

Joint Policy and Student Achievement Committee Meeting
6-14-2012

Agenda Item 1: Approve the minutes from the May 10 Student Achievement Committee Meeting

- Christine Kushner began the meeting at 12:07pm and recognized the agenda for the day.
- Ms. Kushner mentioned outcomes for the meeting on the grading policy
 - The Board should provide suggested changes to staff and provide guidance on what to take to bring to the next work session
- Board members and staff made additional changes to the May 10 meeting minutes and Debra Goldman made a motion to approve the May 10 minutes with the changes.

Agenda Item 2: Review Suggested Changes to 5520 R&P – Grading Practices

Agenda item began at 12:15pm.

- Ruth Steidinger researched grading practices and policies online and throughout the country
 - Some procedures were hard to find
 - Every school in NC uses a seven-point scale. Examples: Chapel Hill, Greensboro, and Durham - use this system for consistency
 - Ruth opened the floor for questions
- Staff began reviewing the grading policy document and moved on to the R&P because they did not have questions
 - Staff took into account community input and feedback and changes were reflected in the R&P.
 - Ruth gave an example of what the R&P looks like and recognized the Board Advisory Council meeting minutes that contributed to the R&P. Ruth stated that parents prefer A-F grading.
 - Debra Goldman mentioned that the R&P does not reflect the changes from the May 10 meeting minutes.
 - Jim Martin provided feedback on “evidence of education”, which is listed in the R&P. Jim Martin asked about the difference between a four and “mastery.” Staff began conversation about the difference between computing a number and demonstrating mastery.
 - Marvin Connelly provided input on the definition of mastery and Jim Martin asked for language that teachers and parents could better understand. Christine Kushner mentioned that this change will be for the 2013-14 school year and needs to align with Common Core Standards and any other changes in the school.
 - Cathy Moore asked for clarification on creating the policy and R&P. Jim Martin asked if negotiables could be included in the R&P and recommended that the policy should have non-negotiables. Debra Goldman mentioned that in her BAC meeting, they supported moving to a ten point grading scale and conversation began about being at either a seven or ten point grading scale.
 - Jim Martin discussed the grading scale at the university level and stated that changing the grading scale would be a legislative issue. Ruth Steidinger recognized the last change in the R&P regarding grades and behaviors. Jim Martin recognized items in Section A that he felt were non-negotiable. Marvin Connelly discussed the behavior section of the R&P and Debra Goldman asked to see the rubric that staff was working on.
 - Conversation continued around the table on thoughts and suggestions on the grading policy and R&P; Susan Evans stated that if they are true non-academic behaviors then she would like to have them separated. Christine Kushner stated that the Board should focus on the policy and the Board suggested that they add the context of “grades are not discipline” into the policy.

- Cathy stated that they would make a list of what academic vs. non-academic behaviors may look like. Susan Evans proposed that they give staff direction on what they are looking for in the policy; Christine Kushner proposed thinking about a zero recovery policy. Cathy closed this portion out with recommendations that they will bring to the next meeting.

Agenda Item 3: Discussion of Recommended Forms of Accelerative Practice as Outlined in Policy 5532

Agenda Item began at 1:07pm.

- Cathy Moore contacted every elementary and middle school to determine the effectiveness of the policy; students that are currently single subject, can continue to go that route
- Cathy Moore stated that she would contact all AIG teachers after the committee meeting
- Jim Martin asked why WCPSS would not continue what they are currently doing for single subject students;
 - Jim Martin recommended we wait and see how it fits for students now;
- Committee members began conversation on accelerating students and its effectiveness
 - Jim Martin recommended that putting a freeze on acceleration is not a good idea; How does fit in the big picture of Common Core?

Agenda Item 4: Discussion of Dual Enrollment for High School Academic Enrichment

Agenda Item began at 1:29pm.

- John Williams reviewed the draft policy and stated that this policy must be complete before the school year starts.
- John Williams stated that the draft policy back would be presented at the next Policy Committee meeting and the July 24 Board of Education meeting.

Agenda Item 5: Discussion of Expanded Learning Opportunities

Agenda Item began at 1:37pm.

- Opportunities for afterschool programming for students that require remediation and what that might look like; how we serve our Title I schools is changing as well;
 - ESEA waivers allow the dollars to be used after school as well;
- Christine Kushner asked for an inventory of the afterschool programs we offer, where we have them, where we do not, and the quality of the programs;
- Christine Kushner opened the floor for questions.

Agenda Item 6: Closure and Next Steps

- Board Members proposed another meeting date for July 18 from 12-2pm.
- Christine Kushner mentioned that she would like to develop a meeting calendar for the remainder of the school year at the next meeting; Bookmark the second Thursday of every month.
- The meeting ended at 1:56pm, with a motion to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted by:

Committee Chair, Christine Kushner

Staff Representative, Cathy Q. Moore

Recording Secretary, Julie H. Ward

Board Chair, Kevin Hill