NOTES

COMMITTEE MEETING CALLED TO ORDER 4:04 p.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sue Deigaard</td>
<td>4:04 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio Lira</td>
<td>4:04 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Sung</td>
<td>4:11 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff: Silvia Trinh, Chief of Staff
Elneita Hutchins Taylor, General Counsel
Vermeille Jones, Director, Board Services
Sherry Williams, Press Secretary

Other: Lisa McBride, Attorney, Thompson & Horton
Dr. Doris Delaney, Conservator

DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR April 4, 2019

Review Notes from Previous Meetings

No changes. Minutes accepted.

- BOARD POLICY AE(LOCAL), EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY
Dr. Lira: Since the minutes have been accepted, we are going to move to AE (LOCAL) Educational Philosophy on page 7 of 10. Trustee Deigaard do you have any concerns or comments on this issue?

Ms. Deigaard: I didn't know we were going to make any more changes.

Ms. McBride: At the last board meeting, there was a motion from the table, at first reading, that this policy be referred back to the committee because Trustee Santos wanted to make an amendment related to the 50% of time on non-student outcome related discussions, if more than 5 minutes were spent on STAAR related discussion, I think she wanted the remainder of time not to count.

Ms. Deigaard: Since she is not here, I propose that we table that until the next Policy Committee Meeting regarding her amendment.

Dr. Lira: There are two amendments. The first was to amend this policy to have 5% discussion on STAAR and 50% discussions on student outcomes, and I amended the amendment to be 10%. My rationale was that we are held accountable for student assessments under Goal 3, which relates to student achievement gaps.

Ms. Deigaard: We have three goals. Goal One is about reading and writing, and is measured by STAAR, Goal Two is global graduates which is college and career readiness. Goal Three is one year of academic growth. So, two of our three goals use STAAR as a measurement. So, the 50% of student outcomes, Dr. Delaney, as it relates to Lone Star Governance, would be a measure on the progress of our three goals and constraints. So, if we want to measure something else it wouldn’t count towards that 50%?

Dr. Delaney: I believe Trustee Santos said any discussion as it related to testing. As I document things as it relates to Lone Star Governance in the minutes, I am going to follow the rules of Lone Star Governance so that proposal goes against it. The board has a right to choose whatever it chooses.

Dr. Lira: This is first reading. right Ms. McBride?

Ms. Deigaard: It was second reading but then the amendment was added, and this was tabled so now we are talking about this amendment.

Dr. Lira: If I understand correctly, it was brought back to the Policy Committee to revise the language to include 10% of the 50% discussion only on the STAAR assessment, and not the other assessments.
Ms. Deigaard: If we are discussing Goal 1.2 today for instance, during the board meeting, how would we have that discussion without talking about STAAR if we limited it to 10%. If we are talking about it for an hour, no more than 10% of that or 6 minutes are spent talking about STAAR, what do we spend the other 54 minutes talking about?

Ms. Sung: Progress measure 1.2, how does the district assess writing, with a STAAR release test?

Ms. Trinh: Yes, in the fall it is a DLA (District Level Assessment) and in the spring it is a STAAR release test.

Ms. Sung: If we went through the monitoring calendar, we could see which of these progress measures and goals are using the STAAR or the release and which of these are using the universal screener or DLA.

Ms. Deigaard: Is she okay if this is other tests and not a STAAR test? Are you okay if this is other tests?

Dr. Lira: Yes, that’s fine.

Ms. Sung: (Checking the monitoring calendar to identify when STAAR data is covered)

Dr. Delaney: So, the purpose of this is to look for ways not to talk about STAAR? Are we trying to comply with what Trustee Santos might want to see or is this in alignment with what the other board members would want to see? Is this the way the board wants presentations to go or is this conversation from the board? Is this regarding conversation, because you all decide what you want to discuss, or is this for information to give to administration so that when they present, they would avoid talking about STAAR? What is the intent? I am concerned that I feel like we are trying to get in Trustee Santos’ head to figure out what she was thinking regarding this amendment.

Dr. Lira: I understand parts of it as our district and our state has over-emphasized testing for our students, and I think Trustee Santos wants to minimize that discussion. I think the more we discuss it and talk about it, we add to that messaging.

Ms. Sung: I think it is good to look at the diverse and multiple indicators that tell the story of what we are looking at. We need to know if we are improving life outcomes for the students as well with some of the additional indicators. I think that looking at the calendar to make sure we are looking at diverse indicators is good so we can make sure students pass tests, but also so that students can have better lives. By going through this calendar, this gives me reassurance that we are looking at diverse indicators in our framework.
Dr. Lira: I have my opinions on this, but I think that some of this reporting is pretty excessive, and I think that we can get the same message across in a more concise fashion. In my opinion, too much time is spent on minute details with certain bars and graphs and lines that are very convoluted when all you have to say is that we decreased by 5% or we increased by 5%. However, if you want to add a lot of time in discussing that, then…

Dr. Delaney: That is board-driven.

