

BOARD OF EDUCATION
Madison Metropolitan School District
Doyle Administration Building, 545 West Dayton Street, Room 103
Madison, Wisconsin

Jane Belmore, Interim Superintendent

PLANNING and DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
Minutes for February 11, 2013

The Planning and Development Committee meeting was called to order by Vice President Marj Passman at 5:40 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Maya Cole, Ed Hughes, Beth Moss
MEMBERS ABSENT:	None
STAFF PRESENT:	Sue Abplanalp, Jane Belmore, Joe Gothard, Steve Hartley, Mike Hertting, Dylan Pauly, Andrew Statz, Lisa Wachtel, Nancy Yoder, Barbara Lehman – Recording Secretary
OTHERS PRESENT:	Board Members Mary Burke, Marj Passman, Arlene Silveira

Maya Cole took over as chair

(Action in italics)

I. PUBLIC APPEARANCES

Anna Moffit wanted to make sure that the proposed charter school guiding principles and policy ensured access for all students. She felt the word “qualified” student negated the entire principle and did not believe children need to qualify to receive a public education. She recommended that the word be deleted or that a transparent discussion be had about that word.

Jeff Spitzer-Resnick, attorney, also had concerns with use of the word “qualified” student.

Jackie Woodruff referenced the Board’s Equity Policy and wanted the proposed charter policy to be in alignment guaranteeing equal access and a balance of all economic and demographics that are reflective of the entire district population.

TJ Mertz echoed the concerns with the use of the word “qualified” student. He was also concerned that the rubric to be used to evaluate the proposal would not be public. He wanted the policy to require evaluations for categories 2 and 3 and that it emphasize the most important district resource of students’ time throughout.

Allison Volkman, new district parent, touted the incredible diversity at Thoreau Elementary School and feared that use of the word “qualified” student would exclude students with special needs. She stated that all students are qualified for public education.

Kati Walsh stated that the proposed charter policy did not include art, music, and gym requirements or a distinction between instrumentalities and non-instrumentalities and unions. She felt students should be taught by licensed teachers for the required number of minutes. She also noted that using the words “research-based curriculum” does not guarantee that all students will be served. She also stated that many arts ideas are not being used to integrate.

Karen Vieth, Sennett Middle School teacher, asked that the policy ensure equitable access in the way it serves students, i.e., monitoring whether students are being successful and that student Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) are being met. She questioned why students have to qualify for a free and appropriate public education. She indicated that partners often fail to reflect and do not serve certain segments of our society and she wanted the bar set higher for our district.

Margaret Stumpf, teaches special education students at Sennett who are in the Dual Language Immersion (DLI) house fed by Nuestro Mundo and Glendale Elementary and whose son attended Nuestro Mundo Community School, was concerned about the instrumentality/non-instrumentality piece of the policy. She was also worried

that use of the word “qualified” student would allow charters that can be segregated and that IEPs will not have to be implemented by qualified special education teachers.

There were no written registrations.

II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES DATED JANUARY 14, 2013**

It was moved by Beth Moss and seconded by Ed Hughes to approve the minutes from the Planning and Development Committee meeting dated January 14, 2013, which were distributed via e-mail. Motion unanimously carried.

III. **DISCUSSION/PRESENTATION ITEMS**

A. **Update on School Room Use and Walk-Throughs—**

Andrew Statz noted that the committee would get a demonstration at the March meeting on room use at the schools that would help in the culmination of a tool to use across the district. The challenge to overcome is that there are so many different ways to configure a school and trying to find ways to express these configurations. Sue Abplanalp noted that they are sharing this tool with the principals so they can see the space issues in other buildings and how space is used across the district. Staff will also talk about some of the quick fixes to be recommended.

Discussion Topics:

- Good to share building use tool with other staff members as well as principals.
- Committee members wanted to see the rubric for the building walk-throughs and ensure that all the needs within the building are being considered.

FOLLOW UP:

- ✓ Looking forward to the demonstration next month of the room tool and the discussion and sharing of room use best practices on the web site

B. **Proposed Charter School Guiding Principles and Policy—Appendix 000-7-14**

Steve Hartley and Dylan Pauly first responded to the request for a red-line version of the policy. She viewed this version as more of a re-write than something that could be red-lined. The intent was to gather viable feedback from the Board about this new policy. She was open to any change on the word “qualified” which she defined as things like residency, age, lottery status, etc.

Mr. Hartley reviewed the main areas of change in the timeline, review process, and requirements for funding. After reviewing the Julie Mead PowerPoint, they found the Milwaukee policy to be very detailed that also included language for things that were previous stumbling blocks. They felt this policy would align with the district’s current vision and value statement with a clear set of principles.

Feedback on Guiding Principles:

- Why use of word struggling—could be stated as students who are not reaching their full potential and for those who would like a different style of teaching.
- Appreciate “broaden and not replicate.”
- Suggest we take Guiding Principles and tighten the language so it is more like what Mead has written.
- Define art, music, and gym.
- Says “highly qualified” but does not say “credentialed” teachers. Has to say something about recognizing current contracts.
- Use strong criteria up front.
- District is not obligated to have charter schools and can say that all of this is discretionary.
- Add stronger language for students with special needs and take out “qualified” word.
- Use draft Guiding Principles but tighten them up.
- Use the language around full potential of students and broadening but not replicating.

Timeline:

- Planning grants will probably phase out from the state. Include time for a review committee.
- Timeline has to be more visual and account for the following:
 - initial proposal

- superintendent reviews same set of questions for each proposal
 - administrative analysis and recommendation to the Board
 - hold a public hearing
 - detailed proposal
 - superintendent does final administrative analysis
 - public hearing
 - board decision
- Can add board members to a review committee or create a standing committee of the board.

Funding Formula:

- Use a funding formula.
- Not cost neutral.
- May be more money the first couple years.
- Other authorizers will use a fixed amount; that would make the MMSD competitive.
- Benefit of putting it in is affordability.
- Might focus people.
- No dollar value but some language to help give guidance.
- Have to make a statement about private fundraising.

Instrumentality v. non-Instrumentality

- Include in principles and values.
- Prefer instrumentality but concern is Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) may hamper innovative approaches.
- Include a statement in the Guiding Principles about the preferences but within the rubric assign a weight to the issue.
- Can both be accommodated?
- Legislature is considering creating an overriding board authority. If the district will not consider a non-instrumentality, that adds support to the legislature about school districts not being willing to consider innovative things.
- Provide two alternatives and the Board will vote up or down on this issue.
- Future of Act 10 will answer questions about creating bottlenecks by creating Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), allowing flexibility within the CBA to do something like longer school days for which the teachers are compensated, streamlining the process, etc.
- May not have a choice because there will be a state board. Will have to vote this up or down.
- Receive those funds directly in addition to funds from the district.
- There will be certain funds that follow the student that would qualify.

FOLLOW UP:

- ✓ Bring back revisions to March committee meeting.

IV. PROPOSED ACTION ITEMS FOR FEBRUARY 25, 2013 REGULAR BOARD MEETING

No action items for this month.

V. CONSENT ITEMS FOR FEBRUARY 25, 2013 REGULAR BOARD MEETING

No consent items for this month.

VI. IDENTIFICATION OF FUTURE COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS

No discussion.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Maya Cole and seconded by Beth Moss to adjourn the meeting at 7:20 p.m. Motion unanimously carried.