

AAC Meeting #1 Minutes

10 members of the public in attendance

Start 6:00 p.m.

End 7:20 p.m.

- Opening & Welcoming from Scott Washington Office of Capital Improvements & Planning
 - Beginning the boundary review process
 - Introduces Consultant, Scott Leopold from Cooperative Strategies
- Scott Leopold, Consultant gives the agenda for the evening.
- Introduction of AAC members
 - Each member gave introduction & how members are affiliated with the district
- Roles & Responsibilities
 - Roles & responsibilities for all AAC members were described
 - No scenarios created by the AAC they are strictly advisory
- Legal presentation from Mark Blom
 - Work is subject to sunshine laws, the Maryland open meetings act
 - Also the Maryland Public Information Act and how it applies to the AAC's work and documents
 - Comments / work from the committee will be subject to an open record request these items will be subject to the public information act
 - "Don't send anything you wouldn't want on the front page of the paper"
 - When the district responds to a public information request the response is put on the districts website for all to see
- Scope
 - Read and audit the feasibility study
 - Make feedback / recommendation to the superintendent
 - Committee not charge with the creation of scenarios
- Schedule
 - Full schedule of AAC meetings and the rest of the project as a whole were described
 - Final decision in November
- Policy 6010
 - Policy that defines the AAC
 - Lays out policy standards for how the AAC will review the feasibility study
- Feasibility Study
 - Members asked to have large versions of maps for the next meeting
- Feasibility Study Plan Alternatives presented by Tim Rogers, Office of School Planning
- Overview listing all options

- ES Option #1
 - Picking up polygon 304 a portion of turf valley and sending it to bushy park
 - Bushy park has the most capacity in this area
 - West friendship & St Johns lane are over crowded need relief
- ES Option #2
 - More movement than the first option and associated MS moves
 - No island in this options
 - Moving students from West Friendship to Waverly
 - Move students from Tridelphia Ridge to Bushypark
 - Relieve students by moving from St. Johns Lane to Manor Woods
- Southwestern ES #1
 - Reassign 3 polygons from Pointers run to Clarksville
- Southwestern ES #2
 - A little bit more of a move for this option but uses the capacity at bushy park
 - Noted that this option creates an island
- Southwestern ES #2
 - Smallest move of these three elementary options
 - Tradeoff is it does not provide all of the relief for pointers run, it would continue to be over crowded
- Columbia Option #1
 - Bryant Woods is projected to be overcrowded
 - All schools in this area have received additions
 - Clements crossing to Swansfield
 - Then moving some students from Bryant woods to Clements Crossing
 - Any moves in this area require middle schools moves to balance out enrollment
- Columbia Option #2
 - Scaled back a little from option one
 - Different way to balance middle school fields, a little larger than option 1
 - Some areas moved from one walking zone are actually close enough that they are walkable to the school they are being reassigned to
- Columbia Option #3
 - More reserved option of the three for this area
 - This leaves Clements Crossing a little higher than the other options
- High School Option #1
 - Approximately moves 2500 students
 - Idea is to relieve overcrowding
 - Utilizing capacity in the western part of the district
 - No option moves all HS's into board policy for utilization, there isn't enough capacity in the county to do so.
 - Associated MS feeds to align to this option, about 300 MS students impacted

High School Option #2

- Approximately moves 1500 students
- Leaving more HS overcrowded, especially in the east
- Less movement of students in this option
- Associated MS feeds to align to this option, about 150 MS students impacted

- Comprehensive Boundary Options
 - Could be a full boundary scenario for all three levels

- Committee questions
 - Asked if there are any members on the committee that are representing the Free & Reduced Lunch families
 - Concerns raised that there isn't direct representation

 - Is this feasibility study final, can we request more information if that is needed for us to make a recommendation?
 - Specifically, is there anyone on the county represented on this committee to make sure there are data and input from them as well
 - Can we get these links of all resources shown on the presentation?
 - Do you have data on how many students live in the county that don't attend public schools?
 - Could we use census data to approximate
 - Talking about educational outcomes, different choices the board will have to make during this process. Two different criteria, islands vs small feeds do we have any information on the impacts of one versus the other?
 - If this information is known that may help inform the board on their decisions.

