

Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee/Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee Meeting of the Whole

Monday, March 14, 2016, 4:30 – 7:30 pm
Auditorium, John Stanford Center

MINUTES

1. **Call to Order:** Director Rick Burke called the meeting to order at 4:32 p.m.
 - a. Directors Burke, Geary, Pinkham, Harris and Peters were present. Associate Superintendent for Teaching and Learning Michael Tolley staffed the meeting.
 - b. **Approval of Agenda:**
Director Pinkham called for a motion to approve the agenda and Director Geary seconded. The agenda was approved unanimously.
 - c. **Approval of Minutes:**
Director Geary called for a motion to approve the minutes and Director Pinkham seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

2. **Agenda Items:**
 - a. **BAR for Collections for New Libraries:**
 1. Eric Caldwell, Manager of Library and Instructional Technology Services, explained this is a Board Action Report to approve the process for selecting library collections for 5 of the 6 school programs/sites opening up next school year (Hazel Wolf K-8, Genesee Hill Elementary, Arbor Heights Elementary, Thornton Creek Elementary and Seattle World Schools) to provide a new or renovated library for the schools when they move into their new building as well as fund additional books.

The process requires a quote from vendors asking for guidelines – Collection development, provide books of a certain amount (hard bound books), warranty and placement of books on shelves, etc. The vendors are responsible for the process from the beginning. Eric is working to make this happen before schools starts. In order to make it work, we go through the RFQ to select a vendor. When the vendor is selected, staff will work with the vendor to make the selection. The problem is the timeline for selecting the vendor. The Purchasing Department will need additional time in selecting the vendor. The district will need an approved vendor before the work can start. Approval of the vendor is based on the RFQ.

Eric is requesting approval for the process. He is not sure if the vendor will be selected by the April 6th School Board meeting. Eric is requesting a vote to move forward to have an approval of this process – Introduce this item to the School Board without selecting a vendor. The other alternative is to move the process to May in which there is no time to select book for each collection which will take a month.

Directors asked about the public weighing in on the vendor decision.

Directors asked about potential savings. Eric explained last time we went through the process, we had 15 percent in savings. The district has qualifications that the vendors have to meet.

Directors asked for clarification - If the committee considers the Board Action Report for introduction, the list of perspective vendors will not be final to allow the district to meet the timeframe.

For the record, Director Burke announced that Director Harris joined the meeting and can join the conversation at any time.

Eric explained the requirement for the collections of new libraries is a new program and/or existing program for renovated or existing buildings to meet the needs of students.

Directors provided a suggested edits to the Board Action Report. Staff will need to call out which schools are new, renovated and/or existing library as well as identifying new schools and programs; identify the number of schools/programs that are currently under this Board Action Report; list potential vendors names in the Recommended Motion section of the Board Action Report.

2. DECISION of the Committee:

- i. The Committee moved this item forward for consideration with amendments discussed, inclusion of potential vendors and clarification of the BAR to have a focus on what is purchased for the particular programs to the full School Board.

b. SMART Goal #2, MTSS-B:

1. Michael Tolley explained that Bernardo Ruiz, Director of School & Family Partnerships/Equity & Race Relations, and Pat Sander, Executive Director of Coordinated School Health Services, are not in the room at this time. They are presenting to the Mayor's Education Summit Advisory Committee at City Hall.

Michael explained there was a School Board work session on this topic and content was provided at that time. Staff had an opportunity to present to the City's Department of Education on Early Learning (DEEL) the same information that was presented to the School Board on the Superintendent SMART Goal #2: MTSS-B. The presentation was well received and was provided, so we can work on doing a better job in partnering with the City's DEEL. There was a request that we provide the information in the Friday Memo which was included in the March 11th Friday Update to the School Board.

Directors asked if it was possible to get a cut out from the budget for the MTSS-B implementation of \$800,000 that was set aside last year. Michael explained there was a resolution brought forward to implement non-violent suspensions and along with that came a list of initiatives. This funding is being used to staff positions and support these initiatives.

c. Special Education Update:

1. Wyeth Jessee, Executive Director of Special Education, provided an update on the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that is related to the Superintendent SMART Goal #3. Wyeth received verification for the northwest and southwest regions. Staff is working with the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) on verification

for the central region. The visit to the northeast region was postponed two weeks ago. Wyeth expects to hear about the central region soon. It takes a month to 6 weeks following the on-site review of the schools they selected to receive verification.

