

## **AAC Meeting #4**

### **July 9, 2019**

#### **Attendance**

AAC Members: Heidi Abdelhady, Bessie Bordenave, Justin Carguilo, Frank Eastham, Willie Flowers, Paige Getty, Quiana Holmes, Steven Hunt, 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

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

#### **Meeting Minute Approval (7/9/2019)**

Moved approval of the meeting minutes.

Motion by Frank Eastham, Seconded by Steven Hunt

Final resolution: Motion failed.

Members discussed concern that there was insufficient content regarding Title I conversation. An update will be sent to include additional details. As a point of order, the committee was reminded that meeting minutes are not a transcription and that only those who attended a meeting can vote on those minutes.

The group agreed to an audio record of the 7/9/19 meeting at the request of an AAC member.

#### **Meeting 3 Review**

Mr. Leopold reviewed the agenda, committee deliverable, roles/responsibilities, scope, schedule, student density map, private school student information, a review of prior meetings, categories of input, agreement/disagreement for inputs (countywide/tactical). The AAC members were welcomed to attend Community Input Meetings as individuals.

#### **Finalize Considerations for the Superintendent**

Mr. Leopold introduced Mr. Rogers, who reviewed Wester Elementary School options from the Feasibility study. Mr. Leopold, along with AAC members discussed the benefits and challenges of the Wester Option 1, based on the categories of input, which included the following:

Benefits:

- Does not seem to have unintended consequences.
- Relatively low number of students impacted
- No walkers would require transportation.
- Does not have corresponding middle school changes

Challenges:

- Creates an island
- Concerns about longevity of the plan in the out years when compared to option 2 and Waverley ES continues to be overutilized and who is being moved, will the receiving school have resources to accommodate those students?

Mr. Rogers continued to review Western Option 2. AAC discussed the benefits and challenges of Western Option 2, and included the following

Benefits:

- Longer lasting for more schools involved when compared to Option 1.
- Keeps contiguous boundaries.

Challenges:

- Impacts more students, including middle school changes and students impacted in the 2017/18 process (2017-18 K-2nd graders), which does appear to be not equitable
- Would this still work if those students who were reassigned in 2017/18 (double moves) were permitted to finish at their current school? (This concern can be mitigated by the Board's exemption for the students)
- Available resources to accommodate those students?

Discussion on Policy 6010 and application of the policy towards students impacted and developing boundaries using a lens of equity, fairness and inclusion, that prior moves should be considered as well as student needs impacted by the moves and could the receiving school accommodate their needs occurred.

Discussion on crowded schools are also high FARM participation schools and Title I funding with these students. Concerns discussed on differentiated staffing and resources are not going with the students that need the resources and that making the numbers work is different than meeting the needs of students to meet their academic potential.

Discussion relating to all options shown in Feasibility Study have insignificant or no change to socioeconomic or academic data used in study. Discussion on Study continuing to concentrate poverty in Title I schools and integrating those students with more need into more prosperous schools. Change/diversifying the schools can create positive deviance to change the situation for better outcomes.

Discussion on a massive plan that blends the discussion of capacity with equity and having a combination of island and domino moves could meet demographic and utilization challenges, one that could impact demographics.

Review of Title I resources and that it does not move with individual students. Howard County gets funding for Title I for countywide participation based on total population, regardless of which school the students attend. Individual school boundaries do not impact how much funding Howard County receives. The HCPSS decides how to allocate funding to the schools. Decisions about meeting educational needs of students is up to HCPSS in the budget process and separate than boundary process. Title I school gets more funding. Members reminded each other that Title I conversations only impact elementary school level.

Discussed transitioning students, creating incremental plans (no consensus), burdening one segment of the population over another in terms of islands or domino moves, student identity; segregation; and all other policy factors are to be taken into consideration for equity.

Discussion continued with the Feasibility Study scenarios not changing demographics or using lens of equity. A majority of the AAC members agreed that more students opportunity for a better quality education should exist and that capacity utilization within target gives more students more equal opportunity.

Discussed with AAC members that the Policy 6010 standards are not prioritized, but the group can prioritize the standards. Also discussed when the policy was revised and what revisions occurred (e.g., roles and responsibilities and implementation procedures).

Discussed the Policy Statement includes equity and utilization and the committee needs to decide as a committee a recommendation to the superintendent and what is most important factor.

Discussed that equity needs to be addressed and how it can applied to any scenario, including that the school attendance areas should have quality equitable educational opportunities for all students. AAC members agreed that the boundary process should be a conscious process and do better by the students, not focus on only the details of data, but include these higher values should apply to decisions moving forward.

Discussed that Policy 6010 actually illustrates the focus and specific trigger in process and that it does not mandate that the Board take action that scenarios may achieve one consideration and violate another.

AAC members agreed that equity should be first the first consideration as utilization is balanced at schools and that it is a lens when we adjust boundaries and the goal should be to provide quality and equity, and uphold values. The public will decide what they will do (attend public schools, provide home school, or attend private schools).

Discussed reassigning disadvantaged students out of a school, build an addition and bring in more affluent students (no consensus).

AAC agreed to a consensus that they would not compare the Feasibility Study options as it relates to the county-wide and tactical categories of input and rather revised the countywide considerations of input to add four overarching goals relating to equity and include:

The feasibility study options do not address moving towards balanced demographics within all schools. Assurance is needed to show that student needs will be met in receiving schools. (We acknowledge that this will require a plan that is an order of magnitude larger than the feasibility study options as far as number of students reassigned). Majority agreed, two members abstained.

Consider creating a more specific trigger in the attendance area process that will prompt a boundary change process based on demographic makeup of schools within the system, which will align with Policy 6010. Majority agreed, one member abstained.

The School System needs to act in support of its stated values of equity by making bold decisions for the benefit of all students. Educational attainment should be the priority. The majority agreed, one member abstained.

Analyze the stated goal of the feasibility study. The current tendency seems to be focused on capacity and utilization and a “do no harm” mentality on other parameters like equity. Majority agreed, three members abstained.

#### **Remaining categories of input (Future Improvements & Out of Scope)**

Mr. Leopold reminded the AAC of the two other considerations of input, and asked for additional input. None were noted. Mr. Leopold indicated that the AAC will receive after this evening the revised categories of input, based on the evening’s discussion; revised July 2, 2019 meeting minutes and draft July 9, 2019 minutes; and a post-process survey. Mr. Leopold thanked the committee for the work completed.

Meeting adjourned 8:08 p.m.