

Policy 6010 Review Committee – 2020 Review

Meeting 12 on 12/29/20

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 | Attended (video conference) |
| Bradly Siskind, General Resident | Absent |
| Brent Loveless, PTACHC; 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 – subs Missie Baxter and Cathleen Lopez | Absent |
| James Cecil, CAC | Attended (video conference) |
| Jamie Proctor, Teacher | Absent |
| Joseph Allen, Central Office | Absent |
| 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
- Discussion on Standards IV A 3; Standards IV B (standards/weighting/priorities); any outstanding items
- Last scheduled meeting – ending this evening gives us the best chance to stay on the staff/Board review/approval schedule currently planned.

Discussion:

Consensus text is on the attached policy and implementation procedure documents.

- Standards IV. A. 3. – This was the last remaining *parking lot* item that had not yet been addressed or was out of scope.
 - Consensus at a prior meeting on: School attendance area projections are outside the 80-100% capacity utilization range.
 - Discussion
 - A committee member previously recommended adding “***and available capacity exists***” at the end of the item. Suggested so that boundary review is not initiated when there are schools that need relief, but no schools have available capacity to receive more students
 - Consensus on: ***School attendance area projections are outside the 80-100% capacity utilization range and available capacity exists.***
- Standards IV. B. 3. – Continuation of discussion of this section, the standards and the weighting/prioritization

- Introductory paragraph in this section still had a portion that did not have consensus:
 - The Board, Superintendent/designee and the AAC will consider the impact of the following factors when in the review or development of any school attendance area adjustment plan. Capacity utilization will be considered, in addition to these other weighted **facility, community and diversity** factors to the greatest extent possible. It may not be feasible to reconcile each and every school attendance area adjustment with each and every factor.
 - Discussion on a previous recommendation to add “**facility, community and diversity**” which was brought up because the sub header sections were removed based on the committee’s reorganization of this section
 - Discussed the terms facility, community and diversity as well as capacity, stability and equity.
 - Consider including diversity in community
 - Cannot roll diversity into community
 - Consider adding equity to the list
 - Consider removing all three terms if it causes too much confusion or it is too wordy
 - Difference between equality and equity
 - Listed as descriptions, not a comprehensive list
 - All factors/standards are equity concerns
 - Consensus was to exclude the descriptions: The Board, Superintendent/designee and the AAC will consider the impact of the following factors during the review or development of any school attendance area adjustment plan. Capacity utilization will be considered, in addition to these other weighted factors to the greatest extent possible. It may not be feasible to reconcile each and every school attendance area adjustment with each and every factor.
- Introductory paragraph - this section still had a another portion that did not have consensus:
 - Suggestion to add: “**Attendance area adjustment plans are to be developed and evaluated with an analytical approach based on the criteria identified below. The three (or four) essential factors included in Standard B1 must be addressed and carry significant weight. The additional factors listed in Standard B2 must be considered.**”
 - Discussion
 - Consider adding “weighted decision matrix”
 - Is that too prescriptive?
 - If required, would it be too difficult to meet the goal?
 - Consider “statistical approach” or “analytical and measurable approach”
 - Consider using “such as”
 - Consider “and evaluated as a weighted decision matrix or using other possible methodologies”
 - Consider adding “The four essential factors included in Standard B1 must be addressed and carry a majority of the overall weight. The additional factors listed in Standard B2 should also be considered.”
 - Is significant too subjective?
 - Safeguard that the top tier is significant as they are the top priorities
 - The variables are the weights; give a low weight to conditions that are low priority
 - The framework needs to be in place for the weighting system
 - The weights are variable so they can be adjusted as conditions change
 - For the significant conditions – if the combo of the top tier (3 or 4 items) is greater than a certain percent, they become significant