There is an area of concern around timelines for evaluations and IEP's. It is the culture change that is part of this. Wyeth met with the Executive Director of Schools on this issue to double down efforts. The team is building out a balance scorecard for timelines and compliance, personnel or new special education teachers, etc. to make sure schools are receiving the additional support they need.

Data – Staff is doing work around gathering information. The Human Resources Department is making sure we are staffing schools appropriately based on the data. We have to keep mindful that the next adjustment period is in May.

EEU – Wyeth met with the representatives at the University of Washington on Thursday, March 10th. He received more details based on the guidance from the State. Wyeth now has a strong verbal description of the agreement, however, he will need to get it written/finalized. The agreement provides information on placement needs that will be available to students, etc. The agreement will come to the School Board for approval.

The Special Education Department is hosting a quarterly review meeting with the U.S. Department of Education, OSEP and OSPI on Tuesday, March 15th for a full day session. Staff will answer questions from the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs division of as well as present information related to the MOU to make sure we are in compliance for providing student services, etc.

Directors mentioned that Representative Kagi was concerned about the Experimental Education Unit (EEU) and now have a sense that it will be wrapped up soon. She is pleased with that.

Directors asked if there is a way to put together some type of cheat sheet, so principals can see the number of students equals a certain amount for FTE, so they can see if the shifts create change. Wyeth explained that there is some complexity in services and needs of students. Schools should be tracking their caseloads and be able to generate reports online. Wyeth is working on creating a system to have in a spreadsheet to flag and notify schools, so the special education supervisors and program specialists will be able to respond accordingly – Provide additional support at the school level.

Directors thanked staff for providing the motivation and encouragement of the staff in the building to do the work.

Directors asked if there was a timeline on when the EEU will be placed on paper. Wyeth explained this will happen sometime next month.

d. Policy 2090, Program Evaluation & Assessment:

1. Shauna Heath, Executive Director of Curriculum, Assessment & Instruction, spoke about the annual report in the first meeting of the new School Board Directors or the last meeting of the previous School Board Directors. The policy is about evaluation and has little to do with assessment. We have been looking at revising Policy 2090 because it does not match with the Superintendent Procedure. Shauna proposed that Eric Anderson, Director of Research & Evaluation, rewrite the procedure to focus on the policy. The assessment component will be embedded in Policy 2163, Supports & Interventions/Superintendent Procedure, 2163SP.

Directors recommended making the policy match the Superintendent Procedure. Have Policy 2200, Equitable Access to Programs & Services, that sort of relates to this and Policy 2163. We do not want to create a policy, but to clarify the ones that we have. The first step is to determine the assessment program, determine goals and identify the needs of students. Directors are concerned that Policy 2163 supports an intervention that does not identify students who are in need of supports at a program level.

Michael Tolley agrees that there is a need for a framework of different types of assessments. Policy 2090 focuses on the evaluation and effectiveness of program work on building out policy, and the aspects of the use of assessments would clear out some of the confusion. Then have an option on how we use assessment to inform. This would clarify the use and types of stakeholders who needs to be involved. The other suggestion is to develop a policy on assessment by itself.

Directors like the idea of separating the policies and see that piece as important and in line with the conversation we have been having. Directors would like a better sense of how to determine how we pick informative assessment without splitting up how we choose assessments. We need help in terms of the process and making sure we are meeting goals.

Shauna explained that a separate policy would define each type of assessment that we use and their purpose as well as the purpose of the state assessments.

Michael explained that it would be incorporated in Policy 2163. In terms of program evaluation, assessment is only one measure. In recent years, the Research & Evaluation Department was not able to meet the expectations of conducting an extensive research of services/programs because we did not have the appropriate staff to conduct the work. Dr. Jessica Beaver, Senior Research Scientist has been hired to conduct program evaluations to understand the impact of programs and services in the district. Now that we have the capacity to do this, it makes sense to adjust the policy and procedures.

Directors provided a question for future meetings. State assessment is about state reporting, but we are giving a month of academic time. Directors would like to understand what options are available that can give students classroom time back and still check boxes for the state? If we can explore if any of the barriers can come down in the next two years would be of value for the students.