 - Discussion on understanding of feeder information and boundary islands and exactly what those are.
 - Is traffic involved in this information at all? Is there anyone in the county who collects this data or is it even available.
 - This is a consideration as distance and time.
 - Counts and other data may be able to be collected from the state / county
 - Is there data on new development happening in the county?
 - Aggregated by boundary / school
 - Can we show growth patterns by school to show how the enrollment and building has changed over the last 5 years? Instead of just showing total growth for the entire county.
 - This data is a part of enrollment process
 - Detailed description of how the enrollment process is completed every year starting in September. Also, description of how 5 years of historical data is used to apply to the projections and how there is a best fit model to help apply, this is how the art of the projections is applied.
 - Examples given how land use & zoning decisions made can affect enrollment projections in the future
 - Examples how economy slowing/speeding up can affect accuracy of the projections
 - Do we have data on FARM / ELL projected out years for each of these options presented?
 - This is done with aggregating current counts; the district does not project enrollment in these programs since they are a choice

- Can we use historic rates of enrollment in these programs to supplement the data we have?
- Are the options in any rank or priority order?
 - No, the options are just in a random order for discussion
- Does the district give recommendations or just provide options?
 - Based on current plan no, but in the past, they have.
- Discussion on what exactly a polygon is and how to interpret the maps in the feasibility study.
- In Columbia option 1 or 2 this impact where kids go to middle school but won't affect middle school enrollment significantly enough to move these middle schools out of board policy for utilization.
- High school 13 is coming and high school enrollment continues to increase has there been talks of future high schools being larger capacity?
 - Current design capacity for HS 13 is 1650
 - Additions for HS in capital budget
- Is the enrollment projection an attending projection?
 - Yes, it is geographic + the addition of transfers
- What is the deliverable for the AAC to produce?
- Are homeless students counted in this projection? Is that data included in this process?
 - Yes, they are in the geographic counts for students at each school
- Question about non-transported students and what that means.
- Question about when the district would or wouldn't provide transportation and grandfathering
 - Concerns for impacted students and the impact of transportation
- Closing Scott Leopold
 - No further questions
 - We will compile FAQ and take any other questions via email.

6/25/19 Meeting

8 members – make sure Hector replaced with Susan

4 staff

2 consultant

9 community

6:04pm open meeting, Scott Washington

Agenda, Scott

Mr. Flower's motion

2nd,

Correct error – replace Hector's name with replacement all in favor, motion passes, 7-0

PPT

Deliverables – high level feedback, super direction, diverse objective group with countywide view

Focus – high level concepts, based on last meeting dialogue

Review from meeting 1 – AAC, Community Members – roles

In and out of scope

Schedule

Policy 6010

FS and online resources

Reallocation of students will not cause loss of federal funding, based on countywide percentage, county allocates by school

Representative for FARM only, countywide group perspective, can look into this

RACE projections, birth data feeds projections, cannot readily projection based on birth data, can look at if available, but not yet. We have existing, and cohort survival rates. Retrospective thing. Informing the super proposal, how it panned out. What was projected in FS original Board plan, year one on those metrics, what happened on year one. All demographic metrics, Could look at trends, but not necessarily project. For this type of study use actual data, reaggregate. Can look into for the future.

Census is total population, not just students enrolled, and do not line up with polygon. Not a direct input at this time. May lose accuracy_____

Last boundary full review? Is it on schedule? Board can consider annually. Based on policy. In past, opening of capacity prompted boundary change. Once board makes motion, there are standards to consider. Use of facility, Community Stability. 2018 plan all three levels, by the end, fewer students only ES and MS reassigned.

Homelessness – not affected by redistricting. Add question to slide.

Student density. Cross hari median center. Blue, dark blue, pink then red. Boundaries as they were at that time. 1st slide, 10 years ago boundaries 10 year, slides move through today. Pink = more than 1000 per square mile. No color, parks, industrial. Highlights importance of creating a plan that uses the schools in higher section in a way to overcome constant growth, eastern half. Greatest needs. Western part of county zoned so that west will not growth. Fewer students in west.

Private school students. American fact finder from census. % students enrolled any school. Enrollment of students in public and private schools. Private losing relative market share. HS market share growing. Countywide level, census. How compare to other comparable counties. Other counties in VA going opposite direction. Naturally in cohort survival.

PPT will be posted online. Next week copies.

Discussion questions.

Island vs complex dominos –

Needs to be based on each individual scenario.

Other underlying values more important. Or domino may be better for less interruption. Making assumption. All other things equal. Ties into other questions. Agree. Challenge, island in wester HC where transportation and most fam have transportation. Parents participate in school activities with transport issues. School B may be easier. Could perhaps maintain some walkers with dominos moves. Agree general idea that it depends on the other considerations of scenario. Ex laurel woods major ES review and may SE schools over-utilized, dominos, DOES had capacity, EX Fulton 40%-50% out, and new back in. Worked for longer-term balance for longer period of time. Islands could be les effective in some cases. Could look like a island on map, same amount of positive/negative impact on students. Depends on what the community sees as their community. Definition of community school, parent involvement, feel paart of community. Feeder patterns may help if stuednts move together. Would wakers be moved? One consideration. We look at both _____.

