



Kentucky Department of  
**E D U C A T I O N**

**Social Studies Standards Revision Committee**

**Date:** Oct 13, 2022

**Time:** 9 a.m. ET

**Location:** KDE

**Meeting Purpose:**

Address the public comments to the revisions to the Social Studies standards as outlined in KRS 158.196

**Meeting Called by:**

Beth Ratway (AIR)

**Members:**

**Present:**

**Advisory Panel (AP):** Kevin Presnell, Jill Brown, Michelle Gabbard Bloomfield, Carrie Harmon, Drake Williams, Bonnie Lewis, Ryan New, Harmony Hendrick, Ashley Adkins, Maria Ahlers, Katie Booth, Caylyn Lemaster, Caroline Sheffield, Kendra Childress, Maggie Lowe

**Review Committee (RC):** Kim Sergent, Tiffany Grimm, Jodi Lewis, Laura Cooley, Susie Jano Childers, Ryan Crowley

**KDE Staff:** Thomas Clouse, Heather Ransom, Lauren Gallicchio, Chrystal Rowland

**AIR Staff:** Beth Ratway, Kim Imel and Courtney Gross

**Public Observers:**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Focus</b>	<b>Lead</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
<b>9:00-9:10</b>	Sign on the sign on sheet	Beth Ratway	Beth engaged the participants with a “Questions, Hopes and Concerns” activity.
<b>9:10-9:15</b>	Call to Order and Roll Call	Beth Ratway	<p><b>Meeting called to Order:</b> 9:10 AM ET</p> <p><b>Roll call:</b></p> <p>AP: Kevin Presnell, Jill Brown, Michelle Gabbard Bloomfield, Carrie Harmon, Drake Williams, Bonnie Lewis, Ryan New, Harmony Hendrick, Ashley Adkins, Maria Ahlers, Katie Booth, Caylyn Lemaster, Caroline Sheffield, Kendra Childress, Maggie Lowe</p> <p>RC: Kim Sergent, Tiffany Grimm, Jodi Lewis, Laura Cooley, Susie Jano Childers, Ryan Crowley</p> <p><b>Motion to accept agenda:</b> Laura Cooley <i>Seconded:</i> Caylyn Lemaster</p>
<b>9:15-9:19</b>	Welcome	Beth Ratway	Beth provided a brief review of the previous day's meeting and went over the goals for the day.
<b>9:19-9:42</b>	Review of Feedback	Beth Ratway	<p>Brief overview of QHC activity from yesterday and addressed questions/concerns in today's QHC.</p> <p>Beth reviewed the pulse check data from yesterday on justifications created by the group yesterday. There were two justifications for discussion related to Standards v. Clarification theme &amp; Miscellaneous/Other [unrealistic high expectation].</p> <p><b>Open Discussion about the following:</b></p>

Time	Focus	Lead	Discussion
			<p>Standards v. Clarification theme: Justification was discussed. The RC/AP voted to maintain the justification as-is.</p> <p>Miscellaneous/Other theme: Justification was discussed. Recommended a language adjustment to include additional language such as “We want to reaffirm that students can do this” (support grade-level appropriateness of the standards). Can use law committee had to adhere to in 2019.</p> <p>Side conversation occurred around addressing the fundamental documents and issue with acknowledging individuals that supported the development of the US. For HS grade band, recommendation to either add an additional standard highlighting the historical actors or add language to the current fundamental document standard that emphasizes studying the historical actors as well.</p>
<b>9:42-10:17</b>	Review of Pulse Check Data and Revisions	Small Mixed Group Work	<p>Participants reviewed the justifications they created yesterday and made adjustments as appropriate based on pulse check and general comments.</p> <p>After the small groups discussed/updated their justifications, the APs began to vote on justification statements in order to move them to the RC.</p>
<b>10:17-11:40</b>	Addressing the general comments and letters	Small Mixed Group Work	Groups reviewed the general comments and letters to determine those they accept/no change and justifications (APs).
<b>11:40-11:58</b>	AP Individual Review of Recommendations	Individual Work	AP reviewed the recommendations and completed a Pulse Check Survey.

Time	Focus	Lead	Discussion
11:58-2:03	<p>Working Lunch (12:15- 1:15 for lunch):</p> <p>Addressing grade-band data (AP)</p> <p>Reviewing general comments/letter recommendations (RC)</p>	Small Group Work	RC reviewed the AP justifications that addressed public comment.
2:03-2:16	Review of 'foundational v. fundamental' documents in glossary	Large Group Discussion	<p>One justification was rejected since the AP decision was inaccurate. Change was made from "No Change" to "Accept" and then was accepted by RC.</p> <p>Discussion occurred around the Glossary term "fundamental documents" as to whether to have one term (e.g., "fundamental documents" only), both terms (i.e., "foundational documents" and "fundamental documents") or add definition of foundational document to fundamental document in the foundational document definition (i.e., "documents that provide significant insight into key actions, movements or moments or help establish a precedent or core principles").</p> <p><b>Decision Made</b> (accepted by AP/RC): Change to only one word - "fundamental documents" with updated definition language ("documents that provide significant insight into key actions, movements or moments or help establish a precedent or core principles")</p>

Time	Focus	Lead	Discussion
2:16-3:57	<p>Addressing grade-band data (AP)/Work on Implementation issues/supports (AP)</p> <p>Reviewing general comments/letter recommendations(RC)/Vote on Final Recommendations (RC)</p>	Small Group Work	The RC continued to review the AP justification statements and voted on accepting the justifications. APs continued grade band work as needed and worked on implementation supports.
3:57-4:01	Meeting Adjournment	Beth Ratway	<p><b>Motion to adjourn:</b> Tiffany Grimm</p> <p><b>Seconded:</b> Susie Jano Childers</p> <p><b>Meeting adjourned:</b> 4:01 PM EST</p>