Shauna explained that it would be a minimum of 1 year. The state said no changes in 2016-2017.

c. K-5 ELA Adoption:

1. Kathleen Vasquez, Program Manager for Literacy & Social Studies, explained that she is here to provide an update on where we are in the K-5 English Language Arts (ELA) Adoption process. After the last meeting, a survey was launched that went to families and staff to get a read of what they value to help inform criteria. The survey was translated into five languages. The survey can be found on the Literacy Adoption website until April 4th where they will use the information/feedback to make sure the criteria is reflective of the communities which includes the values and interests of teachers and parents. The good news is there are currently 928 responses from families and community members and 288 from teachers.

Applications to sit on the adoption committee were open for 2 and a half weeks. To receive a broader range of applicants, emails were sent to K-5 families and teachers as well as families with students entering Kindergarten. Notices to apply were also broadcasted through Twitter, Facebook, School Beat, the Race & Equity Department, Family Support Workers and Native American programs. The Executive Director of Schools made an appeal to teachers and principals to get a much broader representation.

Adoption Committee – There were 69 applicants. 39 were selected committee members. The committee members consist of teachers, parents and librarian, Advanced Learning, Early Learning, English Language Learners, Native American Education and Special Education representatives.

Eric Caldwell explained that one of the requirements from the policy and procedures for the Instructional Materials Committee (IMC) membership is to inform the C&I Policy Committee Directors of the members of the IMC each fall. The deadline to apply was March 2nd. Eric worked through Principal Association of Seattle Schools (PASS), communications (email, School Beat, etc.). The committee consists of 3 standing members (Executive Director of Curriculum & Instruction, Manager of Library Services and the Instructional Materials Specialist), 2 principals/assistant principals and 2 parents.

Kathleen met with the Special Education Department. The Special Education Department plans to run the concurrent RFP after phase one of the adoption. The materials will augment what is adopted with additional resources to support special education teachers in Reading and Writing. The Special Education Department will examine what the committee has selected and choose the materials that will support special education students.

There was a communications problem with the Purchasing Department. Kathleen is working with the Purchasing Department on the RFP timeline adjustment. It is believed that the Request for Proposal (RFP) will go out this week. The Adoption Committee will meet for the first time on Tuesday, March 15th at the Old Van Asselt building. Kathleen invited the School Board Directors and C&I Policy Committee members to participate in the process.

Directors asked if Kathleen will be looking at the selection of vendors to be in conjunction with Wyeth Jessee as far as taking his input or will this be a separate process. Kathleen explained this will be a separate process and Wyeth and his staff will run this process. He will be informed by the narrowed three choices. The Special Education Department would like to wait for the end of the first phase and review what matches best with the vendors.

Directors asked why not wait until it is narrowed down to one vendor. It seems like a waste of time. Kathleen explained that she will have to direct this question to Wyeth for response.

Shauna explained this is a modified adoption, so staff can work with Wyeth. The committee will put forward two resources and make recommendations for both.

Michael Tolley explained this was a recent change in School Board Policy. In order to give the School Board Directors the opportunity to look at several options before we bring forward the vendors.

Directors would like more information on this and want to make sure there is a clear understanding.

Directors wonder if phonics based instruction Readers Writers will be addressed by the task force. Kathleen explained that under the policy, we are required to evaluate whatever comes to us for review. Readers Writers Units of Study will come as one piece to review, and we have asked the vendor to couple it with compatible materials to teach phonics and phonemic awareness, so that it meets all of the components of the Balanced Literacy Framework. Readers and Writers Units of Study should be evaluated because there are a number of schools using them—reportedly, about 50% of our teachers. We have asked all vendors to send a host of resources that meet all components of the framework. The committee understands that they have accepted a seat to meet the needs of the entire district. We will be addressing a lot of resources that will allow teachers to teach the full curriculum. The committee is tasked with creating the criteria before moving forward. The criterion allows the committee look at the whole spectrum. Kathleen invited the School Board Directors to take a look at the process.

Directors are not clear on the field testing. Kathleen explained this is a new piece of the policy. The field test will take place the first two months of next school year. The plan is to field test the top three resources. The Adoption Committee will review it in November or December 2016.

Directors discussed the School Board Director's desire to have more frequent materials adoption. Can you give guidance on how we can do a good job and faster for middle school Math that would be greatly accepted? Kathleen explained it is longer, but feel that we will be more informed – Communities and teachers will be more informed. The Directors will be much more informed because they will have exhausted all angles of evaluation.

