



**COOPERATIVE
STRATEGIES**

COMPLETE FINANCIAL & DEMOGRAPHIC PLANNING FOR EDUCATION

HOWARD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

ATTENDANCE BOUNDARY PROCESS: ATTENDANCE AREA COMMITTEE DRAFT REPORT

AUGUST 10, 2019

PREPARED FOR:

Howard County Public School System

10910 Clarksville Pike

Ellicott City, MD 21042

T 410.313.6600

PREPARED BY:

Cooperative Strategies

3325 Hilliard Rome Road

Hilliard, OH 43026

T 614.798.8828

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Consensus Building.....	1
Majority Opinion.....	4
Minority Opinion	4
Recurring Concerns.....	4
Future Process Improvements.....	5
Appendix A: AAC Meeting Minutes.....	6
Meeting #1: June 18, 2019	6
Meeting #2: June 25, 2019	11
Meeting #3: July 2, 2019 (DRAFT).....	14
Meeting #4: July 7, 2019 (DRAFT).....	19

INTRODUCTION

In June of 2019, the Howard County Public School System [HCPSS] contracted with Cooperative Strategies to facilitate the attendance area process following the release of the 2019 Feasibility study on June 13. One of the first components of this process is the Attendance Area Committee [AAC].

The 2019 AAC process differed significantly when compared to previous boundary review processes due to changes in policy. The 2019 AAC did not develop an attendance area scenario nor solicit public input. The scope was limited to providing feedback to the Superintendent on the feasibility study, based on Policy 6010.

The AAC was composed of thirteen members, which were appointed by the superintendent. The value that the committee added was exemplified by diversity and the objectivity of the members.

The committee convened in June and July of 2019 for a total of four times. The outline of meetings can be found in the table below:

Meeting	Topics
Meeting #1: 6/18 at Atholton HS	Introduction, Process Overview, Feasibility Study Presentation, Q & A.
Meeting #2: 6/25 at Atholton HS	Island vs. Domino moves, frequency and extent of processes, rezoning vs. portables
Meeting #3: 7/2 at Atholton HS	Title I, consensus building
Meeting #4: 7/9 at Atholton HS	Continuation of Title I discussion, consensus building

Consensus Building

Throughout meetings three and four, the committee spent time developing consensus around several topics. The committee provided input on the word that was used to describe each concept and role was taken to understand the level of support on these issues. The tables on the following pages show the results of these discussions.

Consensus Building

Concept	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
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." (As indicated in Policy 6010.)			
Additional Ideas:			
• Consider needs over comfort.	9	1	0
• Strive to increase parent involvement			
• Insure students are not singled out in moves.			
Define first filter: What is the effect on equity that this move will have?			
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	10	0	0
Keep walkers as walkers whenever possible	10	0	0
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	10	0	0
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.	10	0	2
(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)			

Consensus Building (Continued)

Concept	Agree	Disagree	Abstain
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	11	0	1
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.	11	0	1
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.	9	0	3
Islands are acceptable, but it depends...:			
Consider the following factors:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	10	0	0
Domino moves are acceptable, but it depends:			
Consider the following factors:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	10	0	0
All things being equal, consider Domino over Island	5	4	1
All things being equal, consider Island over Domino	4	4	2

Majority Opinion

The majority of the AAC discussion centered on the current socio-economic imbalance with the current attendance boundary configuration. Although Policy 6010 does not explicitly define socio-economic imbalance as a trigger for a boundary review process, the majority of committee concluded that the current imbalance was an important issue and that the options presented in feasibility study did not address this standard. There was also in-depth discussion and concern about the effectiveness of the Title I program and the efficacy of centralizing Title I resources among 13 elementary schools.

The general sentiment of the committee was that an effort to balance the socio-economics of all boundaries is needed. If this is not possible in a single boundary change process, at the very least, changes should work towards that goal incrementally.

Minority Opinion

While socio-economic equity is an important factor, it should not be attained at expense of all other policy considerations.

