

MANCHESTER SCHOOL DISTRICT SAU #37

COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION

September 6, 2016

**Immediately following
the Joint Committee meeting**

Chair Langton called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Committee Members Langton, Avard, Girard, Freeman, Van Houten

Messrs: C. Martin, S. DeVincent, D. Ryan, C. Cohen, K. Delfond, A. Allen, C. Brennan

Chair Langton advised that the purpose of the public forum is to give the residents of Manchester the opportunity to address the committee on items of concerns affecting the community; that each person will be given only one opportunity to speak; that comments shall be limited to three minutes to allow all participants the opportunity to speak and any comments must be directed to the Chair. Any resident wishing to speak will come forward to the nearest microphone, clearly state their name and address when recognized and give their comments.

Ms. Patrice Benard, 31 Aurore Avenue, stated:

I want to address the science program that you are looking at. I have already talked to the representatives from McGraw Hill about the spelling errors I found. Homeschool moms don't like it when we find spelling errors. In looking at the list of books and the titles, did you not just spend \$90,000 on books to improve closer reading? You did. Well, here's another set of books to improve the Common Core state standards, especially the standards for closer reading. How many of these books do you plan on spending our taxpayer money on? How many of our teachers don't know how to teach reading? I think this is a waste of money, time and taxpayers' and students' and teachers' efforts. This is unnecessary. One or the other and you already voted for the other one, Nany Boyles closer reading books. There are abundant numbers of

informational texts as common Core requires that do apply to science and historical references in those 37 books that you have already approved. This would be a waste of time and money. The next item I would like to discuss, pages 43-62, the NG grant. I'm not quite sure why you would give a grant to a school that fails... If you look at the grant submitted by Principal Amy Allen, I don't think she is the one who wrote the presentation. The number of grammatical, spelling and style errors on those pages made my head spin. She mentions that she has areas of focus, but of course she is not going to focus on parent and community involvement because god knows that might actually work. No, she wants to focus on PACE and projected based learning. Honestly, she is trying to change the classrooms to multiage classrooms. It might not be a bad idea, but she is doing it in context of PACE and project based learning. Again, you are having the wool pulled over your eyes. She is going headlong with her agenda and she really doesn't care what the taxpayers think. Be careful what you wish for and be careful what kinds of federal funds you take. I think you are being swindled again.

Ms. Amy Allen, Principal of Parker Varney, stated:

Just to clarify with the NG grant, as I mentioned before with Curriculum and Instruction, parental and family engagement is one of the six pillars. We are prioritizing and we continue to prioritize family and engagement and look to partner with families in many ways. We have increased our parental volunteers from ten to 150 in a matter of a year and we continue to encourage them to come in and to work with us. I look forward, if you have any questions later on, about the NG grant to explain that to you. It is just a great opportunity to continue with what we are doing. It is not a personal agenda. It is actually driven with the students, their families and our staff.

*There being no one else present wishing to speak, on motion of **Committee Member Avard**, duly seconded by **Committee Member Girard**, it was voted to take all comments under advisement and further to receive and file any written documentation presented.*

Chair Langton addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Approval of minutes from the June 28, 2016 meeting.

*On motion of **Committee Member Freeman**, duly seconded by **Committee Member Avard**, it was voted to approve the minutes.*

Chair Langton addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Ratify and confirm the phone poll conducted July 25, 2016 to approve the literacy coach training and the professional leave in the amount of \$17,500.
(Note: The phone poll of the full Board of School Committee was ratified at the 8/8/2016 meeting.)

Committee Member Girard stated I'm just curious why we need to do this since it has already been approved by the board.

Ms. Maura Leahy, Clerk of the Board of School Committee, responded it is more of just a procedural to make sure all the I's are dotted and the T's are crossed. Because it was a phone poll of this committee as well as the board I thought the prudent thing to do was to have it both ratified and confirmed by both the committee and the board as well.

*On motion of **Committee Member Van Houten**, duly seconded by **Committee Member Avard**, it was voted to ratify and confirm the phone poll.*

Chair Langton addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Pilot of Elementary Inspire Science Materials.

Dr. Christine Martin, Assistant Superintendent, if I may bring forward Sharon DeVincent from our federal projects department to discuss the research that she has done in this area and the funding for this project as well.

Ms. Sharon DeVincent, Director of Federal Projects and Professional Development, stated these materials were something that one of our Title I schools was interested in using in their building to support science and STEM/STEAM throughout the school day and integrate it into different areas. I was approached about these materials and we wanted to bring it forward so you guys have an opportunity to look over the materials and ask questions about them. I brought the representatives from McGraw Hill here to answer any questions you might have about the materials.

Committee Member Girard stated several months ago there were folks before this committee who were discussing the evaluation of our district wide science curriculum and I was wondering how, if at all, that fit into that. I forget the lady's name. One, I think was West and the other was from McLaughlin maybe.

Mr. David Ryan, Assistant Superintendent, stated one from Central and the other was from McLaughlin, that's correct.

Committee Member Girard stated they were talking about, if I'm not mistaken, Mr. Ryan, they were discussing looking into the next gen science standards and other science standards, which I did remember to forward you a set of standards, correct? They said they would welcome any submissions. In my failing memory, did I remember to send you the science standards that I had looked at?

Mr. Ryan replied I did not receive any for science from you, no.

Committee Member Girard stated then I will have to go back and make sure I send them to you. Is this part and parcel of that? Are you doing something completely independent of what the secondary school teachers are doing?

Ms. DeVincent replied I didn't even know the secondary school teachers were doing anything. This was just something that one of the elementary schools wanted to try to try to integrate some more science.

Committee Member Girard asked is this going to be at one school or is this going throughout the district?

Ms. DeVincent replied actually other schools were interested too. It was one that just approached me with it.

Committee Member Girard stated and the one that approached you with it, is it a secret?

Ms. DeVincent replied there are about four or five schools that are interested in piloting and trying out the materials.

Committee Member Girard asked is there one is currently doing it?

Ms. DeVincent replied not that I'm aware of.

Committee Member Girard stated I don't know if Mr. Ryan or Dr. Martin can answer this question. Has anybody taken a look at this to see whether or not it is in alignment with the efforts to rewrite our secondary school science curriculum?

Dr. Martin replied I would defer to the folks from McGraw Hill. I'm assuming that a contemporary publication would be focused on the next generation science standards.

Ms. Carol Cohen, McGraw Hill, stated it is. It is written to the next generation science standards. I'm the New Hampshire sales representative for McGraw Hill. It is written to the next generation science standards.

