**Curriculum Board Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting Date: September 6, 2016 @5:00 p.m. – SSC**

**Members:** Attendance

Kimberly Hatchett Yes x No

Annette Johnson Yes x No

Kirsten Strand Yes x No

Dr. Carla Johnson Yes x No

Suzanne Bement Yes x No

Diane Argueta Yes x No

Jennifer Dalrymple Yes x No

Dr. Marion Hoyda Yes x No

Heather Kincaid Yes x No

Beatrice Reyes Childress Yes x No

Jessica Orstead Yes x No

Yolanda Stovall Yes x No

Ms. Hatchett opened the meeting at 5:00 p.m. Dr. Johnson prefaced the meeting by explaining the order of presentation would be changing slightly from the printed agenda.

***I. Dual Language Follow Up***

Ms. Argueta explained that with Dr. Hoyda’s input, changed first slide to “Dual Language Program: a Continued Conversation,” more appropriate since moving forward it will include discussion with full cabinet.

Dual language is research-based. Ms. Argueta indicated a link for the research. End goal in the district is for students to be literate in both English and Spanish. It promotes bilingualism, biliteracy, grade-level academic achievement, and multicultural competence. New program would be along the lines of what’s currently available to district’s high school students with the seal of biliteracy.

Two types of dual language programs: one -way, composed of native Spanish speakers; and two-way, which includes 50/50 native Spanish speakers/native English speakers.

Ms. Hatchett asked which the district is considering. Ms. Argueta is proposing that the district start with one way and move to two-way based on staffing considerations first. Across the state and across the nation, there’s a shortage of highly qualified bilingual staff so that’s one of the reasons why, at least initially, we would begin with a one-way program.

Ms. Johnson asked how many students are we talking about with the one-way program; Ms. Argueta said that’s still being decided. Her initial proposal included targeting three elementary schools due to staffing and subbing concerns. However, due to high mobility in the district and other factors, previous administration floated the idea to implement it district wide. More conversations are needed in both cabinet and with others to solidify the vision for what we want the program to be.

Ms. Hatchett asked if Ms. Argueta’s presentation is based on previous administration’s goal for a district-wide implementation; Ms. Argueta stated partially, but that she definitely supports dual language due to the fact that the district starts with a 90% rate native Spanish language instruction already in preK-1st programming. Ms. Argueta would be fine pushing it out district wide since we already have that different language of instruction at 90%, so it already aligns to dual language.

Ms. Hatchett asked Ms. Argueta what she would propose now; Ms. Argueta said to be fair, the continued conversation is necessary to hear other viewpoints and perspectives in order to obtain a more well-rounded picture, rather than the current proposal which was developed with the input of previous administration.

Ms. Hatchett asked what the difference in staffing entails with a one-way vs. two-pay program; Ms. Argueta explained either way would start with Kindergarten, so with both one- and two-way, would hire a highly qualified, bilingual teacher but currently, district has five, long-term subs. Because we already have a deficiency in highly qualified staff we wouldn’t look to staff two-way before staffing what is required by the state.

Ms. Hatchett asked if whether one way or two way, would need bilingual teachers across the board; Ms. Argueta confirmed that yes, the teachers need to be bilingual for K-2nd grades for one way or two way. Depending on the model, however, could play with staffing somewhat.

Ms. Strand said if district did one way, would still have gen ed classrooms, so wouldn’t need bilingual teachers but if it did two way would need bilingual teachers for every class because every child is involved.

Ms. Argueta explained that currently, the district doesn’t have enough students to fill a two way (which is 50% native Spanish/50% native English) across the district because some buildings don’t have enough students to fill a gen ed classroom.

Ms. Johnson asked with the one way program, obviously some changes were made this year, correct? Ms. Argueta confirmed that yes, those have been ongoing since Dr. Popp started. In response to a question by Ms. Hatchett, Ms. Argueta stated that district currently does not have dual language at all.

