Policy Committee Meeting
Board Services Conference Room
April 25, 2019
10:00 a.m.

NOTES

COMMITTEE MEETING CALLED TO ORDER 10:04 a.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Member</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Santos</td>
<td>10:04 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Deigaard</td>
<td>10:07 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio Lira</td>
<td>10:04 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Sung</td>
<td>10:04 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Other: Lisa McBride, Attorney, Thompson & Horton

DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR April 25, 2019

Review Notes from Previous Meetings

Minutes were never approved

Trustee Santos: We will review the notes from the previous meeting at the end.

*******************************************************************************
Ms. Santos: I want to go ahead and jump to the 50% policy.

Ms. Sung: She believes Lone Star Governance restricts them to having 3 progress measures, and there are now currently five.

Ms. Deigaard: She is concerned that adding more goals is creating moving targets for administration although she supports making closing the achievement gap as a goal.

Ms. Santos: LSG isn’t perfected, and we need to adjust LSG to best fit the needs of this district. We are still working on this as a policy making body.

Ms. Trinh: Administration is okay with the changes and are aware that the monitoring calendar would change. We will bring forward the new calendar in June.

Ms. Sung: She has concerns with how the goal was written because it is focused just on the gap between the economically and non-economically disadvantaged students. The goal should state, “As measured by the average of the percentage point gaps,” then there should be a list of the 5 groups below that.

Ms. Santos: She missed the last policy committee meeting and now Goal 4 was added, but she is not up for using STAAR for tracking all the data. She feels the universal screener is a “crap” way to drive instruction.

Dr. Lira: What is the simplest way to say all the things to make sure we have all five groups addressed in closing the achievement gap. How do we measure that? The sub groups have been served but haven’t been served effectively. It would be helpful to me if we have a cheat sheet to have a layout of all the goals, progress measures, and constraints listed.

Ms. Sung: I would suggest adding the “average” language and change the progress measure to 1, 2, and 3.
Ms. Santos: Has an issue of using universal screeners because it’s a disconnect.

Ms. Sung: We are already using or doing this because it is a constraint.

Ms. Deigaard: I like the language of “average.” I want to welcome the chief of staff to be closer to them in this work. Are there any gaps we don’t know of that’s not included?

Ms. Trinh: The biggest gap was special education not progressing at a rate we want to see.

Ms. Deigaard: Refugee children would be represented in with English Language Learner children, and we want to make sure we don’t have a blind spot. Average is still a better word for closing the achievement gap. Is there a way to make the language more explicit?

Ms. Santos: We need to worry about kids learning then we are talking about measuring the goals. You all are measuring by DLA and release STAAR. I would respectfully request that teachers look at that DLA so they are working backwards to scaffold the information effectively. DLA’s don’t have to be that detailed and universal screeners aren’t the best way of measuring student progress. Goal progress measures could be based off of a small snapshot, and not a universal screener that costs us millions of dollars.

Ms. Sung: A district wide screener doesn’t necessarily have to be Renaissance.

Dr. Lira: I think it should be researched-based with empirical data.

Ms. Sung: The trade-off with this is the more complicated you make the language with the formula; the less people understand it.

Ms. Deigaard: I’m wondering if we need a correlating constraint that says the achievement gap can’t be closed by performance of either group declining.

Ms. Trinh: This section of Board Policy AE (LOCAL), related to Goal 4, is first reading.
Ms. McBride: You could make this a constraint or the other way, if you recall, AJ gave some examples of deep dive questions that were good goal progress monitoring where you ask the superintendent or administration for their thoughts in placing the goal progress monitoring into context. So you can do it both ways as part of the goal progress monitoring to look at are we achieving this goal by groups of who is doing worse, or by creating a constraint.

Ms. Santos: Let’s get back to P. 7 of 10- 50% goal. It seems like we did better this time around because we met 25% of our discussion for student outcomes. (Trustee Sung stated, this was only if we move the constraint over to the goal.)

Ms. Santos: My only proposal was going to be, “The board shall not spend more than 50% of its time on student outcome related questions to add, if more than 5 % of the board’s time is spent on test or related discussions, that all time be on the 5% shall not count on student outcome related discussion for the purposes of this policy.”

Ms. Sung: Can you talk a little bit about what you mean by tests?

