

IV-A

May 18, 2015 Culture, Climate and Learning Subcommittee Meeting Notes

3:45 p.m. - Board Room

131 W. Nittany Avenue

State College, PA 16801

I. Call to Order

Dr. Pawelczyk began the Board Subcommittee for Culture, Climate and Learning meeting at 3:47 p.m.

Present: Deirdre Bauer, Mary Jenn Dorman, David Hutchinson, Jeanne Knouse (arrived at 4:16 p.m.), Jacque Martin, Bob O'Donnell, Jim Pawelczyk, Jason Perrin, Dorothea Stahl, Laurel Zydney

II. Curriculum Policy 105: Review the Revised Draft Policy

Dr. Pawelczyk noted that the subcommittee would first review Policy 105 - Curriculum, to get as close as possible to finalize in preparation to take the revised draft to the Board. The last half-hour would be used to review the revisions for Policy 114.

Dr. O'Donnell and Ms. Zydney have worked together on the draft revision and it appears to have changed a good amount. In response to the question of why we are doing this, Dr. O'Donnell explained this is being done to clarify the policy. The current policy is very vague and they have used the wording, "Board shall" and "Superintendent shall," so that responsibilities are very clear. Ms. Zydney added they started bigger and took some things out. The SCASD policy structure is a little different than some of the other policy examples that were reviewed. Policy 105, 106, and 107 are a suite of policies covering curriculum design, implementation and evaluation. Keeping Policy 105 tightly focused makes a lot of sense; it sets the tone for the companion policies.

Ms. Zydney noted they started with the Purpose and wanted to be very clear on what curriculum is and then went to the definition. Dr. O'Donnell noted they did not make this up but did refine other policies.

Reviewed statement in A - Purpose of Policy:

The fourth statement was changed from, " To identify processes by which...." to read,
To establish responsibility by which....

Reviewed B - Definitions:

Members discussed being comfortable with the definition of curriculum, the final sentence is from Montgomery County's policy, seeing curriculum as a framework, we are not assessing curriculum but students, standards not being the what but the know and can get there different ways, you need to have goals, grow all students and know what we are growing them toward, the idea of exposure which falls under more toward Learning Enrichment, and putting the PDE definition back in.

Changes to B - second sentence take out “defined as” and third sentence remove all stakeholders for sentence to read, **“The curriculum provides expectations for what students should know....”**

Reviewed letter C - The Curriculum shall - the following changes were made:

Sentence 1 - remove “varied” and change “diverse learning styles” to **diverse learners**

Sentence 2 - All were in agreement with what was there

Sentence 3 - add, **within the scope that is taught**, at the end after “individual talents”

Sentences 4 and 5 - All were in agreement with what was there.

Sentence 6 - End at **“...strategic plan.”**

Letter D - Curriculum documents typically include:

Sentences 1 - 3 were fine with what was there

Sentence 4 - change “teachers” to **teaching**

Sentence 5 - change “course goals” to **learning goals**

Letter E - The Board shall:

Sentence 1 after some discussion will read, **“Approve written curriculum with academic standards. Specifically, this will include scopes and sequences, grade level/course descriptions, and understandings.”**

Letter F - The Superintendent shall: Change to - **Superintendent or Designee**

Sentence 1 - All were fine with what was there

Sentence 2 - Remove both “appropriate” and “as appropriate”

Sentence 3 - End sentence with **“...plan.”** - Remove “or appoint a designee for this”

Add Sentence 4 - **“Ensure curriculum implementation at building level is consistent with the District’s adopted curriculum.”**

Last statement will remain as is - using the word **may** and not shall

There were two items included for discussion regarding teachers having copies of the written curriculum and classroom assessments being provided to stakeholders to show the learning process that could be used to modify instruction to improve student learning. A subcommittee member noted that because Policy 105 is about - “What is Curriculum?” these two statements did not belong in this policy.

The group discussed the last statement and the use of the word partnership, direction comes from the Strategic Plan process, this makes rules less clear, need to keep as a “may,” not shall statement and one of the subcommittee members felt differently. The last statement was changed to read: **“During curriculum development, the superintendent may have input from stakeholders, including but not limited to, the school board, administrators, staff, parents, students, and the community.”** Ms. Zydney and Dr. O’Donnell will make sure the changes are made for this policy and Ms. Dorman will put the revised policy in policy format to be taken to the full board for review in the near future.

III. New Business

Proposed Revisions for Policy 114 - Gifted Education

Dr. O'Donnell spoke on the PDE Report that was shared and under Recommendations/Needs, page 6, we need to review this policy for clarity and also separate Learning Enrichment from this policy. In this revision, Policy 114 will refer only to Gifted Education. Learning Enrichment (LE) is part of general education and accelerates kids at grade level and provides more opportunities for experiential learning.

Ms. Martin left the meeting at 4:55 p.m.

Ms. Knouse explained that Chapter 16 identifies kids with a need and a GIEP. With LE, we are providing for a different, but related, need. She anticipates that the administration will want to draft a new Policy for Learning Enrichment (LE) next year. Students will see program changes as the LE program is modified. There are potential opportunities to use either "pull out" or "push in" strategies. Currently we are not required to do either.

Both the PDE and UVA reports point out that, the core curriculum does not belong with gifted support teacher. Gifted Education is School Code driven and needs to be addressed separately.

We will need to provide clarity with LE, some language will need taken out, and we will need to identify strategies to accelerate and enrich. Dr. O'Donnell added that we are not taking anything off the table for students but we are making a clear distinction between Gifted Education and Learning Enrichment. There will need to be clear purpose statements for ease moving forward.

Ms. Stahl left the meeting at 5:13 p.m.

The revised policy will be going to the Board with strikeouts of the LE components to show the differences between current policy and proposed policy. The Learning Enrichment policy will come at a later time. Things will change with Learning Enrichment and the capacity to support change will affect the final configuration of the program. Community feedback from this year will help clarify the beliefs/purpose of the program, which will help frame options on how best to move forward with LE.

IV. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

V. Adjournment

Dr. Pawelczyk ended the Culture, Climate and Learning Subcommittee meeting at 5:17 p.m.

Submitted by,

Mary Jenn Dorman, Board Secretary