Ms. Johnson mentioned that the district used to have an early exit program which she is a proponent of – test scores were better and not as many bilingual teachers were needed. She counted nine vacancies on the personnel report, but even if there are only five, the kids deserve a real teacher in their classrooms. We can’t even fill those positions right now, so is not seeing where there’s a big benefit. When the district had early exit the test scores rose and there didn’t seem like there was as much strain on the teaching staff. To some degree, the district has a hybrid dual language program anyway because kids enter speaking pretty good Spanish; they just lack English skills.

Ms. Reyes Childress said district did not have any early exit program; rather, we had a program that looked at student proficiency levels. Students who didn’t need a full bilingual program we placed in a more sheltered type of program at K-2nd. That’s not technically an exit since students are still receiving services. Just wanted to clarify, as the two are not the same thing.

Ms. Johnson said there was a year after we made that change that the district exited a ton of kids and she has not actually seen these exit scores for a long time. Ms. Argueta said it was the year of the 1,099 exits. Ms. Reyes Childress explained that kids were placed based on their proficiency levels, not “oh, you’re a Kindergartener, therefore you go full-on bilingual Spanish speaking.” We looked at the actual scores and placed students based on what we thought their needs were.

Ms. Strand asked if district was doing that currently; Ms. Argueta said no. She’s conferred with ISBE on early exit/late exit, that terminology – when you have sheltered programming at the early grades in particular, it’s still considered services. It’s not exiting them from needing services; it’s exiting from native language instruction. The state does start counting the years in the program starting with 1st grade, not counting preK or Kindergarten. In reference to the 1,099 students, Ms. Argueta can provide data on where those kids are now and what their scores look like – it would be nice to see. However, won’t have a clear apples-to-apples comparison because state testing – and even local testing – has changed from year to year.

Ms. Hatchett said that before the district chooses a direction, need to define what goals are with dual language, i.e., what do we want it to be and who are we trying to serve. Because when she thinks of it, she defines it as every child coming into the district has an opportunity to leave knowing two languages, whether they speak Spanish or English initially. If that’s not the terminology someone needs to help her understand – is that fair?

Ms. Argueta said it’s fair if that’s the type of program district wants to have. However, many factors weigh into that, including funding, for example – the only students we could fund with Title III grants are those who qualify for services. Materials are another – we know that Spanish resources cost a lot more. Staffing – there’s no way around the fact that we would need to staff for students who are eligible for services first vs. those who are not in order to be in compliance.

Ms. Hatchett asked how Ms. Argueta would implement dual language; Ms. Argueta said that it needs to be a continuing conversation and we really haven’t had that yet. We’re in the process of doing some background work, particularly speaking to the questions asked today – where have we been, where are we going, what changes have we made.

Ms. Hatchett asked if district were to start a pilot on dual language, how would Ms. Argueta define it; Ms. Argueta said her proposal would be to start one way as it could be staffed. Can never have a perfect plan for dual language – it must be monitored and evaluated to see how it goes. Dual language experts often caution against calling it a pilot because it takes five to eight years – five years to begin to see the growth and then eight years to really see the students begin to perform at the grade level of their peers. Have to be careful, for example, not to say in year three, “Oh we’re not seeing any growth; we’re stopping it.” Those kids, once you begin to implement, should really be able to follow the whole program.

Ms. Johnson said it does get back to supporting staffing – we start the school year and we aren’t fully staffed and there are a lot of issues with substitute teachers. Such a large dual language program is difficult to staff properly, particularly when you have to have a sub for a bilingual teacher. If it’s hard to find gen ed subs, sure it’s much harder to find bilingual ones. The district is definitely challenged by finding enough qualified people to teach.

Ms. Argueta said even with current programming, that is the district’s situation.

Ms. Strand said it sounds as though there are still a lot of conversations that need to happen.

Ms. Argueta said she appreciates the insight into data that still needs to be presented, not just for dual language but just in general. Need to formulate a vision and figure out how to get to that.

