



BOARD CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES MONDAY, MAY 10, 2010

Members of the Board Curriculum Committee met on Monday, May 10, 2010, in the Dining Room at the Education Center. The following Board Members were in attendance: Rosario Amato (arrived at 7:15 p.m), William Burkhardt, Michele Cann, Judith Dexter, Irene Follweiler, Loretta Leeson, Eugene McKeon, and Aurea Ortiz (arrived 6:18 p.m)

Absent: Michael Faccinetto

Also in attendance were Dr. Thomas Persing, interim superintendent of schools; Dr. Margaret K. Barilla, educational consultant-assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction; Dr. Dean Donaher, director of student services; Thomas Washington, assistant superintendent for human resources; Richard Agretto, director of special education; Iris Cintrón, supervisor of minority affairs/governmental programs and grants; Frank Arbushites, director of technology; principals, teachers, and representatives of the press.

Mrs. Dexter called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

COURTESY OF THE FLOOR – None

CO-TEACHING – MR. AGRETTO

Mr. Agretto reviewed district special education data provided to the board last month which revealed the percentage of IEP students exposed to regular education curriculum over the past five years. He also reviewed the teacher staffing report and pointed out that the teacher numbers had only increased 4.9 in the past five years with a dramatic increase in the exposure of the students to regular education. Mr. Agretto commented on the increased amount of excellent staff development opportunities along with great building leadership and a change in culture by incorporating the students into regular education.

Mr. Agretto introduced the Nitschmann Middle School special education co-teaching team of Ms. Sarah Hriniak and Ms. Samantha Sommer. The team provided a presentation of their classroom program structure which involved the co-teaching concept. They provided examples of teaching tools and methods which promoted team work and positive reinforcement. The teachers stated that they promoted problem solving techniques by their students with encouragement to seek assistance from their classmates. The teachers covered other academic strengthening skills provided to the special education students.

They noted that they celebrated every single accomplishment made by the students in their classroom. The teachers provided multiple examples of their instructional style, which included the incorporation of music to reinforce concepts in the co-teaching environment. They emphasized self-sufficiency with regard to problem solving skills. The co-teachers also reviewed their self-monitoring method for student behavior so the students were always aware of their progress.

The co-teaching teachers from Marvine Elementary School provided a presentation with regard to their student support system. Ms. Alice Breon, the special education at the school, discussed how inclusion was embraced in their school. Ms. Breon teacher reflected on the high rate of economically disadvantaged and ELL student population in the school and the challenge associated with mixing special education in the classroom. She pointed out that full inclusion presently existed at Marvine Elementary School with the exception of accommodations for testing. She noted after taking two courses related to working with ELL students she discovered that many of the same accommodations used for those students worked for special education students. She also brought attention to the support of their principal, who encouraged the teachers in the building, which made a major difference in the school year.

Input was also provided by a regular education teacher, Ms. Carolyn Fulks, who commented about the positive gain from the learning support students and the regular education students in the classroom. She noted positive attitudes, confidence, and pride associated with the students' work. She complimented the skills of Ms. Alice Breon and Ms. Judy Hoke, reading specialist. The students did not consider her as their sole teacher but rather looked at all three instructors equally. She explained that with the co-teaching model the students were grouped by their needs and were taught the same material but at different levels.

Ms. Judy Hoke, reading specialist, commented that she observed gains in reading for both regular education and learning support students. They worked hard to create a community of learners where every student was an integral part of the classroom community. The learning support students saw their regular education classmates as peers and an extension of their support system. She expressed that the co-teaching model has enabled success with the students.

Ms. Breon stated the co-teaching model has been wonderful for all students with the learning support students achieving their goals with a result of higher expectations because they had so many great role models in the classroom. The students in regular education had the opportunity to be leaders and examples to the other students. It was also noted that several struggling learners in the group did not have to go for testing or be referred because they were able to meet goals because of differentiated instruction and support within the classroom.

Director Dexter commented that it was good to hear how inclusion was being incorporated into the schools and that they were having positive results. She also said the accomplishments at Marvine and Nitschmann were good to hear about in light of last year's budget cuts which resulted in reduced student supports.

Mr. Agretto emphasized that many principals and teachers realized the importance and value of the work being done in the classrooms for all students.