It is aa cap util problem/solution process. Bulk of conversation. Consider other standatds. May make one type of moves fit more considerations if look at demographics. Island could move school ave cloer to countywide average. Contiugous area pull from edges, could change dem in an educationally unfavorable. Move students to crete greater diversity in all schools and amaintain ommuntiy aspect. Value of ed when aprents involved. Diverse schools value of education. Sometimes not compatible.

AA process look at more than just the #s. When move comm, what resouces are avail to helkp transition feel welcome and adjust. What else can be done. Comm agendcues and groupd. Need to disms need farm stidnets in one place to get funding. Should diversify. More diversy, greater resources. Put studnets in place where they see opportunities, funding lost makes up for education .

13 ES as title 1. Over 40%. What would they lose.

District funded for title 1 at district one, allocation at disccussion of district.

Acuity tool to allocate resources if relocate students. How do we move resources to go with students? Fundamental shift to follow needs not building. Also differentiated staffing, can be adjusted based on student needs. Could be change in differentiated staffing. EX credentials in title 1 schools need more training/credentials. Move vulnerable students moved, fundamental change in policy to move resources higher demand for expertise.

para ed with 2 year degree is higher, than just GED. System looks for 2 yr college education so they can move. % high. Must become regulatory, honor across system.

Boundary changes – less often more broad, or less moves and more frequent. Or build more schools? Moves that last in target as long as possible with an eye of future additions/buildings. Lonest might not necessarily 'win'. Overall philosophical realm, size of the schools to be built. What are the Boards thoughts? When schools come online. Should district build schools ahead of development? What is data telling you? Where is land available. State funding impacted by need.

Ed specs for each level. Adjust prototype school as curriculum changes. State must see need. Land use and zoning impacts ... sewer ... capacity in west.

ES 3, MS 3-4, HS 5 years to plan and build.

Secure land in advance. In areas esp development is coming. Currently depend on county because funding depleted in site acquisition HCPSS should be involved with knowing about development Land bank – Columbia sites agreement, Mr Rouse, land agreement between school system to designate during development phases identify sites that would be designated on final development plans that site should meet needs. Sites determined 80s on FDP open space school site for school or park or both. Will be transferred to BOE. Will be owned sites. The comprehensive plan guides all development in HC. Revisited in 2006 started. Getting ready to re-review. HCPSS at table for comp plan to get measurable targets. Hopeto sit at the table.

Larger moves, more time with results. No one wants small moves more often. PPL mad, but only once, not over and over. Each year when schools out, anxiety. Big tough convo. Better more certainly. Remember private school chart slide. HCPSS provide resources. Can't provide 100% of the people. Best interest HC population and considers as many factors as possible to make that changes. High quality schools, parents are ok after transition because all schools provide high level' Sometimes is community and how to be involved, not necessary move, but ability to be involved. I was told vs I was asked.

How much impact made to utilize capacities. Move more kids to make more change in demographics. EX 2 or three plans cap util same, things are different are socioecon and # moved students. Long transport too far. It depends on exact nature of moves and students being moved. Ed outcomes inform

that decision. Comfort less important (familiarity) not big obstacle, as it econ disadvantages what is new set up to be? Education and life impact. IE walk a few steps vs walk a mile. Not about comfort.

Sometimes we things we can move one dem to a school with sim demo, but stress on families. Exception of families in a dif schools. It depends. Prioritize needs of disadvantaged students That's what equity is about. Priority need over comfort. Impact on students with need may be harder. Listed to the students with the need to bring equity.

Per space or remain in rels

NOTE – count rels and all schools are within or below target util .

NOTE – Cost to get rid of rels, over \$150M

Submitted 92M, got 56M, budget this year

Ex school use of longer days, 2 shifts, vocation schools. One building used at capacity at diff times. Can provide. ARL, internships, etc absence, not all students in school all day. Discussion with Board.

7th grade to 12th grad, half education

Positives, negatives rels. Positive to be separated. Weather. PODS in a villa. Principal determines use and timing. Cost \$140. Classroom \$300,000 cost, plus other bathrooms/halls costs/core spaces.

Should take rels out of discussion. Do something about high util.

Pressure on core spaces with higher util, even if capacities in relo.

Experience? RElo vs classroom. Diff experience. More pressure on school.

Working toward goal, relo make more target until capacity comes online. Not far if school high long time and reasonable moves that could have been made in the interim. Could serve individual interests. Plan to alleviate issue. Not as a an out to not plan appropriately. Know where co has development, know student location, know funding restraints, know timing. School needed in overutilized area, cloes to securing site, used as reason to not adjust boundaries, but timing off, adjust now, then kids all goen before next adjustments. BALANCE variables.

