



Timberlane Regional School District Minutes

Type of Meeting	Curriculum and Assessment Committee
Date	Feb. 7, 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 Jan. 24th, 2023
Notes: Meeting called to order at 4:03
Motion to <i>Approve</i> by: Kim McCormick Seconded by: Ashley Harbel
7 in favor; 0 opposed; 3 abstentions

TOPIC: TRHS Extended Block Schedule	
Discussion:	Mark Pedersen/Sandy Allaire
<ul style="list-style-type: none">● 2/2/23 School Board Meeting - before meeting Sandy/Mark were asked to give a historical overview of block scheduling in our district.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Board voted Oct. 2016 to endorse the schedule for the Secondary Campus○ Additional requests made - financial impact of block schedule and impact on shift on student achievement data.○ MS/HS implemented Fall of 2017● Goal: Bringing information to C & A for review and feedback to refine what to bring to the board next Thursday. Today's conversation is for information - not for or against.● Justin, Sandy, and Mark have been working (in conjunction with secondary admin) to gather information requested.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ State Assessment Data - longitudinal data to be brought to the board - because of this request, data to be presented to the board has been streamlined.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Data includes pre-block scheduling through today.▪ Pulled from 2016-current, 2016/17 was Smart Balanced Assessment, now the NHSAS	



Timberlane Regional School District Minutes

- MS - if we are trying to establish a trend in block scheduling, we want to look at 3-5 as well, since the trend may show that it isn't impacted directly by the schedule if across all grades.
- 2018 testing would be the first year students are on the block schedule.
- MS - the schools in blue (on SAT data) - how many schools are block? Sandy will visually show this on the graph.
- SA - should we keep the participation data in this?
 - AH - yes - Mark has it in his data points as well, so should match.
- o Mark Pedersen
 - Increase in staffing - does not include special ed, counselors, etc... Data is academic, credit bearing courses (and staffing). Pure numbers - we have not increased pure numbers of staffing. Student to teacher ratio has slightly gone down.
 - Comparison to other districts - used IExplore data from state website - used one data point to compare. Public high schools plus public academies (did not include charter schools)
 - Percent proficient 2018-2022 ELA and Math - the lower the percent proficient = red, higher percent proficient = darker green.
 - o Most schools across the state - majority went down between 2018 and 2022 (60+ schools) in proficiency.
 - o Lower participation rate = more red/orange schools
 - o Timberlane in lower third/quarter of participation in the state.
 - Comparison Data - green schools = highest proficiency score/red schools = lowest proficiency scores.
 - o Cost per pupil
 - o Average teacher salary - almost a direct correlate to proficiency (TRSD 54 out of 80)
 - MS - is this strictly salary, not compensation and benefits?
 - MP - Not sure how the state got this data - but will look into it to see if the state says how they did this.
 - MS - have the data if asked, but
 - SA - presumption that a single variable has a direct correlation to student achievement - almost too many variables to isolate what is the one that is making the biggest impact. By showing this, shows the complexity.
 - MS - data point about free and reduced lunch? Is coming later in data.
 - o Classes taught by experienced (state defining this as teachers who have an experienced educator certification)
 - o Economical Disadvantaged - higher disadvantaged - more white in this column.
 - There are a number of schools that are less than 10%. The way the state determined that was by students applying for free and reduced lunch of Oct. 2021. At that time, schools were in second year of free and reduced for all students.



Timberlane Regional School District Minutes

- o Students with disabilities - TRHS - 74 out of 78 schools. Darker green - less kids with disabilities. We are fourth highest in the state.
 - MS - historic over identifying of students - this data might show otherwise with achievement.
- o Equalized tax rate - not sure what the state means by this - some go by district and some go by town.
- o Drop out rate - darker green=smaller drop out rate - TRHS - 1.17%
- o Post secondary enrollment - not sure where the data collects this data from - point made about students not going to certain schools.
 - MP - Anecdotal from counseling department - kids are still getting into the schools, but students/parents are making the decision to not go based on cost of schools.
- o Minimum credits recovered
- o School schedule - took notes on how every school operates. 57 out of 80 have some version of block scheduling.
 - MB - what are other schools doing if not on a block.
 - MP - some semblance of a daily schedule
 - Sort to highest achievement - mix of yes and no for block scheduling.
- o Enrollment count - pulled data from classes that we run (number of classes, sections, average number of students, total number of students in those sections).
 - 2010-2011 - 777 sections of classes (including study halls) - 14,111 kids assigned to sections. 18.16 students per section average Some teachers teach 5 or 6 teachers, co-teaching, etc..
 - 140 study halls in regular schedule
 - Year prior to block - 8 classes per teacher
 - Year after block - 7.5 classes per teacher
 - Study halls cut in half during block scheduling.
- o No one correlate to student achievement on test scores - data is what you make of it.
- MB - important to have all the data out there - don't want to provide correlation to causation.
- MB - what is the financial impact?
 - MP - what are the two numbers you use to calculate this?
 - TG - when we went to the block, saved money because we didn't have as many positions.
- MS - how many hours in front of students? How much "free time" for teachers?
- Schedule to schedule comparison - see graphic
 - In old schedule - two duties a teacher could have - a study portion of the lunch study hall period, during a full period study hall, or full period hall duty.