Ms. Hatchett said she believes having a dual language program that provides every child the opportunity to speak two languages when they leave will say a whole lot about the district. Just as a for instance, what if we decided on a pilot in one school, where every child coming in would be in the dual language program. I can’t see a parent wanting a child not to be able to speak both languages. A lot of companies are looking for people who can speak more than one language. There’s an advantage to the district to do this.

If the district started the program in one or two schools, making sure we have adequate staffing, it would put the district in a good place.

Ms. Strand said most Kindergarten students come in speaking only Spanish.

Ms. Argueta used Bardwell as an example – with four sections of Kindergarten, three bilingual and one gen ed – the district could say that that gen ed Kindergarten class would be our dual language Kindergarten. If there are 25 kids, you could split it in to 12 and 13 and fill the rest with native language speakers to ultimately come up with two dual language classrooms containing 50% Spanish speakers and 50% English speakers each. Because instruction would be 90% in Spanish, would need to have the commitment of everyone to make it work.

Ms. Hatchett asked how many area districts have dual language; Ms. Argueta said Naperville districts 203 and 204, Plano district 88, and Oswego do currently, and District 129 is in the planning stages. Ms. Hatchett asked if it was the whole district; Ms. Argueta explained no dual language program is the same.

Ms. Johnson said there is no one that is dual language across the board. Ms. Argueta added that there are dual language states like New Mexico and Colorado.

Ms. Johnson said that some programs have it where instruction is 50/50, not 90/10. Ms. Argueta agreed but said it’s because they don’t have the same high percentage of Hispanic students as East Aurora.

Ms. Johnson said that the feedback she’s receiving from the Latino community indicates they have high expectations that their kids are immersed in English. Not learning enough English is definitely hurting the district’s test scores which then leads to the state coming in because the district looks challenged. Felt the hybrid system from a couple years ago was working okay – test scores went up and we were exiting more kids. Then there’s the argument about the teachers from Spain – there’s a segment of the community that really doesn’t like that but there’s no way to get around it to fill positions.

Ms. Strand said there’s also some pushback as far as when the kids are immersed in English they lose their Spanish language abilities – they can speak street Spanish but they’re not truly bilingual -- which does a disservice to them. Ms. Argueta agreed and said the goal of dual language is to graduate as many English and Spanish proficient students as possible. Listening today, hearing that, we don’t have to go that back and thinks that’s a good point but respectfully asks that there be discussion with the district’s new team and figure out what it would look like.

Ms. Johnson said ultimately, administration needs to come back to the committee with a recommendation. While kids may lose some of their native language, there are very few international colleges that have bilingual programs. The colleges in this country are very English oriented. All the SAT scores and other things that get you into college are all based on being able to speak English. Being bilingual is a great thing, but the district is also very challenged and it’s important to get our kids proficient in English so they can make a good living for themselves.

***II. District Test Scores Presentation***

Ms. Kincaid presenting. Provided updated hard copies to replace previous version available electronically. Said she is sharing preliminary data scores. Will share publically and across the district once data is finalized. State of Illinois just released their scores last Friday so do have that but as far as comparisons with other districts that has not yet been released.

Additionally, at a later date will share more specific data, for example, by gender, race and ethnicity, IEP, free-and-reduced lunch, etc. ACCESS and DLM data for special education students will also come later.

Met last week with the district’s principal team and secondary and elementary directors to cover this information which as committee can see, is prepared not only from a global elementary or secondary level but also per grade level, comparing math and reading, just to get a perspective on strengths and weaknesses within individual schools and across the district.