- Safeguard the importance of the top three or four conditions against being diluted with the other conditions
 - Flexibility could erode the entire attempt/intent
 - Additional factors “must” vs “should” be considered
 - Majority means greater than 50%; combined top four should be majority
 - The top four (not only the top three) are to be in top tier
- Consensus: ***“Attendance area adjustment plans are to be developed and evaluated with an analytical approach such as a weighted decision matrix based on the factors identified below. The four essential factors included in Standard B1 must be addressed and carry a majority of the overall weight. The additional factors listed in Standard B2 should also be considered.”***
- Standards IV. B. I. – header
 - Consensus on ***“Essential Factors, listed in priority order”***
- Standards IV. B. I. a. – finalize language
 - Discussion on: Efficient use of available space. ***For example, by maintaining a building’s program capacity utilization between 90% and 100% for as long a period of time as possible.***
 - For as long a period of time as possible is covered in the next item (long range enrollment)
 - What if some are great and others suffering
 - Improve utilization for all schools
 - Consensus on: ***“Efficient use of available space, by maintaining a building’s program capacity utilization between 90% and 100%.”***
- Standards IV. B. I. b1. – finalize language
 - Discussion on: Long-range enrollment, capital plans and capacity needs of school infrastructures (e.g., cafeterias, restrooms and other shared core facilities).
 - Add term “projections” or “trends” after “long-range enrollment” to increase clarity
 - Consensus on: ***“Long-range enrollment projections, capital plans and capacity needs of school infrastructures (e.g., cafeterias, restrooms and other shared core facilities).”***
- Standards IV. B. I. b1. – continue discussion on FARM data and Title I
 - Discussion on ***“Equitable distribution of the socioeconomic composition of the school population as measured by participation in the federal FARMS program. No new school should open with an attendance area that is projected to qualify as a Title I school within TBD and the total number of Title I eligible schools must not increase.”***
 - Need to move each school closer to countywide average
 - Concern about opening new schools at very high percentage of FARM participation
 - Concern about attendance area geography and distance from school
 - School choice options are the next step to address equity which causes lack of stability
 - Opening a school at a high FARM rate and adjusting the boundaries again later, or opening it near the countywide average and not need to adjust the boundaries again soon
 - The number moved/bus service is most important to the students
 - The description of the student interest sounds like it is more related to feed, moving from one level to the next together
 - Consider “Every effort should be given not to open a new school +/- 10% of the current county average.”
 - Consider “New schools should not be opened with a FARM participation rate greater than 10% more or less than the countywide average.”
 - Consider “Every effort should be given to maintain school attendance area FARM participation rates +/- 10% of the current county average.”
 - Consider “School attendance areas that tend to bring FARM participation rates closer to the county average are preferred over those that tend to drive them farther from the average”
 - What about +/- 15% rather than +/-10%

- Does this impact where a new school can be built? School site determination is in Policy 6000.
- Consensus on: ***“Equitable distribution of the socioeconomic composition of the school population as measured by participation in the federal FARMS program. School attendance areas should attempt to bring school FARMS participation rates closer to the county average.”***
- Standards IV. B. II. a. – diversity
 - Discussion on: ***“The diversity of the student population as defined in Policy 1080.”***
 - This consideration replaced “The racial/ethnic composition of the student population.”
 - Consensus on: ***“The diversity of the student population as defined in Policy 1080.”***
- Standards IV. B. II. e. – regional programs
 - Discussion on: Location ***and utilization*** of regional programs, maintaining an equitable distribution of programs across the county.
 - Consensus on: ***“Location and utilization of regional programs, maintaining an equitable distribution of programs across the county.”***
- Standards IV. B. II. c. – frequency of reassignment
 - Discussion on: ***“Frequency with which any one ~~student~~ geographic area is reassigned, making every attempt to not reassign that same geographic area ~~move a student more than once at any school level or the same student more frequently than once every five years.~~”***
 - Concern that the 5 years is too restrictive
 - Once more school level is more flexible
 - Concern that students are locked into school assignments after 6th grade
 - Consensus on: ***“Limit the frequency with which any one geographic area is reassigned, with attempts not to reassign cohorts more than once within a school level.”***

Reminders:

- REMINDER that any consensus and dissenting options will be presented to the Board.
- Currently, NO dissenting opinions have been submitted to the chair(s).
- Please let the committee Co-chairs, Dan Lubeley and Jennifer Bubenko, know if you want to give a dissenting opinion no later than Tuesday, January 12, 2021 (two weeks after the completion of the committee’s work).

Resources:

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

- In the meeting 12 folder:
 - <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/10Pyw1K1SA1p0uS7OMnZ2ld-QlvHd0itt?usp=sharing>
 - Summary notes / marked up Policy/IP documents from Meeting 12
- All other documents saved through this point in the process are saved in the other Google folders

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

Meeting adjourned at 6:47pm.