

Type of Meeting	Curriculum and Assessment Committee
Date	9/5/2023
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
Agenda	Previously disseminated and posted online.
Notetaker	Ashley Harbel

Approval of minutes from 6/13/23

Notes: Meeting called to order at 4:05PM

Motion to *Approve* by: KM Seconded by: TG

9 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstentions

TOPIC: TRMS Grade 6 Social Studies Curriculum - 2nd read		
Discussion:	Jen Puchlopek	
• JP - documents are in our C&A drive to reference		
	de changes to 6th grade curriculum, which led to one small change to 7th grade social studies (one m what was pulled out of 6th).	
	New 7th grade unit (with what was pulled out of 6th grade) Two that will be aliminated from (th grade, Crasse and Mass America, are picked up in other	

- o Two that will be eliminated from 6th grade Greece and MesoAmerica are picked up in other areas of 6th grade and 7th grade curriculum
- o Reorganize separate Intro to SS Skills and Prehistory to build some more skill building and slow down instruction for students. Better fit for student learning
- o Add India curriculum
- SA 6th grade used Greece as the intro to democracy and 7th grade would do another intro to democracy. Now combined.
- SA this is our second read ready to take a vote to move the revisions on to the whole school board for consideration and adoption of the 6th grade curriculum.
- KM is this for next school year?



o JP - we would implement it now from when it is approved

Motion: KM - motion to move 6th grade curriculum to the board for consideration Seconded - TG

- SA this work was done with JP and with the 6th grade teachers
 - JP we wanted to give them voice in this process. Took a long time to get everyone on the same page and be intentional with changes.

11 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions

Conclusions:	sions: Motion approved	
Action Items		Person Responsible / Deadline
Move to school board		SA and MP

TOPIC: K-12 Science		
Discussion:	Mark Pedersen	
• MP		
0	When we started our science curriculum, we adopted NGSS (next generation science standards)	
	before the state did.	
0	Used language of NGSS to build competencies and curriculum	
0	State then wrote model competencies - which are similar to what we have and scope of what we	
	have - looking at how science operates and doing science (patterns, cause and effect, etc)	
	Changes now - looking at model competencies and adopting those - it streamlines the work that we	
	have done in the past	
	KM - is this similar to model policies of the school board association and how we may adopt these?	
	MP - yes	
	l changes aligned with state model competencies 6-12	
	s work was born out of a science curriculum committee that has some admin, and MS/HS	
	lum leaders. They met monthly for all of 22-23 year to dig into this work. Teacher representation.	
	is is coming from the teachers	
• MP		
0	recently brought forensic science through C&A - used the state competencies when building that	
	course to trial run it.	
0	Summer teacher work - realigned competencies into the curriculum that they have (see Science	
	Competencies NEW sheet)	
0	Competencies that were there had been asking students to do these things - we just renamed and	
	reorganized them to better fit the state model competencies.	
0	MS - same competencies but at different grade levels	



- 7th grade spends weeks being reflective about teaching. They have made some major changes to unit more in title and organization than in content
- See Document 6-12 Science Curriculum Changes for major and minor changes
- AH so nothing is shifting grade levels?
 - $\circ\quad$ MP no they are restructuring within grade level
 - SA are they eliminating things?
 - $\circ\quad$ MP not really.
- DW Are all the competencies assessed multiple times throughout the continuum?
 - MP Nature of Science is the one we see the most. But all of the other ones are seen multiple times.
- DW do you hear anything about confusion about competencies?
 - MP not really. We are hearing parents asking more questions now about competencies.
- MP -
 - Minor changes to HS curriculum documents don't affect what we are teaching our kids. Essential question changes (either because they are not resonating with kids or rewording), realigning some standards within units, and shifting some of the vocabulary to fit within units better.
- SA next steps for this committee for changes 6-12 are you thinking you will be bringing back the revised units for a first and second read?
 - $\circ~$ MP 6-8 curriculum documents are in our folder, 9-12 need to work on.
 - SA is it a bring back to the group and bring back to the board of all the competency changes holistically vs. individual documents. It might be overwhelming to board
 - DW/KM agree to move forward holistic view versus rewriting 30/40 documents.
 - KM so more of just a different wording? Not a different sequence?
 - MP yes the wording in each individual competency is going to be different everything that is in them is still there.
- PL some of these things I want to ask why? Why are we removing these essential questions, vocab, etc... from these units?
 - MP these are the words and questions in these units, but now some of these are not true to the nature of that topic/unit.
 - MP essential questions are the "ungoogleable" questions to get kids thinking and asking questions. Questions often have multiple answers. Not removing without replacing with a question that gets to the same ideas.
- PL for 7th grade changing titles the ones on the right seem simpler it looks like they use different vocabulary that is less complicated.
 - $\circ\quad$ MP I don't know what the rationale is for changing the titles. But will investigate
 - $\circ~$ PL we want to make sure the titles are engaging and at a student's level
 - PL/DW is there an avoidance of certain topics/words?
- LC working on K-5 work
 - Hopeful to get a motion on the competency changes so that those can be made before the first trimester when they need to be put in the gradebook.
 - \circ $\;$ Then, work on the changes in the curriculum documents