One thing to take note of is the change in tests from year 2014-2015 to last year, 2015-2016. In 14-15 they actually had two separate sessions – the students took the test at about the 75% of the school year – which was our PBA (performance-based assessment), and then they took a second test at the end of the year called the EOY. Those scored were merged to give one overall 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 score. Last year, 15-16, in response to a lot of concern across the state about how the testing was done, they shortened it to one test administration. Additionally, the time and the number of tests changed. Math decreased overall testing time by approximately 60 minutes and ELA decreased by about 30 minutes. The number of tests decreased from eight to nine in 14-15 to six or seven in 15-16. The state has indicated for 16-17 that PARCC will remain the same for grades 3-8, so next year at this time we will have true comparison data.

Ms. Hatchett asked when test was taken; Ms. Kincaid answered April 2016. In terms of scoring, students are divided into one of five levels: did not meet, partially met, approached, met, or exceeded. Cut scores are consistent; every student, regardless of grade level, is assigned a score between 650 and 850. The cut score to get in to the “exceed” category depends on the grade level and test taken.

Ms. Kincaid showed visual presentation of overall picture per grade in comparison to school year 2015 with school year 2016. As a district, we followed the state trend of increasing scores in ELA in 3rd grade with a slight decrease in grades 4-8. Math increased, as it did overall in the state, in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6. Then in grade 7 the state overall score slightly decreased while the district’s increased, and in grade 8 both the district and state scores slightly decreased.

Ms. Hatchett asked what the district is doing at the Magnet school that it isn’t doing at the other schools; Ms. Kincaid said there’s a lottery to gain admittance and there are qualifications to be part of that lottery. Many of the students coming into that lottery are performing at higher levels. Magnet also provides a stronger focus on math and science.

Ms. Hatchett asked if every child at Magnet was at grade level before entering the lottery; Ms. Kincaid confirmed.

Ms. Strand explained that it’s not all the best and brightest students; there are 450 Magnet students. Ms. Johnson added that there’s a long list of students on the wait list for Magnet.

Ms. Hatchett asked if district could add more magnet schools, have two or three. Ms. Strand said that by doing that, eventually will take all the best and brightest out of regular schools. Ms. Hatchett said or it could make them all feel like they’re the best and the brightest and they will perform at the level we expect them to perform.

Ms. Johnson says a lot of it is perception and that Magnet is changing the view of the district’s schools in general.

Ms. Hatchett said that looking at the math scores at Beaupre or Oak Park, could call them a magnet school and they will perform.

Ms. Kincaid continued presentation for grades 3-5 for both ELA and math, and then segued into data by grade level. She noted there’s really no consistency in terms of overall performance – some schools increased, some decreased, some that spike in 4th grade and some that dip in 4th grade. Basically, ELA scores are consistently inconsistent.

These areas are some we really looked at last week with principals as far as some targeted instructional strategies.

Ms. Hatchett asked what’s happening with the ELA scores for 3rd grade at Brady; Ms. Kincaid said those data are what’s being discussed currently with not only the building team but also the director of elementary. Ms. Ordaz is charged with working with principals to map goals using the data to effect some change.

Ms. Kincaid continued her presentation of elementary data compared to the state.

Ms. Johnson asked what grade all-day Kinder students are in now; Ms. Kincaid stated 2nd grade.

Ms. Kincaid continued summary of grade level scores. Stated conversations were had last week with principals in terms of strengths in particular buildings and some additional focal points per school at different grade levels.

Ms. Johnson said Johnson school at one point was “most improved” school in Kane County when it received the grand for iPads. Its scores jumped and have held pretty steady. In terms of technology, does Johnson still have an advantage over the other schools because it got the jump a long time ago? Ms. Reyes Childress agreed that Johnson definitely has an advantage because teachers there have been using the devices for years longer than the other schools. That said, the district is pretty saturated at the moment as far as one-to-one devices – this year both Kinder and 1st grade students have their own devices. Johnson, because they started earlier and have had staff dedicated to that for a longer time, that’s what makes the difference, not just the device alone but how staff is using it instructionally.

Ms. Reyes Childress said district has seen the same at BKC with the incorporation of the devices into their everyday instruction.