CURRICULUM AUDIT –

Dr. Barilla deferred her presentation because of the limited availability of time. She would consider addressing it at the end of the meeting or could also present it at the finance meeting.

TECHNOLOGY AUDIT –

Mr. Arbushites discussed the goals for using technology. He expressed that he was glad to have the opportunity to compile the audit because it gave him the chance to have a bird's eye view of what was being done in technology. He addressed the following areas:

1. Goals for Using Technology in BASD – Why did they use technology and why was it important to their programs in the district? He noted the three goals which were listed in the strategic planning document:
 - a. Create and maintain a productive technology infrastructure for all staff and students.
 - * Network equipment
 - * Student Information System
 - * Business and Financial Systems
 - b. Provide educational technology resources, training, and support for all users to use technology successfully.
 - * Technology as a tool for teaching and learning – Curriculum is planned and then the appropriate technology is found to address the need. The expertise of teachers is needed in planning the curriculum along with the expertise of technology integration specialists to help to identify the best technology resources available to help deliver the curriculum.
 - * K-12 technology benchmarks and curriculum – There was a continuum of technology skills contained in the benchmarks document which included the instruction of responsible use of technology and 21st Century Skills.
 - * Staff development

Mr. Arbushites emphasized that curriculum and staff development along with the planning of purposeful activities was an ongoing process. They wanted to have an intentional plan in place for any technology built into the curriculum.

- c. Provide a sound, research-based educational framework of 21st Century Skills and curriculum that can be supported with appropriate educational technology resources.
 - * Partnership for 21st Century Skills web site (<http://www.p21.org>) – There was a core academic subject area knowledge that had to be built along with it beginning with a base of core knowledge.
 - * Essential skills: critical thinking, problem solving, communication, and collaboration
 - * Learning and innovation skills, creativity
 - * Information literacy, media, and technology skills

Mr. Arbushites provided an overview of educational technology in the district. He stated it was based on the ISTE standards, the PA Standards for Science and Technology, and refined those to spell out more specific K-12 Technology Benchmarks which identified specific skills and technology that students should be learning as they moved through each grade level. He also brought attention to Classrooms for the Future and the former Skill 21 initiatives.

Mr. Arbushites explained that Skill 21 is a classroom sets model at the middle schools. They were continuing the important work especially with Classrooms for the Future with continued skill building at the high school level so students could continue learning technology. He noted that staff development was also a critically important piece to help teachers know how to implement technology in their classrooms.

2. Technology Equipment Summary – Mr. Arbushites reviewed the equipment and software offered in the district buildings:

- * Platforms: Macintosh and PC computers are both supported
- * Software: iLife and iWork suites are utilized with Macintosh systems
- * Financial Considerations: Purchases are chosen carefully with consideration of balancing the need for growth with the financial constraints of the district. Users are matched with the appropriate technology tools. State contract vendors are required for hardware and software purchases. Repairs are done via mail order rather than directly through Apple®, resulting in a yearly savings of almost \$10,000.
- * Hardware and Software Purchases: The technology department worked with the curriculum and instruction department, along with principals, to plan the purchase, deployment, and distribution of computer equipment. The principals determined allocation within the building and also provided secure storage.
- * Major Initiatives: SKILL21 and CFF – The grant funding expired for the CFF program but professional development and online courses continued.
- * Inventory: Managed internally
- * Work Orders: Database used to manage the recording and tracking of any difficulties with computer equipment.

3. Elementary and Middle School Technology Curriculum –

- * Academic Integration Curriculum: Students received 45 minutes each week at the elementary level.
- * Aligned with PA Standards
- * Curriculum revision with Techpaths – Website revealed curriculum as it is developed. Teachers have the ability to add their own resources such as software tools, documents/worksheets, or reference websites. Curriculum can be viewed as a monthly snapshot.
- * Middle School Technology – involved in continued development of skills and coordination between elementary and high schools.

Mr. Arbushites shared commentary from district teachers involved in online courses such as authentic and differentiated instruction. One instructor commented about the importance of the students being 21st Century literate in addition to being proficient thinkers, writers, speakers, listeners, and problem solvers. They should be able to use technology to enhance those skills. Authentic instruction emphasized the necessary 21st Century skills and made learning relevant and engaging. He also shared feedback received on post instruction evaluations about the need for more technology workshops with regular and sustained exposure.

