

## **Policy Meeting April 28, 2010:**

All BOE members were present except for Mr. Tedesco, who apparently had a minor medical procedure. Media Present- Shae Crisson, Dan Bowen, wral.com man, Keung Hui was not there; Diana Bader texted him, and Ray Martin arrived for the N&O. Others Present- Anne Cooper, Diana Bader, Amy Lee, Amy Kurz, Louise Lee, Amy Womble Debra Goldman brought the meeting to order. After reading and approving the last meeting's minutes, the committee discussed new policies related to Public Comment. Ms. Goldman said that the BOE hadn't had formal policies in place previously and that it would be helpful for people to know the rules. The order of some of the components of this policy was changed. (We have copies of the rules that can be shared, if desired.) The board talked about the need to develop an online signup process.

Ms. Goldman said that "we" have allotted enough time to make this a workshop on 6200. (Reportedly, this was announced to others in advance so that they could bring their materials.) Dr. McLaurin asked if other members wanted to study the Wake Ed Partnership Report "since assignment is related to achievement." Dr. McLaurin mentioned that Mr. Tedesco had mentioned ways to look at kids in different ways than nodes/F&R numbers.

When asked if they had read the Wake Ed report, Ms. Goldman said that she had skimmed it. Others majority members did not appear to have read it. Dr. McLaurin discussed elements of the April 23 Wake Ed Partnership Report. She mentioned that we could create demographic clusters similar to what Mr. Tedesco suggested but that we needed other ways to measure challenged children. She mentioned that the report suggested looking at the parents' educational background as well as identifying children from

single parent homes. Dr. McLaurin again stated that if we want to change the assignment policy and not create all challenged schools that we needed other measurements.

Mr. Margiotta then stated that the problem is where the schools are located.

Ms. Goldman said that “we have to work with what we’ve got and move forward.”

Dr. McLaurin again asked if there were not a different way to avoid creating challenged schools.

Mr. Margiotta replied that it was not the intent to create such schools.

Mr. Malone and Ms. Goldman ( and their other BOE members) said that this issue shouldn’t be addressed in assignment.

Dr. McLaurin then stated that assignment policies can affect achievement.

Mr. Margiotta stated that we are losing high-income kids to private schools.

Ms. Goldman said that if we have a choice model, people will apply to different schools. She stated that we have a Student Achievement Committee- that we don’t want this as part of Policy. She reminded the committee that the Student Assignment policy should be in line with the “directive.”

Dr. McLaurin said that her understanding about schools of choice was that they tended to resegregate.

Mrs. Prickett then made some points (which we had trouble following) about Robeson County having all Title 1 schools.

Dr. Morrison seemed to question whether Mrs. Prickett felt this was a good

thing. Dr. Morrison said that she was from Robeson County and that we are fortunate that Wake County is not in this situation.

Mr. Sutton then stated that policy needs to drive the assignment committee.

Mrs. Prickett then said that she would like for students who qualify for Title 1 to get the services (are they not doing so?).

Ms. Goldman reminded committee members that at the last meeting she had talked about the need to connect the directive and 6200 and the voluntary desegregation plan. She said that the directive does not need to be part of the Student Assignment Policy.

Mr. Sutton said that the policy should be the overarching framework.

Mr. Malone said that “we have an overarching directive” and that we are trying to connect communities through neighborhoods.

Ms. Goldman then asked Dr. McLaurin , “You asked how to include low performing?”

Mrs. Prickett said that we can't use EOG's as a measure b/c that is too narrow and “just an NC test.”

Speaking to Dr. McLaurin, Mrs. Prickett said that “I like hearing you say to ‘look at the whole child’. That’s why we have social workers, etc.”

Dr. McLaurin stated that her point was that we should address children who are challenged in some way- mentioned limited English proficiency, special ed, and those with poor EOG scores.

Ms. Goldman said that perhaps we could say "student performance below grade level."

Mrs. Prickett interjected that she didn't think this policy should address

achievement.

Mr. Margiotta asked, " Are we helping through an assignment policy or a student achievement policy?"

Mrs. Prickett then stated that she had seen AG kids fall through the cracks and that "we could all be in a higher needs category" at some time.

Mr. Malone then said, "I tell you what. I'm ready to make a motion."

Mr. Malone stated that he would like to make a motion regarding part G of Policy 6200, which included limited English proficiency students as well as those receiving special education services (but did not include any measure of poor performing students).

Dr. McLaurin said, "when you identify those two groups only, you are EXCLUDING other high needs kids."

