

Instructional Practices Committee Meeting

October 22, 2019

2:45 pm – Main Office Conference Room

The meeting begins by reviewing minutes from last meeting. Meeting minutes are unanimously accepted.

The meeting begins by appointing:

Note taker – Lauren

Board Scribe – Yolanda

Process Observer- Holly

Rick begins by reporting out on the GPA/Class Rank subcommittee. He feels there is a good mix of opinions and conversation. The overall sense of the room is a willingness to consider a lot of different options. If he were to guess he would guess that the committee would eventually move to not have a top 10 but potentially find some other form of recognition in its place. He is bringing the question to the steering committee - conversation about recognizing the top 5 or 10 percent, recognizing the arts, etc. One student is particularly vocal about what it feels like to be the “average” student at HB. Tom adds that they need to see how it goes.

Yolanda reports out on the first Grading and Assessment subcommittee meeting. They began with introductions and discussed the charter and broke it down a bit. Each member expressed why they volunteered to be on this subcommittee. They spent time brainstorming what would be a part of the discussion for Grading and Assessment. This list did reflect many of the essential questions the steering committee had developed. Yolanda shared that there is a broad range of backgrounds and perspectives which will lead to productive conversation.

Rick discusses timelines. He wonders what can be included by this upcoming Program of Studies in November. Having some vision for the change of top 10 may be able to occur as it would most likely be phased out in some way if that is the decision. Holly wonders if the top 10 changes are truly connected to the Program of Studies. Amanda explains that parents do cite certain documents when asking questions. Holly says that it may be tricky to even change top 10 for the class of 2021 and acknowledges that there is policy does need to be changed.

Tom expresses the trickle down effect of top 10 and course requests and weighting classes. Tom asks the committee if they have any objections to replacing top 10 with other recognitions. Claire discusses being open to this. Holly says that if there are sports awards and other awards,

etc should we remove recognizing overall academic achievement? Yolanda brings up where we recognize it as a question as well. Would it be at graduation?

Rick asks about setting a deadline for subcommittee recommendations. Top 10 is referred to in the Program of Studies as it cites policy. The team discusses whether the one sentence reference should be removed from the POS while the subcommittee is working on a recommendation. Holly mentions how it would most likely not be a one year roll out.

Rick mentions that the current deadline may not be feasible. Tom expresses that the recommendation will have an impact on the other subcommittees. Amanda notes that the original deadline was December 15. The recommendation would come to this steering committee then become a presentation to the school board/policy committee. Tom mentions that if the process accelerates then the timeline can be moved up. Holly shares that December 11 is the date of the December School Board Meeting.

Amanda says that the board packet is created the week prior to the meeting. Holly and Tom explain that an item can be added, especially as it is a presentation and the public can hear the information. It would not be voted on necessarily at that meeting.

The other two subcommittees need to see how their discussion evolves before setting a clear deadline. Yolanda asks if the steering committee wants to drive the scope of questions as grading and assessment is so huge. Amanda suggests that the grading subcommittee decide 3 main points or drivers to bring to the steering committee. Holly asks if this work is being done at PLC or meetings. Jenn explains that the work that comes out of the subcommittee will impact work of PLC. Tom explains that the subcommittee can address equity and inclusiveness which can then lead to change in policy if needed. Or the steering committee can discuss digging deeper where needed.

Tiffany asks how assessment is created to the school board. They do not dictate assessment at all through policy. Tom explains that, for example, if grading is not done uniformly enough and there are issues the board can look at policy and what support policy can offer. How grading is reported is also linked to policy which can then also be linked to weighting, etc.

Holly explains how even though it is not directly written in policy it can impact how the board looks at policy. For example, the policy about alternative credits, etc. Rick asks if assessment is too narrow of a scope. Amanda says that assessment is very broad and the subcommittee can look at what we are doing right and what are we currently missing/is not working and bring the key components to the steering committee. She feels it would be a good idea to have some back and forth with the grading and assessment subcommittee and the steering committee.

Tiffany feels that the departments sound so different and that they seem to travel as smaller groups. She is interested in a larger overview and finding out where the departments are doing things differently to hone in on the greatness that exists within. Jen expresses that departments may assess differently as they are different content areas. She emphasizes that having

assessments be authentic is extremely important. Tiffany wonders about what different departments do in regard to traditional tests vs performance assessments and what departments use which assessment methods. She continues by stating that maybe the school does not want all assessments to be the same among departments, but that learning from each other can be beneficial.

Amanda explains that she is not saying the subcommittee will only focus on one question. She explains that the subcommittee will find the top two essential questions to focus on then peel away the layers.

Tom discusses equity in grading. He feels that maybe if we can find a way to have all assessment opportunities available to all students in all settings we may get a better picture of their abilities. He notes how other methods of assessment can be offered to students if they struggle in certain ways.

Tiffany expresses that there doesn't seem to be a consensus among departments about assessment and grading. Amanda explains that this is the work of the subcommittee to have this grading and assessment discussion and develop the big questions and needs to bring to the steering committee. Holly asks if the subcommittee has representation from every department. There is not representation from World Language or Unified Arts. The subcommittee can reach out to these departments to dig into the work. Amanda says that PLC's can be used to facilitate some of this conversation.

Jen asks if the grading and assessment subcommittee is 7-12 and it is. Holly expresses that the conversation 7-12 is important. Holly discusses access and tier one supports in the handbook that teachers can use to help students if they struggle in different ways.

Discussion on weighted vs. unweighted subcommittee--no deadline established at this time

Next meeting for IPC Steering Committee:

Tuesday, Dec. 3, 2019

2:45-4:15 pm

HBHS Main Office Conference Room

Process Observer reported out: Process was followed.