Mr. Arbushites provided an example of a PSSA preparation program utilized in some of the schools called Study Island. He explained that the program assisted the students in identifying areas of needed enrichment, and noted over 520,000 reading and math questions had been answered by students at East Hills Middle School this past year. He also commented on the Read 180 Scholastic Program which demonstrated positive gains in student reading skills. He stated that the success of the programs was attributed to following a model with a solid base of research along with the commitment of educators.

Ms. Moran made comment on the Scholastic Read180 Program which has been used in the district for the past six years. She said the program's approach was very solid. She noted that the flexibility of the program encouraged learning. She also reviewed the benefits of the Epals network which encouraged students to learn, communicate, and collaborate on projects with students around the globe. She also discussed another program which was free of charge for Title I schools. The "In2Books" program provided five free books for the students and involved mentorship from college students to retired teachers with ongoing communication exchanged between parties throughout the world. She admired the relationship formed between the students and an influential adult, which provided emotional, psychological and educational support.

Dr. Barilla stated the Scantron Performance Series testing system was purchased this year for student assessment. She added that the recommendation would be to return to 4Sight as an online assessment. She pointed out the change would save the district approximately \$40,000. There were some concerns with regard to some of the assessments and reporting provided by Scantron and some of the principals found that some of the data received was not really usable regarding instruction.

Director Dexter questioned the reliability of the Scantron system and shared that she could not understand or view many results on the website. She inquired if they were initially misled about the program.

Dr. Barilla said they had tried on several occasions to obtain answers for their questions and were unsuccessful.

Director Dexter asked if they received the benefit of the dollars invested and commented that she only saw a raw number when she inquired online with no reference to explain details of the testing.

Director Burkhardt said he heard there was a problem with the administration of the test for all students.

Mr. Michael Wagner, dean of students at Liberty High School, said he was responsible for administering tests in September and January and noted great network difficulties.

Director Dexter inquired if the network issue was on the end of the district or through Scantron.

Mrs. JoAnn Durante replied that there was an issue on the end of the district because they could not test more than 222 students at Liberty High School unless they were hard-wired and that could only be accomplished by closing down the business department and take those students out of class to use their lab. She said they would be in the same predicament with the 4Sight test.

Director Burkhardt asked why the money was spent on the testing if it could not be accomplished in the larger schools.

Dr. Barilla commented that assessments were required for grant qualification. She pointed out that 4Sight was more cost effective, user friendly, and can be done within one class period.

Director Dexter said they needed to figure out the problem and if it was because of a discrepancy between what they thought they were buying and what they actually received; it needed to be reported and the bill reviewed. She added that if it was a misjudgment on the part of the district, then it was a different story. She pointed out that the 4Sight assessment provided her with more information.

Director Leeson commented that she thought they moved from 4Sight to Scantron because 4Sight was not a good predictor of PSSA results.

Dr. Barilla replied that when 4Sight was actually administered without any adaptations, there was 80 to 90 percent correlation with the PSSA. She said the test was not necessarily an assessment they would want to use to drive instruction but it was a benchmark assessment which was required to get financial support from EAP funding for tutoring.

4. Considerations and Recommendations for Future Purchases –

Mr. Arbushites emphasized the need for students to be prepared for their future whether they were entering the workforce, trade school, military, or moving on to college. Many of their recommendations were based upon the district's strategic plan. He discussed the reality of the need for cutbacks in the district which would affect technology. They wanted to make best use of the funds available so the essential curriculum needs could continue to be met. He also reviewed a graph which demonstrated the statistics associated with the age of the laptop inventory in the schools. He commented on the ages of laptops and desktops in all schools, noting that the laptops were out of warranty after three years with the possibility of the unavailability of parts in the future. He recommended keeping the laptops at the middle school for at least one more year and then evaluate conditions. He reviewed that high school CFF laptops ranged in age from one to three years old. There was a need to upgrade the district servers on a regular basis and he pointed out that many servers in the network center were almost ten years old. The current desktops in middle school computer labs (East Hills and Nitschmann) were between eight and nine years old and needed replacement. His goal was to upgrade high school business labs on a regular basis.

He reviewed the current status of the elementary school equipment and noted that 76 percent of the equipment was five years old or greater.

