research and we have been working on our 3s and 4s and continue to gather information about kindergarten. As a group, that is where we are heading for the next cycle of warrant articles.
 - o KM when you look at Kindergarten in the budget, is it considered revenue?
 - LC Yes
 - KM Does that revenue then offset the cost of it?
 - LC No. We have been told it is over 350,000 of revenue. But it is not a direct correlation between the two. Any special education students that we recommend to K is free and anyone who gets free and reduced for free tuition. Because we charge tuition, we don't get the whole adequacy aid, but we can't anticipate what we might get if we didn't charge. We have 3-4 teachers in the K program.
 - KM I don't want that to be counted as profit/revenue.
- SA with regard to policy IIB we could refer it back to policy and say we have had conversations and this is where we are at and then let the policy committee have a conversation with these findings, we could say what our recommendation is?
- MB if a new policy is adopted, could that change the default budget?
 - o KM/SA we are not sure.
 - o MB if you could change the policy and it would impact the budget with more money?
 - o SA I think we would have our budget and then figure out how to work with the budget we have
 - o LC laws have changed and we can't change our budget to meet the law so most likely not.
- LC these numbers/research aren't concrete and the minimum standards coming out we are already at the "strive for" numbers.
- SG I think this gives us some time to actually create a sub committee to do the research and present something factual that we can sink our teeth into and they could bring them back into this group. (SG volunteers).
- MB The fact that there isn't any conclusive evidence that supports smaller numbers supports higher numbers.
 - o LC John Hattie meta analysis .21 impact size on achievement.
- LC motion to start a class size sub committee so we can dig into deeper research and come back with a recommendation for a future date.
 - o SA Seconded the motion
 - o 9 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions
 - o Sarah will reach out to members of the committee

Conclusions:	Motion passed - subcommittee will be formed	
Action Items		Person Responsible / Deadline



Sarah Galligher will be reaching out to put together this committee.

 Discussion: Jen Puchlopek JP - We brought forward for each middle school grade - to approve those titles as whole class reads and continue a process with MS teachers to develop a stronger process around independent reading and lit circle texts to enlist parent permission/approval to choose those books. Whole class reads - everyone in class would be read by everyone and activities would center around it. Anything else proposed would come back to C and A committee. SA - this is an extension of the process that is already used at the HS level. It is the first time we have done this at the MS level. JP - we already have these texts in place at the MS - looking at grandfathering these in through the C and A and then bring forward others. LC - thinking about taking the process down to the MS - and we have been talking about varied levels of students - do we have a good handle on how a 6th grade teacher is using a book with students that might be reading a second-eighth grade level in the classroom? JP - I would say that this is the same at all levels - maybe their differentiation needs to be a little deeper because they don't have levels at the MS level, but even with the different levels, kids need different needs. They would need to accommodate/modify for the students. LC - so they are giving different assignments to each student? JP - potentially - we haven't asked them this. AH - I would say that there is a difference between independent reading level - are they reading aloud, using audiobooks, stop and talking. LC - have these been vetted before? JP - no LC - I don't know what all of the books are about - so we might not be comfortable voting to accept these without knowing what the texts are about. JP - we followed a similar process with the HS when we first started - we weren't able to go through all the texts. 	TOPIC: TRMS	TOPIC: TRMS Whole Class ELA Book Lists		
 continue a process with MS teachers to develop a stronger process around independent reading and lit circle texts to enlist parent permission/approval to choose those books. Whole class reads - everyone in class would be read by everyone and activities would center around it. Anything else proposed would come back to C and A committee. SA - this is an extension of the process that is already used at the HS level. It is the first time we have done this at the MS level. JP - we already have these texts in place at the MS - looking at grandfathering these in through the C and A and then bring forward others. LC - thinking about taking the process down to the MS - and we have been talking about varied levels of students - do we have a good handle on how a 6th grade teacher is using a book with students that might be reading a second-eighth grade level in the classroom? JP - I would say that this is the same at all levels - maybe their differentiation needs to be a little deeper because they don't have levels at the MS level, but even with the different levels, kids need different needs. They would need to accommodate/modify for the students. LC - so they are giving different assignments to each student? JP - potentially - we haven't asked them this. AH - I would say that there is a difference between independent reading level - are they reading aloud, using audiobooks, stop and talking. LC - have these been vetted before? JP - no LC - I don't know what all of the books are about - so we might not be comfortable voting to accept these without knowing what the texts are about. JP - we followed a similar process with the HS when we first started - we weren't able to go through 	Discussion:	Jen Puchlopek		
 SA - are any of these considered controversial? JP - they don't - but there was discussion about <i>Free Lunch</i> but it doesn't meet our definition. MB - what is our process and is this a policy? SA - It is not an official policy. But in practice and procedure, this committee has vetted, reviewed, 	 JP - We continuction circle to class we back to one on the studen be readed on the studen be studen be studen be readed on the studen be st	 de brought forward for each middle school grade - to approve those titles as whole class reads and ue a process with MS teachers to develop a stronger process around independent reading and lit exts to enlist parent permission/approval to choose those books. Whole class reads - everyone in orould be read by everyone and activities would center around it. Anything else proposed would come of C and A committee. SA - this is an extension of the process that is already used at the HS level. It is the first time we have done this at the MS level. JP - we already have these texts in place at the MS - looking at grandfathering these in through the C and A and then bring forward others. inking about taking the process down to the MS - and we have been talking about varied levels of ts - do we have a good handle on how a 6th grade teacher is using a book with students that might ling a second-eighth grade level in the classroom? JP - I would say that this is the same at all levels - maybe their differentiation needs to be a little deeper because they don't have levels at the MS level, but even with the different levels, kids need different needs. They would need to accommodate/modify for the students. LC - so they are giving different assignments to each student? JP - no LC - I don't know what all of the books are about - so we might not be comfortable voting to accept these without knowing what the texts are about. JP - we followed a similar process with the HS when we first started - we weren't able to go through all the texts. e any of these considered controversial? JP - they don't - but there was discussion about <i>Free Lunch</i> but it doesn't meet our definition. <i>v</i> hat is our process and is this a policy? 		