Ms. Johnson asked if all schools are about the same in terms of technology access; Ms. Reyes Childress said yes, with the exception of the high school because it’s so big. It’s approximately three students for every one device there prior to the last big tech purchase; will have to revisit numbers to see how close we are now.

Ms. Kincaid then presented middle school data, separately and in comparison to the state. Waldo is very consistent and Magnet has the highest performance levels for this past year at the 6th grade level.

Ms. Kincaid then presented high school data. Not multiple schools, so the data look different. No comparison data from year to year is available. State has reported scores as a conglomerate for grades 9-12 so Ms. Kincaid has not seen separate date for ELA 9 or algebra I.

Other data include graduating class data, so students who graduated in 2016. Scores comprised of the most recent ACT score. Most students took the ACT in spring of their junior year but can retake fall of their senior year, which then supersedes the previous score. Data is the most recent test score, not necessarily the best test score. ACT scores for the last several years have been relatively consistent overall.

For the 16-17 school year the state has transitioned to the SAT for the spring testing. The high school will no longer be administering PARCC as it’s not required by the state. As a result, district is piloting some SAT testing with select 8th and 9th graders.

Scores set by ACT show college readiness benchmarks which measures ability to pass college freshman coursework. Ms. Kincaid presented data showing percentage of district students meeting the mark in English, math, science, and social studies and the percentage meeting all four content areas.

Ms. Kincaid discussed high school AP coursework both district- and state-wide. The district has seen an increase over the past five years in the number of AP scholar awards; this year the district had 22 AP scholars. Have also seen an increase in the number of students taking AP exams. When Ms. Kincaid met with high school administrators, discussed not only increasing supports to students but also to teachers. Students are allowed to self-select, which means they choose whether to take the AP exam. Have also made a concerted effort to add more AP courses and classes in a variety of content areas. Dr. Johnson is looking to add even more classes. In terms of translating that experience into actual college credit – that’s based on the score, so we want to ensure we’re providing those supports.

Ms. Kincaid said once overall district test scores are finalized will share with the public and will have the additional comparisons and subgroup analysis to present to the committee.

Dr. Johnson shared her discussion with the math consultants, Randy and Sue Pippen, who emphasized how critical it is to stick with a curriculum for a number of years. Dr. Johnson is hoping the district keeps the brand new science, math, and language arts curriculums in place long enough to see the fruits of this labor.

Ms. Johnson stated wants to see ACCESS scores.

Ms. Strand asked if all students take PARCC if they take ACCESS or is it one or the other; Ms. Kincaid said all students take PARCC who take ACCESS but not all students that take PARCC take DLM. The district has a population of special education students that just take DLM which is their state testing as opposed to PARCC.

***III. Special Education Model: Cost Analysis Presentation***

Will be delayed until the October meeting.

***IV. Alternative Education Presentation***

Ms. Stovall introduced Ms. Orstead, who presented on alternative education; Mr. Crespo, the current principal, also in attendance.

Ms. Orstead stated that two years ago, the district began really looking at alternative programming, alternative encompassing a pretty big umbrella but meaning “how do we support kids who need something different?” Ms. Orstead stated she will give an overview of the programs and how they’re run throughout the district.

2014-2015 was the year alternative programming was brought back into the district. Presented slide showing staffing that year vs. during the 2015-2016 school year.

Ms. Strand asked why such a decrease in the second year; Ms. Orstead said can look into why, but believes previous administration was looking to cut costs in the district overall, not just with alternative programming.

Ms. Hatchett confirmed that for the 16-17 school year, staffing is the same as last year; Ms. Orstead said yes. Ms. Hatchett asked if the district is missing something regarding staffing; Ms. Orstead that will depend on the global view of what alternative programming is going to look like. The extension campus is one piece of that but as far as the high school, there is some staff that needs to be put back. Particularly with trauma-informed practices, need to create teams of individuals who can get to the students who are really struggling, behaviorally as well as academically and then socially and emotionally.