If you ahe to use rels. Nwusa new building built. Disadvantage if not right away, lack of self, grade down. Temp OK, Perm prob. Political will not change? Circles talking without solutions.

Past dictates future. Capacity proj exceeding cap. What worked and what didn't work. # continue to ruse. What did we learn from that proj study? Not repeat. HS13, ES 43... etc. DLES. US1 high growth area. Lessons learned, open the schools lower target util to allow growth. Still see more growth, longer term, add another school. (1) open school low util (2) creating more infrastructure, but still need more. Knowing more capacity in those regions. Look to schools up for systemic reno and ad additions. For HHES, ES #43. DLES BOE approved smaller school with regional programs in school. Land confines opportunity with size of building.

Land bank, only ES and MS

Consideration to build up. Yes. Concern with renovating existing and zoning.

Should boundary on be changed with new capacity. Head shaking.

Impact feed??? Impact on ___ local school sytem. Housing auth and school system. Rate of students from section 8 or fhousing

Meeting 8:12pm

AAC Meeting #3

July 2nd 2019

- Introduction by Mr. Scott Washington to kick off the meeting

Scott Leopold Cooperative Strategies

- Agenda
- Approval of minutes from AAC meeting #2
- First and Second of the minutes (first from Steven Hunt, second from Quiana Holmes)
- Overview of Deliverable
- Roles & Responsibilities
- Review of Scope of this process
 - o Review feasibility study and present to Superintendent
 - o How they relate to board policy
 - o Not to create options
- Overall Schedule
 - o Community Meetings next week
- Recap of previous meetings
 - o Recap of density maps from last meetings
 - o Historically Private vs Public Enrollment
 - o Discussion Questions from last meeting
 - o Islands vs domino moves discussion
 - o Minor changes more frequently versus major changes less frequently

Title I Presentation

Amy Tieperman

Julie Knauer

What is Title I,

- Started 1965, Elementary and Secondary Education Act 1965
- HCPSS is allocated around 5 million, Nationally 15 Billion

Purpose of Title I

- Formula funds to assure that all students have fair and equal opportunity to receive a high quality education

Funds use

- Highest poverty schools
- Most at risk students
- School level activities
- Supplemental to existing funds

How do they decide amount to distribute?

- Nationally divided by federal gov based on census data
- States do a similar process
- Districts use FARM data to divide up money to the districts

School Ranking

- By grade span or Districtwide
- HCPSS does grade span grouping

Money decided based on a per pupil standard

Currently 12 Title I schools, next year 13 Title I schools

Per Pupil allocation

- Each student who qualifies based on FARM usually around 1,000 per pupil

Targeted assisted vs. Schoolwide

Targeted

- Targeted resources only for a selected group of students
- Funds to buy computers etc can only be used by FARM students

Schoolwide

- Allows you to use funds for entire schools
- Can enhance any program or school activity and all students in school FARM or not can use resources

Questions

- What about Schools that aren't on the Title I list, how do we handle FARM students who attend the other schools?
 - o Supt pushing to make sure that all students who can apply for FARM funds and resources, helps with after school / summer school other programs etc..
 - o This fund is specifically for certain schools in the county there are other programs that have funds that target of kids with academic needs regardless of the socio economically status of their school
- More specifically what do you do for kids not in title I schools
 - o They will not receive title I funds but there are other programs to target these students
- What would happen if a school that is currently 40% and after boundary changes they are less than the 40% threshold
 - o We would get these same amount of money, there would be less flexibility in how the funds are used
 - o It would switch to a targeted program at that school instead of a full Title I school
- Is title I just based on the number of FARM students in the county?
 - o Yes
- Where does 40% threshold come from

- Federal Law
- So, if we lower the number of schools that meet the 40% threshold hold do we
 - The other schools in HCPSS are eligible but not funding
- Could you have a hybrid model of targeted vs school wide
 - No
- In HCPSS we only do school-wide, so in the case they slide under the 40% threshold those schools would change back to a targeted program
- How do you decide what to fund for all the lower schools that are targeted
 - They study how much money the schools would actually get and how much would be effective
- How do you measure the success of FARM students, because we aren't flexible enough to do targeted program
 - Micro level 20 kids chosen to get after school tutoring in Math for example
 - Did those do better than 20 students who chose not to do this program
 - On macro level funds are generally allocated to more staffing for these title I schools and this helps these schools
 - System level it is difficult to just pull out 20 students and look at just these students and apply funds and study the affect while leaving out the rest of students, can't put them in separate environments
- Do all of the kids qualified for FARM get first dibs at summer programs?
 - Have to be under performing to qualify
 - Administrators selected who would benefit the most from it
 - Discussing how to make program more available to more students
- Lisa Davis, Title I doesn't want only Schoolwide Title I program
 - Point of targeted program is to help students who need it most
 - Title I isn't trying to make whole schools of just Title I students
 - Loosing school wide isn't a bad thing, targeting allows FARM students to get funding even though the entire school is title I
- If FARM student is moved to a new school that is no longer Title I, does funding go with that student to the new school?
 - Title I funding would still come to the district
- What happens to that 1000 dollars does it go to a pot of money somewhere else or does it follow the student
 - Money is centered around the school because it based on census this is any student in the county even if they don't go to HCPSS
- Any data on whether success of Title I school vs Targeted program improvement or not?
 - No data available at this moment
- Did the shift in 2014 from target wide to the school wide style have any impact on student success data?
 - All parents and staff get to vote on whether to stay targeted assistance or schoolwide
 - All schools voted to go school wide
 - At this point we haven't looked at this data
 - Funding didn't change just the type of program at the school changed

