

Type of Meeting	Curriculum and Assessment Committee
Date	11-7-23
Facilitator	Sandy Allaire
Attendees	Sandy Allaire, Mark Pederson, Lucy Canotas, Tim Guanci, Jennifer Puchlopek, Don Woodworth, Paul Lacain, Kelley Brooks, Dawn Roberson.
Agenda	Previously disseminated and posted online.
Notetaker	Tim Guanci

Approval of minutes from 9-5-23

Notes: Meeting called to order at 4:05

Motion to *Approve* by: MP

Seconded by: TG

in favor;9 opposed; 0 abstentions 0

TOPIC: Email Referencing free all day Kindergarten		
Discussion:	Talked about the need to look into the feasibility of establishing free all day Kindergarten in the district. Lucy is working on investigating this.	
•		
Conclusions:		
Action Items Person Responsible / Deadlin		Person Responsible / Deadline

TOPIC: Middle School Math	
Discussion:	MS Math competency proposed changes
JP reviewed the potential changes to the MS math competencies.	



- G8 Competency Statistics and Probability might have been added to 8th grade by mistake
- SA asked is the skill is addressed in the 8th grade standards or the 7th grade standards
- MP shares that this standard is carried over into some courses in the high school.
- JP informed the group that the probability and statistics standard is seen in 7th grade and that is where the teacher believe that it should be placed
- PL asked to review slide covering the probability and statistics competency for 8th grade
- MP stated that the teachers believe that it was placed their in error because the skills covered in 8th grade do not focus on probability and statistics
- LC Asks if the competency is still there. The team confirms that it is currently in the docs.
- SA asks is it would make sense to change the title instead to make it fit more to what the main topic of the unit would be
- LC Asks about the way units are named at TRMS. If it is an instructional unit then it shouldn't be in the title.
- JP asks is she should go back to the group to see if it would make more sense to change the name of the unit
- SA asks if there are other areas of 8th grade math that go back to Statistics and Probability. She is planning to look at the 8th grade math state standards to see if they are missing from the curriculum docs.
- LC brought up the point that probability and statistics is the name of the actual domain that the standards are linked to, if that's not the case then we should look at potentially changing the title of the unit instead.

Conclusions:	SA suggested that we look through the units and review the actual standards before we make a final decision and review the documents and suggested changes in Dec after we do more of a deep dive	
Action Items		Person Responsible / Deadline
		Committee/Next Meeting

TOPIC: Discussion: Keeping/ adjusting competency verbiage

- JP Proposing to remove a competency around rational numbers and would prefer it to say real numbers. Rational numbers fit under real numbers. This would allow consistency from 6th-8th.
- MP asked if that is involved in all grade levels in the vocabulary area.
- LC-It seems redundant to have those two competencies. How do they impact each other?
 Somewhere along the line the hierarchical structure needs to be articulated. Should later grades continue to include the first competency still?
- JP stated that she believes that doesn't impact the high school competencies but she can go back and review those to confirm that



- MP Rational is a vocabulary word.
- LC reminded us that at a certain point we need to circle back to review what the point of those vocabulary terms is in the competency docs
- PL shares that he understands the thought process behind wanting the change as all numbers are real numbers. He asks who suggested this and what department. He would like the differences between real and rational numbers taught somewhere.
- JP the math teacher leader meets with all of the middle school math teachers to identify and propose potential changes.

Conclusions:	Between this month and next month we can dig in and make sure those changes would not impact the high school competencies as they are written.	
Action Items		Person Responsible / Deadline
		Committee/Next Meeting

TOPIC: MS G8 1	ELA
Discussion:	Proposing an Essential Questions change to unit "Justice". They would like to go from two to one essential question.

- JP 8th grade ELA is requesting to revise two essential questions and revise the two essential questions down to just one essential question
- JP asks MP to project the G8 Competency doc for the justice unit to show where those changes would be made. Proposal is to combine to the single question of "Why is social justice important to a functioning society"
- DW asks if we are trying to revise a political issue or are we trying to identify why justice is blind
- Jen says that they would like to have a broader question to teach around.
- MP Did they talk about why they specifically brought in the word "social"?
- SA brings up that in 8th grade they review 12 Angry Men and focus on justice. SA brings up the point: is justice important to a functioning society?
- PL says that he doesn't see much about social justice in the competency docs. It is in the vocabulary.
- SA says a lot of the vocabulary comes directly from that text.
- JP remember we don't want to put the text as part of the curriculum, there is just so much more to those units than just that text.
- SA do we want to suggest that we bring it back to the teachers to see if they would like to omit "social"
- PL spoke about how a large majority of our students might not understand why jury duty is important and the importance of justice and justice being blind.
- DW would this allow them to focus more on the justice system and how its organized?
- IP remember this is an ELA unit not a social studies unit.
- LC i wouldn't want to take a word out of their questions without understanding where they were trying to go.
- DW asks why this wasn't more in social studies that ELA, why was this important to ELA?



