Policy 6010 Review Committee – 2020 Review
Meeting 10 on 12/15/20

Began meeting at 4:07pm via video conference.

Attendance:

Daniel Lubeley, Co-Chair, Director of Capital Planning and Construction, HCPSS	Attended (video conference)
Jennifer Bubenko, Co-Chair, Planning Specialist, HCPSS	Attended (video conference)
Anthony Duan, HCASC	Absent (provided feedback before meeting)
Bradly Siskind, General Resident	Attended (video conference)
Brent Loveless, PTACHC; Meg Ricks	Attended (video conference)
Camille Young, HCASC	Absent
Cathy Datz, General Resident	Absent
Colleen Morris, HCEA	Absent
Cynthia Fikes, NAACP	Absent
Eva Yiu, Central Office	Absent
Gillian Spivey, HCAA	Absent
James Cecil, CAC	Attended (video conference)
Jamie Proctor, Teacher	Attended (video conference)
Joseph Allen, Central Office	Attended (video conference)
Kelley Powell, School-based	Absent
Megan Hartten, Teacher	Attended (video conference)
Dr. Meng Zhu, CAPA	Attended (video conference)
Monica Pringle, Central Office	Attended (video conference)
Stephanie Mummert, SECAC	Attended (video conference)
Steven Hunt, Former AAC Member	Attended (video conference)
Trinity Steele, Student	Absent

Daniel Lubeley, Director of Capital Planning and Construction, and Co-chair of the committee, opened the meeting.

- Welcome
- Expectations of Participation (Policy 1000 Civility)
    - to support a safe, engaging and supportive environment during committee meetings
- Timeline
    - Next meeting December 22 and 29; able and encouraged to provide input between meetings
        - **Please send any EDITS that you wish to be considered in the Dec. 22 meeting to Chairs by December 18 if possible (if not, at the latest Dec 21st)**
    - If we complete committee work in December, we might be able to stay on track for Board approval in May. Further extensions complicate the schedule and staff will have even less time to implement changes for New HS #13, Hammond HS, and Talbott Springs ES boundary review process.
- Committee members are welcome to attend Board meetings during policy presentations and can also provide public testimony as individuals
- Provide committee with survey on strategy to move forward with Section IV B
- Discussion on Implementation Procedures (timeline)
- Review survey results

Discussion:

**EDITS and notes also included on attached implementation procedure document*

- Implementation Procedures – Timeline **Discussion**
    - Some committee members offered a revised schedule for committee review (see timeline graphic and "Start of Meeting" IP document for details)
        - Summary of revised schedule

            - Stay within general timeline beginning/end (January-November)
            - Rearrange schedule to have earlier public input
            - Add an early projection report (with new projections and areas of concern), but not have a Feasibility Study (has considerations and strategies).
                - Provides new projections earlier
                - Community feedback will be focused on concerns/overarching goals (not whether a person likes a plan or not because the plan does or does not reassign their child)
                - Staff has reviewed and requested the Superintendent Recommendation be moved to July for sufficient time to receive feedback and complete recommendation/report
                - Superintendent recommendation is earlier (July rather than August) to give Board more time for PH/WS
            - Give Board more time so that they can have 30 day cycles (Public Hearing, then Work Session, then direct staff to make new scenarios)
    - Add to each step – how long the step takes and how long before implementation
    - This schedule may or may not be viewed favorably by others, including staff, especially removal of the Feasibility Study. If the Superintendent does not like that there is no Feasibility Study, what happens?
    - Can this schedule be accommodated with current staff? The current and proposed schedules are both very difficult with the current number of staff, and even when we have consultants, the impact/strain on staff is still significant.
    - Can the policy IP include a graphic of the timeline, rather than text? We can ask Policy office. If not, we can use a graphic in other ways (internet, presentations, etc). The graphic can show the length of time each step takes, overlapping of processes, and would be easier to read/understand.
    - Can we title the redistricting processes (ex. Opening of New HS #13 boundary review)
    - Do other jurisdictions (maybe Montgomery County) have independent Feasibility Studies created/presented?
    - Requirements / procedures for plan submissions: if community members want to submit plans, they can be judged under the same criteria/expectations and have to meet certain minimum expectations to be considered (ie. Not just don't move ## polygon) and shared with the Board and public.
    - Soften language "plans" to include any input because many people will not be able to develop a full scenario/plan
    - Are Board members submitting plans the same way? Individual Board members are community members. The intent of some of the changes in the text has been to indicate that the Board itself does not make plans, they instruct staff to make changes to meet certain goals.
    - Replace "community members" with "public"
    - What does tools mean? Any scenario testing software/programs. It was written generically because software/programs change over time
    - Where does APFO fit into this timeline? APFO capacity chart is the end of the 18 month process, using the prior year's projections.
    - Input and Board plans should be made available to the public.