- From equity and capacity perspective is there flexibility for resources to go with the students instead of the school
 - o Yes we could
 - o Decision is based on what the school wanted staff, parents, etc...
 - o These are federal guidelines
- Boils down to island vs. domino and how we impact schools that are FARM do we move FARM students to a school under the threshold, do the dollars follow that student or does he lose those resources
 - o They would pick up the current 14 schools that are Title I if there were a redistricting and study the data and start all over with the schools with the highest percentage of FARM and reallocate funds
 - o Funds would stay the same but number of Title I schools may change
 - o In a school with smaller population of FARM we may be able to do better without Title I funds on our own vs areas with higher concentrations which may be more effective with funds
- So, do we have data on performance of this issue?
 - o We have lots of data we just don't have data comparing title I schoolwide versus Targeted program
 - o Opportunity for data collection and study by the district on this topic
 - o Lots more work on funds and how we allocate than just Title I
 - o Typically, easier to apply extra funds at ES level than MS or HS based on scheduling and types of programs
- Can we study impacts of Title I funds, and then outcomes of these students at the high school level?
 - o How long have we been doing this, and can we study the outcomes of these young people and the outcomes for when they graduate high school
 - o Are any of these interventions working?
- Are they working to make outcomes better for students who are academically ready to survive in this world?
- Are we measuring this data as a district?
 - o We have not specifically sorted non-graduating students and studied whether or not they received these funds or programs
 - o This is a good data and study for the district

- How much do you value Title I, you have to know the value of what is being lost
 - o Gone through 3 or 4 different student systems in that time
 - o Possibility to setup things now so the AAC of the future has this data in the future when they are doing this works
- So, if outcomes shows that FARM students aren't graduating at same rates as other students
- The concern is what are you going to do differently to address FARM students to generate different outcomes for these students

- We work with a whole group of different staff that specifically focus on how we can improve outcomes for these students
- One of the main concerns from a boundary review, do we as a part of our recommendations do we jeopardize the allocation at the school level or is that something the district will handle after the fact?
 - Do we not need to be mindful of this because the district will receive the same amount of money because you look at it holistically?
 - That is correct this is the process the district does and we don't lose any funds but how it is allocated and what types of programs we have Targeted vs. School-wide may change but this is not a priority for this committee.
 - The county will continue to allocate the funds no matter what happens with the redistricting
 - Don't really want to make more FARM school wide programs would just concentrate the FARM students at certain schools
- A lot of research that says if you put students in with a more diverse schools that performance will improve
- Is not a preference from the district they make a decision on how to allocate funds in a way that they see is most beneficial.

Consensus Building Activity

Categories of Input and maintain a county-wide view

Discussion about Categories of input 1st item, Agree 9, Disagree 1, Abstain 1

- Don't like the term prioritize it says that other are not a priority.
- Like the term optimize the learning environments
- Its not just title I its issues with concentrations of poverty, it's a psychological impact of moving students from one school to another
- Lets not put the burden on the back of students who have the most need
- Year after year the families that show up are the families that can economically show up and influence the board and allow these people to continue to segregate themselves
- Equity should be the first factor, we have allowed for too long for people with means to influence decision making
- Transportation and time for families working two and three jobs and how to ensure equity when they may not be able to show up and protest like other families
- It is more about will children have the resources they need in each facility to succeed rather than just making the numbers look good. Resources, staffing, programing, safety, and psychological healthy is there first then move the boundary.
- Policy 6010 is there to attempt to do this