Committee Member Girard stated I have a couple of specific questions about what is in here. On page 37 of our agenda in grade five there is information on the water cycle. One of the fun things I have been able to do as a school board member is be a judge in the fourth grade water cycle contest sponsored by the Manchester Water Works and the itinerant poster contest. Has anybody considered the fact that this proposes to teach the water cycle a grade later than we are already doing and have built a rather long and impressive historic activity in this city through that water science fair and that poster contest?

Ms. DeVincent replied I don't know if anybody gave any thought exactly to that. I would not see it changing. I would say it would be a continuation of what they have learned and maybe continuing the education of it. They always say you want to teach things multiple times.

Ms. Cohen stated there will be different aspects in different grade, but they probably have water cycle in multiple grades.

Committee Member Girard stated on page 36, I see a number of entries throughout this thing about energy from the sun, solar this and solar that, which I'm fine with, but in the fourth grade we have a module about energy from natural resources and we have energy from water and wind energy. Call me crazy, because they are natural resources, so is natural gas, so is wood, so is oil, so is coal. Are we presenting a political correct environmental energy power generation through this thing or are we talking about all of the resources that are available to an industrial country that needs abundant and affordable energy.

Ms. Kristen Delfond, McGraw Hill, stated I'm a curriculum specialist with McGraw Hill. The topics were chosen by grade level according to NGSS standards so what you see happen in grade three and grade four and grade five is driven by those standards. To speak to your question directly, I would want to look in the book myself.

Committee Member Girard stated you're the publisher of the book. You mean you don't know what is in your own book, with due respect.

Ms. Delfond stated well I didn't write the book.

Committee Member Girard stated a salesman knows their product I would think.

Ms. Delfond stated we do know the product, but to speak to every grade level particular and what they are teaching in every module, I would refer to the book to study that myself to become an expert on that particular module in that grade level.

Committee Member Girard stated Madame Chair, I don't have any further specific questions at this time. I do, however, have some comments, which I will reserve until members have had a chance to ask their questions and you look for a motion to discuss.

Dr. Martin stated a couple things that I would like to remind the committee of. When we look at these materials they are resources. In the 21st century we don't start on day one at the beginning of a book and work our way through the book. These are resources that teachers will use to teach the next generation science standards in a pilot format, four or five schools, as Ms. DeVincent mentioned. If there are gaps and this the purpose of a pilot, if there are gaps, then the teacher will then supplement with other resources. I agree with Committee Member Girard, we do not want to throw the baby out with the bathwater so to speak and dismiss our wonderful science fairs that are focused on water, but I think that they would be a great impetus for the unit on the water cycle in grade five and maybe we would decide in Manchester that we are going to teach that grade five unit in grade four because it is more applicable to how our teachers want to present the next generation science standards. If we can keep in mind that this is a resource and for pilot purposes asking the committee's approval to move forward so that our teachers can experiment with these tools.

Committee Member Girard stated I appreciate that they are resources, Dr. Martin, and I think four to five elementary schools, when you have 14 of them, is a sizeable pilot. I also am aware that when you provide the resources there is an expectation that the resources are going to be used.

Dr. Martin stated agreed.

Committee Member Girard started I guess since we seem to be entering into bit a discussion phase here, in as much as this doesn't seem to be coordinated with what the secondary school revisions of our science curriculum are looking at, and given that the board hasn't had any discussion whatsoever about the next generation science standards, which haven't been adopted by the state, which haven't been adopted by the city, I'm somewhat reticent in looking for an explanation as to why I would start a pilot program on something that doesn't seem to be integrated with secondary school efforts and a set of standards that nobody in the state of New Hampshire has adopted.

Dr. Martin stated I appreciate, Mr. Girard, you know I always appreciate your comments and questions. It was my understanding, it has been a bit, that when we talked with the folks from the high schools and the middle schools that they were developing units of instruction based on the next generation science standards though we may or may not have, as a community, adopted those, we have an obligation to teach science and that is what's out there right now. I'm not aware of the standards that you have to share and I'm very welcome to look at those.

Committee Member Girard stated you'll get them.

Dr. Martin stated and that's great. I guess what I'm saying is I look at these units of instruction and I don't see anything that would contradict what would be best practices in the areas of science education at this point in time.

Committee Member Girard stated the other concern that I'll air here, just as a general one, we hear, and it actually blows my mind how much I have heard this from teachers and even

principals in the schools, about how little time they have to really teach reading and writing and building blocks of math. There was one principal who frankly even told me, and I won't say who it is because I don't want anybody under the bus, that they are not following the district's curriculum in teaching cursive handwriting in elementary school even though it is a standard the board adopted because we don't have time with everything else that we have to do between the curriculum, the testing, everything else. I have spoken with elementary school teachers and I know there is going to be a range of opinions on this that think introducing a structured science curriculum into the elementary grades is not only unnecessary, but something that takes away time that they need to really teach kids, particularly in the earlier grades, those basis reading, writing and math skills that they really need to master in order to be able to pick up the science, whether it is in the later elementary grades or in the secondary schools. Those are the reservations that I have about moving forward with this. As you know I'm all for pilots, but a pilot that I think is not going to head in the right direction is something that I have reservations about.

Chair Langton stated just a clarification by the individuals here for the presentation, could you clarify at the top for anyone in the public who might have seen this online as far as the agenda, under "Lexile levels" A, O, B. I know what a Lexile level is, but could you explain what that means?

Ms. Delfond replied sure. The A, O, B is in reference to the leveled readers that are one of the resources with Inspire science materials. A standard for approaching level; O is on level; B is beyond level and the ELL is English language learner so it is differentiation.

Chair Langton stated so there will be three different books, units?

Ms. Delfond stated for each module of instruction, there are two leveled reader titles, two non-fiction titles and Carol is holding up the four leveled readers that would be in one module so instruction.

Chair Langton stated and again, could you tell us the schools that are interested in the pilot?

Ms. Cohen replied I'm not quite sure that I have them all, but I know Hallsville, Northwest, Weston and there was one other.

Ms. DeVincent stated Hallsville was the first one that approached me and said I want to try these out with my staff. The principal there, she would have been here if she could have, but she was unable to make it, was just looking for some ways to provide some science materials that teachers could use and imbed as they needed to throughout the day. It wasn't necessarily to follow the exact modules or lesson plans that came with the materials. It would be an option for teachers. As Dr. Martin said, it is a resource. Teachers could use it at their discretion. It was just a principal seeing a need in her building to just get some very factual science materials into the hands that could be very versatile and used at different parts of the day that have some inquiry pieces to it to help build the student scientist, as we like to think of them.

Chair Langton stated just a couple of clarifying questions before we continue, is science taught every day at the elementary level?

Dr. Martin replied my understanding, we have asked this question a lot, in many schools there is an actual block of instruction that may be every other day, they may be switching off on science or social studies.