Recurring Concerns:

- There was no representative of the Free And Reduced-price Meals (FARM) segment of the community on the committee. However, it should be noted that each of the committee members were tasked with considering the needs of all students.
- The committee continually requested longitudinal data around the effectiveness of Title I funding. There was concern around students receiving Title I services should they be reassigned to a non-Title I school.

Future Process Improvements

- The timeline was compressed - allow two weeks between each AAC meeting.
- Provide more information around the intent of the feasibility study (e.g. balancing utilization while minimizing number of students reassigned).
- Consider clarifying Policy 6010 to explicitly define socio-economic imbalance as a trigger for a boundary-change process.
- Provide longitudinal data around educational outcomes relative to rezoning (e.g. Does rezoning students directly impact their pathway to success?).
- In the feasibility study, provide more data around areas that were moved in previous processes.

APPENDIX A – AAC Meeting Minutes

AAC Meeting #1 Minutes

June 18, 2019

Attendance

AAC Members: Bessie Bordenave, Susan Otradovec, Heidi Abdelhady, Justin Carguilo, Larry Walker, Leonardo McClarty, Lisa Schlossnagle, Paige Getty, Quiana Holmes, Steven Hunt, Suleman Malik, Willie Flowers

HCPSS Staff: Anissa Brown Dennis, Scott Washington, Renee Kamen, Tim Rogers, Jennifer Bubenko

Cooperative Strategies (Consultant): Alex Boyer, Scott Leopold

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

Introductions

Opening remarks were given by Mr. Scott Washington Director, Capital Planning and Construction. Mr. Washington introduced Mr. Scott Leopold, Cooperative Strategies.

Mr. Leopold spoke of the meeting's agenda, and asked for each member to introduce themselves and how they are affiliated with the school system.

Roles & Responsibilities

Mr. Leopold discussed the roles and responsibilities for the committee members and that this group will not be creating scenarios, and the role is strictly advisory for the Superintendent's consideration.

Legal presentation

Mr. Mark Blom, HCPSS General Counsel, notified the AAC was subject to the sunshine laws, the Maryland Open Meetings Act and the Maryland Public Information Act. HCPSS staff will post agendas, provide notice of the meetings, hold the meetings in public places, write minutes for the committee to approve to follow the Open Meetings Act. Mr. Blom also informed them that comments, work, emails, documents from the committee were subject to an open record request. He also mentioned that when the school system responds to a public information request, the response would be published on the school system's website.

APPENDIX A – AAC Meeting Minutes

Scope

Mr. Leopold reviewed the scope of the committee. Deliverables would be as follows:

Audit of the feasibility study recommendations to the Superintendent

Read and audit the feasibility study and provide feedback to the Superintendent

Scenarios will not be created

Receiving/reviewing public input will not occur

Schedule

The group reviewed the full schedule of AAC meetings and the boundary review process. It was noted the final decision on any changes in boundaries would be made by the Board of Education in November.

Policy 6010

Mr. Leopold reviewed Policy 6010 School Attendance Areas, which defines the Board, Superintendent/Designee, and AAC roles in the process. The standards for considering the boundary studies were discussed as well as the standards for how the AAC would review the Feasibility Study.

Feasibility Study

Mr. Tim Rogers, School Planning Analyst discussed the plan alternatives in the Feasibility Study. Large maps would be provided to AAC members at the next meeting. An overview of each option was given, and included the following:

Western ES Option #1

- Reassigning polygon 304 (a portion of Turf Valley) to Bushy Park ES
- Bushy Park ES has the most capacity in this area
- West Friendship ES & St. Johns Lane ES are crowded and need relief

Western ES Option #2

- More movement than the first option and includes associated middle school moves
- No island in this options
- Moving students from West Friendship ES to Waverly ES
- Move students from Triadelphia Ridge ES to Bushy Park ES
- Relieve crowding by moving from St. Johns Lane ES to Manor Woods ES

APPENDIX A—AAC Meeting Minutes

Southwestern ES #1

- Reassign 3 polygons from Pointers Run ES to Clarksville ES

Southwestern ES #2

- A little bit more of a move for this option but uses the capacity at Bushy Park ES
- This option creates an island