Mr. Arbushites concluded with a list of recommendations:

- Follow BASD Strategic Plan for future technology purchases as funding permitted
- Implement a refresh cycle that allowed for regular replacement of computer equipment
- Build sustainability into grant purchases – Mr. Arbushites noted that it could become a financial burden for the district to replace equipment when it is obsolete if the grant money is exhausted.
- Investigate the cost-effectiveness of various methods of obsolete computer equipment disposal
- Continue to follow the Pennsylvania Auditor General’s recommendations for inventory and security

Director Amato brought attention to the needs of the district to keep the technology in place for the students and expressed concern about the equipment becoming obsolete. He asked about a dollar figure necessary to maintain the inventory. He inquired about a future plan because they did not want to be a position where they had worthless equipment.

Mr. Arbushites commented that they needed to evaluate the curriculum and program needs. He said he could not provide an accurate figure this evening.

Director Leeson inquired about the computers at the high school level and their condition. She thought the computers in the business lab at Liberty were new.

Mrs. Durante commented that they were older computers.

Director Leeson asked about the 24 sets associated with Classrooms for the Future. She asked if they were continuing the training.

Mr. Arbushites replied they were continuing the training during in-service days, summer academy, and in workshops for teachers after school. He said the computers were divided up according to the principal’s discretion among the language arts, math, science, and social studies departments.

Director Leeson commended Mr. Arbushites about a compliment she heard from the district auditor, Mr. Gorman, regarding his inventory control.

Director Dexter asked how much money the district has spent in the past year with regard to technology. She asked if he could determine the amount of dollars spent including grant funding for computer technology.

Mr. Arbushites replied there was a 4-year lease payment of \$737,000 per year.

Director Dexter requested the amount for purchases and leases, including grant money, because of the discussion about building in the sustainability.

GRADUATION PROFICIENCY REQUIREMENT

Dr. Barilla, Mrs. Durante, and Mr. LaPorta presented the current statistical data of students at both high schools who have not demonstrated proficiency. Dr. Barilla noted that the principals were addressing issues with the students at present to insure that as many students as possible could graduate. The students were given various options in order to meet proficiency. There were also classes offered at the high school called Math Gap or English CAT, which were classes designed for the students who needed to meet proficiency. She also mentioned the use of Scantron or 4Sight testing. Coursework was also taken into consideration by the principals for students who have not done well on the PSSA. Support systems were discussed which assisted the students such as after-school tutoring and based upon the data, the student could demonstrate proficiency. The IEP process for special education students was also considered. She stated the principals were the individuals who had the last call with regard to making a recommendation to the board that a student was proficient and ready to graduate. Dr. Barilla also reviewed options with regard to graduation proficiency for ELL students such as demonstrated growth through the WIDA test, the stages of learning language, or the students could have a portfolio that reviewed their work over time. Dr. Barilla reviewed the data provided through color coded graphing. She pointed out that the IEP process was not considered on the diagram for special education students.

Mrs. Durante commented that the PSSA proficiency requirement did not address the transient population which continued to occur at Liberty High School. She noted there were 741 projected total graduates at the high school for the upcoming graduation and 32 of those students knew in September that they would not graduate until August. She added that 5 students in that group were proficient in both math and reading. She pointed out they were given the directive by past administration to not retest ESOL and special education students during the fall PSSA retest. She added that at least 118 students were impacted by their IEP on the math section with 110 impacted by the reading section, where they may be excused to not retest but could show proficiency in some other fashion. She said many of the students were currently enrolled or have taken either CAT or GAP tutoring where they showed an increase in proficiency. She also shared that several students were scheduled to take 4Sight tests to show improvement. Mrs. Durante stated the last final document was provided on December 20 with retest information coming on the fourth week of January. She said students have not approached the idea for a principal to review what they had done to show improvement. She added that the students were invited to do so but the reality is that they still had the same amount of students who would not graduate anyway because they did not meet the 26 credits. She concluded that she felt it was a large amount of students.

Mr. LaPorta stated that they were looking at approximately 30 students who have not demonstrated proficiency through one of the testing mechanisms or by passing a CAT or GAP course. The students were currently assigned to tutoring sessions after school and would have the opportunity to take a 4Sight or Scantron test. If the testing was not effective, the students would have to demonstrate growth within their highest level of mathematics.