 SA thats the specific unit in ELA that's the unit they chose MP there is more to that term justice than just our legal system 		
Conclusions:	We will bring it back to the teachers and get more rational as to why they want to change it	
Action Items		Person Responsible / Deadline
		JP /Next Meeting

TOPIC: Program	m of Studies
Discussion:	Laying out all of the proposed changes to the Program of Studies for 2024-2025

- MP passed out a document mapping out every proposed change to the program of studies. MP reviews what the program of studies is and how it's used within the high school. MP reviews where the program of studies is located in the committee documents folder. The program of studies goes to print in Dec. We then receive the program of studies in Jan. The high school counselors then go down to the middle school in late Jan. Early Feb. to review the course selection process that the high school uses as well as review the diploma planning worksheet that is included in the program of studies.
- MP It is required for the board to approve these proposed changes.
- DW One thing that i was always worried about was how one change would impact other courses and pathways or offerings.
- MP This one change is the biggest change in terms of what you might be referencing. Due to the number of courses being offered and the number of students signing up for classes. What we would like to do this year is archive specific courses allowing us to still offer courses for evening division or if we need to bring a course back we could bring back at a later date as needed. It can be difficult to run some of these very specific courses due to staffing and teacher experience/expertise. Running sections of environmental and forensics are upcoming. The belief is that with the offerings being kept in the program of studies we would still have enough courses being offered to allow students to take four years of science.
- SA reviewed how in ELA we did have to track and limit specific offerings of accelerated classes that were being offered previously. I'm wondering how many accelerated options we are still offering if we are going to be archiving these classes.
- JP We separated expository to give accelerated options, the thing that concerns me is that we did this previously and then due to low sign ups we kept pushing off offerings and not running specific classes for several years in a row. It impacted the number of sections that we could run on a specific course.
- MP if we completely eliminated them from the program of studies we would then in theory have to bring them through the C&A process.
- DW brought up that previously we had classes that were in the program of studies that we just left off of the course selection sheet
- MP if we have the course in the program of studies but don't offer them then it's almost like false
 advertising. Kids would previously be picking classes that fit their schedule just to fill their schedules.
 Teachers would then also be teaching a class that they weren't passionate about the content or the course
 of level of specificity.
- MP tonight would be our first read, early december would be second read and then get it to board directly
 after for first read allowing us to get the second read in front of the board allowing it to go to print on
 time.



- MP reviews a scenarios where 17 students would sign up for 3 classes that wouldn't run due to low numbers then having us assign those students to a different course
- JP asks if we are hesitant to archive them or just because we might be listing courses that won't be offered on the course sign up sheet.
- MP my hesitation to get rid of the course if you need to bring it back because you have a teacher that is
 then passionate about those courses or topics if you start seeing a spike in interest based off of the course
 itself.
- SA what i'm struggling with is how are mean measuring student interest if we are not asking the students
- LC asked if i'm a student that wants to take one of those courses that is not run during the day then they would still be able to take it during evening division.
- MP broke down how there might be students that are taking an environment that has a focus of botany or a focus of zoology. Students wouldn't be able to take a duplicate course so we would be able to run marine bio during evening division.
- LC is it possible to not offer a course but to keep the curriculum docs in order to offer the students an alternative pathway.
- SA maybe this is a change to our current policy that would allow us to revise our language adding in relating to courses that met prior board approval allowing those classes to easily come back.
- MP one of our biggest fears was that if you had a course that had been approved by one board and the you had to then present to a different board would it allow the course to then be able to come back
- LC what is the main focus or the root problem is it the process of is is it the course
- SA my main concern is that we are advertising classes to students but then we don't offer it, maybe it's an addendum to the program of studies that we could get approval from the board to bring back one of the archived courses if there was a need to bring that specific course back
- PL why was board approval such a sticking point
- MP reviewed the process of how the course would go through first and second read at C&A then at the board and then with the program of studies so it could be a three month process.
- DW I don't like throwing away good courses that could still be used and that could still get significant student interest in them.
- DW suggested dropping the second sentence about what would be involved in bringing then back or how but to just focus on they could be brought back at a later date.
- PL do we need to make a revision to the Policy or is it just being kept in the bucket
- MP it seems like it would just be keeping these classes in the bucket and rotating them back into circulation and putting other classes in the bucket
- MP there will be a change from health I bringing one topic from health I to fitness

Conclusions:	MP will make changes to this and bring it back for a second read next month, MP will redraft the program of studies to include the addendum	
Action Items		Person Responsible / Deadline

TOPIC: iReady	Fall Benchmark Results K-8
Discussion:	• SA we will table iReady Benchmark Results K-8 to next months meeting due to the time.



	 MP identified where the benchmark data was located in the committee folder so that members could review the data before next months meeting. 		
•			
Conclusions:			
Action Items		Person Responsible / Deadline	
TOPIC: Other			
Discussion:	ssion:		
Conclusions:			
Action Items		Person Responsible / Deadline	
Observers			
Resource Persons			
Special Notes	Meeting adjourned at		