

**Course Weight Task Force**  
**-June 8, 2017-**  
**Minutes**

**I. Co-chair Cartha Siddiqui welcomed Task Force members and introduced**

- A. Co-Chair - James Idea
- B. Senior Staff Liaison - Tyler Ream
- C. Co-district Task Force Lead - Lance Stallworth & Randolph Adami

**II. Review of Task Force Charge, Timeline, & Outcomes**

Cartha reviewed the Board Charge for the Task Force, including limitations and deliverables.. Cartha reiterated from the first meeting that while our Task Force was not charged to address all possible GPA and grading issues, that we are offering a “parking lot” for those questions, thoughts, concerns that we will share with the Board of Trustees for later work.

Cartha then shared our 3-phase approach to the work:

- A. Gain solid understanding of our current practices
- B. Develop guiding principles to ground our design work.
  - 1. Committee discussions
  - 2. Data analysis
  - 3. Empathy work
- C. Design and test possible revisions to our current practices

**III. Norms**

Cartha Siddiqui reminded members of our shared commitment to norms:

- Value other members’ opinions and perspective/listen
- Assume good intentions - we want the best outcome that serves ALL kids in the system
- Acknowledge that we come from various backgrounds and experiences
- Honor each other’s time
- Seek to understand others
- Have an open mind
- Keep confidentiality of what is said in the room
- Stay on task and minimize side conversations
- Facilitators
  - Start/end on time
  - Timely information

**IV. Overview of current system**

Lance Stallworth presented an overview of our current course weight system and a brief

historical overview.

**V. Guiding Principles**

James Idea and Lance Stallworth facilitated a group discussion to unpack the guiding principles of our current course weight practices. Tables then worked through a similar exercise to unpack the guiding principles of three other area school districts.

Randolph Adami then guided the members through a brainstorming activity in which each table developed a list of possible guiding principles that could ground our work. Each table wrote and posted their list around the room. Members then participated in a gallery walk in which they reviewed all lists and indicated their top three principles using sticky dots. Members were assured that this exercise was an early indicator of preference and not a final vote. The results of this exercise are included at the end of these minutes.

**VI. Empathy**

Tyler Ream provided an overview of human-centered design, focusing specifically on the importance of empathy work. The committee will undertake empathy work beginning at our next meeting in August.

**VII. Summer Research**

Task Force members were provided an opportunity to request data or other information be prepared over the summer for their next meeting in August. The list of these requests is included at the end of these minutes.

Our next Task Force meeting is tentatively scheduled for August 15 from 3:30-5:30..

<b>Well Rounded Students</b>		<b>52</b>
Well Rounded Students		3
Not necessarily limited to 16 and/or core subjects		11
Stretch students to a variety of experiences		5
Recognize and reward individual strengths by allowing all above grade level courses weighted		10
Create simple formula or way to tabulate Course selections based on interest (well-rounded)		7
Equal access to achieve high GPA across disciplines		3
Value rigorous subject other than 4 core		6
Complement new graduation plan		4
<b>Weight should reflect level of rigor</b>		<b>17</b>
Should Pre-AP & AP receive the same weight?		
Dual Credit? Pre-AP=.5 weight vs. 1.0		
Foundation requirement....		5
Reward college level rigor		3
Align the weight of the course (i.e. .5 Pre-AP 1 AP) including academic & vocational tracks		6
Value student who tackles the most rigor		3
<b>System less restricted on class numbers (1.0)</b>	2	
<b>Fairness</b>	7	
<b>Flexibility in the system</b>	4	
<b>Reasonable parameters</b>	3	
<b>Personalized Learning/approval</b>	2	
<b>Respectful of student well being</b>	7	
<b>Value the discrepancy</b>	1	
<b>Consistent Divisor</b>	5	

**Course Weight Task Force  
Summer 2017 – Research Requests**

Data Requests

1. List of courses considered “advanced” in the SBISD Program of Studies.
2. Student counts in each advanced course for the 2016-2017 school year, disaggregated by campus.
3. List of high school credit classes offered at each middle school.
4. Student counts of middle school students taking high school courses, disaggregated by campus (2016-2017 school year).
5. Grade distribution for middle students taking high school credit classes (2016-2017 school year).
6. GPA range of students in top 10% at each high school campus (2017 graduates).
7. Scatter plot number of advanced courses taken in high school by students who graduated in top 10% (2017 graduates).
8. Scatter plot number of students who took 3+ years of an “activity” class (2017 graduates). Activity classes=band, choir, theater arts, athletics, art, orchestra, CTE
9. Student counts Spanish III PAP, Spanish IV+AP (2016-2017 school year high school students).

Information Requests

1. How are our kids impacted in college admissions by our current practice?
2. Do other districts give different weights for PAP, AP, IB, Dual Credit?

Empathy work for the fall

1. Transcript comparisons – impact on transcripts with different assumptions
2. How are our current practices influencing student course requests? How would different rules change that decision making?
3. How do GT students see our current rules and potential changes impacting their course request decisions?