Type of Meeting	Curriculum and Assessment Committee
Date	2/6/24
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, ~~Chris Snyder, Sarah Galligher,~~ Dawn Roberson
Agenda	Previously disseminated and posted online.
Notetaker	Ashley Harbel

Approval of minutes from 1/9/24
Notes: Meeting called to order at 4:05PM
Motion to *Approve* by: Kim McCormick (as amended) Seconded by: Tim Guanci
10 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions

TOPIC: Desired Results Developmental Profile (DRDP)- Update	
Discussion:	Kim Rivers - Early Childhood Coordinator for the district

- https://www.childplus.com/drdp/about/
- SA - Reminder from last meeting - we discussed the decision that we should adopt DRDP as the program. Since that meeting, the state has adopted it.
- KR
    - SE Indicators - 2 indicators that we are focused on.
    - Indicator 7 - there are three areas that the state wants us to measure at the preschool level. We assess multiple times to see baseline and then their progress.
    - Up until now - state allowed districts to choose. That has changed and the system we are currently using is now phasing out.
    - DRDP/TGold - districts piloted the programs and the state made a determination.
    - Jan. 25, 2024 - memo from NH DOE - only allowing the DRDP to be the preschool measure moving forward.
    - DRDP Packet

- state created alignment with the NH Early Learning Standards
- DRDP domains that the assessment is looking at. There is a continuum from early supports/services through grade 3. For our purposes, we are only looking at the fundamental preschool view. There are capabilities to potentially broaden our use. But only the one preschool/pre-K is required by state and ends when student goes into K.
- DRDP allows collaboration between disciplines - gray area and discussions to have to pinpoint where students are. Will be able to track progress more closely and accurately.
- Reports that will help teachers target skills
- LC - two big talking points - collaborative process to the rubric and what that should look like for training and next steps for staff and how we can use this with all students, not just special ed in preschool/preK and how that can be used for the transition.
- KR
  - state says it is free for 200 students at this point, which would cover our students if we add students that are non-special ed.
  - State will be offering training on scoring a student and then on how to use the program.
- SA - if we were to be a training site, when might that be?
  - KR - I am thinking the spring. Trainings are 30 people. We could train all our teachers and related service providers. We could add in surrounding districts as well.
- KB - indicator 7 is on our determination from the state for needing improvement. They had pulled incorrect data, but moving forward, this will be helpful and getting more people trained would be a good idea.
- KR - this program really gives the opportunities for those shades of gray.
- KM - how many preschoolers/preK do we have in the district?
  - KR - under the 200 mark (total students).
- KM - would it make sense to do this all at once for all students?
  - KR - we should do it first as a special education team and then roll out to related service providers. Our preK teachers are dual certified anyway, so they will be trained. But it will be a smaller scale.
- CH - is there anything special they need to have tech wise?
  - KR - online website. Ken would look at form from the site. No downloads, etc…

Conclusions:	

Action Items	Person Responsible / Deadline
Create training schedule for staff and related service providers	Lucy/Kim/Kelley

TOPIC: Policies KEC Challenged Materials / IJM Challenged Materials- Update and action

Discussion:	Sandy Allaire

- Policy KEC - bringing back to second read after initial conversation in January.
- SA
    - Questions we had last meeting - do we want to move this right to policy or take a look at it again?
    - We sent it to legal to review and specifically asked them to look at language changes in KEC about stakeholder groups identified as complainants.
        - Eliminated staff (we discussed going through staff handbook for a process for this instead of in the policy)
        - Can we restrict to parents of current students (waiting on legal to get feedback).
    - SA has looked at multiple policies. Dover for example, reference article XI of the state constitutions - this gives residents and taxpayers the ability to challenge if they have been bought with taxpayer money.
    - Looking to leave it as residents - taxpayer - can lodge a complaint and go through the process.
    - KEC-R - KEC used to have both policy and procedure in it. This separates the two out. Procedures do not get approved through board.
        - Section G - Concern about large number of complaints. This would give an opportunity to appeal to superintendent to extend the process.
        - Describes appeal process to superintendent and school board. School board's decision would be final.
        - Section 8 of procedure - currently cannot be reviewed again for four years. But also have a line that the board can appeal. The board can always vote to waive policy.
            - Group consensus that the last sentence can be struck due to conflicting with the sentence before.
    - KEC-X - the form the complainant would complete as part of the procedure. Changed to reflect the changes in procedure.
        - TG - what does resident mean?
        - CH - this is for taking it out completely? There is a separate form for if an individual parent wants to restrict their student?
            - SA - yes. That is a separate form.
                - There is the controversial materials form that is for a work that all students are reading, etc… All students must have it signed as a permission slip, parents can opt students out.
                - Parents can object outside of that for their individual student outside of that procedure.

Conclusions:	Move to policy committee for first read in March

Action Items	Person Responsible / Deadline
Bring to policy	Sandy Allaire

Observers	
Resource Persons	
Special Notes	Meeting adjourned at 4:45 PM