Chair Langton asked or every other week?

Dr. Martin replied I'm not aware of every other week. I'm aware of every other day, but I will inquire more specifically. I think what you are seeing much more commonly used in our schools is this idea of imbedded science instruction through the STEAM approach in particular or imbedded through several content areas. I see it as both, a defined instructional block, not daily, and in addition, imbedded in the content of STEAM and sciences.

Chair Langton asked what is the cost associated with this?

Ms. Cohen replied with the pilot, I guess it would depend on how many schools are piloting. If it is one or two schools the cost would be about \$14 per student. For the pilot they would be buying one consumable. If multiple schools... We haven't gone to some of the schools yet. We wanted to get approval first before we went forward. We were asked to do that. Schools that have emailed me in the past, I know you had purchased some of Nancy Boyles materials, but we did an event with Nancy Boyles and she was doing some close reading with these materials and your principals came to that event and that's where they started to see a little bit about our Inspired Science program. The ones that came there wanted to pilot Inspire, but it wasn't ready last year. It is just now ready and it is just now coming on the market. When we were showing it we were showing the level three as prototypes. We haven't reached out to all the schools. If more schools want to then the cost will go down.

Mr. Ryan stated both you and Dr. Martin have kind of touched on the point I wanted to make with regard to the Lexile levels, guided reading levels and the benchmark levels. This really is more about a literacy program than it is anything else as we are finding in all of our integrated core subjects so students who are reading at these specific levels, while they are learning about science, what they are also learning about is the literacy of science and therefore learning how to read or become better readers, particularly our students in our ELL column. We find that students who are native speakers of a language other than English were really struggling in topics such as science because the vocabulary is very complex and this will help advance their understanding of it, as it will all young readers who are going through grades one through. That was the point I wanted to make.

Committee Member Van Houten stated just to add that, I was noting too that a student journal is a component so we are tying in the language arts with the writing as well and I think that kind of a program that takes in the essential skills while adding the content is something that we are more looking for in our schools today, but my question is back to what Committee Member Langton mentioned, the cost. I know that you said what the cost is, but I'm not sure, does that come out of the individual school's budget?

Ms. DeVincent replied yes. This is something, like I said, that one particular school would like and they would have their own budget so the schools would have their own Title I.

Committee Member Girard stated you just said if you got approval you were going to solicit more schools to participate so is this a four or five school pilot or is this something you are looking to expand immediately upon walking out of the building with the approval?

Ms. Cohen replied it would probably be a four or five school pilot. If schools haven't asked me about it I've not gone into schools knocking on doors saying I have a science program for you. What I do think might happen is that these schools that are piloting it might really like the materials and how they integrate into the reading, into the math that they may talk to their peers. Before I said yes to anybody else, I wanted to make sure that was something that the School Board approved.

Committee Member Girard stated when you say you wanted to make sure you said yes to anybody else, you mean outside of the four schools whose name you have given us here?

Ms. Cohen replied correct, and I can't recall because it was last year and I didn't bring my notebook with me, but there were some other principals that were at that close reading. They did ask me at the time about piloting and I know that Hallsville was right up there doing it right away and I believe there was another principal that I can't recall that asked me then. I have not spoken to her because we did not have materials ready and that's what I said at the time. I'm just following up on the ones that are asking me right now.

Committee Member Girard stated and I have a question about what we do with social studies and not because Dr. Martin brought it up because as someone was talking it dawned on me that the State of New Hampshire, I think someone was talking about STEM, the State of New Hampshire is now mandating standardized testing in social studies and civics because we are so awful at, our population is so ignorant of the basic history and heritage. What are we doing in the elementary schools for history? I know the fourth grade is supposed to be New Hampshire history year, tour the State House and never really learn anything about the state.

Dr. Martin stated I can certainly, Mr. Girard, provide in the board update packet what the elementary schools are currently doing with social studies. I'm happy to do that. It is very much the same kind of thing as what they are doing with science. It is very much integrated into, in many cases, the literacy component, but I'm happy to articulate for you more clearly. We also have a relatively current resources, I can't remember the vendor, but we have a relatively current resource for all of our elementary schools as well.

Committee Member Girard stated I'm sure I'm going to take some flak for this, but I'm one of those folks who likes to see the books that are going to be bought. I might have an opinion about them or some insight and I'll tell you why particularly with a science book. In my daughter's schools, which is a charter school, she had a science book too. The science book blames deforestation for the plague that ravaged Europe, which, of course, is factually not true. I think sometimes we tend not to look at science books... There were other things, but that's the one that jumps right out to mind. There are other things that might warrant a look. I think I have made myself clear. I am not a fan of this close reading thing. I have some questions about an item later on the agenda that has to do with the NWEA scores and i-ready scores. The school that piloted this close reading thing that we are doing is one of the schools that did not make... Let's just say that it was outpaced by almost every other school whose testing scores did not improve by at least the goal that was set. One of the questions I have, did those tests take place before or after they started the pilot program because if they took place after the pilot program started then it kind of makes the case that maybe that pilot wasn't successful and we should have had that information before we went ahead and threw it into all the elementary schools because while everyone might be excited by it, guess what, other schools that don't have the program did

much better. I think there are a lot of questions here about moving forward and I think it is pretty clear my vote won't be to do that, respectfully.

Committee Member Avard stated just whenever we are looking at a pilot program there is usually a definition to it as far as timeframe and this doesn't have any kind of time limit on it. What is the scope of this for a pilot? When are we looking to begin? When does the pilot end?

Ms. Cohen replied we didn't work out all the details yet because we didn't have the approval to move forward with the pilot. With the approval to go forward with the pilot we can work out those details. It would be a one year pilot. The only cost to each school would be the consumable piece, which would be the "be a scientist notebook" and we would provide the leveled readers and the teacher materials, the online components as well as the student reference book free to the classes.

Committee Member Avard asked when are you coming back to us with the finalized program if we approve tonight?

Ms. Cohen replied I would probably work with each individual school and work on a professional development time for them to go in and do some training as well as start delivering some products.

Committee Member Avard stated I'm not comfortable voting on a pilot that I don't know the score of the pilot.

Ms. Cohen stated I see what you are saying.

Committee Member Avard stated I'm assuming that you are looking for us to say okay, go ahead and put together a plan and then you are going to come back to us. I'm just assuming that's what you just said, that we are then going to get a definition of this pilot and we will have another vote or are you looking for us to just say go ahead with whatever you have set up and leave it open.

