

Session 6: March 12, 2026

Meeting Recap

1) What did we discuss? (Topic)

The Task Force dove deeper on three strategies that had strong support in earlier sessions:

- Clubs during the school day
- Course Failure Prevention
- Multi-grade Mentoring / Advisory

We reviewed a sample schedule illustrating how time could be allocated across each of these strategies, though individual schools could tailor based on their student and teacher preferences and needs.

In addition, we explored what it would take to implement a 7-period day at more schools, and the budget and staffing implications of doing so. For each of these strategies, we posed a series of targeted questions to gauge areas of agreement and disagreement.

2) What did we learn about the potential impact and feasibility of these options?

Each of these strategies would require a full faculty vote to implement, because of constraints within the teacher contract, specifically stipulations of limiting core teachers to 150 student load limit and all teachers to no more than 3 distinct course preparations. The common interpretation of the student load stipulation would mean that clubs, course failure prevention, and advisory would add to a teacher's load, even if they are students they teacher already sees in a course period, leading to many teachers load increasing above 150 students. These strategies would also count as an additional course preparation, despite occurring less frequently than a full credit course.

In addition, implementing a 7-period day where teachers teach 5 of 7 periods would require either increasing class sizes above 40 students, or hiring more teachers, which would cost between \$11-\$15m dollars. Alternatively, if schools implemented a 7 period day where teachers taught 5 periods, some core teacher loads would exceed 150 students, and elective teacher loads would increase substantially.

3) What was the feedback from the group?

Discussion highlights from the group included:

- **Agreement that a 7-period schedule could benefit students, but is likely not feasible given budget and staffing implications:** The group generally agreed that students could navigate the added demands of a 7-period day and would benefit from the extra slot. However, the group was split on whether to support a 7-period schedule where teachers teach 5 periods, given it would increase the district deficit by up to \$15m. The group was strongly against a 7-period schedule where teachers teach 6 periods.
- **Alignment on the value of in-school club time, with implementation questions remaining:** The group agreed that offering clubs during the school day is critical for equitable access to peer connection. However, there was some disagreement around implementation details, including scheduling (when club time occurs and for how long) and how decisions are made at the district and individual school level.
- **Strong alignment on moving toward “course failure prevention” and away from “credit recovery”:** The group expressed strong agreement that dedicating school-day time to small-group, “just-in-time” academic support can better support students succeed in foundational courses the first time and stay on track for graduation. Participants also generally supported embedding alongside a consistent, well-designed advisory to integrate relational support, build relationships and Life Ready skills.
- **Risks of requiring a faculty vote and support for negotiated pathways:** While a lot of this strategies had support, participants raised concerns that strategies dependent on a faculty vote could create cultural challenges, increase staff tension, and lead to inconsistent experiences across schools. Many emphasized that the district should explore ways to implement or negotiate these strategies without relying on a faculty vote.

4) Improvements for Next Time

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

- **Begin drafting the recommendation:** The next session will focus on developing the draft recommendation, continuing to test key strategies while clarifying what a final proposal could look like.

- **Move toward consensus:** We will build on prior discussion by focusing on areas of disagreement and working toward greater alignment across the group.
- **Revisit viable, lower-barrier options:** We will bring back select options from earlier sessions that are more budget-neutral and do not require a faculty vote for further consideration.

5) What recommendations were made (if any)?

- The group began to narrow down to an initial recommendation, by voting on a set of alignment questions tailored towards the benefits and challenges with each option. Next session, we will build on this progress by grounding the discussion in language that moves closer to a final recommendation.