Meeting Date: October 5, 2016

Members Present: Sumit Bhargava, Josh Bloom, Letitia Burton, Christine Chan, Courtney Carlomagno, Brenda Carrillo, Elizabeth Darby, Judy Dauberman, Teri Gilbert, Wendy Goodridge, Denise Herrmann, Jerry Hong, Libby Horn, Otak Jump, James Lubbe, Anmol Nagar, Vidhu Navjeevan, Christina Schmidt, Indira Selvakumaraswamy, Miriam Stevenson, David Sitzer, Rika Yamamoto, Scott Yarbrough, Yvonne Yeh. Support Staff Present: Ken Yale, Myrna Zendejas

Decisions Made: none today

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Who’s Responsible?</th>
<th>By when?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forward PowerPoint from today’s subcommittee report to all SCC</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>10/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare draft recommendations</td>
<td>Districtwide Implementation Plan Subcommittee</td>
<td>10/26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to develop and implement SCC subcommittee action plans</td>
<td>All subcommittees</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design Subcommittee Draft Recommendations

- The Design Subcommittee presented its initial draft recommendations for an SEL framework, standards and benchmarks. They focused their presentation on a recently published SEL approach developed by Washington State. They believe Washington incorporated many of the best elements from both CASEL and University of Chicago/ Wallace Foundation. Rather than summarizing all this information in the minutes, a detailed PowerPoint is posted on the SCC website.

- SCC members broke into small groups to critique each of the six sets of standards, benchmarks and indicators. Detailed written feedback was provided to the subcommittee about what SCC members liked, disliked, and what was missing.

- SCC reconvened to debrief after the small group feedback. Comments by individual SCC members included:

  o Support for Standard 6 (Social Engagement), which promotes an active role in society. Palo Alto could benefit from this.
  o Concern that the indicators could create a checklist and profile for an ideal personality, which no one could actually achieve. This could potentially result in more rather than less stress depending on how it’s applied.
  o It’s OK that students challenge adults, depending on time, place and tone. We shouldn’t take that away.
  o Spend more time on indicators and values that are important to Palo Alto
  o Are the Washington standards and benchmarks truly embracing cultural differences?
  o Appreciation was expressed for the change in language to include equity
  o You don’t get what you don't measure. Meet the students where they are and support their growth in needed areas.
  o How do teachers provide praise or feedback in these areas without being patronizing, especially at the secondary level?
Concern was expressed that explicit values do not seem to be embedded in this model.

The importance of flexibility with the indicators was emphasized, recognizing that students of the same age develop and mature at different rates.

The role of student agency is important. Providing resources won’t be helpful if students aren’t motivated to access them.

Appreciation was expressed for the balance between the personal and social in the standards. They need to be taught simultaneously.

**SCC Participation Agreement**

- The originally planned agenda item on consensus process was postponed until next meeting. Instead, the SCC Participation Agreement was discussed.

- An ongoing dilemma was framed. On the one hand, SCC members must reach consensus on complex and controversial recommendations that will powerfully impact the education and well-being of every PAUSD student. Given the diversity of roles, interests and opinions within SCC and the tight timeline, consensus process requires very consistent attendance throughout a sequential process that builds collaboration, trust, communication and shared knowledge. On the other hand, there’s a need to be respectful of the diverse personal and professional responsibilities, priorities and commitments of SCC members, including for the safety and well-being of family members and clients. These competing commitments inevitably create ongoing schedule conflicts, and challenge the ability of SCC members to fulfill the SCC Participation Agreement.

- SCC members discussed when it’s reasonable for exceptions to the Participation Agreement to be made, and how the policy can be applied fairly, equitably and transparently. Members appreciated each other’s dedication and commitment, and expressed a strong desire to keep the current SCC membership intact.

**Meeting Closure**

- The meeting ended with a closing circle appreciating the contributions of members, and especially the work of the Design Subcommittee. The next meeting is October 26, 6:00 – 8:30 p.m., in the District Office Board Room. The agenda will include presentation and discussion of draft recommendations by the Districtwide Implementation Plan Subcommittee.