Mrs. Prickett said that if a statement sounded too exclusive (in reference to attempts to identify poor performing students) that it should just be left out.

Ms. Goldman told Dr. McLaurin that she was looking for less limiting wording.

Dr. McLaurin replied that such wording could not be left out- that her point was about students with higher needs.

Ms. Goldman then asked Dr. McLaurin what she thought about listing limited English proficiency, the required special ed students, and then those who performed below grade level.

Dr. McLaurin appealed to Dr. Hargens for help. Dr. Hargens said that this is policy not R&P and that below grade level could mean different things. She said that we could put more specifics in R&P.

Dr. McLaurin once again asserted that we needed to avoid too many

challenging children in a school. She proposed an amendment that addressed students with limited English proficiency, special ed students, and those below grade level.

Mrs. Prickett said that "below grade level" is too out there.

Mr. Margiotta again stated that we don't want this in an assignment policy.

Again, Dr. McLaurin said that assignment affects student achievement.

Mrs. Prickett replied that the policy was well written (by Ms. Goldman) and that it doesn't need change.

Mr. Sutton then asked, "what about working together and collaboration? we need to take others' considerations."

To that, Mrs. Prickett replied that she didn't think this had to do with personalities, that it was really good for the students to have stability.

Mr. Sutton asked, "you said that performance below grade level is 'out there'?"

He asked if NCLB covered that -implying that we should as well.

At that point, Mrs. Prickett, Ms. Goldman, and Mr. Malone quickly jumped on that idea.

Mrs. Prickett said that we want to be fair and that EVAAS will help.

Mr. Sutton said that this wouldn't fly on Tuesday based on our own policies.

Mr. Margiotta then suggested changing the wording of Policy 6200 from "will" to "every effort will be made." (at every use of "will" throughout the

policy")

Mr. Sutton asked, "what about the really poor kids?"

Mrs. Prickett said, "what do you mean by poor? someone who has lost their job?"

The conversation steered back to Policy wording with Ms. Goldman offering an amendment to change the "wills" to "shoulds."

Dr. McLaurin agreed with "should" and again asked if they would address the poorest children.

Mr. Hill said that Mr. Tedesco had stated last Friday (at the zone model meeting) that where kids go to school affects achievement. There was a moment of silence.

Ms. Goldman pointed out that the old draft of Policy 6200 was about "healthy schools" and that the new draft was about "helping students." She wants to address individual students.

She added that we have NCLB to address problems if we have system wide problems over the years.

She said that her draft talked about "individual students" as opposed to the existing policy, which addresses "populations of students."

To that Dr. McLaurin asked, "So you become a Title 1 school and you can choose to move out." She asked Dr. Hargens how many students elect to leave a school under NCLB, to which she replied, "only a small number." Dr. McLaurin pointed out that those who choose to leave are the more successful ones.

Once again Dr. McLaurin asserted that how we assign students can make a difference and that to choose to ignore achievement when assigning students is a big mistake and that it is neglecting a big part of their

responsibility to the system.

Ms. Goldman then said that changing assignment doesn't solve problems.

At that point Dr. McLaurin asked Mrs. Prickett if as a teacher she would have rather had a class of 100% poor students or 50% poor. Mrs. Prickett did not give an answer and made several statements that seemed to imply creating Title 1 schools intentionally.

Mr. Sutton again asked, "what's wrong with defining higher needs?"

Ms. Goldman said, "what about AG kids- they have needs. Assignment should accommodate higher needs and not be limited to others' needs. Mr. Sutton suggested that they use the current policy with some changes. At that point, a vote was taken and Ms. Goldman's version (Assignment should accommodate students with higher needs including those identified as LEP and those requiring special education services) was passed 2-1.

Policy 5532, which involves acceleration and whole grade advancement was briefly discussed. The next Policy Committee meeting will be held May 12.

At this point, several BOE members conducted interviews with the media. Mrs. Prickett spoke about equal opportunities and getting children the services they need. We said no one on the school board is trying to resegregate the schools. She said that we use F&R numbers now but that she believed we need to look at the whole child and that everyone "no matter what SES can be high need." She said that she doesn't want kids isolated in the policy and wants it broad so that all can get services. She said that she likes looking at the " individual student vs. the narrow, old policy (F&R #'s that change)." She stated that it is a new day in Wake County-fair, equitable, and positive. She says that we have not been using EVAAS as aggressively as we will do now.

Dr. McLaurin also gave an interview and asked "if we don't even mention student achievement , what kind of school board is this?" She also stated that a large portion of the city will resegregate.