Ms. Deigaard: How would we do that with our progress monitoring? How do we progress monitor when all of these goals are tied to a test? At the last-minute Trustee Sung was looking at the monitoring calendar and determined that STAAR is monitoring a few times but that’s if we are looking at STAAR as the test you are referring to in your amendment.

Ms. Sung: June and August are when STAAR is measured based on the board monitoring calendar.

Ms. Deigaard: With the inputs, there is still a way to have that conversation regarding the data we are being provided. We can ask the non-testing questions within the presentations that are provided to us.

Ms. Santos: I would like a goal around attendance.

Ms. Deigaard: My preference would be to address enrollment and attendance, and I would also like to address the hiring of an LSG coach.
Ms. Santos: I would like to get together and evaluate the goals we already have. I don’t want to continue working on something that I am not vested in. We are going to leave this as is, and we will not make any amendments. If it passes, it passes, if it doesn’t, it doesn’t.

Ms. McBride: It has not passed as a policy.

Ms. Trinh: We will work with whatever has been brought forward. The question is do we wait until June.

Ms. McBride: There is an internal print deadline that we have been trying to be better about meeting and not adding things after.

Ms. Santos: Can we check with Trustee Davila, because this has been back and forth on the back-burner since January, and I would like to move it along.

Ms. Sung: Since we are making requests of administration, could I also ask that the language for Goal 4 be changed to reflect, “the average.”

Ms. Trinh: Would you mind writing something up that captures what you are thinking?

Ms. Sung: Sure, because what I can’t write is the start and end of the goals.

Ms. Trinh: Yes, we will do that but if you can get the other to me.

Dr. Lira: Hold on for one second because I need to speak. My policy committee meetings were not structured where your time and ideas were so limited. The equity portion of the AE (LOCAL) policy has been on the agenda for a long time and I don’t appreciate that. The conservator, we had brought it up to administration, and we were changing the wording from goals to guidelines, which is very different in my opinion.
**Proposed Action Items for AE(Local):**

- Board Policy AE(LOCAL) will move to second reading for the portion of changing the constraint to Goal #4 at the Regular Board Meeting being held on May 9, 2019.
- Equity Portion of AE (LOCAL) will be held for discussion at the next Policy Committee Meeting, following the proposed meeting with Mr. Crabbir of TEA.

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

**BOARD POLICY EL(LOCAL), CHARTER CAMPUS OR PROGRAM**

**Discussion:**

Ms. Santos: I am going to give us some work to do. We will pick up the Educational Philosophy in May. The EL (LOCAL) regarding Charter Campuses policy will be handled by Trustee Deigaard.

Ms. Deigaard: Will administration provide us, for our next policy committee meeting, with recommendations for changing this? Recommendations from administration for revising this so that it has a performance contract element, and also in that performance contract, what is the process for notifying parents that that campus is not going to be under contract with us the next year. There needs to be within our policy what the plan is, if a contract is not going to be renewed, what are we going to do with the kids.

Ms. Santos: There needs to be an October deadline. I don’t want them in the spring semester anymore, and I want that in policy, and along with some type of audit, or financial reporting.

Ms. Deigaard: Finishing what I was saying about the deadlines for families, they need to know if their school might not be an option for the following year in time for them to apply for magnet schools, providing district with time to look at staffing, etc. This should be part of the district’s performance contract indicating here are the goals we expect you to meet for our students.

Ms. Deigaard: Would administration provide some suggested changes to how would we like to change the policy recommendations. It needs to be in our policy what the plan is for enrolling students, preparation for families, and this should be part of the performance contract.

Ms. Santos: We need some sample policies on the educational philosophy and meeting with AJ, so we are good to go when we come back in here
Proposed Action Items for EL (LOCAL):

- This item will be discussed at the next Policy Committee Meeting being held in May.

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

- BOARD POLICY GKD(LOCAL), COMMUNITY RELATIONS: NONSCHOOL USE OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

Discussion:

Ms. Santos: Another thing I feel that needs to be written in policy is the use of our facilities, as far as, “I had a group of students and teachers say that they were being kicked out of gates, because they were hosting a press conference here.” “I don’t ever want our students or our teachers to be kicked out past the gate because that is never a safe thing, so our board room at Hattie Mae White should be accessible to every tax-payer, and I want to make sure our facilities are being utilized in a safe way.”

Proposed Action Items for GKD(LOCAL):

- This item will be discussed at the next Policy Committee Meeting being held in May.

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

Meeting Adjourned: 11:04 a.m.