

College & Career Readiness Task Force 4/22/15 meeting

Task Force members:

Elana Aberge, Myra Arnone, Michelle Bainter, Chris Bede, Colleen Broughton, Jessica Cuillier, Sharon Curry, Brenda Dean, Andrew Dimitriou, Heather Frazier, Monica Garcia, Dawn Goetter, Valerie Horvath, Tim Hudson, Nalini Iyer, Robert Johnson, Joe Joss, Leslie Levad, Matt Livingston, Jennifer Macchiarella, Stacey McCrath, Carol McGuigan, Gary Moed, Emma Morris, Holly Odle, Debbie Ohrman, Kelly Pease, Brenda Quayle, Lindsay Roger, Elizabeth Sirjani, Lara Sokoloff, Christina Thomas, Jane Todd, Jamie Walton, Annette Wolf

Welcome

Matt introduced several members of the task force who were attending their first meeting.

Task Force Common Interests

Matt reviewed information on interest-based negotiation. Matt noted it will be important as we review the research and determine our interests and how they intersect.

Task force members provided their interests at the end of the last meeting. A non-task force member organized the interests into a few different categories. Matt provided the page of interests, divided into student-focused, quality instructional time and high quality outcomes. Task force members each wrote down three interests that seem common to the members of the group. Each table then identified two interests. With seven tables, that came to 14 interests. Matt collected the interests. He will come back to the group with five interests that best represent the overall group interests at the next meeting.

Study & Analyze Research

Matt asked the group to review the first research article* and to pull out specific significant ideas that resonated with them. Each table discussed the first article, focusing on the significant ideas found. The group shared “wonders” they had after discussing the article.

Questions from previous meeting for clarification

Matt shared the answers to the two questions asked by task force members in the last meeting.

Q) One of the parameters is: to provide for a consistent staff work length/day at all levels, K-12. Why does the length of the staff work day need to be the same for teachers at all levels?

A) Historically, from a contractual perspective, we have had a consistent work day for teachers, as contracted. A change in the day would have to be negotiated. It's not likely that the association would be in favor of a differentiated work day with teachers at different levels making different salaries based on work day length.

Q) Our short-term solution for meeting the Basic Ed requirement starting in 2015-16 is to use the approach of averaging the instructional hours for grades 1-12 to 1,027. Why did we decide to use the approach of averaging the hours in the short term?

A) The law specifies we have two different ways we can meet the new requirement. One is to average the hours, which we chose to do that in the short term. This choice buys us time so that this group can

learn about and analyze the options and that takes time. Our work as a task force will inform any longer term change.

For next meeting, Matt asked task force members to familiarize themselves with the survey conducted last year on the potential of a 7th period day. The group will review it together at the next meeting. It will also review the next article, on [The Case for Improving and Expanding Time in School](#).

*Patall, E., Cooper, H., and Allen, A.B. (2010). Extending the School Day or School Year: A Systematic Review of Research (1985-2009). *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 80, No. 3, pp. 401-436. DOI: 10.3102/0034654310377086.