Mr. LaPorta said there were approximately ten students in the area of reading proficiency. He pointed out that ESOL students have shown significant levels of growth through the WIDA testing process.

Director Ortiz inquired about the PSSA math scores for ELL students in consideration that math was universal. She was surprised the students did better in reading.

A teacher from Liberty commented on the difficulty associated with the math portion of the PSSA which was language imbedded with open-ended questions.

Dr. Barilla thought that if a student was not enrolled in a school prior to October 1, their score did not count towards proficiency. The student's participation score was included. She also clarified that the math assessment could be read to any student.

The teacher pointed out that they were limited on translators for various languages.

Director Ortiz commented that it could have been read to the students but it was not done.

Mrs. Kim Harper noted that the ESOL students were demonstrating proficiency by attending after-school tutoring and in other areas.

Director Cann inquired if all of the students at risk of failure were aware of their situation.

Mrs. Durante stated that the students had to show proficiency which could be accomplished through course work. She added that they had the opportunity to retest and some students have chosen to use their course grades to show progress.

The principals replied that the students were notified.

Director Burkhardt asked to review the number of students in jeopardy of failure.

Mrs. Durante replied there were 154 students in addition to 32 students. She pointed out that 14 were currently enrolled in CAT, awaiting a grade and 43 were currently in GAP, awaiting a grade; 33 were proficient in math and 74 were proficient in reading with retesting taking place this week. She reiterated that the counselors have met with the students and were also notified by a letter.

Director Leeson asked if they had 154 more than in previous years at Liberty High School.

Mrs. Durante agreed.

Director Leeson asked about the status of Freedom High School.

Mr. LaPorta noted there were 30 students presently not proficient with two currently enrolled in LAMP. Eight students were attending tutoring to demonstrate proficiency and 17 students have been determined to meet proficiency based upon transfer scores or academic achievement.

Mr. LaPorta said there was consultation with principals, assistant principals, and guidance counselors to determine the students' performance. He stated there were currently five students still under review. He concluded there were 13 students presently ineligible to graduate.

Director Leeson asked Mrs. Durante if she anticipated the 135 students would make graduation.

Mrs. Durante replied affirmatively because they were scheduled for retesting. She added that she ran CAT and GAP every marking period.

Director Burkhardt commented that the students did not deserve to receive a diploma if they did not put forth the effort and take advantage of the offered options.

Mrs. Durante felt the integrity of the diploma needed to be maintained. She brought attention to the multiple opportunities available for academic assistance, including Saturday sessions. She said the principals and guidance counselors were on top of them as opposed to the students coming to them.

Mr. LaPorta noted poor attendance was a factor.

Director McKeon inquired about contact of the students' parents. He commented that extracurricular participation should be suspended if the students didn't attend the tutoring sessions.

Director Follweiler expressed that she admired Mrs. Durante statement regarding the preservation of the integrity of the diploma. She said that the students should care that the diploma meant something and they should only graduate only if they were deserving of the honor.

Director Dexter commended the high school principals for their efforts.

HIGH SCHOOL SCIENCE CURRICULUM AND TEXTBOOKS

Dr. Barilla inquired about the approval of science books for purchase. She reviewed that the science department chairpersons, Eric Baltz and Beth Guarriello, made a presentation to the board at the previous board meeting and would be bringing updated curriculum to the board at the June meeting.

Director Dexter received a general consensus from the Board of School Directors in support of the purchase of books.

Director Leeson commented about the environmental science curriculum and asked if the area could still be evaluated. She said it appeared that most school districts were imbedding environmental science in biology and chemistry, which meant that most other students would have an additional year of science than what was offered to the district's students.

HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM OF STUDIES

Dr. Barilla requested to postpone addressing the high school program of studies until the June Board Curriculum Committee Meeting.

ELEMENTARY SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM

Dr. Barilla introduced the principals involved in working on elementary social studies curriculum and stated they would be returning next month for further discussion.

Mrs. Karen Aulizio, the principal at Thomas Jefferson Elementary School and the administrator in charge of elementary social studies introduced her colleagues who assisted on the curriculum committee; Mrs. Deb Roeder, the principal at Miller Heights Elementary, and Dr. Elizabeth Conard, the principal at Calypso Elementary. She also noted that Ms. Jodi Sponchiado, the principal at Governor Wolf Elementary also served on the committee.