Directors provided four brief points. When meeting with the adoption committee, think about the need to fit in the instructional day. There is not enough class time. Include specific guidelines on how best to use instructional time. As we consider materials, includes informative assessment components/tools. Directors requested the information to be provided in the Friday Memo for the update on the IMC and Adoption Committees. In regards to the process for special education, is there consideration for the same process for Highly Capable?

Shauna explained that Kathleen does consider all the groups/programs. Staff can provide this information in the Friday Memo. A concurrent adoption can occur. It is concurrent, but it is running two full adoptions at the same time. Is there space to provide professional development or substitutes for 3,000 staff members who have to attend at the same time?

Director Burke announced Director Peters joined the meeting.

Directors asked what it means to do a concurrent adoption. The part of the puzzle would not be complicated. Shauna explained it puts pressure on the system. We can run the process.

Michael mentioned that he supports getting instructional materials to teachers. We spent the last two years trying to get to this point.

f. Committee Work Plan and Goals:

1. Michael Tolley explained that based on the conversation earlier, we were saying that School Board Policy 2090 with the thought of incorporating Policy 2163. We will need to work on the policies at the same time. Michael suggests adding Policy 2163 to the April 4th C&I Policy Committee meeting agenda.

During the Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee Meeting of the Whole, the hope is to gather feedback from the entire School Board and suggest bringing the revised version of Policy A01.00 back to the C&I Policy Committee meeting on April 4th for consideration.

Directors noted the request to add Policy A01.00 to the work plan for April 4, May 9 and June 13. Directors noted the target for the May 9th for the Middle School Math Adoption. If we wait any longer the students will not be able to have the instructional materials in time.

Michael explained on May 9th, staff will bring forward Policy 2415 which includes the High School Credit Requirements. We currently have a 24 Credits Task Force to review and make recommendations. Michael flagged the conversation on Policy 2415 will be extensive and will require community input.

BREAK at 6:04 p.m.

C&I Policy Committee of the Whole – Policy A01.00, Instructional Philosophy

1. **Call to Order:** Director Rick Burke called the meeting to order at 6:13 p.m.
2. **Roll Call:** Directors present: Rick Burke, Jill Geary, Scott Pinkham, Sue Peters, Betty Patu, Leslie Harris and Stephan Blanford. Staff present: Michael Tolley, Shauna Heath, Michael Starosky and Misa Garmoe

Michael Tolley spoke about the opportunity to take a look at one of the guiding policies that informs other policies at SPS. Policy A01.00, Instructional Philosophy is a one page policy that is critically important for what we believe for our students. Staff would like to gather feedback from School Board Directors on this policy. So far, we have received feedback from two School Board Directors, but would like to gather additional information/feedback from everyone.

Michael spoke about the guiding questions that were sent to the School Board Directors last week. The goal is to gather the information and use it to inform the edits to the policy and bring the policy back to Curriculum & Instruction Policy Committee meeting on April 4th based on the feedback provided this evening.

Michael introduced Michael Starosky, Chief of Schools, Shauna Heath, Executive Director of Curriculum & Instruction, and Misa Garmoe, Director of School Operations.

The intent of the protocol is to have time to read and reflect on the policy. We will walk through the guiding questions one at a time. Look at each question and then we would like to gather feedback.

Protocol:

What do you agree with in the text?

What do you want to argue with in the text?
What parts of the text do you want to aspire to?

1. Why is this policy important?

Directors provided feedback as follows:

- The philosophy is going to be cornerstone in how we look at everything that we do and what we are doing aligning with how we are instructing our kids, which is our charge.
- This policy sets the tone/direction that helps directors, principals, classroom teachers to know what the School Board Directors thoughts are on how education should be delivered in each of our schools.
- The policy reminds us of why we are here. What education means to all of our students. Our purpose.
- It also establishes our vision and expectations for our district and the opportunity to think together as a School Board.

2. What is the purpose of this policy?

Directors provided feedback as follows:

- It fits in this arena between vision statement and policy level governance. Policy cannot fit everything, something not explicitly covered. We need to look to core values, mission statement and ask if this covers the process.

3. How do we implement this policy, Instructional Philosophy?

Michael Tolley explained that question 3 is similar to question 4.