- Capacity does not change every year
 - o This is why there is a range of target utilization to handle cases where the number of classes per grade fluctuates from year to year
 - o Capacity is only changed when there is an addition, renovation or when a program is added or removed
 - o Pg 2 of policy 6010 letter O number 1,2,3 defines the formula for capacity
 - o It would be very hard for the district to continue to plan if the capacity of facilities changed yearly, the board could at any time ask to restudy capacity and look to recalculate capacity based on different teacher ratios
 - o Discussion of first filter term versus major to describe how to look at equity
 - Agree that first filter means that before anything else look at impact of equity
 - Instead lets get a better balance of all students at all schools
 - Moved on to come back to this issue
 - Talking about wording not application
 -
 - o Consensus around less frequently changing boundaries but more extensive impact, 10 members agree
 - o Keep walkers walking whenever possible, 10 members agree
 - o Temporary use of relocatable, 10 members agree
 - Change wording to short term.
 - Make clear this is not a long-term solution
 - Make sure we consider cost of transportation and busing, when we spend money on that the money is gone
 - Relocatable that cost is a lot can they be repurposed or sold so the funds can be recouped in some portion later
 - Can't really move more than three times before structurally becomes an issue
 - Money could be more effective in a relocatable versus in a bus or transportation
 - Is this more a facility master planning discussion?
- Capital budget is long term 10 year plan but based on funding constraints this changes every year. Overtime something like relocatable can become an issue because funding could continue to be adjusted based on other priorities.

Islands Discussion, 10 members agree

- Concerns about breaking up a neighborhood and adding this to the language
- We will wordsmith this one
- Can we define reasonable, what are we basing that time off of?
- But west vs east Columbia is very different

Domino Moves Discussion,

- Domino typically impacts more students
- Look at gentler shift of domino moves, looking at specifically the edges of boundaries to shift students

- This is really the intent of domino moves
- Generally, the dominos seem to work best, but is this good from an equity standpoint because of self-segregation and concentration of poverty.
- Should we consider more islands or more dominos and one over the other
 - o All things equal Domino over island Agree 5 Disagree 4 Abstain 1
 - o All things equal island over domino Agree 4 Disagree 4 Abstain 2

Questions about consensus

- How do we quantify disadvantaged students?
 - o For this purpose, we are going to use FARM data

Option: Western ES Option #1

Main idea: Access capacity at Bushy Park ES relieve Waverly ES and West Friendship ES.

AAC Comments:

Is the growth on West Friendship based on hosing in the area?

- Based on SDP elementary projection form West Friendship ES
- Tradeoff Waverly more utilized than it is now
- Does an island move make more sense because there is no impact to FARM data?
- Looking at out years, if you look at Waverly ES going up to 116 drops to 108 in 2030 and bushy park up to 112 and consistently higher than that.
 - o Long-term feasibility of this option
 - o Long-term this area is still a problem
- Consider express routes for the island in this option
 - o Would be an increase in transportation to bushy park ES vs. waverly ES

- Difference between APFO capacity and feasibility study
 - o Based on FY 2020 budget
 - o May see difference in charts because of program movement in feasibility study
 - o Regional programs tend to be about 10 or 15 students
 - o Pre-k is not in either capacity charts
-

AAC Meeting #3

July 9, 2019

Attendance

AAC Members: Heidi Abdelhady, Bessie Bordenave, Justin Carguilo, Frank Eastham, Willie Flowers, Paige Getty, Quiana Holmes, Steven Hunt, **Leonardo McClarty**, **Larry Walker**, Suleman Malik, Susan Otradovec, Lisa Schlossnagle.

HCPSS Staff: Anissa Brown Dennis, Scott Washington, Renee Kamen, Tim Rogers, Jennifer Bubenko

Cooperative Strategies (Consultant): Scott Leopold

Community: ~17 attendance

Mr. Scott Washington called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

Meeting Minute Approval (7/9/2019)

Move approval of the meeting minutes.

Motion by Frank Eastham, Seconded by Steven Hunt

Concern – insufficient content – staff to update and add more detail and send back out to group for approval – only those who attended can vote on the minutes.

Can today's meeting be audio recorded? Agreed to audio record meeting.

Opening Presentation

Mr. Leopold quick review meeting 3, finalize considerations for super, and out of scope/future improvements.

See Power Point Presentation – Deliverable, Roles/Responsibilities, (welcome to attend Community Input Meetings next two weeks), Scope, Schedule, Student Density map, Private School Students, Discussion questions from meeting 3, Categories of Input, Output of agreement/disagreement for inputs (countywide/tactical).

Western Option 1 (ES1)

EC/TV area. Island #304 reassigned Waverly ES to BPES, create avail cap at Wav to relieve STLJ, WFES.

Western edge WF to BP. 355 Es moved. Result util 3 of 4 under target, WF to grow, Wav ____?

