



Timberlane Regional School District Minutes

Type of Meeting	Curriculum and Assessment Committee
Date	1/9/24
Facilitator	Sandy Allaire
Attendees	Sandy Allaire, Mark Pederson, Lucy Canotas, Christy Hubley , Ashley Harbel, Tim Guanci, Jennifer Puchlopek, Kim McCormick, Don Woodworth, Paul LeCain, Kelley Brooks (online), Chris Snyder , Sarah Galligher
Agenda	Previously disseminated and posted online.
Notetaker	Ashley Harbel

Approval of minutes from 12/5/24
Notes: Meeting called to order at 4:04PM
Motion to <i>Approve</i> by: SG Seconded by: KM
9 in favor; opposed; 2 abstentions

TOPIC: DRDP Approval	
Discussion:	Lucy Canotas
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● LC - Background Information: State requires early childhood professionals to report progress for Sp.Ed students ages 3-5. Tracked to report on indicator 7 (preschool outcome measures (POMS)). Have been using AEPSi to collect information (data collection tool). Last year, state piloting different programs. We did not participate. State will not make final decision until March for what program they are going to recommend. ● DRDP - only one that directly links to POMS data. TS Gold - does not link to the data. Kim Rivers has been going to state meetings and feels that DRDP is the best option. ● TS Gold has a cost - \$13/pp, DRDP - free ● Recommending that we sign agreement with DRDP to start thinking about training with them. They have signed the NH data agreement. We are ahead of time, but want to train staff and implement for next year. ● KM - is this for all students? Or just special ed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LC/KB - for only identified students. Get released from this measure as a 5 year moves to kindergarten. ● KM - is it testing? 	



Timberlane Regional School District Minutes

- o LC - not testing - more questions that the teacher answers. DRDP is similar to current program. Current program does not have rubric for ratings for teachers to use. Hope is that new program will be less subjective.
- SG - would it make sense to see what the state is doing?
 - o LC - Kim brought it forward. TS Gold does not collect POMs. Makes sense to go with DRDP and not wait for the state. Kim believes that state will go in this direction.
- KM - does this data follow the child/help the child?
 - o LC - I can go back and ask the teachers. We do it because we have to do it for special ed because of state collection. LC has been involved only for past two years. It does not really transfer. Might help write goals as student is moving to kindergarten. K teachers do not have access to the data.
- KM - students in Pre-K do not have IEPs?
 - o LC - they do. This is for IEP students only.
- AH - trust judgement of LC and Kim Rivers.
- SA - anyone need additional information? We would like to make a decision?
 - o SG - only question would be what the ramifications be if we sign the contract and the state does with the other program?
 - LC - If they do not say everyone needs to go to the DRDP, they cannot say you have to use Gold, as it costs money and they will not be providing funding. They will either say choose or that all should use DRDP.
 - AEPSi will no longer be an option for school data collection.
 - SA - this was determined as the best before cost?
 - LC - they have piloted this and they decided it was the better. We could hold on approval for use with students until we hear. Or we could make a determination anyway.
- AH - make a motion to approve the use of DRDP. TG seconds the motion.
- PL - Would like to dig into the research a little bit before voting on this.
 - o MP - might make sense to dig in a little bit to this. Does it give the board members a better feeling if they are asked about why that program was chosen?
 - o LC - state of NH has PDF document as well from their pilot from last year.
- AH rescinds motion. TG rescinds his second.
- KM - Is the state giving a recommendation?
 - o LC - That will be coming out in March. They wont be able to require TS Gold because it costs money.
 - o LC - These are the only two they are looking at.
- SA - bring back for second review at the next meeting. Mutual consent to look through research and come back with targeted questions? If you have questions, send to Sandy or Lucy and they will filter them to Kim. Kim will be invited to next meeting if it will be beneficial.
- KB - I have used TS Gold. Did not like it. Kim can speak to what has happened on the state level and the options they have given.