Ms. Cohen stated there is no excuse for this, but I do a lot of pilots and all of my pilots are New Hampshire, Maine and Vermont. I'm a New Hampshire, Maine and Vermont sales representative and my schools are all fairly small so if I have it in my budget to support the materials then I do the pilots. At the end of the pilots, if they choose not to purchase I don't pick up the materials if the school can use them. If they can't use them then I pick up the materials. If they are piloting multiple programs then I do pick up the materials because they chose another program, but if they are just trying this out because they think it is going to help their kids then I leave the leveled readers because they are going to continue to help their kids. I was hearing before too that it is really about the partnership, how we want to help Manchester too. We have McGraw Hill, we have a big name behind us that has some resources and I have a rather large budget. I'm a retired teacher in New Hampshire. She is also a teacher in New Hampshire. We just want to help too.

Committee Member Avard stated and I'm not trying to hamstring you on this. When I vote on something I want to know the scope of what I'm voting on. If you need us to set a scope tonight we can set a scope tonight or if you need to come back to us with further development of this pilot we can. I just can't vote on it unless we know what we are voting on.

Ms. DeVincent stated I guess with your permission we would reach out and find out exactly which of those four or five schools want to do something and we would come up with a plan for the year and get that right back to you.

Committee Member Avard stated so you are looking for us to approve the investigation of a pilot.

Ms. DeVincent responded yes, because we didn't want to start asking questions of the schools and the principals and getting everyone all excited about the materials until you guys have a chance to look at the materials and make some decisions there.

Chair Langton stated I just have a clarifying question and a couple of points. It was mentioned that someone had reviewed these books and there were spelling errors.

Ms. Cohen stated it wasn't the books.

Chair Langton stated I would just like to make sure that that gets rectify. I personally have been teaching science for over 20 years and it is very aggravating to find errors in a science book. Obviously science changes over time and need to be updated, but when the book has content errors, that is a problem. Where are we right now with our science curriculum? I know that we wanted every five years or so, but I don't think that, science, in particular, has been updated in a while.

Mr. Ryan stated right. Thank you for asking that question because I was going to try to bud in and say at the middle and the high school it was Tina Proulx from McLaughlin and Line Ricard at the high school, the BLILs working together at the high schools. They have been working on the revision they started when they came before you to talk about those revisions and the work they have been doing. They will be coming back soon to share their work. One thing I would like to be able to do, however, is ensure that our unit guides for grade five, particularly within the pilot program, have an opportunity to meet with Tina for grade six to make sure that we can bridge and understand the transitions between the two grade levels so that there is vertical continuity in the science curriculum and find out what opportunities exist for other resources or for some overlaps in content and skills.

Committee Member Freeman stated I just noted that your kindergarten samples won't be available until January 2017. I have a real issue approving a pilot program if we don't know what the materials are going to be for every single grade. Can you shed any light on that?

Ms. Delfond replied Inspire Science was piloted nationally last year and with input from teachers and district leaders we look feedback and made some adjustments to the materials for Inspire. The materials that schools are using this year are a 2.0 version, an updated version of Inspire. Changes were made and the kindergarten program required additional changes so the

academic design team worked on grades one through five, tweaking and making the changes, mostly wayfinding changes within the books and on the digital site. Kindergarten is in development right now and is slated to be released before that January date, but it was the last grade to be revamped.

Ms. DeVincent stated and just to add to that, we would get you samples before we put it into the schools. That's the whole point of this, for you guys to see the materials or see what the readers are and that sort of stuff before they go into the classrooms.

Committee Member Freeman stated honestly, I think for lack of a better word I think you are putting the cart before the horse then. If you don't have all the material for this pilot program to present to us now, how can we vote on it? We can't. I can't. I would find it very difficult to vote for something if I only have three-quarters of the information that I need to make a decision. I'm really kind of surprised and a little mystified why you would bring this in front of us if not all of the information was here.

Committee Member Van Houten stated I have a couple of questions that just kind of bit in with bits and pieces. To Mr. Ryan, our curriculum management plan still sits on the table in this committee. If this, or any other pilot for that matter, science pilot or another subject matter were to be accepted within the next year, we would weave that it since this plan is still evolving. Am I correct with that?

Mr. Ryan replied that's correct, and we are looking for some resolution on the curriculum management plan within the next two meetings.

Committee Member Van Houten stated another question that I have, just to clarify and be sure, at the end of this pilot, regardless of our choice you would leave the textbooks with our youngsters, we would only pay for the consumable notebook or workbook, whatever you call it?

Ms. Cohen replied that's correct. The online for the pilot would be one year. Typically when we sell a program it would be a five year digital for the student and the teacher that would not

come with the pilot so they would have access to the digital while they are part of the pilot, but then afterward it would come with the purchase, but the print materials would be yours to keep.

Committee Member Van Houten asked are you offering or proposing a pilot that does not include kindergarten?

Ms. Cohen replied we brought the leveled readers for kindergarten. We were not going to start the pilot for kindergarten until after the first of the year. We were going to offer, with the approval of the leveled readers, that they would be able to access the content ahead of time so they would be integrating the leveled readers into their reading and then starting the science pilot after the first of the year.

Committee Member Van Houten stated so kindergarten is only a half year pilot. I know that my opinion is well known. I respect the expertise of our teachers. I know nothing about teaching science, grade three science, and for me to see the books would probably not be particularly helpful. Assuming the teachers still want to go with this pilot and the schools so, I will certainly be willing to certify their ability to do so from one point of view.

Committee Member Girard stated following up on some questions that Dr. Avard asked, I want to make sure that I understood you correctly. You don't have the details of the pilot, you don't know how long, you don't have any information to present us with that because you didn't want to contact the schools that were interested and work out the plans and get them all excited and then come to the committee and potentially have it shot down. Did I understand that correctly?

Ms. DeVincent replied I wouldn't say it was quite like that. When the one principal came up and asked about the pilot I went and spoke to Dr. Livingston and said someone is interested in trying out these materials and her response to me was have the C&I Committee look at the materials first before we go any further. I found out who was interested, who wasn't interested, but I left it at that and I said let us get it on to the committee so we could get your questions because part of it is figuring out what information we are missing because we look at the stuff a lot and sometimes we answer questions automatically in our heads and it is good to hear what you guys are looking at and what you are seeing and what we need to come back and clarify.

Committee Member Girard stated what the prior statement said to me was that the committee giving you approval to go and start the pilot program was almost implied approval of the program and that's how I took the meaning of what was said because if the committee says okay we are willing to see what you come up with, presumably you are going to go to people and say the committee is interested in developing a pilot program you are going to get them all excited and then you bring it here, we could shoot it down and then you would have the same letdown that you would have had if you had done it before you came to the committee with a complete plan for us to approve.

