

### **1. What we discussed**

Building a shared understanding of the current state of high school schedules, with a focus on:

- Equitable access to earn credits
- Consistent structures for just-in-time supports
- Consistent structures to support students with high school and beyond planning

### **2. What the data for that topic told us**

- Most SPS high schools have a 6-period schedule, which provides just enough slots for students to take the 24 credits required for graduation.
- However, the average student at a school with 6 periods earns enough credits each year to stay on track.
- At schools with 7 or 8 periods, 9th graders get additional time in foundational subjects (math and English) and 11th graders have more space for choice electives or support courses.
- There is a tradeoff between the number of periods and instructional time per course. Schools with more periods have more elective slots but less time in each course.
- Schools have a range of advisory models – some are credit bearing, some aren't. Some meet daily; some meet weekly. And some schools don't have advisory.
- The schools that consistently have higher rates of 9th and 11th graders on track across student groups have a range of schedule types and advisory models.

### **3. Discussion summary and feedback**

We had a very productive discussion on the current state of the schedule, with folks noting both the potential benefits and constraints of different scheduling approaches. Overall, feedback centered on tradeoffs between flexibility, feasibility and student experience and a key desire for additional context and clarity as this work moves forward.

Feedback we heard from the discussion included:

- **Desire for increased access to electives:** Additional periods could increase student choice and the ability for credit recovery, though many noted that this could increase student workload and stress and there was some concern over the operational feasibility of this option.

- **Graduation and credit attainment:** Many expressed concerns that graduation rates and credit attainment might not be fully capturing the student experience and preparedness for beyond High School.
- **Clearer guidelines for advisory:** Strong interest in improving advisory models to strengthen relationships, build peer connection, and increase access to adults outside of class.
- **Suggestions for further exploration:** Folks shared ideas for schedule structures to explore, as well as important considerations about feasibility. The Task Force meetings in February will go deep on potential schedule options, the pros and cons of each of them, and their feasibility within SPS budget and staffing levels.

#### 4. Facilitation Improvements for Next Time

In response to this great discussion and feedback, going forward, we plan to:

- **Incorporate data on credit recovery:** In the next session, we plan to dive into some data on credit recovery, to better answer questions surrounding *when* and *how* credit recovery happens and speak more concretely to a student's ability to truly *learn* the content and skills in their courses.
- **Broaden perspectives:** We will continue to center the student experience, with particular attention to nontraditional students and the districtwide impacts of potential changes beyond high school.
- **Provide clearer context:** Including more details on data sources and their limitations, along with additional context as possible.
- **Space for discussion and meaning making:** We will do our best to maximize time for breakout discussions and share out during the meetings. In addition, we will offer office hours for Task Force participants who have questions about any of the data shared that didn't get fully answered during the session.

#### 5. What recommendations were made (if any)?

- No recommendations were made at this meeting. We plan for the Task Force to start drafting a recommendation in late February. The next two sessions will continue focusing on understanding current challenges and exploring options for different schedule structures but not yet putting a stake in the ground.
- Some participants expressed a desire for greater clarity on how the final recommendation will be made (e.g. by consensus, majority vote, etc.) We will add this to the discussion on January 29th.