Benefits: Fewer students reassigned. Sensible, reasonable, not too much movement. No walkers impacted. Does not move MS students

Challenges: does create island, impact on neighborhood as island, impact next year, (outyears impact not that great), short term impact good, but long term 2022 BP where you started, Wav not move as much – over for entire proj term. Short term benefit; less effective than option 2 for long term for length of effectively using capacity

Option 2: (ES2) Moves same region, reassign approx. 600 (512 at ES 92 at MS), instead of island, more of domino. Use BP to relieve WF and Wav and SJLES, West of 32 WF and MV to BP and G, South of 70 TR to BP, TR can take from WF (reassigned in 2017 process)

Benefits: Longer lasting for more schools involved compared to option 1

Challenges: more students impacted, repeated students impacted 2017 year K-2, --have we looked at phasing? Board could make that call. 66 projected K5 in those poly (that were previously moved not the entire group) disruptive, not equitable if putting them in disadvantage of moving again.

Could make reassignments and board could exempt those students. Ways to minimize impact on students.

When we are redistricting, we are moving students. Must remember that.

Lens of equity. Fairness and inclusion. Must include prior moves. Who are in the polygon. What are the needs? Can the to accommodate in real time. Who moving and what to?

Overcrowded are also high farm schools. Funding with them at title one school. Diff learning, resources, not going with the students that need the resources. Making the numbers work is diff than meeting needs of students to meet academic potential.

FARM and test scores are what we have available. Insignificant or no change in the scenarios for those factors.

Western, SW options, no changes. Minor at Columbia = BW 51% 52% 50% 50%, Econ indicator and standardized tests show similar.

Reason for prior discussion. Discussed notions. Condentrating poverty, stack up people in title 1 schools. The grade don't go up. Same tyupe of young ppl in same times pf schools. Integrate with more prospouseous schools. Could be change Maybe POSITIVE DEVIANCES. Same students in same situation, same results. Change for better outcomes.

To do that, massive plans. Really big plan to strike balance. Not on the table right now.

Either purely capacity approvach and capacouty and euity blended discussion.

Thought that there was a mistake on the charts, seems incorrect.

Use lens of equity driving factor. Frame feedback. Can be a challenge for the scenarios.

FS, proof of content. Group can say FS does not go far enough through the lense of equity. Can we vote on that?

Combo of island and domino. Mix these types of moves, can meet dem and util challenges.

Outcomes – Title I resources not go as far in those schools, other outcomes can be met because of moves. If school is outside of 40%, what happens to the money? Fewer farm students, more individual instruction to those needed.

County gets \$ for Title I for FARM regardless of which school the students attend.

2014 assisted to whole school. What data informed need for change and results and outcomes. Inconclusive.

Boundary doesn't impact how much funding we receive. Decision about meeting needs of students is up to HCPSS in budget process and separate than boundary process. Title I school gets more \$. HCPSS can make a new decision. Ex 390k per school with current 13 schools title I. If spread among 42, about 100k or so, just spreads out funds, About \$1000. In resources 1000 does do much. Most impact most value sought. Only relevant to ES.

If HCPSS moves boundaries, no change in MS and HS. Indirectly, potential to change ____.

Do not lose federal funding regardless of 40% threshold changes to spread money overall. Fewer students with cap needs at schools with cap and resources to manage individual needs students needs still get met. Serious changes to diversify ES MS HS.

Larger redistricting plan, advocating much movement to move the needle on demographics.

This big of a change, go from now to completely even everything out. Or incremental progress. Phase in? Is that enough? Policy 6010, cap, community, demographic. Needs much longer planning period. Needs more time and consideration to make a bigger plan.

FS does not move toward to the mean. Dem not addressed at all.

Balances demographics and needs/resources to meet student potential.

Balancing regions does not move the needle. Keep same socio econ.

Moves, islands, disjointed attendance areas. Move the most challenged students. Can move students out of or into schools. Who can bear the burden longer ride, island? Islands are not in and of themselves bad. Some want to keep island. Doesn't; always break community. Ombudsman with islands if gets greater dem mix.

Any move one community existing to another school. Someone will push against. Ex Mt Eida neighborhood CHS. Connection to community, not happen in same way in Columbia, local events, parks rec events.

Guts to create bold plan. Kind of change to make county better in the long run. Diversity for kids make better citizens.

ADmirablbe, trying to do. Socio econ, not sure doing justinve mindset to students. Discrimination cliques bullying. .Intendinf to regroup. Not justice to kids. Big difference in students and faculty. Diff parent mindset, students with socio econ. Diff child no money concnrs diff mindset. Fix al these problems, find peace in the county, not how it works. Some kids are not even comfortable, native language, judgement, gets worse MS and HS. Even if revamp entire county. ASside from parents deciding where the kids are going.

Totally agree. Admin make sure teachers teach students. Have to be willing to make tough decisions hold ommuntiy accountable for type of the comm we want to see hol dppl accountable.

