



LNSU/LNMUUSD Curriculum Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
2-11-19

Attendees: Bill Sander, Jan Sander, Laura Miller, Eve Gagne, Emily Braggins, Deb Zmick, Lori Lisai, Ian Trombley, Jade Hazard, Brian Schaffer, Griffin Koss

Laura Miller opened the meeting. Committee members were sent discussion points with related links to review prior to this meeting. The agenda was to discuss an action plan proposed to support students who need to complete proficiency standards for graduation, after reviewing current data which finds a number of students are not on track to graduate in 2020.

Brian Schaffer provided an overview of how the data had been collected and reviewed. In January, Lori Lisai and school counselors were tasked with determining how students in the next graduating class were progressing towards the proficiency based graduation (PBG) standards. Past graduation standards, based on the Carnegie model, were provided along with current policy implementing the proficiency-based standards, adopted in recent years. Comparisons were made to highlight how the translation from the old system to the new one has not been seamless.

Ian Trombley, a member of the school counselor team, provided details regarding data collection and offered student narratives to clarify where the difficulties were evident. Information was collected by reviewing the transcript of each student in the group. Patterns in the data emerged. Students not on track to graduate did not have complete credit for content specific proficiencies, such as certain science and math credits. Examples were provided for how previous graduation standard policies had been universal among schools, and now transfer students, some tech students, and other outliers had credits on their transcripts that did not hit specific targets in our PBG model used at the high school now. Where once a student could previously have “mixed and matched” coursework to provide evidence of their science proficiency, now they were required to demonstrate earth sciences and biology proficiencies that are more content specific. Teachers are trying to steer students to facilitate their course loads, but are finding the science content is “top heavy.” The central issue is that the PBG model tried to maintain previously held expectations while changing how we measure and assess students’ learning. It was noted that “what it means to be proficient has changed, not the students.” The system has to catch up.

Brian Schaffer provided the editorial note that despite what teachers have done to transition to the new standards, the sample PBG policy provided by the state AoE was by original design. This means that since implementation, this model will need to be further developed, and must evolve to clarify how to provide evidence of proficiency. The team concluded that options needed to be explored to facilitate more flexibility with our own students. Current models employed by other Vermont high schools were provided in an email for committee members to review prior to meeting. It was mentioned that PowerSchool portal includes student performance indicators to track proficiency targets in sequence. It was reiterated that this is a transition issue that exists, and is at par for a first year challenge during the crossover.

Policies will prove to be important moving forward, and the principles behind our policy development. There will be a greater focus on what other schools are doing to surmount their perceived challenges.

Collaboration opportunities and projects with other schools will be researched and developed. The EPIC model has been introduced at LUHS, at will provide a framework for teachers and school counselors to tailor learning opportunities around proficiency needs. This will increase possibilities for individualized student learning.

The meeting concluded after the school team presented their findings and plan of action.

Submitted by Eve Gagne