- Implementation Procedures – Timeline **Consensus**
    - See attached IP document.
    - Timeline items still to review for consensus start at item "J".

- Committee's Survey results: Weighting / Priorities / Tiers / No order for Section IV B
    - Survey developed to get the intent/desire of the committee to move forward with Section IVB

- See attached detailed survey results (14 participated)
- Here are summarized results:

	Weights	Priorities	Tiers	Nothing	Reference analytical approach
For	5	6	2	1	9
Not sure (not enough info.)	6	3	6	2	3
Against	3	5	6	11	0

*Committee members discussed double voting for weights and priorities, meaning to go with a weighting system and include priorities within the system.

If the committee decides by consensus to move forward with weights, I believe that the weights should be...

All /some are standard in policy	4
Some set as standard/flexibility	3
Determined at onset by Board	4
Determined by Board at some point	1
Determined by plan developer	0
NO ANSWER	2

If the committee decides by consensus to move forward with priorities, I believe that the priorities should be set up in this way:

All are standard in policy	2
Some (3-4) are standard in policy	9
Determined at onset by Board	3
NO ANSWER	0

- What is the alternative / fall back? Without any other recommended direction from the committee, the fall back solution would be to leaving/adjust the policy as-is.

- PARKING LOT:
  - Meeting 2 - Magnet schools/JumpStart/School Choice
  - Meeting 2 - Portables: safety, temporary vs. permanent, health risks
  - Meeting 3 – Timeline - Will be returning to timeline in a later meeting
  - Meeting 3 – Boundary review/consideration of future planned schools (ex HS #14) and timeline as well as multiple reassignments for same homes and construction schedules; noted all pre-planning involved
  - Meeting 4 – Alternative ways/locations to host regional programs
  - Meeting 6 – Standards IV A 3 – include or exclude "and available capacity exists" which was suggested for consideration at end of standard:
    - School attendance area projections are outside the target 80-100% capacity utilization range ***and available capacity exists***
    - Suggested so that boundary review is not imitated when there are schools that need relief, but none with available capacity to take more students
    - Fear that this is too restrictive
  - Meeting 6 – School system should reach out to impacted families; each school and parent should be afforded opportunity to testify *((for public input section of policy))*

- Meeting 7 – How to calculate results of boundary review (scenario testing and excluding those who opt-out of boundary review)
- Meeting 7 – Suggested but not discussed, add "as noted in the IP" to Standards C6

Reminders:

- REMINDER that any consensus and dissenting options will be presented to the Board. Please let the committee Co-chairs, Dan Lubeley and Jennifer Bubenko, know if you want to give a dissenting opinion
- HOMEWORK! Please develop comments/edits and recommended language on the implementation procedures (the end [Board section] of timeline and AAC) and the weighting/priorities to complete Standards IV B.
- **Any recommendation to change language or comments regarding recommended** language for the Policy or the Implementations Procedures that you wish **to be considered need to be submitted to** Daniel_lubebely@hcpss.org and Jennifer_bubenko@hcpss.org
- Please let us know if you want to discuss anything prior to the next meeting.

Schedule:

Dec 18 if possible (Dec 21 at latest) – DUE

- FINAL edits/comments that you want to be considered by the committee
  - IP end of timeline (still highlighted in blue) and AAC
  - Weighting / priorities and Standards IV B
- Any other edits for remaining items
- Prepare for consensus on weights and/or priorities at Dec 22 meeting

Dec 22 – MEETING – TOPIC: Weighting / Standards IV B

- Brief explanation on edits/text proposed
- Consensus on Standards IV B considerations and Weighting and/or priorities

Dec 23 (or before) **– DUE**

- Identify to chairs any areas that you still wish to discuss and provide associated edits

Dec 29 – MEETING on any remaining items

Resources:

Google Drive: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1gtWP3BcP8V9_w9fkTjMsFJuKpCH5Wgrf

- **In the meeting 10 folder:**
  - https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1oi_Juxk0WHK3ukSztRsA1POC4fyb7Dcf?usp=sharing
  - Summary notes from Meeting 10
  - Current Policy mark ups document and IP document
    - START of meeting version (document that we started with at beginning of meeting)
    - END of meeting version (has consensus approval)
  - Timeline (IP text relates to this timeline)
  - Survey results
- All other documents saved through this point in the process are saved in the other Google folders

NOTE: If you cannot attend a meeting, you are welcome to provide feedback to chair(s) between meetings and/or if you are representing an organization, you can send an alternate to cover your organization for the meeting.

If you have any concerns about the meeting notes, please share your concern with the committee chair(s).

Next week's meeting will be on December 22 at 4pm.

Meeting adjourned at 6:14pm.