Disagree with everryhitng that you said. Segregation, historical. If not ----

Most neg outcomes, achievement, same results. Child could be motivated.

Other factors to take into considerations for equity. Not only dem. Other factors.

We're only already looking at cap util. Equity.

Every week look through lense pf equity. % didn't' change in any schools. Not using lens of equity. Shifting same to same, no mix. Give more students opportunity for better quality ff education. Cap utilk give more students more equal opportunity. Not putting low incme in these schools and other sstudents in other schools.. Sme painting. We can not assume that a low income student moved to another school automatically discrimated against, shut down. Kids will go where they feel comftorable and accepted.. Not a consideratopn. Ever professional treat every students the same. Expedctation. Not pull back on deciisons based on perceptiosn.

Omportbae point that trasends into othe considerations. How their kids will adjust. Various concnrs, indiv students jreceived. Schools handle those issues. Share ex[pectedatipns for staff, parenters, all involved in public education. Any boundary adjustments plan can move toward better strucutiure for success to meet education goal systemwide. Bondary adjust can't fix the way staff communicates with students. Moving toward an improvement.

What do we mean by impact. Stuentns reassign.

Address achievement as priority with other factors.

Could move more students and move move dem numbers.

FS proof concent options to balance util of schools outside of ththreshold using 6010. Outside thtrwacahold triggers action.

Polycyt 6010 Is not prioritized. Group can prioritize.

Apply 6010 to apply to FS. Advice to Super in crafting rec to Board. Triggers reviewed

IV A 6. Unbalanced equity related factors.

Policy statement. Equity and util.

Need to decide as a comm, rec to super, what do we feel is most important factor. Purpose is to utilize schools well.

Equity. Needs to be addressed. Entire new process for IV A 6.

Recent review, process improvements. Change in policy. Board had a policy subcommittee. Introduced Feb 2019 changes. Part of reflection period, subcomm, changes to process.

2017 nudged rebirth of policy. Changes in policy IP 2017 AAC created plans took feedback.

Policy 6010, policy statement. Est school area quality equitable opp to all students. Where is that in the scenarios that the AAC is evaluating? The reason that the AAC exists in its form, diff than past. No proposals. Give feedback about policy. Process needs to be diff. Not getting a handle of what needs to be done. Not concerned about outside of comm say or thinks. Conscious of process and do better by the students. Not focus on the details of data. Higher values. Super and Board these are values apply to decisions moving forward.

]

FS is data to use as a resource to apply policy. AAC = something in addition to the data. Not just eval data.

This is not only data. Data should be considered. Have not even applied the policy. Extend the convo. Not only util. Perhaps #6 more specific, more in-depth policy in-depth convos.

Why consider – something else trigger change.

Scope – feedback you understand – policy essence of work. Cut and dry, not so cut and dry. FS not plan for Herculean change based on 2017.

6010 actually illustrates the focus, specific trigger in process. – a process that aligns to 6010. Keeps decision making on priorities of 6010. Equity first as balance schools. **Equity as we adjust boundaries.** Many folks who speak with less of equity.

6010 not need to be specific ??? Considerations. 4 physical plants, roads, #6 not doing justice to students. 1.5 times threshold for title 1. 3x mean. That has major impact on all students. Targets set for other metrics use evaluating.

Doesn't mandate that change must take action. Requires look, no action. Board can not act or act in another way.

Demographic realities inherent to policies structures, can be changed.

Concentration geographically, walking distance to ES, switch to bus, acceptable to leave at school and supplement with funds for educational attainment needs. Basically looking at policy community stability. Demographic characteristics. Achieve 3, violate 2. Demographic vs community/feeder/walk. It depends. Build an add, bring in more students.

Agree with 6010 these considerations unweighted. All can work in service in meeting goals. Then the nitty gritty.

Research that supports or verifies programs validity, graduation rates, same as other students? Walk vs bus, sharing of students, that is what equity. Is not one way transfer. Sharing to bring balance. Bring students into.

Meet goals, quality and equity. Not based on behavior. Uphold values and do what they control. Public private home school their choices. HCPSS act in support of stated values bold courageous decisions.

This cultural implementation of the policy needs to follow policy. Current status not considered broken for other stuff, not only capacity, bring equity to same status. Support stated policies

Room for more of less emphases on different points. Emphases on one more than others. Cap until even though equity in policy.

IP – AAC we determine priorities based on IP rules.

Phrase – this community focused on equity.. not because in charge, because it is what happened.

See votes on PPT

Sending out:

PPT

Revised Minutes from last week with Title one notes

Minutes from this week

Post process survey

Categories of input PPT SLIDE

Items outside scope PPT SLIDE

Meeting adjourned 8:08 p.m.