Mrs. Aulizio reviewed the curriculum process, noting the utilization of the Standards Aligned System by the administrators to incorporate new resources into the teaching of social studies. She introduced the textbook chosen by the committee and the supportive reasoning for their choice. She noted the balance of technology and print along with additional benefits, such as an audio version available for special needs students at no extra cost. She said the initial cost to the district would be substantially reduced because the publishers have agreed to only charge for the student textbooks with teacher materials and manuals included at no extra cost. There were additional resources offered such as interactive field trips, ELL, historical character biographies, and a Social Studies In Action book provided at no extra cost. She stated the company also offered free professional development for the life of the program.

Director Dexter inquired about the readability of the textbook and why the selection was a better choice.

Mrs. Aulizio pointed out the formatting on the textbook pages with many of the textbooks being “too busy.”

Director Dexter inquired if it was typical for a grade level text to initially start at a lower level.

Mrs. Aulizio replied that it was typical for the material to begin at a lower grade level. She reiterated the additional resources offered for learning support, ELL students, as well as the higher achievers, at no additional cost.

Director Follweiler asked if the actual initial book cost similar among all three publishers.

Mrs. Aulizio replied that the quotes were within a few dollars difference.

Dr. Barilla reminded the board members about the availability of the books for review.

ELEMENTARY LITERACY CURRICULUM

Dr. Barilla reviewed that a packet containing elementary literacy curriculum was delivered to the board for review. She requested the item be deferred to the June meeting because Mrs. Bast was unable to attend this meeting to answer questions. Dr. Barilla stated there would also address science, social studies, and academic integration curriculum documents at the June meeting.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR MAY 17, 2010 REGULAR BOARD MEETING

A. NEA Learning and Leadership Grant

Mrs. Cintrón explained that the grant was in the amount of \$5,000 to be used at Broughal Middle School.

Director Leeson asked if there were other schools that qualified for the grant. She thought there might be the opportunity for other district schools to qualify for the grant opportunity.

Mrs. Cintrón replied that information was forwarded to all of the schools regarding the grant opportunities.

B. TITLE 1 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT

Mrs. Cintrón explained that the grant was available to Title I schools which were in the higher end of improvement and are in corrective action. The value of the grant was in the amount of \$270,562 for use at Broughal Middle School, Fountain Hill and Donegan Elementary Schools. Donegan Elementary would be receiving \$109,200 of the total amount because of their corrective action status. The money is to be used for instructional supplies, staff development, and some community services.

Director Leeson inquired if only certain schools qualified for the grant.

Mrs. Cintrón replied that only the schools listed qualified.

C. THE PENNSYLVANIA PACT (PA-PACT) GRANT

Mrs. Cintrón noted the grant totaled \$3,977,883. She would be reviewing more detail with regard to the disbursement at tomorrow's board meeting.

Director Dexter inquired about documents for the board regarding the grant.

Mrs. Cintrón replied that they would be providing a presentation.

Director Dexter asked about receiving the information prior to tomorrow night's meeting because they did not appreciate receiving the information at the meeting. She asked if it could be communicated by email.

Director Leeson commented that they were now seeing some of the regular state money being funneled through the PA-Pact Grant.

Director McKeon asked Mrs. Cintrón for a report in the future regarding the number of grants submitted by each school in the district. He thought there may be some schools taking advantage of many grants while other may not be involved in the programs.

CURRICULUM AUDIT

Dr. Barilla introduced her curriculum audit, which was based upon the Standards Aligned System developed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education. She explained when the elementary principals were working on the social studies curriculum; they built it primarily off of the standards aligned system. She added that the high school science chairpersons also found it to be a wonderful resource.

Dr. Barilla provided her recommendation for a curriculum cycle as follows:

- Year 1 – Research best practices in area
- Year 2 – Develop curriculum aligned to standards
- Year 3 – Review text, recommend and purchase materials (text and technology resources)
- Year 4 – Develop common assessment
- Year 5/6 – Review curriculum; modify, etc.

Dr. Barilla emphasized ongoing professional development and pointed out it was part of the cycle which began in year one and continued on through year six.

She discussed the curriculum purchase priorities for the future. The present year addressed the high school science curriculum, elementary literacy, in addition to elementary and high school social studies. She provided additional recommendations including all academic core areas up to the 2015-2016 academic year. She recommended the allocation of \$150 per student at the secondary level and \$100 per student at the elementary level which included all ancillary materials needed for the course.

