**SCC Meeting Minutes**

**March 16, 2015**

**PRHS Library**

Present: Doug Ross, Bob Price, Julie Fogarty, Jack Friedman, Omkar Waghe, Lilly Friedman, Devin Guild, Kyle Sanders, Will Gunn, Maria Sanders, Hannah Karp, Kim Weeks, Ryan Amtmann, Emelia Fleck

* Ryan Amtmann called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m
* The SCC meeting minutes from January were accepted
* Introductions
* The hand-out, *Grading Policies for Faculty Survey*, was distributed
* Will Gunn updated the committee on the progress with restructuring Academic Advisory
* The curriculum for each grade level is continuing to be developed which include goals and activities
* Dr. Schnell and Will Gunn traveled to Conval High School
* Conval’s advisory program, TASC, is currently administered in over 30 high schools across the United States
* TASC is being promoted by the NEASC
* A second group of PRHS faculty members will be traveling to Conval High School in April to observe the program TASC
* More information about TASC can be found on Conval High Schools [Website](http://conval.edu/schools/CVHS/tasc)
* This model will require significant scheduling changes
* Anyone who is interested in more information or attending meetings was asked to contact Will Gunn
* Ryan reminded the committee that the SCC looked at the TASC program during the 2013-2014 school year at Colchester High School in Vermont.
* This program is a combination of Academic Advisory and the current PRHS Freshmen Seminar Model where students have set times to meet with teachers
* The questions was asked, ‘is the Advisory Committee planning on implementing changes for the 2015-2016 school year’?, ‘is the intent for all four grades to be involved in this implementation’?
* Yes. The August in-service days will be designated professional development training for implementation across all grade levels for the 2015-2016 school year
* The committee was asked to read through the hand-out, *Grading Policies for Faculty Survey*
* Bob Price gave the committee an update on the staff survey for best grading practices
* The discussion at last January’s meeting was to take a philosophical approach on best grading practices
* One of the goals for the current meeting is to determine the questions that will be included to the survey
* There will not be a school-wide survey. This survey will be administered to randomly selected students, teachers and parents
* Philosophically, what is grading? What is its purpose? How do we as a committee ask these questions?
* #5. Do you allow students to re-take exams or quizzes? If we are looking philosophically at this question is it worthwhile to ask them to explain why or why not? Do we want the philosophy behind why someone is as well as why someone is not? Is that valid information? The same question applies to #6 Do you allow late work? If so, what is the policy on the acceptance of late work?
* Is the committee looking at the responses? Are we going to see 60% answered yes on #6 and 40% answered no or are we going to see written out answers? What are we going to do with the collected information? How do we proceed after the information is collected?
* It would be a good addition to add ‘why’ to those questions.
* There are benefits to the survey besides the responses
* In terms of the faculty, starting to build a mental process about the philosophy behind grading and why late work is allowed or not gets everyone thinking about the topic of change
* There are also personal benefits for faculty to evaluate their grading practices and asking themselves ‘why’?
* The philosophy of ‘why’ will start a discussion of adhering to values about learning
* Collected information will provide the SCC with solid evidence to work with in terms of percentages and what areas need to be addressed
* Collecting this information from faculty, parents and students will give the SCC an idea of what discussions are necessary to have, what the perspectives are from each group and what is being communicated to each group
* Should any questions be modified or changed?
* 100% of the faculty will receive the survey
* There will be a discussion with the faculty about the survey questions along with the results
* At the May SCC meeting we will have the results of the survey and a direction of how to proceed
* A concern arose about different grade levels (English 2, 3, Honors, AP). One teacher could have completely different philosophies regarding diverse levels
* Learning does not happen at the same rate
* If students are grouped into different levels does that then determine that our grading policies are inhibited because we do not have weighted grades? Would weighted grades hinder AP and Honors student because they are expected to work at a higher level? Should they receive a reward? Where do weighted grades fit?
* The purpose of the survey is to determine a broad policy of grading
* Would Science and Social Studies be graded the same as Art or CTE?
* The NEASC wants to insure that each teacher is continuously going through a process of reviewing one’s practices but they do not promote instituting a consistent format that is implemented by everyone
* What is the intent of the survey results?
* The NEASC stated that we needed to examine our grading practices. PRHS does not need to change their policy. All teachers are not required to have the same policies
* When the SCC has the survey results a direction of action will be determined
* There are two avenues to explore
	+ - * The SCC committee can release a statement to the School Board or Administration determining which part of the grading policies should be updated in specific areas (consistency across courses, make-up work, weighted –vs- point systems) giving consideration to the feedback of the results of the survey. The SCC would then move onto a different topic next year
			* The SCC committee can state what they recommend the grading policy should be, requiring a lot more time and research making grading policies a topic of consideration again for next year for finalization
			* Which direction should the SCC go in?
* It would be appropriate for the SCC to administer the survey and collect the data
* It would be inappropriate for the SCC to become involved in policy. Those decisions should be determined by the faculty at the institution
* The survey may result in needing additional data or expansion in specific areas
* For parents and students the definitions of formative and summative assessments need to be clear
* Should the question, ‘do you have any assessments where the lowest possible score is not a zero (excluding incompletes)?’ remain in the survey?
* Yes
* Should the question, ‘what do the letter grades A, B, C, D, F represent?’ be included in the survey?
* Many schools have different failure policies (at Bow anything below a 70% is failing, Plymouth it is 60%, at Interlakes and Kingswood it is 65%)
* The PRHS policy includes this information but teachers may not follow it
* There was no decision made
* Ryan Amtmann suggested that in terms of the timeline regarding the survey and collecting the results that the SCC meet in May as well as in June
* The May meeting will be devoted to finalizing the survey results, drafting a proposal of addressing grading polices for examination and creating an agreed finalized plan to vote on as a recommendation to the School Board
* The results of the survey will be finalized by Bob Price and Ryan Amtmann and be shared with the staff and SCC members before the May meeting
* The June meeting will be devoted to voting on a final grading proposal to recommend to the School Board, voting on possible topics for the 2015-2016 school year for the School Board to vote on and voting for the 2015-2016 SCC Chair
* The survey results will be given to the PRHS Faculty who will decide as a group if a recommendation on policy change will be made. The recommendation will be given to the SCC and then presented to the School Board
* The committee was asked to speak with their constituents regarding possible topics for the 2015-2016 SCC year

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 pm

Our next meeting will be held on Monday, May 4th, at 5:15pm in the PRHS Library