Dr. Lira: Policy is only as good as its enforceability. It’s irrelevant if we don’t have enforcement of it to ensure that it happens. Other than that, we are just going around in circles. My opinion is to work on the wording for 10% STAAR discussion, and if Trustee Santos wants to discuss it or add more concerns about it then that is her decision. The reason we are here today is to have that discussion to include that 10% of the 50% related to STAAR discussion. That is my understanding. So, do we move forward with the 10%?

Ms. Deigaard: My suggestion at the beginning of the meeting was to table this one item until the next Policy Committee Meeting when we could have a more robust conversation and include her ideas in it. I also know that when going through our board self-evaluation this week, I noticed that we are piece-milling this. This board has not done its work with intention, and my preference would be for us to do this work in a facilitated way with a Lone Star Governance coach. That way we can move from month-to-month to say where are we trying to go and using that as a road map to get there, and then revise our policy accordingly. My preference would be for us to do the work as a full board with a Lone Star Governance coach to help us work as a board through these conversations.

Dr. Lira: I agree Trustee Deigaard but in all reality, is it practical and is it feasible?

Ms. Deigaard: The board gets the Lone Star Governance coach and the board president schedules out the meetings, and we show up. Trustee Deigaard stated she has talked with President Davila and she is open to the conversation.

Dr. Lira: Has she calendared that type of meeting? I wish I had the level of proficiency that Trustee Sung has but I am not there yet. In terms of student outcomes, I am very familiar with student outcomes. I know what they are, and if you want 50% of student outcomes at every board meeting, just get rid of all the other agenda items, and just discuss student outcomes. It is a very simple solution by deleting the business, the contracts, and the other things at the meetings, and move them to another meeting. Do you want to table this until we can address this?

Ms. Sung: One thing to point out if we look at the monitoring calendar, is that there are only a couple of months where we are discussing STAAR most of the time, and even when we are discussing STAAR, we are also talking about interventions through other programs as well which
isn’t STAAR-focused to me. I think that we would be well under the 10%. One other thing, as we look at this monitoring calendar, is that there are some months where we are spending a lot of time on our Constraint Progress Measure #3, which is closing the achievement gap. The way it is written, it’s about student outcomes but since it is not under our goals it won’t get added into the time for student outcomes. I think it would make sense for someone on this committee to discuss converting Constraint 3 into a goal. The constraint is written like a goal.

Ms. Deigaard: I agree with this being a goal and not a constraint.

Dr. Lira: That will be goal #4.

Dr. Delaney: This is my proposal for that and I totally agree. Let’s hold the change until the Monday meeting so that we can make sure we are doing this correct. I agree that it makes sense to make it a goal.

Ms. Sung: The second thing, which we could talk about Monday, is getting targets set.

Dr. Lira: I say we add that we increase by 3% annually.

Ms. McBride: The goals do have the annual target in them.

**Proposed Action Items for AE(Local):**

- Hold Board Policy AE(LOCAL) for discussion with TEA on Monday, April 8, 2019 to determine next steps with making Constraint 3 into Goal #4.

 **)************************************************************************************************************

- BOARD POLICY BDB(LOCAL), BOARD INTERNAL ORGANIZATION: BOARD COMMITTEES

**Discussion:**

Ms. Sung: We postponed this indefinitely at the last board meeting.
Discussion:

Ms. McBride: Remember BED(LOCAL), you all wanted to re-organize so that the Speakers to Agenda Items and Hearing of Citizens had mirror sub-sections under them about time limit, distribution of materials, etc. There is a section for Speakers to Agenda Items that has its own sub-sections and if you go to Hearing of Citizens, it has its own sub-sections to address specifics. The committee’s preference was that for Hearing of Citizens, it was a maximum of 30 minutes; for Speakers to Agenda Items, it was a maximum of 20 minutes per agenda item. The total time allotment for Hearing of Citizens shall not exceed 30 minutes.

Ms. Deigaard: The idea behind it was for the people who come over and over again to speak about the same thing or about the same topic, month after month, who are signing up for an agenda item but actually speaking about something else. The idea was to dissuade that.

Ms. Sung: Thinks this is a great job, capturing this in words.

Ms. Deigaard: Is there a way to try this, like a trial run, before codifying it into policy?

Ms. McBride: I would be concerned from a legal aspect about giving enough notice to the public about the changes to that meeting.

Dr. Delaney: We are having a chance to do a trial run with agenda items speakers speaking today during Agenda Review.

Ms. Sung: From a teaching perspective, it is easier to learn something if you say that this is what we are committing to, and this is how we are doing things moving forward. So, we need to make it very clear when we tell the public that this is what we are committing to.

Ms. Deigaard: So, we codify in policy and if it doesn’t work or has unintended consequences…

Dr. Lira: We adjust the policy.

Proposed Action Items for BED(LOCAL):
• Submit, with changes discussed, for the April 11, 2019 Board Meeting, for second reading.

***********************************************************************************************************

Meeting Adjourned: 4:50 p.m.