She also discussed the textbook ages in core and elective areas by revealing a detailed chart with a recommended purchase pattern cycle.

Dr. Barilla further reviewed the core area book purchase cycle for the upcoming and successive academic years. She also reviewed the non-core cycle for a six-year future period. Dr. Barilla stated the areas have not been addressed. She brought attention to industrial technology with new research and practices such as an engineering course presently offered at Parkland High School that addressed robotics. She pointed out the branching out of offerings beyond what was referred to as traditional industrial technology.

Dr. Barilla recommended an accelerated cycle and also encouraged the investigation of new offerings in the areas of family/consumer science, art, the gifted program and fitness/health.

Dr. Barilla stated there were options in world language such as sign language which could be considered. She noted that there was not enough funding to address all areas in one year.

Dr. Barilla introduced the 2009-2010 documents which will be presented to the board for review in the near future. She also stated recommended the PA SAS site to update elective curriculum over the next three years to reach 100 percent compliance by the 2013-2014 academic year. She recommended updating the elementary science curriculum in the 2010-2011 academic year.

She reviewed a transition plan for the curriculum and instruction department and reviewed the multiple areas that would need to be addressed with responsibilities redirected at the administrative level. The primary areas involved in the transition plan are:

- Supervision of curriculum and assessment development transferred to building principals
- Develop a transition plan for curriculum
- Develop a transition plan for professional development
- Develop a transition plan for collaboration between buildings
- Develop a transition plan for assessments – Identify building administrators responsible for the development/monitoring of standard aligned assessments in all core academic areas
- The BASD Board Curriculum Area – Review board policies/Support development of a five-year curriculum cycle and fully support textbook and curriculum process

COURTESY OF THE FLOOR

Mr. Stephen Antalics – 737 Ridge Street, Bethlehem

Mr. Antalics commented on Director Follweiler’s statement regarding that a diploma should be earned. He stated that it should be earned by qualifying academic work. He brought attention to an earlier discussion that students were given assistance with administration being the aggressor. He inquired if a student was free to participate in athletics if they were not scholastically eligible. He asked if there was a policy that restricted the student from extracurricular activities if they were not performing at the required level in academics. He asked if there was a scholastic academic policy in place with regard to probationary status. He commented that it was the student’s job to learn and if athletics or extracurricular activities were important to them, they would be motivated to establish a priority.

Dr. Persing referred to the PIAA regulations which covered the ineligibility rules. He deferred to Dr. Donaher with regard to the policy governing extracurricular activities.

Dr. Donaher agreed that the district adhered to the PIAA regulations with regard to ineligibility and commented that the extracurricular area was somewhat vague.

Director Leeson noted it was the first year that they had the graduation requirements. She said they had a past requirement to pass a certain number of courses and to also complete community service but this year they must reference PSSA testing.

Mr. Antalics strongly suggested that the district consider incorporating an academic requirement into the code of conduct.

Mr. Antalics also commented on fundamental requirements at the college level. He reviewed that math professors at colleges commented that the students were taught to answer mathematical problems but were not taught how to get there.

OPEN FORUM

Director Follweiler addressed Mr. Antalics commentary. She said that she assumed it was across the board in any extracurricular activity that if a student was passing a course, there were restrictions in place. She recommended reviewing the policies at a future meeting and streamline it for easier interpretation for the students.

Director Dexter pointed out that band was an academic subject at the high school level.

Director Ortiz stated she asked for some transiency tracking at Donegan Elementary School because of the decline in enrollment.

Mr. Washington stated he would address the decline at the budget hearing tomorrow.

Director Ortiz addressed the increase in availability of AP courses and asked for information on minority enrollment.

Director Amato inquired about athletic scholarships currently awarded to school district athletes, specifically for “students who played for the district teams.”

Dr. Donaher agreed to provide him with the information.

Director Leeson commented on the importance of the technology audit because it involved a heavy expense. She believed they needed discussion of technology in relation to best practices, developing the curriculum in standards, and then reviewing their needs instead of just going to the “what we need” area first.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Minutes prepared by:

Donna L. Wenz
Confidential Secretary – Department of Curriculum and Instruction