- LC when MP and LC started the work, they looked at units and competencies to make sure they are spread out across the board. In some cases, the competencies that were created and were over complicated when we created ours.
 - Competencies on the pages are from NGSS and they align with the content/units that we pulled from.
 - 2019 pattern that we had been using at Timberlane was changed to better help the reporting process. Moved to writing competencies that aligned with science practices, not with content. All followed the same language stems (science skills).
 - We are ready to move away from this pattern and move to specific competencies to skills that we are teaching and ways we are assessing kids, as well as when/what students are learning across elementary schools and realigning.
 - Ready to move to integration of content with ELA, writing, etc... and work towards aligning schools and eventually assessments, etc...
- LC we would like to move competencies to the board first and then write curriculum documents.
- DW is that hard to do to get them to align timeframes?
 - LC it is important to give them time that they need to align and discuss with each other both subs for teachers and early release PD time/curriculum work
 - DW similar resources at every site?
 - LC we are in a better place with more consistency, expectations, instruction, etc...
- SA I am proposing that we move competencies to the second board meeting in Sept. for a first read?
- MP ideally if we could get the new competencies approved, then we could start to report out on those and in the background slowly working on curriculum documents.
- SA Sept. 21st is before the early release day would have questions that could bring back to teachers.
- KM when you are looking at the elementary school one is this more information than they had before?
 - LC the competencies are the state model ones, which are the HS versions. The state then broke those down and made I Can statements from them that the students see and assess on. The competency is K-12.
 - KM so they have to be able to teach the skills to build the competency? Do they have something in particular they are teaching to help teach that?
 - LC they have those units we have not changed those yet have not heard the need to change the skills yet, but there may be change in essential questions, engagement strategies. NGSS puts out a unit plan that aligns with this competency. Our units already have all of that in it.
 - SA the I Can statements tell the teachers, kids, parents at that grade level what the skills are at that grade level. It gives more clarity.
 - LC the evidence collection is what we are going to be digging into more. Was spearheaded by our assessment scores - looking at what we are addressing with the topics and the science content.

Motion - AH Move to bring the competency changes to the board for a first read Seconded - CH 10 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions



٦

Conclusions:		
Action Items		Person Responsible / Deadline
MP - find out rationale for title changes in 7th grade Move competencies to board for first read		Mark Pedersen Lucy/Mark

Discussion:	Geometry, Prob Stats Trig, Other
• JP	
0	K-12 math meetings happening as well
0	6-12 math - met and worked to come to a conclusion that there are minor changes that need to be made.
• JP - Ge	cometry - see competency revision overview
0	Two new competencies that teachers want to put in place
0	Used to have 5 competencies - they would like to go down to 2 - some specificity in some
	competencies that did not fit. Wanted to broaden them in order to report out more often.
0	AH - so they umbrella underneath the new ones?
	 The new two competencies are more generalized that can be adapted to each unit and all the content that is embedded.
0	DW - so it seems opposite of what science does?
	 MP - we have taken out content, which math still has in.
	• Ex: Geo - circles - why just focus on circles? Allows them to use them in the competencies in multiple units
0	I Can statements - still a part of the rubrics (revised) and nothing is lost.
0	KM - so would it make sense to say we are moving away from content in competencies to a more broad statement that can be applied to rubrics
О	DW - the standards go up into the overarching skills - some ability in how you get there vs. all of those things up front of what you are teaching.
0	KM - sometimes hard to think about how competencies connect to the content.
0	MP - is it the transferable skills?
0	LC - there are 6 units - it broadens to 2 competencies that will be assessed over time
0	AH - these are the skills we want them to be competent in by the end of the year and assess multiple times throughout the year.
0	KM - so the competency as it applies to circles, then the competency as it applies to squares
0	AH - think about it as an umbrella - the standards go under the competency. The essential question
	goes under standards. They nest under each other.
0	DW - you need to have done the practice and individual skills in order to achieve the competency.

- JP Prob/Stats/Trig see Competency revision doc
 - o Started with 12/13 competencies
 - AH this is our new course that has been taught for a year it makes sense that they would consolidate
 - o JP they had taken competencies from classes that they had combined. After a year, they want to go down to 8 competencies.
 - o Color coding how they moved from old to new (ex 2 yellow old ones match with 1 new one)
 - o Teachers aligned all old rubrics, I Can statements all are nested under new competencies so nothing is loss
 - o AH so all skills are still represented?
 - JP yes
 - o JP New curriculum documents
 - Graphing, modeling, logic show up in all units mathematical practices that are represented in multiple parts in the curriculum.
 - DW this is as clear as I have seen the math department create
 - o JP it cuts down on reporting, but not on what they are doing and the teaching.
 - o SA the teachers worked this summer to iron it out
- LC the difference with science is a K-12 move vs. Geometry is 1 course. Is there work we need to do that shows alignment K-12 for math to show that it does not change that?
 - o DW if they see from the course description to the skills then they will be thrilled easier to track and trace the why
 - o CH trig one is easier to understand
 - o DW one example for each discipline on what moved and why would work well.
- KM we need to do something that tells the board that this is a year's worth of work that went through teachers, curriculum directors, then C&A before going to the board.
- DW people are asking what were you doing to help move our students forward this is one of the things we are doing.
- KM and to show the public that the teachers are doing so much more work than just in the classroom.
- DW focus on national and state direction.
- PL important that you can simplify the mission and the goal of what we are trying to do more comfort to engage and empower students to learn the skills they need. These were all well-written.

Motion - AH Move to bring the competency changes for Geometry and Prob/Trig/Stats to the board for a first read Seconded - KM

10 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions

Conclusions:	
Action Items	Person Responsible / Deadline
6-8 math - coming to next meeting Move to board for the first read	Sandy, Mark, Jen



TOPIC: Subcommittee on Challenged Materials		
Discussion:		
 Subcommittee work from summer Class Size policy - moved to policy for recommendation - going to board for first read. If interested in subcommittee for the challenged materials subcommittees, email Sandy IJM - Challenged Materials KEC - Challenged Materials 		
Conclusions:		
Action Items Person Responsible / Deadline		Person Responsible / Deadline

Email Sandy if interested

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

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