Ms. Johnson asked if there’s a social worker; Ms. Orstead explained that there is a social worker at the extension campus but that person no longer falls under the heading of alternative ed; instead, that social worker is dedicated to DREAMSS, a special education program.

The Regional Safe Schools Program (RSSP) is a program run through Kane Co. ROE and utilizes two online learning platforms: in the middle school, CompassLearning (Odyssey), and at the high school, Edgenuity. Students at the extension campus do not have the option to take as many electives as the high school due to staffing.

The Truancy Alternative and Optional Education Program (TAOEP) or TAP, which has been dedicated solely to pregnant teenage mothers, but as a grant program it encompasses truancy as well.

Ms. Johnson asked why TAP can’t be sent back to the high school to create room at the extension campus; said in the past, the district has supported this program due to being way over budget on the grant. Mentioned issues with teachers and the union in the past about bad behavior from RSSP kids within the middle schools and high school; there’s no room for them here at the extension campus because other programs being housed there. Ms. Johnson elaborated by saying that these students are in the program in lieu of expulsion but are still housed in regular school buildings.

Ms. Orstead explained that typically, all the students at the extension campus are there in lieu of expulsion. Their cases have been presented to the board and the board has opted to place them alternatively.

Ms. Johnson asked if RSSP students are basically under house arrest; Ms. Orstead said not all of them. Some have probation officers but some don’t. They’re only there due to a single incident. Not all have prior juvenile incidents. Prior to 2014-2015, RSSP was at the high school from 4-7 p.m. We started to see data that indicated that the program was not allowing students to graduate anywhere close to on time. The program was moved to the extension campus to provide them with a typical school day and academics.

Ms. Johnson said a perception exists with the teachers that the extension campus is tougher to get into to than Harvard. Feels that these kids used to be grouped a bit differently.

eLearning night school is offered to high school students to recover credits and meet graduation requirements on time. Two years ago, the district reached out to Northern Illinois Food Bank to offer students meals as they are staying after school from 3:00-8:00 p.m. Ms. Hatchett asked if this program was for any student or only for alternative students; Ms. Orstead explained that it’s for any student at the high school; alternative ed students cannot participate in this particular program. It is housed at the high school.

The DREAMSS program – a special education program – was placed at the extension campus last year but was traditionally a high school-run program. It’s for those students who need more structure and less distraction. It’s used before outplacement to a more therapeutic setting which can come with a hefty price tag. DREAMSS is a way to insulate students from that stimulus where they can make wrong decisions.

The eLearning night school is housed at the high school itself while the extension campus (EAEC) houses RSSP, TAEOP, and DREAMSS. Ms. Orstead then enumerated enrollment in various programs throughout the past several years. RSSP had 33 students last year (15-16).

Ms. Hatchett asked of students in the various programs, how many graduated; Ms. Orstead said seven students graduated from the RSSP program last year (15-16). The year before there were two. Five students in the TAP program met graduation requirements last year. Total students in TAP last year was 23, comprised solely of District 131 students.

Ms. Johnson stated she wants to look at where the grant is at since the program has been notoriously in the red for the past few years. Mentioned the daycare at the high school. Ms. Orstead the problem is space for the number of babies the program would need to house. The EAEC and the high school can have up to eight infants each; combining the two would require a larger daycare space.

Ms. Hatchett asked how are the numbers changing from year to year; Ms. Orstead explained there’s been an increase in the number of students recommended to alternative ed.

Ms. Orstead said in 2014-2015, the alternative education program oversaw a credit recovery program in the middle schools; now the middle schools run that on their own.

Ms. Orstead presented middle school data including the number of students returning to home school or moving to 8th to high school, as well as the number promoted to the next grade. Some students can accelerate to high school more quickly than with regular programming because they can more easily focus.

Ms. Orstead presented high school data including attendance rate, graduation status, number courses completed, and credit hours recovered. Ms. Johnson asked if students bused to EAEC; Ms. Orstead stated no students are bused except DREAMSS and homeless students.

