

Secondary Grading Practices Committee Meeting Minutes
March 11, 2010 – Administration Center

Assistant Superintendent Greg Zinn opened the meeting and thanked all members for their commitment to reviewing the District's proposed grading policies. Members received copies of the revised grading policy, Policy IK, (printed below), and feedback from the February 11, 2010 meeting.

Proposed Policy IK – Academic Achievement

In accordance with the District's primary mission, the Board of Directors affirms that the purpose of grading and reporting is to communicate to students, parents/guardians, and educators an accurate reflection of what a student knows, understands, and can do as measured by Oregon State and District Curriculum standards/learning goals.

The District will:

1. Distribute to parents/guardians and students, at the beginning of each class/course, information on class/course expectations, Oregon State and District curriculum standards/learning goals, and performance criteria.
2. Report student performance in two ways, separately:
 - a. Individual academic achievement based on a variety of assessment methods that are aligned with Oregon State and District curriculum standards/learning goals, and are summative in nature.
 - b. Evaluations of student dispositions, behaviors, and other nonacademic factors that may influence academic achievement.
3. Ensure that academic achievement grades are calculated accurately and consistently throughout the District, and that these grades provide meaningful information supportive of student achievement.

Definitions:

1. *Academic achievement*: an accurate summative evaluation of what a student knows, understands, and is able to do at report card time.
2. *Summative assessment*: an assessment given to evaluate and document what students have learned at the conclusion of a period of instruction. This term is used to distinguish such assessment from *formative assessment*, which provides feedback to students and teachers during instruction.
3. *Dispositions*: attitudes and feeling about learning.

Much of the meeting discussion centered on the exact wording of the proposed policy, with the following comments and suggestions put forth:

- In Section 2 does the wording *report student performance in two ways* mean that grades will be reported in two ways or is the District grading two different things for each student?
- Section 2a of the policy does not mention *proficiency grading*. Has the idea of proficiency grading been removed?

- Neither Section 2a nor the definitions below define *student dispositions* in enough detail. How are attitudes and feelings measured and/or quantified? Should the definition read attitudes and feelings *affecting* education rather than *about* learning? How are attitudes and feelings distinguished from academic skills/habits of mind which are taught and measured? If individual teachers apply their own definitions, there will not be district-wide consistency. Should the word *dispositions* be replaced with *intellectual habits*, *academic behaviors* or *academic skills and behaviors*?
- In Section 3, what is the model for the *accurate calculation* of grades?
- What does the term *consistently* mean in Section 3? Will the same definition apply to all grades? Does it mean that every student will be assessed on the same grading scale?
- It was suggested that the definition of Summative Assessment include the words *at report card time*.

Other comments/suggestions noted:

- The AR needs to address how many opportunities a student has to meet standards and how frequently he/she has these opportunities.
- The AR needs to address what colleges and universities need to know on a student transcript.
- The AR needs to address how the District will support teachers with grading technology.
- The AR needs to address homework – does it count towards a student grade, what is the definition of homework, how can homework be used by teachers to assess students?
- The AR needs to address teacher comments on report cards – do these comments count as nonacademic reporting?

Board Member Patti McCloud told the committee their feedback would be taken forward. The proposed policy will reflect on-going work. The goal of the Board is that any and all grading and assessment reform be meaningful to students, parents, and teachers.

Next Steps:

- Begin to develop a process for developing proficiency-based teaching and learning.
- Committee participation in the Business Education Compact (BEC) workshop.
- Share Hilhi proficiency work and work from teachers around Oregon.
- Convene a Professional Development Subcommittee for training on balanced grading scales.