Conclusions:	Hold until next meeting
Action Items	Person Responsible / Deadline
● Second discussion at Feb. meeting to approve/deny	SA



Timberlane Regional School District Minutes

TOPIC: TRHS Math Competency Change - 2nd Read	
Discussion:	Jen Puchlopek
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Document in materials for 12/5 folder - HS Graphing/Functions ● JP - second read here. If we vote to approve then we bring it to the board. Nothing has changed from last meeting. Discussed last time - eliminating graphing competency. Only HS level courses. We would take a rubric/do the rubric work to make sure that the graphing skills are listed in the functions rubric. There was a great deal of overlap in those two rubrics. ● SA - this is a similar recommendation to the TRMS math competency. We have two distinct competencies - this eliminates redundancy and the skills will be factored into the competency where there is current overlap. ● DW - people will be asking if we are taking content away. It will be important to teach skills as we define it versus content. ● SA - any questions or concerns. ● TG - make a motion to bring to the board for the first read. KM - second. ● SA - to DW point - make a targeted effort to make sure in the presentation to the board to make sure that we explain that it is not eliminating content. This is the third one like this. I don't want it to be a perception that teachers are not eliminating content. JP and MP ● LC - is it also about how this is written? Instead of eliminate - incorporate, add in that skills will remain the same, etc... make sure that it is clear. ● 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 absetensions 	
Conclusions:	Bring to Board
Action Items	Person Responsible / Deadline
Bring to board for vote	SA/MP/JP

TOPIC: Policies: KEC - Challenged Materials, IJM - Challenged Materials	
Discussion:	Sandy Allaire
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SA - last spring - talked about handful of policies pertained to ability of community members to challenge/oppose to library or classroom resources. Looked at connected policies. We came to consensus to bring that to subcommittee. SA met with Jennifer Toth, Atkinson Librarian - she has been very involved. District librarians put forth recommendations to Sandy. Looked at sample policies as well as some samples/examples from state and settled on what is brought today. ● SA - Policy KEC - under school community relations. This exact same policy is also IJM under instruction. They are word for word the same. Coded differently and put in two different categories. Policy IJM does not exist as a policy in NH School Association - not maintained or recommended at state level (just at 	



Timberlane Regional School District Minutes

community relations section). We could make a recommendation to policy to keep both, we could alert of duplication.

- SA -
 - Not looking at IGE tonight - parental objections to specific course material - will look at and might make updates from school board association. Includes language about instruction connected to sex ed, health, etc...
 - IJL - selection of library resources - will be brought in the future to the committee.
- SA - Resources in drive - only recommended changes - hard copy has what it currently is.
- SA - as you read through it - it says procedures to be followed. When SA and JT looked at it, policy and procedure are two separate things, but ours has some procedures currently intertwined in the current policy. Coding of KEC-R is the procedural language. School board adopts school board policy. District employees then develop procedures to follow the policy.
- SA - took the NH school board association model policy. Ours looks much different. Both are dated (2004/2005).
- SA - recommendations from librarians
 - Questions that came up - Who has the ability to challenge, how frequently, and what is the procedure of the challenge?
 - Limited who can challenge - citizens of the district. Will be vetted through legal. Limit to taxpayers - resident citizens.
 - All procedural language is taken out of policy and moved to procedure KEC-R.
 - Challenges go directly to the principal (language in procedure that if it is a library resource, librarian would be involved).
 - Review committee (in procedure)
 - Frequency/Timeline - challenge goes to principal, then committee makes a decision, appeal can be made to superintendent/decision made, appeal can be made to school board. If school board maintains the resource
 - Took original procedure, recommendations of librarians, looked at samples from other districts.
 - First review - questions to consider - is the procedure clear to all parties involved? Speak to formation/membership of review committee, role of committee
 - AH - is that the person cannot challenge again in four years? Or the material?
 - SA - It is the instructional material
- Will present to legal to make sure that the four years is in our purview.
- SA - sharing for information - questions and discussion for next month. On the drive
- SA - It will also go to Policy Committee for two reads - we are primary review committee.
- KM - the procedure part is not going to be voted on by policy?
 - SA - Procedure part will not be taken action on.
- KM - usually when it goes to the board, they are
- PL - is Timberlane community clearly defined?
 - SA - we can define it as towns
 - AH - does that exclude employees?
 - DW - we might want to have a chain of command for this in the school? A different procedure?



