Policy 6010 Review Committee – 2020 Review
Meeting 11 on 12/22/20

Began meeting at 4:14pm 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	Absent
Brent Loveless, PTACHC; Meg Ricks	Meg Ricks - Attended (video conference)
Camille Young, HCASC	Absent
Cathy Datz, General Resident	Absent
Colleen Morris, HCEA	Absent
Cynthia Fikes, NAACP	Attended (video conference)
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 29; encouraged to provide input between meetings
        - **Please send any EDITS that you wish to be considered in the Dec. 29 meeting to Chairs by December 28**
    - If we complete committee work in December, we might be able to stay on track for Board approval in May.
- Discussion on Implementation Procedures (completion of timeline and AAC) and Standards IV B (standards/weighting/priorities)f

Discussion:

**EDITS and notes also included on attached policy and implementation procedure documents*

- Implementation Procedures – Timeline
    - J – reworded to indicate one or more public hearing/work session (rather than 1) and added "may" instruct staff to develop alternative plans.
    - Noted text in introduction on IP regarding timing/sequence needing to be altered as needed
    - L – reworded suggested text to be more specific
    - Consensus on: J, Ja, Jb, L
    - Document formatting to be updated at the end of the committee's work
- Implementation Procedures – AAC

    - No changes to this section
- Standards IVB
    - In the last meeting, some members supported the weighting and others indicated that they may support weighting with more information
    - Added text about analytical approach for consideration by committee.
    - Committee members supported text about analytical approach
    - There was suggested order of priorities / weighting provided supporting the student perspective
    - There was a priority listing provided by small group work earlier during this process
    - Looking for a full weighting system or the intent?
        - Weighting – analytical way to develop and compare plans
        - Full weighting system beyond the capability of the committee right now
        - Too strict/rigid policy considerations can have unintended consequences and there is not time to develop a full system right now
        - Perhaps provide guidance for the school system to seek out university or consultant guidance
        - Each boundary review is unique and should not make the conditions too rigid
        - Raise up the top 3-4 priorities
        - Board will be indicating their reasoning and intent for initiating boundary review at onset of process
        - Consider weighting like looking at each of the grades for the seven courses, or a course grade being made up of (example) 25% term paper, 25% homework and 50% final test.
        - Now, people can use any of the standards as equal
        - Consider impact on number of students and depth of impact (ex utilization, FARM)
        - If the priority list is used, and has no weights, it is no different than the list now
        - Using a weighted system, is to say what we stand for. Identity the top 3 and have the others have latitude
        - Plans exist from prior years with merit that were not used; Data and plans are made available
        - Safeguard the most important considerations, make sure that they are protected
        - Last time the Board wasn't able to figure things out in real time
    - What is the intent of the weighted system? Look at the text about analytical approach. What is next? The policy is intent, the IP is implementation, and the operations of the school system are to figure out how to implement.
    - Two break out groups discussed options and reported out. Results were quite similar.
        - Raise up 3-4 standards as priority, to be addressed, non-negotiable
            - Those standards in priority order, with significant weight
        - Other standards to be considered
        - Possible a tiered approach – top priority tier, then other tier(s)
        - Reminder to look at the student member submitted recommendations of priorities and take them into account when setting the list.

- PARKING LOT:
    - Meeting 2 - Magnet schools/JumpStart/School Choice ((out of scope))
    - Meeting 2 - Portables: safety, temporary vs. permanent, health risks ((out of scope))
    - 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 ((out of scope))
    - 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
    - Meeting 11 – Consider training on AAC code of contact for social media

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
        - Weighting/priorities to complete Standards IV B.
        - Any other text still noted in blue highlight in the working policy document
- **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 28 – DUE

- FINAL edits/comments that you want to be considered by the committee
- Prepare for consensus on weights and/or priorities at Dec 29 meeting

Dec 29 – MEETING on any remaining items

Resources:

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

- **In the meeting 11 folder:**
    - https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ZCxoIWfEhSbfjNfmzbmpfvwn3ZtVr_76?usp=sharing
    - Summary notes from Meeting 11
    - Current Policy mark ups document and IP document; survey results; timeline; weighting notes; homework on weights
- 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 29 at 4pm.

Meeting adjourned at 6:00pm.