Southwestern ES #3

- Smallest move of these three elementary options
- Tradeoff is it does not provide all of the relief for Pointers Run ES, but it would continue to be crowded

Columbia Option #1

- Bryant Woods ES is projected to be crowded
- All schools in this area have received additions
- Clemens Crossing ES to Swansfield ES
- Then moving some students from Bryant Woods ES to Clements Crossing ES
- Any moves in this area require middle schools moves to balance out enrollment

Columbia Option #2

- Scaled back a little from option one
- Different way to balance middle school fields, a little larger than the first option
- Some areas moved from one walking zone are actually close enough that they are walkable to the school they are being reassigned

Columbia Option #3

- More reserved option of the three for this area
- This leaves Clemens Crossing ES a little higher than the other options

High School Option #1

- Reassigns approximately 2,500 students
- Idea is to relieve crowding
- Utilizing capacity in the western part of the county
- No option moves all high schools into board policy for target utilization, there isn't enough capacity in the county to do so.
- Associated middle school feeds to align to this option, about 300 students impacted

APPENDIX A – AAC Meeting Minutes

High School Option #2

- Reassigns approximately 1,500 students
- Leaving more high schools overcrowded, especially in the east
- Less movement of students in this option
- Associated middle school feeds to align to this option, about 150 students impacted

Comprehensive Boundary Option

- Example of a full boundary scenario for all three levels

In response to committee questions, the following responses were provided:

- All AAC committee members are to represent all student needs and interests such as Free & Reduced-Priced Meal (FARM).
- Information from the County Government will be provided to the committee through HCPSS staff.
- Information regarding resources provided in the PowerPoint is available on the HCPSS website.
- Data on students who attend private school is not available at this time, but the committee could use Census data to approximate the information at the county level. Information from the Census could not be distributed to the polygon or school level.
- Discussion on data on the impact of educational outcomes post boundary changes (ex. islands vs small feeds) occurred.
- Discussion on feeder information and boundary islands
- Discussion on data collection regarding traffic conditions (e.g., accident data or time traveled) involved.
- Discussion on data collection on new development (by-school and by-polygon) to show growth patterns by school from five years.
- Discussion on data collection/projection of demographic data in relation to ELL and FARM for trends in participation.
- Discussion of Feasibility Study options order. The current Feasibility Study does not have recommendations, just alternative options to start the discussion.
- Discussion on what a polygon is and how to interpret the maps in the Feasibility Study.
- Discussion on the impacts of middle schools moves to capacity utilization for the Columbia options.
- Discussion on high school enrollment and seat-need and who determines capacity.
- Discussion on the enrollment projection being a geographic projection plus the addition of transfers, including homeless population.

APPENDIX A – AAC Meeting Minutes

- Discussion of the deliverable for the AAC to produce. Productive feedback, concerns, and themes relative to policy to the Superintendent for his preparation for a recommendation to the Board.
- Discussion on the definition non-transported students or walk zone.
- Discussion on Board considerations on exemptions according to the Policy and past practices.

Closing remarks from Mr. Scott Leopold included acknowledgement of data and mapping requests for the next meeting. He indicated that if any questions arise between meetings, please email Ms. Bubenko. A compilation of the questions would be provided to the committee.

Adjournment: By consensus, the AAC meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

DRAFT

APPENDIX A – AAC Meeting Minutes

AAC Meeting #2 Minutes

June 25, 2019

Attendance

AAC Members: Heidi Abdelhady (arrived late), Bessie Bordenave, Frank Eastham, Willie Flowers, Paige Getty, Steven Hunt, Leonardo McClarty, Lisa Schlossnagle, Larry Walker, Suleman Malik, Susan Otradovec

HCPSS Staff: Anissa Brown Dennis, Scott Washington, Renee Kamen, Jennifer Bubenko
Cooperative Strategies (Consultant): Galina Kostiv, Scott Leopold

Mr. Scott Washington called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

Welcome

Opening remarks were given by Mr. Scott Washington Director, Capital Planning and Construction. Mr. Washington introduced Mr. Scott Leopold, Cooperative Strategies.