Ms. DeVincent stated my apologies if it came across that way. That wasn't the intent. It was more of letting you guys see the materials, getting your feedback. Like Dr. Avard said, we didn't plan a scope or plan at this point because right now it is just having the materials approved, but we would come up with a scope or plan and that would still need your approval because the scope or plan that we may come up with meeting with the principals might be different than what we are looking to approve in the committee. It is kind of a two step process.

The first step is, is this something that is viable that we could move forward with and look at creating a scope and plan for for the pilot. We would get the exact details, dollar amounts, exactly which schools want to particular, exactly which grade levels.

Ms. Cohen stated training dates, all of that.

Ms. DeVincent stated exactly. And then that would come back before the committee for you guys to look that over and decide if that is how you want to move forward. At no point would it be assumed one way or the other.

Committee Member Girard stated okay. I guess the only other question I have, and I don't know who to direct it to, probably Dr. Martin, one of the things that I don't really have a feel for is exactly what we are doing curriculum wise in various subjects. How does this fit in? Has anybody assessed or evaluated that?

Dr. Martin replied the idea of teaching science and social studies using what we used to refer to as trade books, which now we call, what is the term?

Ms. Cohen replied trade books.

Dr. Martin stated it is a great term. It is authentic literature. It is using authentic literature to teach the content. Basically, our science and social studies curriculum, as currently exist, although in need of revision, are based on standards that exist, that are widely known by publishing companies that provide resources that fit in. All of those materials are available online in our curriculum department so that you can see what is being taught. I think this is very much in alignment from the standpoint of our focus on literacy, one of our district goals being that our students will be on grade level, 85% of our students will be on grade level by the time that they are in third grade. This push that is very necessary for us to move forward so that students cannot learn to read, but read to learn as they move forward beyond grade three. Again, I would remind you that in its pilot format, this is a perfect opportunity, again, for us. I'm reminded by what happened with the piloting of kindergarten. Teachers spoke up and said these

materials need revision because of x, y and z and that is the purpose of a pilot for us as well, to say we liked this resource, but we want to look at other resources because we feel there are gaps in what we need to present. This has my backing for that reason.

Committee Member Girard stated I honestly don't think that we are ready to take any motion on this or take any action. I agree with Dr. Avard, if you want us to consider a pilot program then we should know what the parameters of the program are, we should know where it is going to be, we should know how long it is going to be, we should know what the benchmarks are going to be to determine whether it is successful, and we should know what the materials are going to be. I appreciate the superintendent saying going to C&I, but if I understood you, it was go to C&I and let them know what the materials were going to be. It seems to me that we have some of them that we could have access to, but we won't, for another several months, have access to the rest of it. It almost seems to me that we probably should wait until all of the materials are available to take a look at it, which by the way, I would think give you some time to actually develop a plan that meets the parameters that have been set out by Dr. Avard and then we can have a discussion about this in January or whenever all the materials are available, whichever is sooner.

Committee Member Avard stated the other addition I would want on that, at the end of the pilot, if we do decide to move forward, what will be the cost to the district. I think we will need that information in order to know if this is even something we want to pursue because if it turns out that a year from now we are going to be on the hook for \$20 million, I know it is not and I'm just being ridiculous with it, we are going to say no. It is going to kill the whole thing up front. Knowing what the cost will be down the road, if they want to keep it, will be very helpful for us.

Chair Langton stated perhaps, is this something the committee would like this group to come back after Sharon confers with other elementary schools. C&I generally meets the last Tuesday of the month.

Committee Member Avard asked do we need a motion to that effect or just send them on their way with a directive?

Committee Member Girard asked is this limited to Title I schools because they have budgets that they can spend on stuff like this?

Ms. DeVincent replied I would probably reach out to all the elementary schools because some of them do have other funding sources that they use to purchase materials.

Committee Member Girard stated I also think we should limit the scope of the pilot. I'm uncomfortable with five schools. I think that is too big a sample. I think four might be too. I would be happy with three, maybe four. I don't want someone to say we piloted it in half the district.

Chair Langton stated generally a pilot is a smaller subset that either moves it forward or not.

Committee Member Girard stated I think it needs to be large enough and I think it needs to be over a broad enough, I hate the term cohort, but cohort of schools. I'm thinking three, maybe four.

Chair Langton stated the administration could get together and come up with a plan and bring back to us the schools that you would like to see it piloted in. It looks like you gave us some specifics as far as materials per grade level, but just answering more of the questions that the committee had tonight.

Committee Member Van Houten asked I just want to know, was the intent of this to do a full school pilot or to use a couple of teachers in each school as pilot subjects?

Ms. DeVincent replied I know at least at Hallsville that the principal wanted to do it in all grade levels that the materials were available for.

Chair Langton stated if you could come back with that kind of information, will it be a whole school piloting it, just one grade level at each of the different schools—just some more specifics

for us. Anything further? You can work out with administration as far as when you are available to be on the next agenda. Thank you so much. We really appreciate you staying this late this evening.

Chair Langton addressed item 8 of the agenda:

8. Grant and Donation report as follows:

NG Grant: \$25,000

Dr. DeVincent stated Ms. Allen had come before the committee before and asked about and had received an approval to apply for the grant for the NG funds and she had spoken about NG. She has applied for the funds. They have come back and said that the amount that would be awarded would be \$25,000 and that is what this is, just going back through. I can try to answer some questions for you, but it is really just a continuation of that. The \$25,000, just a point of clarification, when she originally applied for the NG funds it was going to be its own grant, but the state went ahead and decided to just add that \$25,000 to that reallocation grant that we have been talking about over the past couple of months so that's why it says under amount \$25,000 in the Title I reallocation because they just added it to that grant in our online grant management system, so just a clarification there.

Committee Member Van Houten stated there is a \$30,000 figure here as well. Is that what she had originally put in for?

Ms. DeVincent replied yes.

Committee Member Van Houten stated and she got \$25,000 of that \$30,000.

Ms. DeVincent stated correct.

Committee Member Girard asked what is NG² mean?

Ms. DeVincent replied I believe it stands for no grades, no grades so it is NG².

Committee Member Girard stated I have several concerns, not the least of which, in reading through this, it looks like this is going to continue funding for PACE. As we know, PACE is sitting on the table. Principal Allen, thank you for being late here tonight. I have several questions about this grant. I'll start off on a positive note. I am not a huge fan of saying because you are eight years old you belong in the third grade. I think the idea of starting to combine grade levels so you can work with kids where they are at based on their skills and not their age is something I would like to encourage. That said, I am concerned about a model that doesn't provide grades, I don't know how the kids are evaluated and I'll throw a couple other things out there. I don't understand the term "cultural competency". I don't understand, but my gut tells me I need to question the terms that say "social and emotional learning" and I would like to know how this is feeding into the PACE program in your building since that remains an item of discussion or at least on the table here in this committee. I'll start there.

