

## **APPROVED: Outcomes Committee Meeting Minutes #3**

*Via <https://bostonprep-org.zoom.us/j/7171526696>*

January 17, 2025

11:00 AM- 12:15 PM

**Committee Members Present:** Sarah James, Tom Huff, Natalie Branch-Lewis, Vanessa Lipschitz, Bryant Jones, David Berkeley, David Wolff

**Staff Members Present:** Lauren Bardsley, Robert Rametti, Lily Jewell, Meekerly Sanon, Vanessa Shiu, VaLonda Harris, Tori Riley

### **I. Open Meeting Protocol:**

- Sarah Called the meeting to order at 11:04 AM. Welcomed committee back in the new year
- Set the tone that we have the task of confirming the policy context for graduation requirements
- Conducted icebreaker to set an positive and engaging tone

### **II. Vote Approval of Minutes**

- Sarah presented the previous minutes. Bryant made a motion to approve, Vanessa seconded. All members made a motion to approve.

### **III. Public Comment**

- Sarah James invited members of the community to join. No community members were present.

### **IV. Agenda/ School Business**

- Policy Changes: Question 2 Ballot Questions

- There have been several policy changes impacting schools on a state level and we will need to address how these policies have impacted our internal policies. Given that question 2 was voted in, MCAS is no longer a HS graduation requirement. The committee works to vote on a policy for graduation to present to the board.
- Meekerley clarified what Question 2 means for our kids: students will still take the MCAS. It is now up to each individual district to determine local graduation requirements and local competency determinations among our student population
- Prior to Question 2: Graduation requirements must include local graduation requirements and statewide competency. Now Post Question 2 graduation requirements mean students must meet local graduation requirements as well as local competency determination

- DESE continues to expect the MCAS tests to continue to be administered by all MA schools with schools demonstrating 95%+ participation to remain in good standing

- Our goal is to decide and agree on local competency determination
- Meekerly opened it up for any questions from the committee. Additionally, wanted to make sure that the committee and board feel comfortable explaining to others what the impact of question 2 has on our school community
- Iteration 1- Worked on and met with community members to receive feedback and further develop. Wanted to make sure that we are still holding a high bar for our students. Moved to iteration 2
- Iteration 2 of Proposal:

- Local Graduation requirements: MCAS score of 470 in ELA, Math, Science (Physics or Biology)
- Local Competency Determination: Passing core requirements (ELA, Languages, History, Science, Math, PE/Health, Arts, Electives, Ethics, Summer Enrichment)- includes an increased weight for IAs from 10% to 20% of final score. Additionally, passing ethics defense.
  - The goal is to vote in a policy that will be able to remain consistent over the years to keep it simple for students and staff to understand the bar.
- Discussion Questions on Graduation Requirements:
  - Are we in agreement in support of MCAS as part of the requirement? Why?
  - Minimum Score
  - Avoiding Redundancy
  - History Implications
  - Updating our Approach to Ethics Defense
  - Question: How does this impact our current seniors? And has this been communicated to families?
    - The proposed graduation requirements are currently the requirements for students, which would cause less disruptions
  - Question: how will families and kids feel about us keeping MCAS when the state does not?
    - Want to make sure that the language is extremely clear for students, families, and community members
    - We want to make sure the bar is high enough and accurate representation of what students would need to be able to do to succeed in college
  - Question: How does the student experience change? Is it simply the IA counting for more?
    - We can decide if the weight of IA changes this year or next year
  - Question: Do we know what BPS is doing? How will this impact recruiting students?
    - We want to maintain a high bar for students and families so we are fulfilling our mission
- Discuss Next Steps: Re-do iterations and re-meet as a committee, Proposal adaptation right now, Move to recommend iteration 2 with the adjustments we discussed for approval at the board meeting in February with agreement to come back to discussion for future cohorts.
- Sarah requested motion to vote to recommend this iteration to the board, Tom moved, Natalie seconded. Berkeley voted yes, Wolff voted yes, Sarah voted yes, Tom voted yes, Natalie voted yes. We moved to recommend this iteration to the board.
- Committee requested the school based team make sure the language in the memo is super clear for current seniors and how this will impact our future cohorts of students

**V. Sarah closed meeting at 12:15 pm**