

Remote  
Via Zoom

July 23, 2020

**Present:** Amanda Garces (Chair); Mark Hage (Vice Chair); Amber Wylie; Barbra Marden; Bruce Pandya; Celilo Bauman Swain; Cynthia Reyes; Infinite Culcleasure; Mara Iverson; Maxwell Barrows; Vera Sheehan; Natasha Eckart Baning; Xusana Davis; Heather Thomas Lynn; Mia Schultz; Heather Lynn; Melanie Stultz Backus; Amber Arnold; Michael Martin

**Members of the public:** Mary Simons and Lee Riley

### **Call to Order/Amendments to Agenda**

The meeting convened at 5:15pm

### **Review and Approve Minutes from March 14 and May 26<sup>th</sup>, 2020**

Minutes approved Chelsea Myers abstained for the March 14<sup>th</sup> because she was absent.

### **Opportunity for Public to be Heard**

No public comments.

Amanda Garces (Chair) kicked off the meeting by asking everyone to introduce themselves and say a word of wisdom.

### **Act 1 – Substandard sub-committee report – categories of inquiry and Questions for analyzing and discussing Vermont’s educational standards Work Plan Amendments and Approval**

Amanda Garces (Chair), went over the focus of the meeting, which was to analyze and give feedback on the tool created to analyze the standards. The tool was revised by the substandard sub-committee in three different meetings and now taking into consideration by the whole working group.

Garces thanked the subcommittee members for their contributions to the document.

## Standards sub-committee

The document will be used to analyze, discuss, interrogate the current educational standards. We identify 6 categories of inquiry covered in the Substandard sub-committee report. These are

1. Accessibility, Research & Scope.
2. Student – Centered Learning & Activism
3. Social, Cultural & Linguistic Diversity
4. Justice & Social Equity
5. Professional Support for Teachers, Administrators, Educational Support Professional & School Boards.
6. Restorative Practices.

Each category will have a subset of questions to interrogate the standards and where you will have a chance to agree disagree, ask further questions and a prompt for narrative reflection.

Further Mr. Hage advised the attendees that as we analyze these standards, it is important to obtain feedback around the language used in the document. The document should help us identify where our standards are strong and where they are deficient. By taking a deeper dive in the standards we will enable the intended recipient (such as School Districts, Staff and community members) to think differently of the standards.

Feedback from working group members:

- Not enough focus on disability Vs. race and sexual orientation.
- This will be our tool but we need the public to understand it.
- The way it was written is inaccessible for many people.
- Break the long statements into several shorter statements.
- Feedback around simplifying the language into understandable concepts.
- Concerns about people understanding the concepts
- Adding a glossary to the document
- Adding a checkbox to each Recommendation was made to add a glossary of the key notes.
- Accessibility
- Q: Do we need two versions or just one. (Having an accessible version is key people with disabilities. We do not want our groups is left out.

For our next meeting we will come back with the tool and standard to see how it will look like.

Q: what is the thing that you are going to need to feel good about this document:

- Accessibility and sensitivity to audience and drive schools to go deeper into the work
- Disability aspect appropriately represented
- Introduction for the reader and a short example. The following example could be used and how to engage in that.
- I hope we can bring this document to a place where it feels like a legal backing for students who do not receive the same support our others and it is affirming. An accountability mechanism. Hoping this can provide where students can access easily.

- A document that can make someone think and how to improve education.
- Make sure that there is a real example of how it looks like and what does it look like in the different lenses of race, ethnicity, gender, liability, etc.
- Document will fit in the “how we are learning not just what we are learning. Providing real examples to show what you are already teaching and how easy it is to incorporate this.
- Readability and glossary is what I need to feel comfortable.
- Understand what the document does, what it is and examples and showing the how to use this document so that they can use it in other contexts that we can give them. If we provide this template that they help them understand that they can use this as a lesson plan and what the mirror is and not required them to do extra work. IT feels like it could be a tool and parents and students can use because we don't have to re-use everything.
- Ability and disability need to be articulated
- LGBTI could also be articulated – sexism, ableism and LGBTI should be separated like others so people can think one by one. What is that you are looking for that your content should reflect.
- Clear purpose statement and a clear example to help navigate this document.
- Main thing is reducing the amount of jargon

### **Timeline and Budget**

Timeline: We are going to sub-committee to revise

Come back for the August meeting revise and approve document for crowdsource distribution.

**Budget:** Mrs. Garces asked feedback from the group on what should be included on the budget ask to the legislature. She shared the google document where people can go and make edits.

We currently need note taker and invest in is readable.com to make our documents accessible.

### **Housekeeping**

The Chair will send out a doodle invite for subcommittee members to opt for days when we can meet. Once the subcommittee signs off on the document we will then share it back.

Next meeting: A doodle invite for the work group members to vote on the next meeting date.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30p.m.

Minutes recorded and prepared by Barbra Marden and Amanda Garces.