Ms. Amy Allen, Principal of Parker Varney Elementary School, stated first, the multi-grade classrooms. This isn't a new item. Last year we had a multi K-1 classroom because of our enrollment numbers. We had a K-1 classroom last year. As far as PACE, we are continuing to do performance assessments. We have made no move to become a PACE school or a PACE district. We are learning how to do performance assessments and talk about deeper learning. Can you say your other questions?

Committee Member Girard replied cultural competency and social and emotional learning.

Ms. Allen stated sure. Many schools have Leader in Me. We are looking at responsive classroom, developing relationships with our students. That's what we are doing with our social and emotional learning.

Committee Member Girard asked so that is similar to the Leader in Me Program?

Ms. Allen replied yes, just a different perspective, different language.

Ms. DeVincent stated responsive classroom has been around for a while. It is just a different way to communicate with the kids, different language to use. It is similar to what the schools are doing with Leader in Me. It is just a different way of approaching the same need in students.

Committee Member Girard stated okay. One of the things I'm trying to get my head around, perhaps, Dr. Martin, you can help me, I don't have any experience with responsive classroom. I take your word that it is a good thing, but I have now been to the Leader in Me schools and I would like to know how it works in the district if you have some schools doing Leader in Me and you have some schools doing responsive classroom and you have some schools doing City Year and you have... It almost seems to me like a hodgepodge. That may be a good thing because I happen to believe that people at the building level should have some latitude to do what they need to in their unique circumstance. I'm not sure what I'm asking, but I guess I'm trying to figure out how it all fits together.

Dr. Martin stated I think I know what you are asking. As a principal that did not have the funding to do the Leader in Me, what I did have was teachers who were well trained in responsive classroom so I thought a lot about that and initially being envious of the schools that did Leader in Me and then I look at my discipline data at Webster School as principal, I looked at my attendance data, I looked at my student engagement data and realized that the Leader in Me might be a nice thing for Webster School, but was not necessary for Webster School in order for students to find that leader in me because we were doing the same kinds of things through our responsive classroom model. I think it speaks to that you need to know your audience. You need to know who your clients are. In some schools these programs are very functional and very necessary and in other schools not necessarily to that extent, that kind of formalization. I hope that answers that question.

Committee Member Girard stated I think so. Thank you, Dr. Martin. A couple of questions. Is everything in your school moving toward project based learning and if so, how are you working with the kids for whom that is not the ideal situation?

Ms. Allen replied project based learning is just one of the instructional practices that we use. We have direct instruction, small group, large group, we look at all evidence based practices and try to meet the individual needs of our students.

Committee Member Girard asked how much individual work do the kids do? I'll tell you, I've had kids in a project based learning situation in this district and it concerns me. I would like to know how much time they spend doing group projects versus working on their own because believe it or not there are times in the world when you have to work on your own.

Ms. Allen stated absolutely. You actually need both sets of skills, those individual work skills and group skills. There is no set percentage. It is really what works for students. Some students work much better independently and they will be given those opportunities. Our job is to teach them and we try to figure out how they learn best. Going back to your original question, cultural competency, that is one of the categories that we are set from the United States Department of Ed for problem of practice data to collect. We did not select cultural competency as an area that we would focus on.

Committee Member Girard stated it is in the write up.

Ms. Allen stated as an unmet need. Those were the areas that we could choose from and then we went into our current proposed focused, co teacher, personalized learning, social/emotional, project based and it will continue with our performance assessment.

Committee Member Girard stated priority two tenet, you talk about your math and you would be working with Dr. Bob.

Ms. Allen stated correct, that we would continue working with him.

Committee Member Girard asked are you currently working with him?

Ms. Allen replied we have worked with him for several years now, for about three years. As we have had reductions within our Title funds we do not have a math coach position at Parker Varney. We had tried that position before and it was not successful. This model has been a successful way to build capacity within our teachers.

Committee Member Girard asked have you seen your math test scores improve over the last three years working with him? What would your standardized tests say?

Ms. Allen replied we don't have the jump from Smarter Balance, but our performance tasks, the hands on learning, the formative assessments, we have seen great growth to develop competency.

Committee Member Girard stated evidence of impact, how will we know it worked? Where did these benchmarks come from?

Ms. Allen replied the attendance date.

Committee Member Girard stated all of them, the attendance, behavioral.

Ms. Allen responded those come from our student data system that we pull. We track data. We are a data driven school so we look at ways to drive instruction. One of the struggles with these grants, a lot of these interventions, you are not going to see a huge one year growth to do a program. Sometimes it is going to take several years' growth. As you can see, when we look at evidence we try to do multiple data points so we know exactly what is...

Committee Member Girard stated let me refine my question here, Amy. What I'm looking for is, why is a 10% improvement a benchmark of success? Why it is not 15%, why is it not 20%? I guess what I'm looking for is what determines what would be a measure of success? That's really what I'm asking, not whether or not you are data driven.

Ms. Allen responded that what criteria within a benchmark within a reasonable growth.

Committee Member Girard asked but where does that come from?

Ms. Allen replied it comes from the student data team and trends over time.

Committee Member Girard stated and then the final question I have here, in your budget you had money for training for City Year.

Ms. Allen stated correct.

Committee Member Girard asked is that the person who stays in the building that is going to be trained? What are you going to be training them to do because the corps members are only there for a year?

Ms. Allen replied we want to train them in leveled literacy, LLI, for reading instruction.

Committee Member Girard asked is that the corps members?

Ms. Allen replied corps members, yes, and our impact manager. If they are providing interventions we want to make sure it is through research based practice and we can collect that data so we are all working on the same outcomes for the students. We are going to be training our paraprofessionals, which has never been done before.

Chair Langton stated a follow up with what Committee Member Girard just mentioned. The City Year corps members are there for a year and then gone. Your paras, most probably, will continue to stay.

Ms. Allen stated we hope so.

Chair Langton stated I'm just a little concerned with training a group that we will lose. I definitely would say the paras first.

Ms. Allen stated absolutely. The training for City Year will be happening during the school day so it wouldn't be any additional time. That money would actually be paid for the staff for the paraprofessionals and the other interventionists. I put it in there because I think it is important for anybody who is providing an intervention to students that they are all trained with an evidenced based research process so we can track our data.

Committee Member Avard stated same page, same line of questions as far as the money goes. You asked for \$30,000 and got \$25,000. What is changing on this budget?

Ms. Allen replied it will come out of the technology and the PD line.

Committee Member Avard moved to approve the grant. The motion was duly seconded by Committee Member Girard.

