

AAC Meeting #3 July 2, 2019

Attendance

AAC Members: Heidi Abdelhady, Justing Carguilo, Frank Eastham, Willie Flowers, Quiana Holmes, Steven Hunt, Leonardo McClarty, Larry Walker, Suleman Malik, Susan Otradovec

HCPSS Staff: Scott Washington, Renee Kamen, Tim Rogers, Lisa Davis, Julie Knaur, Amy Tieperman
Cooperative Strategies (Consultant): Alex Boyer, Scott Leopold

Mr. Scott Washington called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Meeting Minute Approval (6/25/2019)

Move approval of the meeting minutes.

Motion by Steven Hunt, Seconded by Quiana Holmes

Final resolution: Motion carries

Yea: Heidi Abdelhady, Justing Carguilo, Frank Eastham, Willie Flowers, Quiana Holmes, Steven Hunt, Leonardo McClarty, Larry Walker, Suleman Malik, Susan Otradovec

Title I Presentation

Mr. Leopold introduced staff from the Howard County Public School System's (HCPSS) Title I staff, Ms. Tieperman and Ms. Knaur. Discussed what is Title I, when it started and its purpose. They informed the group on funding allocations by the Federal government (based on Census data) to each state. They discussed the AAC that Maryland does a similar process to distribute the money to the school districts; however, HCPSS ranks school by Free and Reduced-Price Meal participation to designation of Title I schools, similar to other school districts.

Discussed difference between a Title I "targeted assisted" and "school-wide" school that included how Title I funds can be used based on the school's designation (e.g., funds can only be used for a select group of students vs funds used school-wide to enhance any program or school activity).-

Discussed educational supports for students not in Title I schools, or if a student is reassigned to a school without Title I status. The supports not from Title I funding are funded through county dollars, include reading and math interventions as examples.

Discussed the origin of 40% as a threshold to measure when a school receives (Federal law) Title I funding and what occurs if, through a boundary change. Discussion included Title I staff studying how much money allocated at a school and the effectiveness of the allocation on the programming for that school (i.e., does spreading the money to more schools as effective as concentrating to a few).-

Discussed what measurements are in place to measure the success of targeted assisted school versus school-wide Title I programs and whether the current Title I programs work in terms of getting students ready to succeed. There are no current measurements in place; although much data exists and it is difficult to sample.

Discussed concerns of AAC regarding jeopardizing Title I funds post-boundary adjustment, and concluded with County will continue to receive funds. Discussed that Title I money does not follow individual students, rather, Title I money would continue to be allocated by the Federal government, distributed to the State level, and the State would continue to allocate funding to Howard County. Change in Title I status or whether a school is designated a school-wide or targeted assistance Title I could occur after a boundary change (example is Ducketts Lane ES).

~~Discussed Title I status after a boundary decision by Board, how decisions are made in determining which schools become Title I, how money is allocated by school.~~

~~Discussed how much money the schools would actually get versus how much would be effective.~~

~~Discussed what happens to schools that are above 40% threshold that may be lower if a boundary change occurs.~~

Meeting 2/Consensus

Mr. Scott Leopold, Cooperative Strategies briefly reviewed the AAC scope and June 25 discussion points. Categories of input were introduced: 1) maintains a countywide view; 2) tactical view; 3) future improvements; 4) concerns that are out of AAC scope.

Countywide View, applies to all options. Consensus was taken for each statement. Discussion on the following topics occurred:

- 1) Use lens of equity as the driving factor for any boundary adjustment. Consider the students with the greatest needs. "Because the impact of change may be harder on students with need."

Majority of AAC members accepted language regarding overarching principal in the boundary review:

Minority Opinion: Use of "the" before words "driving factor"

Discussion on not placing the burden on the back of students with the most need; Policy 6010 standards; and providing resources students need in each facility to succeed rather than just balancing capacity.

- 2) Make more extensive reassignments less frequently (rather than smaller adjustments more frequently) if results (target utilization, etc.) can be maintained longer; more productive use of buildings and less anxiety for parents annually.

All AAC members came to consensus on "make more extensive reassignments less frequently." No discussion occurred.

- 3) Keep walkers walking whenever possible.

All AAC members came to consensus on “keep walkers walking whenever possible.” No discussion occurred.

- 4) Temporary use of relocatables is understood to provide immediate (short-term) need for space, but permanent use of relocatables in place of boundary line adjustments is not acceptable

All members came to consensus on temporary use of relocatable classrooms. Change wording to short term.

Discussion on adding the word “short-term” to immediate; 10-year capital budget in relation to a relocatable classroom program and availability of funding to provide permanent classroom space occurred.

Discussion on tactical view of boundary reviews. Consensus was taken for each statement. Discussion on the following topics occurred:

- 1) Islands are acceptable, but it depends

Consider the following factors:

- Focus on areas that are not walkable to any school.
- Do not create low percentage feeders, consider vertical feeder alignment.
- Ensure that travel times are reasonable, consider express routes for island zones.
- Keep neighborhoods together

Discussion on island moves occurred. All AAC members came to a consensus on islands being acceptable, depending on other Policy factors.

- 2) Domino moves are acceptable, but it depends:

Consider the following factors:

- Ensure that walkable areas stay walkable.
- Do not create low percentage feeds, consider vertical feeder alignment.
- Due to the higher impact of the change, consider longevity of impacts.

Discussion on the impacts of domino occurred and relationship to equity, self-segregation and poverty concentration.

All AAC members came to a consensus on islands being acceptable, depending on other Policy factors.

Discussion occurred on a preference of one tactical concept over another (domino moves versus islands). Two new tactical views were added through this discussion:

- 3) All things being equal, consider Domino over Island.

Majority of AAC agreed with this statement, but minority did not, and one member abstained.

4) All things being equal, consider Island over Domino.

No majority of the AAC agreed with this statement, and two members abstained.

Feasibility Study Review

Mr. Leopold directed the AAC to the review of the Feasibility Study, and applying the results of the consensus above to the options provided in the Feasibility Study.

Discussion on Western ES Option #1, occurred. The main idea of this option was to access capacity at Bushy Park ES relieve Waverly ES and West Friendship ES.

Discussion on housing, projections, tradeoffs of reassignment and impacts on socioeconomic data occurred.

Next Meeting

Mr. Leopold addressed remaining AAC comments and instructed the AAC to review the Feasibility Study options as it relates to the countywide and tactical views discussed.

Meeting adjourned 8:05 p.m.