

Magnet Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
February 18, 2016
4-6 p.m.
Vanhoose Education Center

Members Present:

✓	William Allen	✓	Sam Cowan	✓	Zina Knight	✓	Wendy Robertson		Trina Steiden
✓	David Baugh	✓	Giselle Danger-Mercaderes		John Marshall	✓	Chlise Robinson		Milan Bailey
✓	Tammy Berlin	✓	Barbara Dempsey	✓	Kathy McGinnis		Mike Shelton		
✓	Enakshi Bose		Charles Dixon		Beverly Chester Burton	✓	Cassandra Shepherd		
✓	Karen Branham		Bryce Hibbard	✓	Michelle Pennix		Shantai Tudor		
✓	Chris Burba	✓	Michael Hirn		Shantel Reed	✓	Felicia Young		

The meeting began at approximately 4:16 p.m.

Terry Ray, Director of Exceptional Child Education (ECE), gave a brief overview of special education students in JCPS and district and school services available for these students. She provided a handout (pages 3-4, *Exceptional Child Education, Magnet Steering Committee*) that describes:

- federal law, number of students served in district, and types of services offered, and
- potential considerations for the Magnet Steering Committee on access and inclusion issues relative to MSA Recommendation 26.

Questions for Terry Ray from steering committee members:

- Are considerations for access and inclusion more important for ECE kids?
No. Access and inclusion are important issues for all kids, but we must ensure options are available for ECE kids so that they are not excluded disproportionately.
- What is the difference between IEP (individual education plan) and 504 plan? Can you give examples of a 504 plan?
An IEP is for students with identified academic, behavior, and/or mental health issues that negatively affect their learning. Some students may have health issues that require them to be away from classroom, missing learning. A 504 plan ensures that they have an opportunity to get instruction they missed or make up work.
- What does a classroom look like with varying ECE kids?
A resource teacher may have a common topic, but the lessons vary to accommodate a reading disability or a visual impairment or speech impairment.
- Do ECE students have options for which schools they can attend? Some families feel they are told where they can attend, not aware of options.
Yes, families do have options. However, there are certain schools throughout the district better equipped to serve specific disabilities, so we do try to cluster some students (e.g., visual impairment; students requiring assistance with self-care) and encourage families to attend schools that can best serve their children. It's simply cost prohibitive to create appropriate environmental accommodations for all disabilities at every school. A team of ECE staff helps to determine the most appropriate options for each student.
- How does a student get identified as ECE?
If a student receives a referral, then a team will review that student's history, such as academic progress, behavior issues, to determine if an assessment for an individualized education plan (IEP) is warranted. This can take up to 60 days because the assessment must be targeted towards a particular disability that the team suspects is present for the student – you are assessing for one or two disabilities, not a broad sweep for any and everything. This helps to target assistance as well to know where the student most needs support. Many students come in already identified as ECE even at the preschool level (ages 3 and 4), while other students are identified only after they enter primary grades.

Next, subcommittees provided updates on their progress, as available.

- Magnet School Processes

- Karen Branham (Asst Superintendent of Curriculum & Instruction, steering committee member) presented two draft documents from the Magnet School Processes subcommittee. One document is intended for schools proposing new magnets or changes to their existing magnets. These schools will complete an application describing the purpose and plans for developing the magnet program. As feedback, steering committee members suggested expanding and clarifying application sections targeting achievement/learning, goals and potential metrics, and program sustainability so that schools articulate their plans clearly. In addition, committee members suggested asking school applicants to describe (1) how their program will be consistent with, and complementary to, similar magnets in other schools if like-programs exist, and (2) how vertical program alignment and feeder patterns could occur to increase likelihood students can continue in their pathway (e.g., performing arts enrollment from elementary to middle school).
- These same staff developed a framework for reviewing magnet schools to potentially enter or exit probationary status or 'opt out' of their magnet. The draft framework includes rubric-like categories with corresponding criteria for each separate magnet review (entry, exit, or 'opt out'). Finally, the framework includes a set of categories with options for district supports to magnets currently in probationary status. Feedback from the steering committee focused on: (1) defining and expanding success categories on student achievement beyond AMO and KPREP, (2) ensuring the planning (application) and evaluation (framework and criteria) phases are linked sufficiently so that schools are assessed on the same criteria that they were expected to develop, and (3) considering how to monitor and support school diversity beyond the simple district numeric index (refer to *Student Assignment Plan, Attachment C* for diversity index formula – page 6 of these minutes). The subcommittee will revise and come back with updates in March.

- Curriculum & Magnet Oversight

- The subcommittee is in the process of reviewing the Traditional School Guidelines presented in May 2015 to the Board (but not adopted). They are working with the Traditional School Principals and have asked them to develop a common definition for Traditional Schools for the elementary, middle and high school levels. The subcommittee may have a draft document available at the March meeting.

- Application Process and Access

- Subcommittee members have met and determined initial tasks as well as drafted a work plan. They are in the process of reviewing options and practices of other districts regarding application systems as well as research on random draw and criteria-based admission procedures.

- Theme and Career Pathway Quality

- The subcommittee has not been able to meet, but they are reviewing ongoing work and documents relevant to the MSA recommendations from the Ford NGL project and CTE. They will coordinate to review and map the work onto the recommendations to identify clear overlap and gaps, and then suggest work accordingly.

- Evaluation, Research, and Data

- The formation of this subcommittee will be postponed until the Core Team has an opportunity to consider research-based options, comparative models from other districts, and potential obstacles to establishing "success criteria" for evaluating magnet programs. This conversation will begin at March 3rd Core Team meeting, and suggestions and progress will be conveyed to the full steering committee on March 17th.