4. How does a policy with philosophy in the title get implemented?

Directors provided feedback as follows:

- I like the concrete examples. When there is a disagreement and we don't know how to move forward, we can go to the philosophy and see how it is aligned, true to philosophy - Cohesive feel to them if true to philosophy.
- We can use the policy as a lens when making a decision to determine priorities as a district. When faced with a decision we should ask if actions reflect our philosophy. Are we in sync with our values?
- This helps clarify the gray area and should be a guiding way of thinking about a certain area. Hopefully it can provide more clarity/guidance.
- The philosophy behind this policy ensures commitment and responsibility to our students that we serve. We are supposed to provide opportunity to all students. This policy reminds us of our commitments to all our students - Aligns with all we say we are going to do.

- Implementation - This is not going to teach kids to read or learn algebra in 8th grade. This will get some of the issues on the table that we as a School Board value and be specific about it (do we value inclusion, acceleration, and balanced literacy, what are some of the difficult things that will face us in our policy work?)

Michael spoke about the sample policies from other school districts. In preparation for the last question, provide your thoughts. Flip through the policies and determine what we want to keep, remove, add or edit.

5. From the current policy, what is kept, what is removed, what is edited?

Directors provided feedback as follows:

- Vancouver School District document is from 1977. Have they edited since January 1999? I like the format, it is action oriented. The information is not buried in the policy.
- (Staff conducted a quick online search.) Michael noted that the Vancouver policy is the most recent version of their policy. Our strategic plan outlines our mission, vision and beliefs.

Time for review:

Michael asked the Directors to look at the current policy and the suggested edits redline version to see the feedback that was incorporated. We will begin by looking at the introductory paragraph and receive Director's feedback on that.

Directors provided feedback as follows:

- Directors see an assumption in the second sentence. Global economy that is an assumption, research shows there is contention whether college ready means career ready. Look at Center for Career and Technical Education. The language of it is affirmatively saying that it is the same and language in the industry it is not the same.
- Michael explained that this is the feedback we are looking for. When we return with feedback in April, we will incorporate that.
- First paragraph last sentence, "It is the responsibility of the School Board and the Superintendent to ensure that all students receive an education that meets these goals." Would love something harder hitting. It is a moral imperative to make sure that we meet the goals. Directors suggested adding it is amoral imperative and the responsibility of the School Board and Superintendent . . .
- Look at other examples – they value the individual. I would rather see language of how we increase their value.
- The language feels wrong. The first sentence, we believe every student is capable of learning.... I am not sure if this is true. Students develop at a different rate. The Cherokee Board Policy has language that is nice.
- *Our language is too rigid and sterile. The other policy dates from 1990s and reflects language that predates **the recent emphasis on "rigor," "college and career-ready"**. Would like to see us bring this **(whole-child focus and aspirational) language (from the 1990s) to our philosophy.***

- There are some missing words. Safety is missing. If we cannot keep the students safe then we cannot educate them. Do not see equity/equitable. It is the individual learning style that needs to be respected.
- Process question – Are we looking at a rewrite or edit? I hear aspirational language. If John Cerqui or Noel Treat comes here and says there needs to be some consistency, then I feel this is not time well served.
- Erinn Bennett explained that this is the first step. Based on this conversation, staff will incorporate the feedback. The scope of the project goes over and beyond this conversation.
- Keep it high level. Felt it was inconsistent with others we developed (continuum of service, levels of support, and the whole child). Believe that we can still change the feel without making it too long.
- Phrase School Board responsibility – It is missing a part where we believe parents and communities should be a part of this conversation. Bring in communities, they are the first teachers.
- It would be helpful to look at where there were suggested edits (redline) and start there. See where they started to change language.
- Michael Tolley explained that he would like to gather remaining thoughts of the first paragraph and move to the bulleted list.
- Directors spoke about suggested changes provided earlier in the paragraph. Took out in today's global economy.
- There was one vote to keep “global” in the document.
- Like capable of learning, affirmative language. Expectations and goals should be everyone's.
- Thoughts are to lead with accountability. We have expectations for all.
- Decisions need to be made on what needs to be funded and what we will keep.

Michael Tolley asked the Directors to review language next to the bullets – Look at the redline version of the documents in order to receive feedback.