The alternative program is funded in multiple ways. eAcheive is funded through the high school budget; RSSP is funded through Title I, RSSP grant money, teaching and learning, and the high school budget; TAP program is funded partially through the TAEOP grant and the rest comes out of the teaching and learning budget.

Ms. Johnson said in summary, district needs to look at the types of students it’s sending over to the EAEC and teachers at the school need to better understand the program. Believes the program used to be more free flowing in terms of having students there for a semester and then returning them to their home school if their behavior improved. Ms. Orstead said that is still done – a lot of the middle schools will use 45- or 60-day placements but that’s much easier to do at the middle school level than at the high school level because of how much curriculum is being covered and transferring the grades.

***V. European Field Trip Discussion***

Ms. Stovall said one overseas trip to Europe is in the planning stages and there’s another in the works for next year, but wants to get a feel on where the committee stands in light of global events. The request generally starts at the high school but Ms. Stovall wants to know what the vision and goals are in terms of communicating that to teachers. Most trips include six to 20 students along with staff members.

Ms. Hatchett asked if the European trip is already planned; Ms. Stovall said it is tentatively scheduled for June 29-July 10, 2017. In order to establish costs and get on a payment plan, planning needs to start early. Dr. Johnson asked specific European locations on the itinerary; Ms. Stovall said London, Paris, Rome, and Florence.

Ms. Strand asked if district funded; Ms. Stovall said trip is student funded at a little over $5K per student.

Ms. Hatchett asked if Ms. Stovall was asking before students even start going through raising funds if the board would even allow the trip; Ms. Stovall said yes, particularly in light of global situation and before getting too far into the process, wants to confirm the district is on board with it.

Ms. Strand said this is probably a policy discussion; Ms. Stovall said there is a policy in place regarding times of the year vis a vis travel alert times, the latest which ended August 31st. Mentioned that travel companies will cancel trips if there are travel warnings.

Ms. Johnson said she knows the board didn’t write that policy, it’s one of the press policies. It’s the Illinois Association of School Board’s policy. We approved the Cuba trip. Thinks most are done on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Stovall said what she’s hearing is that the high school can start the planning and submit the trips for approval. She will communicate that to the teachers.

Ms. Hatchett confirmed if Ms. Stovall is asking to move forward knowing the travel warnings have been lifted; Ms. Stovall agreed.

Ms. Johnson said most travel companies are on top of it; they don’t allow kids to take unsafe trips. Ms. Strand said most of our students are not getting these opportunities otherwise.

***VI. New Business***

Dr. Johnson said that in October, will be presenting proposals for new courses but the timeline may shift somewhat depending on discussions with interim superintendents.

Ms. Hatchett asked if there will be another presentation on dual language in terms of vision of where the district is going to go and how it will get there; she would like some closure on that. Ms. Argueta agreed, saying she will ask for direction as far as a meeting time to discuss and bring back to the committee. Dr. Hoyda added that they’re not quite sure how it got to the point it is now and the level of board support. Thinks that based on what she’s heard, should be looking at some different options. Need to determine what the criteria will be for analyzing those options and present that to the curriculum committee. It’s been on ongoing discussion; will take into consideration the various comments they’ve heard and the committee can help further that based more specifics at a future date.

Ms. Strand added that at some point, need to get input from the people this will affect. Dr. Hoyda agreed, saying that those people may have ideas about what might be problematic or an opportunity, and those could be added to the selection criteria.

Dr. Johnson said the October curriculum committee meeting will include the special education presentation, an update on dual language, possible course additions – anything else?

Ms. Johnson said she would like an update on the magnet school, particularly regarding how many students are currently on the waiting list. Discuss possibility of adding a second magnet school.

Ms. Argueta asked if committee would like a presentation on ACCESS scores; Ms. Johnson agreed that that was needed.

**VII. Public Comments**

None.

***VIII. Adjournment***

Meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.