Committee Member Girard stated just a comment, Madame Chair. I will support this because I know how invested Principal Allen is and I think when we talk about piloting new things I think that Parker Varney has evolved into a true test case of how things might be different. My skepticism about project based learning notwithstanding, I want you to know that I will support this because of the faith I have in you and what you are doing and with a skeptical, but hopeful eye that we might start to see the standardized test results, something that warrants the path that you have gone down.

Ms. Allen stated absolutely and if I could just clarify. With this model we were actually going to be giving more direct instruction to literacy and math where the students are at. We actually just really leveraging resources. There will actually be less project based learning time and we are just grouping those students that we can target and set those goals so they can increase their test scores and performance within the classroom. We are still doing project based learning, but it is not as our focus. This is really going to help us look at resources differently and training. WE need all of our staff trained. Anybody that is working with students needs to be highly trained.

Committee Member Girard stated I thank you for saying that. I'm actually very happy to hear it.

Chair Langton called for a vote on the motion to approve the grant. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chair Langton addressed item 9 of the agenda:

9. Title I Priority School Grant Funds

Chair Langton stated item nine, we are going to push that off until the later C&I meeting this month. Is that correct? Conferring with administration where we spoke briefly. You are all set with us moving that until September 27th?

Mr. Ryan replied yes, Madame Chair.

Chair Langton addressed item 10 of the agenda:

10. School Improvement Grant Funds.

Dr. Martin stated we once again refer to Ms. DeVincent for this item as it related to grant funding.

Ms. DeVincent stated what item ten is, our initial thoughts on applying for a school improvement grant at Bakersville, Beech, Wilson and Parker Varney> The state approached us probably in the spring sometime and said that there may be some funds available to write some school improvement grants and as soon as we received information on what the application process would look like, that sort of thing, the principals met with their teams and came up with how they might use some school improvement funds. The school improvement funds are targeted to schools that are already considered priority schools and it is additional funding that they can use over multiple years. With the case of these applications, each of the principals have looked at funding over three years and what they might do in their schools. We haven't submitted the application yet. It is going to be a quick turnaround when it does get submitted. The application is due to the state by the 14th, but we did have the draft budgets in a template of what the application is going to look like so that we could bring it before you to answer questions so that that way, when it does go to the state, it is going to be a very quick turnaround for approval so the funds would be available once it completes the School Board approval process and we address all the issues before hand. I do have Ms. Golden here from Wilson, Ms. Brennan here from Beech and then Ms. Allen here for Parker Varney. Ms. Josef from Bakersville was unable to attend tonight. We are just open to questions if you had a chance to look it over.

Chair Langton stated Sharon, one clarification. On page 68 it mentions No Child Left Behind. I know that is not a term that the mayor welcomes in this chamber.

Ms. DeVincent stated what it is, it is money that is left over, I shouldn't say left over, but money that was under No Child Left Behind that the federal government gave back to the states to offer

out to schools as school improvement funds so it is money from No Child Left Behind. Another reason why I wanted to bring it before you early in the process.

Chair Langton asked could you also tell us, is there any relationship between this and number nine, which was Title I Priority School Grant funds or what the difference is and why we can push one off or should we take that tonight?

Ms. DeVincent replied the Priority grant funds are part of that priority set aside so the district is required to set aside 10% of our total Title I funding to priority funds so we have that and then the six schools in the district that are considered priority schools also get additional funding. This year they are each getting an additional \$10,000 in funding. That funding is coming, but it hasn't been released or even available to us so it wasn't as time sensitive as the school improvement grants, which is once these are submitted the state is going to give a response almost right away on whether or not the schools are improved for the funding and how much they will be approved for.

Committee Member Van Houten stated just a couple of very quick questions. The recommendation on the form is to approve the grant, but you actually want us to approve your application to the grant. Is that correct?

Ms. DeVincent replied yes.

Committee Member Van Houten stated that is a very large amount of money. Do we think we can get that?

Ms. DeVincent replied what is the saying, you ask and let them come back with that lower number. Ask for all that you wish.

Committee Member Girard stated if this grant is awarded then, over the next three years those four schools will come into another \$1,473,000.

Ms. DeVincent stated yes, if we were able to get that full amount. There are a total of eight schools in the state that are applying for the school improvement grant and it is a total of I think \$5 million that the state will be getting to allocate to those school improvement grants so we are hopeful. We are Manchester.

Committee Member Girard stated when I was taking a look at the budget, I have to admit that I didn't quite understand how the money would be spent. Would someone care to enlighten me? After a while all these spreadsheets and chart look like gibberish, frankly.

Ms. Christine Brennan, Principal of Beech Street Elementary School, responded it is my understanding that each school had to have a problem of practice and when you write your problem of practice that's how you will spend the money and it is a competitive grant. When you are putting you plan together you are making sure that it matches what your problem of practice is. For example, Beech's problem of practice is, if we believe that students, family and community engage in school that student achievement will happen, so if you notice on the grant application, many of the things that we have, it is not only for the students, but it is for the parents and the community as well. Where I'm sure that Principal Allen's is a little bit different as well as Principal Golden's.

Committee Member Girard stated the only question I really have here is, what extra strings come with this SIG money? What are we subjecting ourselves to from the state or federal departments of education in terms of anything, teacher evaluation, required practices? If this money comes, what are the attached strings?

Ms. DeVincent replied to my knowledge, nothing that we are not already doing anyhow as the school is a priority school. Wilson and Beech already have SIG funds that they are still spending. They are being given an opportunity get more SIG funds. There is no additional. We do collect our data, we do test, we do report and just kind of say these are what our attendance numbers are, this is our growth in general for the school.

Committee Member Girard stated it is just a matter of reporting or are the teachers held to a different evaluation standard? Are the schools held to a different evaluation standard?

Ms. Allen replied no. I asked that question specially too because we were invited back to apply since we were a SIG school before and we are a priority school. I wanted to make sure we weren't taking on anything additional and this would just be one time funds to strengthen what we are doing.

Committee Member Girard asked are these the only four remaining priority schools that we have in the city?

Ms. DeVincent replied we have six priority schools. We have these three here, Bakersville, who wasn't able to be here tonight; Parkside and McDonough.

Committee Member Girard asked why are Parkside and McDonough not part of this application?

Ms. DeVincent replied Parkside, I forget the exact wording, but they have had their SIG grants for about five years. They are nearing the edge. They were not eligible to get additional SIG funds. McDonough wasn't eligible because one of the things is that you are transforming your leadership a bit and there would have had to have been a change in administration and we obviously don't want that because Mr. DiBenedetto does an amazing job. He just wasn't eligible for the funds. We did ask and we did really look into that, but he wasn't eligible.