Facilitators discussed an update to the Board to be held March 8th. In preparation for this presentation, the facilitators requested that subcommittees map out work plans through June 2017 (tasks, timelines, potential products) in as much detail as possible by February 29th. Tentative projections for additional, quarterly updates and presentations to the Board were proposed. Subcommittee work plans will be consolidated into a larger, comprehensive work plan for the Magnet Steering Committee that will be shared with the Board. All committee members are invited to attend the work session.

Finally, the facilitators discussed a community forum option (still potential for late April or early May). The exact format and scope will be determined after: (1) a meeting with the new Chief Communications Officer, and (2) work plans identifying specific opportunities for public input are received.

The steering committee adjourned at 6:05pm. Several subcommittees met briefly to plan next meetings.

**Exceptional Child Education
Magnet Steering Committee
February 18, 2016**

I. Overview

Exceptional Child Education Services (ECE) is a Federal Program

- Authorized by Public Law 94-142 Education for All Handicapped Children Act
- Amended as the Individuals with Disability Education Act (IDEA) in 1986, 1988, 1990, 1997, 2004

Provisions within IDEA

- Free, appropriate, public education for students with disabilities
- Service to students ages 3-21
- Identification, evaluation, eligibility determination, Individual Education Program at no cost to parent
- Decision making by a student's Admission and Release Committee
 - Core members include parents, student as appropriate, administrator, regular education teacher, special education teacher and others as warranted
- Procedural Safeguards to parents including notification, secured permission, participation in decision making, complaint, mediation, due process hearing

II. December 1, 2015

Speech Language Impairment	2726
Other Health Impairment	2526
Developmental Delay	1632 (ages 3-8)
Specific Learning Disability	1589 (includes students with Dyslexia)
Mild Mental Disability	1161
Autism	999
Emotional-Behavioral Disability	867
Functional Mental Disability	467
Multiple Disability	311
Hearing Impairment	97
Orthopedic Impairment	92
Visual Impairment	82
Traumatic Brain Injury	43
Deaf-Blind	3
Total Students Served in ECE	12, 595
% ECE for District	12.43%

III. Service Delivery

6A	6,383	80% or more of day in general education program
6B	1,839	40-80% of day in general education program
6C	2,173	<40% of day in general education program
Other	2,200	Early Childhood, Separate School, Parentally Placed Private School, Homebound/Hospital, Correctional Facility, Residential Facility

IV. Private School Students

Private School students participating in ECE	173 (ages 3-21)
--	-----------------

V. ECE School Based Staff on December 1, 2015

Special Education Teachers	1056
Para Professionals	675
Audiologists	1.5
Speech Language Pathologists	124.5
Sign Language Interpreters	17
Psychologists	39.5
Occupational Therapists	30
Physical Therapists	12
Adaptive PE	4
School Social Workers	3
Medical Nursing Service Staff	6
Counselors/Rehab Counselors	3
Orientation & Mobility Specialists	4
Total School Based ECE Staff	1975.5

VI. Magnet School Considerations for Students Participating in ECE

MSA Recommendation 26:

JCPS should work to ensure greater inclusion and access for English Langue Learners and Special Education students in magnet programs by providing services at all magnet schools to the greatest extent possible.

Access

- Ensure parents understanding of magnet system
- Provide parent assistance in application process
- Reassure parents that ECE services are available to students participating in magnet programming
- Encourage application of students with disabilities including recruitment

Inclusion

- Design application and selection procedures to ensure proportional representation of students with disabilities
- Ensure impartiality in application and selection process
- Provide ECE staffing according to census and student need
- Ensure range of service delivery options in magnet schools including co-teaching, resource and special class (designated schools)
- Provide administrator and teacher training to support evidence based practices in academic and behavior for students with disabilities
- Implement proactive and responsive systems of behavioral support in magnet schools including Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, Restorative Practices Strategies
- Implement strategies to ensure student resilience in magnet school participation
 - Academic safety nets (e.g., interventions, remedial classes, tutorials, study skills)
 - Behavioral safety nets (e.g., social skills instruction, adult and peer mentor)
 - Mental health supports (e.g., group and individual counseling, referral to community services)

The following "factors" will be computed for each Census block group in the school district.

I. Computation of Socio-Economic Factors and Race Factor

- A. Socio-Economic Factor, Household Income: This is taken directly from Census American Community Survey (ACS) B19013.
- B. Socio-Economic Factor, "Educational Average": This is a weighted average computed from Census ACS matrix B1 5002, using the following methodology:
 "Weight" per applied to educational attainment categories: 1 – Finished grade 8 or less;
 2 – Did not finish high school;
 3 – Finished high school
 3.5 – Some college or associate degree 4
 – Bachelor's degree
 5 – Masters or professional degree 6
 – Doctorate

Using the weights above the weighted "average" is computed as follows. The average yields a decimal number between 1.0 and 6.0

"Education Average" =

$$\frac{\sum \text{over all the above categories (Population of category x weight per category)}}{\text{Total population}}$$

- C. Race Factor "Percent non-white": For the purpose of combining a "race" factor with multiple other factors, a single-numeral measure of race will be used. This single-percentage diversity measure is computed from ACS B02001.

$$\frac{\text{"Percent non-white"} = 100 \times \text{Sum of non-white population}}{\text{Total population}}$$

II. Combining Factors to yield categories

Socio-Economic + Race Classification, Unadjusted: The three measures detailed above will be combined to yield an integer "classification" code limited to values 1, 2 and 3, as set forth below.

Income Category=

Income ≤ \$42,000	1
\$42,000 ≤ Income ≤ \$62,000	2
Income ≥ \$62,000	3

Education Category (see categories above) =

Education Average ≤ 3.5	1
3.5 ≤ Education Average ≤ 3.7	2
Education ≥ 3.7	3