Directors provided feedback as follows:

- On the second to last paragraph on back page, the top paragraph....there is the acknowledgement of different stakeholders. Would like to add community partnership and families to recognize their roles in this process.
- Like that this is our instructional philosophy, no excuses philosophy. It is our job to meet the needs of the students. We are not going to relieve ourselves of our obligations.
- Concerned about using no excuses phrase, which has been used to beat up on teachers. Would like to use more constructive language.

- Belief that comes with ethics. We need to work together to achieve with all students, go to parents/families to see what we need to do to help their kids behave and/or become better learners.
- Language could be strengthened that partnerships are essential; however, most of what was said is captured in second to the last paragraph.

Bullet #1:

Directors provided feedback as follows:

- High expectation was stricken, what is the rationale behind this is?
- First bullet starts with the word maintenance. Not sure if this is a good word.
- Need more active verbs.

Bullet #2:

Directors provided feedback as follows:

- Providing all students with academic opportunities that promote multiple career and college possibilities.
- Changes that were already incorporated in the document include adding engaging, rewarding and challenging. Took out aligned to standards.
- Would like to say college, career and life. This is used to develop a whole person.
- I disagree with striking readiness standards. Fear is without alignment with existing standards, we will go back to the way we were before standards.

Bullet #3:

Directors provided feedback as follows:

- Concerned standards might change and not be what we want them to be, locking us in. Added inspired and culturally responsive teaching. I like all the suggested edits in bullet 3.
- Culturally responsive and competent, need to clarify this more.

Bullet #4:

Directors provided feedback as follows:

- This is already large. It needs to have its own bullet or be a separate sentence. Recognizing some students will be prepared wherever necessary.
- My read of this is this is where the equity piece is. Seems to me that either it needs to have its own bullet or separate sentence, given that equity is so important.

- Probably need to separate the bullet.
- Suggest separating it into another bullet and adding language to define what we mean. Language that can meet or exceed standards.
- Like to come up with standards and be consistent with the standards. We need to make clearer what we want in each of the bullets.
- Capabilities, can we find a different word instead of using that word twice? Attributes and then capabilities.
- Shauna Heath explained that the programs in bullet 5 are not really programs. This is the language around basic education.
- Michael Tolley explained that we will align this with current policy.

Bullet #5:

Directors provided feedback as follows:

- When have music, visual performing arts, and technical design let us be broadly inclusive.
- Can we include culturally responsive competency as well?

Bullet #6:

Directors provided feedback as follows:

- Like it
- Would like a process to identify. Don't see the action piece, it is missing a verb.
- Accelerated learning in special education can add implications. We need to run the language by our attorneys.

Michael Tolley asked Directors to provide feedback on the last two closing statements.

- Change to goal, found it confusing. Added will communicate effectively, verbally and in writing. It seemed like an awkward list.
- What are we going to do to get the students to develop? The goal is stated above. How are we going to get students to the goal?
- Communicate effectively feels too generic. We need to tune this up.
- Probably a lot of language from the state we could use.
- Partner and encourage, should be more proactive.
- The sentence seems redundant. School Board members, and elected leadership. Who is the elected leadership? If I think School Board, it is redundant and one needs to be removed.

- Working with city and other governments. Change it to other jurisdictions or elected officials.
- Delineate the school board or make it generic.
- We should be our own titled entity. There is nothing about safe/safety. All those things are key. What is the addition?
- Suggest that Directors look at the document and send suggestions to Michael Tolley - Make a list of what we are suggesting and have a conversation based on this.
- Michael Tolley will need to receive additional feedback before Friday if we have to do it by April 1st.
- Michael Tolley explained that staff will take the feedback and others along with Casey Henry, will take thoughts and bring it back to the April 4th Curriculum & Policy Committee meeting. Thursday, March 24th is the ideal time to receive feedback from School Board Directors.
- When you make the edits, come up with a list of what the district is working on and draw the line to the instructional philosophy that supports MTSS, African American Male Initiative, etc. to see if instructional philosophy is consistent with the district's efforts.

Directors thanked everyone for their time and comments.

3. **Adjourn:** The meeting adjourned at 7:44 p.m.

Decision/Follow Up Items
<p>1. Decision: <i>BAR for Collections for New Libraries – The Committee moved this item forward for consideration with amendments discussed, inclusion of potential vendors and clarification of the BAR to have a focus on what is purchased for the particular programs to the full School Board.</i></p>