- MB so if they are already being used, what are we voting on?
 - SA we are accepting these books right now, but then voting to move forward with the process that the HS goes through.
- LC the other piece what we uncovered that there are other things we need to consider when we move down from HS to elementary levels we don't have in writing what we are looking for. They might meet what we have for HS right now, but might not meet what we put into place in the future.
 - $\circ~$ AH and they have not had issues with these books?
 - JP no some of them they have been using for quite a time and some are newer.
- MB so it is less of a vetting process and more of being aware?
 - SA for this process yes. But we will move forward. Even without the controversial materials for MS and Elementary schools, we still look at grade levels, reading level, how the teacher will be using them, etc...
 - JP these are choices for teachers to use as a whole group they aren't required to use them. This is why they use independent reading and lit circles as well.
 - AH motion grandfather these texts and accept lists as is for use in the MS classes.
- KM seconded it
- 9 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions

Conclusions:	Books accepted	
Action Items		Person Responsible / Deadline
Jen will bring any further titles to C and A		

TOPIC: 2022 NHSAS / SAT district and building results	
Discussion:	Sandy Allaire
• SA in Dee, held TELA (admin accessor) that was forward on state accessment data Full admin district	

- SA in Dec. held TELA (admin session) that was focused on state assessment data. Full admin district team went through a data protocol to make predictions, review the data, make observations, making inferences and statements, and next steps. After that Lucy, Amy Daly, Mark, Sandy, and Justin met with building level admin teams asked them to share findings based on building level conversations. Subcommittee that looked at assessment in the lens of the special education sub group. Traditionally this is something that is shared with the board at a meeting. Not currently on the schedule.
- SA high level look at the data this is a chance to connect with the board members on this committee and ask questions and observations.
- SA the state released assessment results the admin team did not have those in Dec.
- AH would it be helpful for us to share what we observed as an admin team? (MB/KM yes).
- AH one thing that really stood out was the participation rate for the HS. It is in the 70% range. We talked about our messaging around taking the test. Many students feel that it is "optional" but really it is a required test. Anything under 95% counts against us for testing scores.
 - o KM didn't realize that the test was the SAT and the state test. How could they be optional?