Timberlane Regional School District Minutes

- JP - is that the norm to include employees?
 - Model policy does not include any details/specifics
- MP - by restricting it to resident of the town, that takes out a lot of the individuals in the current policy.
- TG/JP - support residents of the town being the ones able to challenge
- DW - there should be an internal procedure for this for staff.
 - AH - is this something then for employees that we can put in the staff handbook?
- DW - what becomes public other than the decision - what types of things will be public knowledge?
 - SA - information is signed by committee as a whole and then sent by superintendent to complainant
 - DW - should names be redacted from this?
- SA - will vet through legal and share with other people at SAU.
- DW - can Justin get feedback from superintendent's association?
 - SA - some of the feedback are from assistant supers in districts that have been changing theirs.

Conclusions:		
Action Items		Person Responsible / Deadline

TOPIC: 2023 District State Assessment Results Presentation

Discussion: Sandy Allaire

- SA - will come back to questions once we go through a few slides
 - State assessments from last spring (students currently in next grade).
 - NHSAS 3-8 (math, ELA), Science (5, 8, 11), SATs (11)
 - State requires 95% participation rate. Parents can opt students out of testing. Less than 95% - difference of scores is counted as zeros. Impacts performance. Have made an effort to address participation. Work with parents to find out about why of opting out in order to try to help. Most schools have met threshold. HS had significant growth (was in 70's for last year).
 - We exceeded state average for all three areas of performance goals.
 - When looking at data - goes to 2019 (pre-covid), did not test in 2020.
 - ELA - 2021 - 50% to 55% - growing at a faster pace than state average.
 - Math - underperformed state average last two years. This year was slightly above. Outpacing growth at state average.
 - Looking at data both at district level, but also at school level. Able to have deep conversations about groupings at certain schools that impacted scores. What is happening in a grade level at the school? Areas of concern? Areas to celebrate? Next steps?
 - 2017-2019 - a different time, most grades levels starting to come out of 2020.



Timberlane Regional School District Minutes

- Subgroup populations - minimum of 11 students to warrant data - students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students. Reading - fell short of target, exceeded state average.
 - KM - is the 2021 number skewed by students during covid not having computers, people to help, etc...?
 - SA - not sure what percentage that reflects. May also not have students who would have qualified but all lunches were free.
- PL - What is level 3?
 - SA - four point scoring system. Cut scores that equal proficient. 3 and 4 are proficient.
- Comparison to other districts - 25 districts - represent ones around us/in our region and a few larger districts/regional. Blue - outperformed, Yellow - under or equal. We fall for reading - tied for 10th out of 26th this year. Last year, tied for 11th out of 26th.
- MS - looking at past three years - seeing growth since year after Covid. Decent gains and moving in right direction.
- Math - grade 4-5 grade shift - scores went down. Talked in depth with teachers at that level. Subgroups - outperformed state averages but not target. Last year - tied for 13th out of 26, this year tied for 9th.
- Science - gain in 11th grade science - changes in how we are administering science at the HS level. State does not set targets - we outperformed state average for sub groups. This year, tied for 11th, last year we were tied for 17th.
- Elementary schools - high level overview of each school.
- PL - trending in the right direction.
- SAT data - scores impacted by participation - but at a lesser degree than in the past. Saw decline - these are the students who transitioned to HS during Covid year. State data and raw scores from college board to compare to state and national scores. Math - last year we were at 34% and state at 35%. However, raw score we outperformed state at 496-488. This could be a participation factor.
 - AH - can we add in a slide that shows we have increased participation instead of just last year's.
- Will be presented to full board in January.
- MP - it is a lot different than when we went to college - a lot of colleges are not using SAT as a measure anymore. Our students are competing at a national/global level - our kids are doing alright.
- KM - and this is one snapshot. Not just a number - so many different factors. The ones that follow the cohort are cool to see them track before and after covid.
- TG - would it make sense to put in a slide about how college acceptance, etc... Or tracking at HS level number of students per year that get accepted to post secondary programs.
- SA - originally get data in spring - state releases a data file in Oct. preliminary data - we can look at it. Then when originally released, data had changed from preliminary for identified students. Outside factors for accountability data.

Conclusions:	Will be brought to board in January.	
Action Items		Person Responsible / Deadline



Timberlane Regional School District Minutes

--	--

Observers	
Resource Persons	
Special Notes	Meeting adjourned at 5:38.