

JCPS MAGNET STEERING COMMITTEE CORE TEAM MINUTES
December 17, 2015

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

- The meeting started at approximately 4:08 P.M.
- One community member attended the meeting as an observer.
- The meeting began with welcome and introductions of student members of the steering committee.
- The facilitator indicated that, based on feedback from some members, meeting minutes will be sent out for review and approval by all committee members from now on before publishing to the Magnet Steering Committee website.
- The facilitator presented a draft of the Magnet Steering Committee Charter (see page 3) and requested feedback and edits from members on or before the next full committee meeting. The charter will serve as a guiding document to describe the steering committee purpose and scope of work; as such, it will be published on the Magnet Steering Committee website once approved by the committee.
- Committee members reviewed the final prioritization of MSA recommendations into three broad categories of alignment to the Magnet Mission, including revisions and additional criteria for priority suggested by Core Team. The Core Team made clear that they want to examine whether and how work on some recommendations should proceed to best support strategic priorities and fairness in the district. One question by a member led to clarification on Recommendation 1 (not explicitly listed on the presented document). The facilitator explained that the content of Recommendation 1 was found to be distributed across three other recommendations (9, 19, and 26); thus, it was removed from the list to avoid unnecessary confusion and duplication. All committee members accepted the categorical prioritization of MSA recommendations with no objections (see page 4).
- The facilitator presented a brief example of timelines for reviewing and implementing recommendations to highlight the impact of cyclical district activities, such as budget decisions and school building projections on enrollments and program needs.
- The timelines discussion prompted conversation about several specific MSA recommendations considered to address more systemic issues by many committee members. For example, Ms. Branham pointed out that, without agreements on a process for establishing new magnets and reviewing current magnets (MSA recommendations 5 and 6), the Curriculum and Instruction Division and some schools cannot serve students and families effectively. As a result, she requested

permission to draft a set of guidelines for new magnets with her staff for review by committee members on or before the next full committee meeting. Another committee member asked about whether there are current practices in place that can be continued until a new process is adopted. Facilitators and several staff confirmed that there is a process for requesting a new magnet, but that no formal, consistent criteria have existed historically, which leads to a one-off approach for approving requests. In addition, there is no review process in place for existing magnets. The committee provided a consensus vote in support of Ms. Branham's proposal.

- Committee members also inquired about work that was in progress by the previous magnet review committee, such as the Traditional School Guidelines (which were completed in May 2015 but not put to vote by the Board of Education). The facilitators indicated that they will forward any relevant documents from the previous review committee and coordinate with staff to present and respond to questions on that work.
- Facilitators reminded committee members of the Board expectation to develop a full plan mapping out timelines and tasks for any recommendations that the committee intends to implement. A committee member asked if they are expected to implement all recommendations, and the facilitator indicated that the committee could decide to eliminate recommendations, if there is sufficient rationale (e.g., a recommendation is not consistent with district strategic priorities or Magnet Mission). Thus far, the committee has not identified recommendations for elimination, although some have been considered lower in priority for implementation. The committee agreed to identify a process for moving forward on all other recommendations by the next meeting with the expectation of creating draft timelines, tasks, and suggested committee work products within a single plan. This plan will be presented to the Board of Education once drafted.
- Committee members proceeded to conduct a needs assessment together on data requested by Core Team members that will inform committee suggestions and guidance to division staff on MSA recommendations (starting with highest priorities). The committee is especially interested in getting a clearer understanding of current practices and decision making processes.
- The steering committee deferred the agenda item of developing subcommittees during the meeting but requested this process as an immediate next step once they have an opportunity to review requested data/documents from the needs assessment.
- The facilitators collected any completed needs assessments from groups; some members agreed to finalize and forward electronically. Facilitators will begin gathering and disseminating data, documents, and responses to committee members over the next few weeks. In addition, facilitators will determine whether to schedule staff presentations at the next full committee meeting based on requested needs in addition to providing documentation.
- The meeting adjourned at 5:58 P.M.

JCPS Magnet Steering Committee CHARTER

PURPOSE

The primary responsibility of the Magnet Steering Committee is to develop and monitor a five-year plan for implementing work to improve magnet programs and schools district-wide. This work is based on, but not strictly limited to, recommendations made by Magnet Schools of America.

ROLES

The committee is composed of two working teams that meet monthly. The Core Team drives the work by initiating and sponsoring work and facilitating communication, while the Extended Team works with the Core Team to provide input on recommendations and priorities.

CRITERIA FOR MEMBERSHIP

The basic criteria include: (a) a willingness to work together to solve issues, (b) commitment to high quality educational choices for all students, and (c) regular meeting participation for a two-year term. Members broadly reflect the diversity of our community and schools.

DECISION MAKING METHODS

The committee strives to function under a consensus model to identify priorities and come to agreements.

DISTRICT VISION

All Jefferson County Public School students graduate prepared, empowered, and inspired to reach their full potential and contribute as thoughtful, responsible citizens of our shared world.

MAGNET MISSION

Provide specialized educational options that attract a diverse population of students to cohesive, theme-based learning environments that promote excellence in student learning.

SCOPE OF WORK

In Scope

- Prioritize and clarify/modify MSA recommendations to improve JCPS magnet schools and programs.
- Provide guidance on priorities and how to implement recommendations in coordination with district departments.

Out of Scope

- Policy decisions (purview of the Board)
- Decisions about status of individual magnet programs and schools

DRAFT

lrt 12-21-2015rev

Alignment of MSA Recommendations to Magnet Mission and District Strategic Plan Priorities

The Magnet Steering Committee conducted an alignment task to determine which MSA recommendations most support the newly developed magnet Mission statement and district priorities. Recommendations were grouped into three broad categories of alignment. The Core Team further discussed the alignment outcomes to come to consensus (reflected in the table). An asterisk indicates that the core team determined that the recommendation will require more extended input and conversation over time due to potential impact on other magnet and non-magnet programs. Several recommendations were linked to other recommendations as potential subtasks (also noted below).

Recommendation Number	Key Topic/Focus	Consensus Ratings
4	Traditional school model review	High
5	Review undersubscribed, low achieving	High
6	Process for new magnets	High
8	5-Star HS review	High
9	Move to whole school magnets (* requires substantial conversation)	High
11	Centralized applications, lotteries, transparency (* requires substantial conversation)	High
20	Theme-related PD	High
21	Program coordinators	High
25	Increase access to school choice materials in multiple languages (better marketing)	High
26	Inclusive practices	High
10	School plans and policies publically available	Medium
12	Move to STEM	Medium
13	Align arts programs	Medium
15	Supported, resourced –equipment (link to Recommendation 15)	Medium
16	Supported, resourced –facilities (link to Recommendation 16)	Medium
17	Career academy model (* requires substantial conversation)	Medium
18	Central office collaboration	Medium
19	Gap group achievement tracking by school/program	Medium
22	Fiscal analysis (link to Recommendation 5)	Medium
24	Industry advisory board	Medium
7	Replicate successful magnets	Low
14	Transportation	Low
23	Like school models (link to Recommendation 20)	Low

Magnet Mission

Provide specialized educational options that attract a diverse population of students to cohesive, theme-based learning environments that promote excellence in student learning.