Meeting Minute Approval (6/18/2019)

Move approval of the meeting minutes, as revised.

Motion by Willie Flowers, Seconded by Leonardo McClarty

Final resolution: Motion carries

Yea: Bessie Bordenave, Frank Eastham, Willie Flowers, Paige Getty, Steven Hunt, Leonardo McClarty, Lisa Schlossnagle, Larry Walker, Suleman Malik, Susan Otradovec

Committee Deliverable (Scott went over this slide in PPT)

Mr. Leopold discussed the committee objectives, and deliverables, which include discussion on high-level, higher-concepts/feedback to the Superintendent. An example was given. In turn, these high-level concepts would be applied to the Feasibility Study, and a report to the Superintendent.

Meeting 1 Review/Questions

Mr. Leopold reviewed roles and responsibilities of the committee, the scope of the review, schedule, policy, and resources.

Discussion of Title I funding allocation at the countywide level and distribution of funds to eligible schools.

APPENDIX A – AAC Meeting Minutes

Discussion of representation of Free and Reduced-Priced meal population.

Discussion on demographic data and ability to project this data as well as accuracy on the data post-boundary study.

Discussion on why Census data is not used in boundary studies and differences in data collection.

Discussion on the last boundary change process, and policy regarding frequency of a boundary process and standards used to determine the considerations of when a boundary review is prompted versus the standards used to study scenarios in Policy 6010.

Discussion on student density in the last ten years and potential factors of student density changes, potential community anxieties, effect on socioeconomics/demographic populations and staffing allocations.

Discussion on countywide private school enrollment versus HCPSS enrollment growth and comparability to other local jurisdictions.

Discussion

Mr. Leopold introduced higher-level philosophical questions surrounding the boundary review process. The discussion encompassed three topics:

- Non-contiguous islands versus “domino” moves.
- Boundary changes be less frequent and more extensive or more frequent and less extensive.
- Students reassigned to permanent space or stay in a relocatable.

Discussion on “islands” versus “domino” moves included past practices, effects on educational outcomes, personal goals (e.g., equity, costs) other standards in the policy and consideration of Title I Funding, as well as the supports from the school system on transition between schools, after a boundary is changed.

Discussion on whether boundary changes be less frequent and more extensive or more frequent and less extensive occurred and included additional capacity and strategic changes in the interim, the master plan process in the county and schools, state funding criteria for new schools, and renovations/additions, building schools before need, and other factors being considered based on policy.

APPENDIX A – AAC Meeting Minutes

Discussion on whether considerations on student reassigned to permanent space or stay if relocatable classrooms can “contain” the growth, which included stresses on core capacity, alternative days for students, student experiences and should boundary reviews only occur when new capacity is introduced.

Future Meeting (July 2)

Mr. Leopold discussed with the AAC the homework for the next meeting, which includes reflecting on the conversations of this evening for consensus building.

Discussion on whether a study has been done on the effects of student generation rates for Section 8 housing on the school system, which expanded on how population projections are completed by attendance area at the various housing types.

Adjournment: By consensus, the AAC meeting was adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

APPENDIX A – AAC Meeting Minutes

AAC Meeting #3 (DRAFT)

July 2, 2019

Attendance

AAC Members: Heidi Abdelhady, Justin 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, Justin 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).

APPENDIX A – AAC Meeting Minutes

Discussed educational supports for students not in Title I schools, or if a student is re-assigned 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).

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:

APPENDIX A—AAC Meeting Minutes

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 rela-

APPENDIX A—AAC Meeting Minutes

tion 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:

APPENDIX A – AAC Meeting Minutes

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.

APPENDIX A – AAC Meeting Minutes

AAC Meeting #4 (DRAFT)

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

APPENDIX A—AAC Meeting Minutes

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 Wester 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 de-

APPENDIX A – AAC Meeting Minutes

veloping 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

APPENDIX A—AAC Meeting Minutes

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

APPENDIX A – AAC Meeting Minutes

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.