

From: Gleason, Kimberly G

Sent: Sunday, March 19, 2023 12:00 PM

To: Garces, Amanda <Amanda.Garces@vermont.gov>; Mark Hage <mhage@vtnea.org>

Cc: Kolbe, Tammy <Tammy.Kolbe@vermont.gov>

Subject: Follow-up on EQS

Good morning, Amanda and Mark!

I am following up with some considerations/questions/requests of the Act 1 Working group from our Friday EQS Committee meeting:

1. The word "caste" appears in the statement of purpose, but it appears no where else in the document other than the definitions. There was a question posed to the EQS Committee as to whether caste might be able to be incorporated into socioeconomic status, since the statement of purpose is not actionable. In your previously provided guidance on this section, the use of "caste" was not addressed: *With this language, the Working Group asserts the need to broaden the categories of protection against discrimination in both public and approved independent schools beyond what is stipulated in Section 2113. These new categories, to be clear, reflect the personal, educational, and professional experiences of our members, their children and families, and their communities, and they are plainly unacceptable barriers to the attainment of an equitable, antiracist, anti-discriminatory, culturally responsive and inclusive education. "Religion" was added because "creed" in Section 2113 is a term many do not understand in this context as being inclusive of and protecting religious practices and beliefs or religious minorities. "Religion," on the other hand, is a term most people do understand.*
2. "Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students" is not used elsewhere in the document, beyond the definition section. "Linguistic Diversity" also appears in the definitions and is used in the document. We are considering whether we break out Cultural and Linguistic Diversity/Diverse Students into two definitions or leave the two combined and reference back to the combined definition.
3. In the definition of "Ethnic Studies" and "Ethnicity" there is a list of examples of Indigenous People of Vermont. We are considering removing the list that appears after the Indigenous People of Vermont to ensure that we have not excluded others, by virtue of including a partial list). We would leave the following: "... (including the Indigenous People of Vermont)."

4. Throughout the document there are places where "students" and "learners," and "teachers" and "educators" are being used. We will be looking for consistency in that language on our final review. We recognize that there may be places where the law dictates the oversight of a licensed educator/teacher, but otherwise, was there a purpose for the distinction between students/learners and teachers/educators from the standpoint of the Act 1 Working Group?

5. Could you clarify the meaning of 2120.1 i) heightening the salience of learning objective and providing mastery-oriented feedback? We may be looking for clarifying language to ensure that the rules can be operationalized.

6. We are considering adding the following terms to the definition section: *anti-racist and neurodiversity*. As there are many definitions for each of these terms, does the Act 1 working group have suggested language for these definitions?

7. Finally, we are going to make certain that terms that appear in the definition section of the rules appear in some form somewhere in the document. If there are definitions that were added by the Act 1 Working Group, but don't otherwise appear in the document, please provide rationale.

We are planning to have a final document moved out of our EQS Committee and reviewed and approved by the full State Board of Education in April. We are working to schedule our next few EQS Committee meetings for the coming two weeks, and a special meeting of the full state board thereafter. We will keep you informed of those upcoming dates. We appreciate your continued collaboration on this important body of work. Please don't hesitate to reach out with any questions.

Best,
Kim
(802) 324-7145