Committee Member Freeman stated given my limited knowledge of federal grants, I have a question. I went through your wish list, more or less, and there is nothing on there that isn't unreasonable, but here is a concern. Nothing I say on there goes toward special education, supplies for special education, weighted vests, therapy balls. None of that goes toward special education. Can you shed some light on that for me?

Ms. DeVincent replied my understanding would be and I might defer to Dr. Martin on this, but I don't believe we could use the funds for that because that is something that needs to be provided. It is supplanting versus supplementing, supplemental supports. That is not to say that there haven't been schools that used Title I funds to get movement or sensory items for some kids, but it can't be related to special ed specifically. It has to be more general. A lot of these things will meet some of the needs of those students just based on having different resources available to them during the day, but as far as buying special education supplies, we are not allowed to do that.

Committee Member Freeman stated Ms. DeVincent, I would like some time to sit down with you and maybe see if I can help you find some federal grants for special ed.

Ms. DeVincent stated I would love that.

*On motion of **Committee Member Avard**, duly seconded by **Committee Member Van Houten**, it was voted to approve this item.*

Chair Langton addressed item 11 of the agenda:

11. EverFi Critical Skills Courses Overview.
(Note: Provided for informational purposes only; no action required.)

Chair Langton stated number 11 we are going to push off until the next meeting due to the length of the previous meeting. The gentleman that was going to do a presentation for us was unable to stay. That's correct, Mr. Ryan?

Mr. Ryan replied that's correct, Madame Chair.

Chair Langton addressed item 12 of the agenda:

12. Presentation of NWEA Scores and i-Ready data by Sharon DeVincent.
(Note: Provided for informational purposes only; no action required.)

Chair Langton stated due to this hour, do you want to do that tonight, Sharon, or we can move it to the 27th. That's not time sensitive.

Ms. DeVincent stated it is not time sensitive. Whichever you prefer, but I believe Mr. Girard had questions so if you wanted to share the questions I can make sure that I have the answers for you.

Committee Member Girard stated I did, with particular interest in the scores at Northwest in reading. If I'm reading this correctly, and let me get the page...

Chair Langton stated Sharon, the NWEA testing, do we do that two, three times a year for all students or do we do it more often for students that we want to progress monitor.

Ms. DeVincent replied it is done three times a year.

Chair Langton asked for all students?

Ms. DeVincent replied yes, it is a benchmarking tool. Right now only three schools are using it. Most of the other Title I schools are using i-ready now. I think almost of them except for the two new schools they are using that instructional piece of i-ready and then the assessments that come as part of that. Once again, it goes back to the schools and what they feel is best for the needs of their students. I have spoken with the different principals, confirming how they are using it, making sure they are using it wisely because it is an expensive program at the end of the day.

Chair Langton asked you need a license for it, right?

Ms. DeVincent replied yes.

Committee Member Girard stated page 167, Sharon, the i-ready reading student growth for school year 15-16 fall diagnostic, spring diagnostic. I'm assuming that this includes Northwest's experience with the pilot program. If I'm reading this correctly, they did not hit 100% of their target growth. They came in at 88%.

Ms. DeVincent stated I'll need to check with them on exactly when they started piloting those materials. I will definitely have that answer for you next time. I couldn't tell you when.

Committee Member Girard stated when I asked back on August 8th whether to not there was any data from the school that actually showed that the performance met the hype, I don't think I got an answer to that and I would be curious to know whether or not this included any results following the instruction of that closer reading program and then I would probably want to find out what was happening at Gossler, Hallsville, Wilson and Parker Varney because they all exceeded their target and they didn't have the program.

Chair Langton asked any further questions for Ms. DeVincent with regard to item 12 so that at the next meeting, if you had any questions or if any questions come up between now and then you can contact Ms. DeVincent.

Chair Langton addressed item 13 of the agenda:

13. Discussion regarding the procedure for administering the SAT.
(Note: This item was referred from the BOSC on 3/14/2016.)

Chair Langton stated since the superintendent is unavailable this evening we will have to postpone that one until the 27th.

Committee Member Girard stated the superintendent won't be the superintendent by the time we execute those and I don't know if we want to enter into that discussion with the two assistants that are likely to still be with the district or if we want to try to have Dr. Livingston discuss that for us within a week of her actually leaving as superintendent.

Chair Langton asked what is the wish of this committee? It could be postponed. Do we have a date yet, Dr. Martin or Mr. Ryan, as to when the SAT will be scheduled for?

Mr. Ryan replied there is a date. I would have to go back in and double check if you don't mind holding on for a minutes. The discussion we would have about this with the superintendent would be September 27th so it would give us time to connect with her. Even if she weren't present we would be able to present a bit more of an organized discussion about it. I'll check that date.

Chair Langton stated we could hear maybe what the superintendent has at this point and possibly hold off moving it forward until we take on a new superintendent at the beginning of October. If you could get that date for us, Mr. Ryan, that would be greatly appreciated.

Committee Member Girard stated speaking of the SATs, are we going to get those? Have those scores come out and when are we going to get them?

Mr. Ryan replied yes, and the board meeting. Yes, they have come out. We have organized those as well as Smarter Balanced and they will be out for you at your board meeting.

Chair Langton asked has that information been provided to the students and their parents?

Mr. Ryan replied the reports aren't ready to be generated just yet. They are still considering them preliminary results. We are showing you preliminary results. In terms of getting reports generated out to students and parents those are not final yet from the state.

Chair Langton asked could you refresh my memory. When were those SATs taken?

Mr. Ryan replied the SATs, March 12.

Committee Member Avard stated if the student logs on to College Board they can see their results. The results are available. My son went on and got his numbers. It is available for parents who want to see it.

Chair Langton stated I think that's important for the public.

Mr. Ryan stated my apologies, ma'am. I thought you were talking about Smarter Balanced results. SAT results are available just as any other administration of the SAT. I have the date for you: April 5, 2017 and the makeup will be May 2nd. That's for the SAT.

TABLED ITEMS

A motion is in order to remove any items from the table.

14. Update on the PACE Program.
(Note: Additional information is attached. Tabled 2/10/2016.)

This item remained on the table.

15. Grant and Donation report as follows:

Title I Reallocation Grant \$342,500

(Note: This item will be discussed at the Joint Meeting of Finance and C&I on 9/6/2016. Retabled 6/28/2016. Originally tabled 5/24/2016.)

On motion of Committee Member Avard, duly seconded by Committee Member Girard, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

On motion of Committee Member Avard, duly seconded by Committee Member Girard, it was voted to receive and file this item.

16. Curriculum Management Draft Plan.

(Note: A public hearing was held on 3/7/2016. A final document is being prepared.)

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business, on motion of Committee Member Avard, duly seconded by Committee Member Girard, it was voted to adjourn at 9:41 p.m.

A True Record. Attest.



Clerk of Committee