Timberlane Regional School District Minutes

- Block schedule - no lunch/study - there are full period study hall or hall duty - teachers have a duty every other day.
- Sandy broke down the two schedules (pre and post)
 - Teacher A -
 - if staff had a lunch study as a duty - one prep that was 48 mins and one was 47 mins.
 - Teacher A - block schedule - 90 min prep period every day.
 - MS - can you add into the old schedule of when announcements were scheduled - be prepared for the question.
 - Teacher A - over two days - 470 mins (daily) of face time/455 mins (block)
 - Prep/lunch - 236/237 mins over two days.
 - Teacher B
 - 472 vs. 460
 - 92 mins vs. 90 of duty
 - Prep - 186 vs. 232 (has full period duty vs the lunch study).
 - Student schedule
 - 7 classes - on block, full study hall 90 mins.
 - 660 min daily vs. 640 study
 - 90 mins study on block vs. 44 mins daily
 - MS - takeaway - students have less face time on a block schedule?
 - Block Scheduling Committee (2015/16)
 - Argument - potential to take 8 classes on block vs. 7 classes on daily. Teachers were always scheduled for the same number of periods, but all students took a study hall for 8th in daily schedule.
 - Argument - start a lesson where they have come from - review, wrap up, etc... estimated 5 mins/5 mins at start of classes - over time this is less time over four classes a day vs. 7 classes.
 - Had done research, met with schools, met with teams, etc...
 - LC - the number of courses offered and teacher ratio are based on student enrollment, not face to face instruction - so there could look like a disconnect.
 - Across the board - there is a loss of instructional seat time across the board.
 - MS - had student when they transitioned. One of the concerns - students sitting for 90 mins - what is the threshold for student learning? Efficiency of teaching?
- If this is something that the board would like to look at - needs to be a larger process
 - Survey teachers, students, community, etc...
- Some of the data is skewed - need more than two years of solid block scheduling data - because of Covid (which had a different schedule) and transition years - next year's juniors would be the first year with three regular block schedule years for data.
- One of the questions was focused on financials - do we have this data point?



Timberlane Regional School District Minutes

- Only data point we really have is number of faculty has decreased over time.
- Teachers are paid annually - not paid minutes per face time
- Inequities - HS teachers have 90 mins of prep each day, but also have 90 mins of duty every other day. Differences at every level across the board. Board asking about school to school inequities. The prep time inequity - was unequal before block schedule as well.
- MB - One concern - student time in front of a teacher - maybe we should not allow study hall anymore?
 - Study hall minutes have stayed about the same (140 in 2010/65 in 2022).
 - In order to get rid of study halls, would need to increase our credit required.
- MS - what percentage of kids go for scholastic diplomas?
 - MP - more than half.
- MS - what are our next steps we want to bring back to the board?
 - LC - None of the data points show students who have gone through all years of block?
 - MB - take the standardized test scores - how we look overall - then use the spreadsheet to show lack of correlation across any set of data
 - KM - we need a full set of data from a cohort that has gone through block.
 - KH - schedule at this time is already done.
 - SA - Principal Vaccarezza needs to have a role in this discussion as well as he leads the building - follow up meeting with Chris and Justin as well. Role of today's meeting was to vet information, not make
- Motion: MB - present and review this data largely as is to the board at the Feb. 16th public meeting
- KM - seconded
- MB - important to put in presentation that as a group we were unable to come up with direct data points for financial impact.
- LC - are we bringing too much data?
 - SA - the planning meeting on Friday will work on that.
 - MS - keep under 10 slides and have the other information ready if needed.

12 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions

Conclusions:	Motion accepted
Action Items	Person Responsible / Deadline
Mark and Sandy will bring to the board	Sandy/Mark

Observers	
Resource Persons	
Special Notes	Meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM