

CONTOOCCOOK VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of the Superintendent of Schools
106 Hancock Road, Peterborough, NH 03458-1197

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

September 26, 2016
SAU Boardroom
5:30 PM

Minutes

Committee Members:

Crista Salamy - Chair, Linda Quintanilha, Bernd Foecking, Janine Lesser, Rich Cahoon

Present: Crista Salamy, Janine Lesser, Rich Cahoon, Kimberly Saunders, Ann Allwarden, Rick Matte, Myron Steere, Kristen Reilly

Crista Salamy called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

5:30 Approval of June 6, 2016 Minutes – 5 minutes

Janine Lesser moved to accept the minutes of June 6th. Second. Rich Cahoon abstained. The minutes of July 25th will be reviewed at the next meeting. **All else in favor. Motion carried.**

5:35 Strategic Plan Goal, Focus Areas, and Action Steps Related to IB and PACE

The Strategic Plan, Action Step 1.3.2, states that the School District will work in conjunction with the NHDOE to explore the opportunities associated with becoming a PACE (Performance Assessment of Competency Education) district by March 2017. In addition, Action Step 1.1.8 states that the School District will examine the potential of participating in the International Baccalaureate (IB) programs.

The new PACE application is posted on the NHDOE website.

IB schools would provide needed accommodations. Adapting the curriculum might be problematic.

Does it make sense to do both IB and PACE? No, that is the reason for the comparison information.

Crista Salamy noted that ConVal has already started down the PACE route therefore, she suggested not pursuing the IB. Rich Cahoon asked why? Crista responded by saying that some of the work has been done already.

Rich Cahoon said that IB has been around for 40 years while PACE is in its early stages.

Crista Salamy further said that this School Board hasn't voted to pursue PACE either.

Janine Lesser asked why not pursue PACE and then investigate IB further two years down the road.

Kimberly Saunders reported that a commitment should be made with PACE, if decided, for three to five years. Discussion took place about what assessment would look like for students if we were both IB and PACE.

Rich Cahoon said that we could put off a decision for a couple of years until other districts within the State figure out how they will deal with both. The push is for all districts to pursue PACE.

ConVal could look into IB for the ATC areas.

The PACE application is due by the end of October.

IB should be part of the investigation process.

Can someone come to the district to talk about PACE so that everyone will know exactly what it is?

Education Committee would have to recommend PACE to the board. The committee agreed that the PACE application will be moved to the full board.

Moved to the full board the authorization for Ann to do the PACE application and bring to the full board and look at exploration of IB. The presentation on PACE should go to the full board.

The link to PACE will be sent to the full board with a presentation. **Second. Unanimous.**

5:50 Strategic Plan Goal, Focus Area, and Action Step Related to Self-Contained Classrooms

Rick Matte asked for guidance on Strategic Plan 1.2.2, The School District will reduce the number of special education self-contained classes. The DOE defines it as inside regular education classrooms less than 40% of the day. ConVal looked at instructional hours per week. 40% of 33.75 is 13.5 hours per week. If a student is in a regular education classroom less than 13.5 it is considered self-contained.

Kimberly Saunders said that there was some concern that some classes had a greater concentration. Rich Cahoon said that the question was specific to the high school; fundamentals courses were part of the discussion. Rick Matte said that he and others have worked hard to have diversification in the classes. Rich asked if it was done by special education students being placed in regular education classes or regular education students in the fundamentals.

The goal is for special education students to have access to a full range of courses.

We would be looking at course enrollments over the last "x" years, and then we would have to look at the percentage of IEP's and 504's to compare enrollment numbers and concentration. Classes would have either been eliminated and students moved into general introductory classes.

Further discussion will take place with Administrative Council. The goal could be rewritten appropriately after this discussion.

More discussion will take place at the November Education Committee meeting.

6:05 Strategic Plan Goal, Focus Areas, and Action Steps Related to Balanced Assessment

Ann Allwarden shared an updated Assessment in the ConVal School District pyramid, including hyperlinks. An informational document, defining the different assessments, should be available to parents.

6:20 Strategic Plan Goal, Focus Areas, and Action Steps Related to Multi-age/Multi-grade

Strategic Plan Action Steps 3.1.1, 3.1.2, and 3.1.3 related to the Focus Area of Multi-grade/Multi-age as a philosophy for providing instruction in the community schools rather than a monetary decision.

Crista Salamy said that our policy needs to be rewritten to reflect current thought.

Is it educationally acceptable?

The point of the question is that if we want to have 45 student elementary schools it would be necessary to have multi-age, multi-grade classrooms.

Equity from school to school is another point. In the larger schools, should they teach multi-age too? Even in single grade classrooms there can be a wide range of levels and abilities.

If classes are going to be combined, it should be done so in a thoughtful, planned way.

In terms of policy, decisions might be made on, as an example, regardless of enrollment numbers we might always have a straight grade K.

Do we need to have more highly skilled teachers in these classrooms?

Another suggestion was that if a school's total enrollment is under "x", there will be multi-age classrooms.

Making a decision about accommodations must be determined.

Administration will look into this further and bring back discussion. Feedback from parents would be important. Consistency is important.

A recommendation will not be in place by mid-November.

Is this a viable practice; is it educationally irresponsible?

More information will be forthcoming at the November 28th Education Committee meeting.

6:35 Pay to Play: Sports Fees

Ann Allwarden shared information on numbers by season. It was broken out by sport and aligned to rosters. Family ID is a system that is used to register students. Some students drop out and would not appear on the roster but would in Family ID. In addition, middle school sports were included in initial numbers and should not have.

Athletic fees were supposed to be re-implemented this fall. They should have come back this year. The background was that when this discussion took place, the board wanted to revisit and compromised for two years.

The goal of not charging fees was to assure that there were no barriers for students to participate in sports. The participation did not drastically change. We don't know if the elimination of fees had an impact.

Looking at the fee schedule, in general, could be reviewed.

Admin Council recommendation that fees return would be a different discussion.

Rich Cahoon said that this is an expensive prospect.

A board vote is needed to change the initial vote.

Rich Cahoon said that he would rather target limited resources and not just give them to everyone.

This will need to go to the full board. They could be suspended for the remainder of this year and reinstate if voted. Why are we privileging athletes but not others? Running Start students are charged fees. AP exam fees are in place etc.

What is defined as a program is necessary.

Next Meeting: Monday, October 24th @ 5:30 PM

Motion to adjourn at 7:28 p.m. Second. Unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda Marschok