- MP there is a state law that allows families to exempt their students from testing this contradicts the state law that requires testing.
- o KM can we put asterisks, etc... so people know that the test scores impact the schools?
- o SA in the past years, we have sent out the letter so they can know they can exempt their students. Talking now about how we can remessage this so people understand the impact.
- AH this is why one of the HS goals is not just about the SAT scores, but also about participation as well we want to increase this at least 4%.
- o MP this year, we are going to do SATs on the March day so we can make up days for the test. Same with the NHSAS science test.
- o LC across the board regardless of scores a lot of our conversation has been around messaging when Sandy used to present these used to present about the impact of exempting and how we use the data as well to help support our students.
- SA other general observations at the district level -
 - Flagged areas for growth definitely math and science looking at our practices and how we can provide additional support. There has been some growth, but still room to move. District level admin had conversations about how we could use other districts (what they are doing at other schools, etc...)
- MB how do these data assessments correlate with other assessments our students take?
 - SA reading and writing and math standards are all connected the curriculum documents are assessments using the same standards, the iready standards are connected.
 - Looking at modulars, practice assessments, i ready to help teachers see the connectivity to the scores.
 - Work in progress conversations about authentic grading (reflecting what students are able to know and do versus being a "good student").
 - MP at the high school the past couple of years what types of questions are the SATs asking. We have done work with using released SAT items with teachers. Working now to focus on science.
 - o LC hard to parce out the data too. Our teachers are looking at the data and helping guide their learning.
 - o SG Portsmouth was below state level several years ago. They took a deep look at the standards and what they actually meant and then looked at the exams to see what the kids are really being asked to do.
 - o KM do you use this data to see what isn't working and what to change?
 - SA this is part of the work we did at the admin level what are areas we can try to identify trends for areas of focus. We then can do targeted professional development and see growth (like geometry from last year). Takes a long time to change.
 - SA other things we are looking at too not all kids perform well on these assessments as well.
 - KM a lot of the things teachers do is subjective but if you look at it like Sarah presented teaching to the standard (having an understanding of how the standard is being tested and the application of the standard).
 - SG if you start to really look at it, there can be aha moments for what the test is trying to get at what is the bigger picture of the standard.



Conclusions:	Schedule a time with the board	
Action Items		Person Responsible / Deadline
MB or KM connect with Brian to schedule a time for Sandy to present (if they would like to)		

	proposed new course for Evening Division – Forensic Science
Discussion:	Mark Pederson
We are	e missed the deadline for day students, but want to try to move this forward for our evening division able to fast track the process for particular classes. This allows us to advertise while getting it ly approved.
• MP - tr science	ying to offer a new course in the evening. Have kids that need a half year course to graduate (in e). We have a teacher interested in evening, eager to teach forensics. We wanted to try this in the g first and see how it went. The teacher is familiar with the course as taught in another HS. Course description - modeled off other HS course Course Competencies - based on state of NH competencies. Different from our competencies (the science department is looking to better align with the state). This would try out the competencies with this course. Includes reading/writing/speaking competencies
0	Did research into what schools are using as forensics curriculum - one that is similar to UBD. Distilled another course into three units. Teacher feels that they can teach it without needing a textbook, labs - thinks that we have all the materials already
	hile Mark is passing it around - at my previous district, this was one of the coolest classes and most r classes.
• MP - th	nis has a bio portion, but also it is chemistry and physical science as well. We want to differentiate ther courses in the evening, which are very life science heavy. SA - how will the teacher handle autopsies?
	 MP - will be dependent on the students he has in front of him. In the past - the human A and P teacher live feed with someone doing autopsies - and walked through the process with the students. Options for virtually doing things with students.
_	rocess - first read, second read - C and A - first read, second read - board. Ideally, we would like it ed for the second section of evening division.
• MP - w	have many seniors that would love to take this and need it to graduate. The have a teacher that is willing to teach this. They came forward last week. We didn't have someone In science at that point.
• SG - m	otion - expedite this process and send this curriculum to the board for a first read. econded
	LC - we don't want this to be the precedent - this is a one time practice. we would worry about having a teacher and possibly not having it pass the board and then having to



have a fall back class.

- o MP Would it be possible to be virtual? Or on another day?
- o SA we can't do a virtual meeting? But could do another meeting?
- Back to the motion
- 8 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstentions

Conclusions:	s: Motion passed to bring to the board	
Action Items		Person Responsible / Deadline
Committee members will read through and still send Mark questions.		

TOPIC: Other	
Discussion:	
Conclusions:	
Action Items	Person Responsible / Deadline

Observers	None
Resource Persons	
Special Notes	Meeting adjourned at 5:38PM