

The Board of Education's goals for the student assignment process include:

- Achieving academic success for ALL children
- ~~Creating safe and stable school environments.~~
- ~~Maintaining a system of schools throughout the county that supports student achievement and equity.~~
- ~~Providing every child with a high quality educational experience and provide an opportunity for all students and teachers to succeed.~~
- ~~Establishing a multi-year, address based assignment plan.~~
- ~~Promoting community-based schools with consideration of proximity to home, student safety, and stability of family.~~
- ~~Providing each student a school assignment within a reasonable distance of his/her home.~~
- Collaborating with the community to access available community resources
- Providing ~~parents with clear choices~~ each student the opportunity to have choices in school calendar and programs.
- Providing a plan that is effective and efficient in utilization of our facilities and transportation.
- Providing a logical progression between elementary, middle, and high school that utilizes consistent, logical and predictable feeder patterns
- Supporting a positive educational environment with a commitment to maintaining superior teaching conditions
- Retaining excellent teachers and principals to enhance school choices and stability
- Offering quality programs in every school
- Providing ing a plan to support families and keep siblings from being separated by tracks or schools without parental consent
- Building a sense of community and connection with neighborhoods through parental involvement

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, 12 pt

~~Maintaining stable student populations that consider proximity to home in each Wake County school is important to ensuring academic success for all students.~~ Assignment policies will recognize the impact of student assignment on students, families, and communities and the costs involved. ~~The promotion of community schools with choice. The assignment plan~~ will increase stability, encourage parental involvement, support and strengthen the community and place emphasis on the education of every student.

Each student enrolled in the Wake County Public School System shall be assigned to a school of his or her grade level considering the attendance area in which that student's parents or court-appointed custodian is domiciled and the student resides. Exceptions will be made as necessary to limit enrollment of a school due to overcrowding or for special programmatic reasons such as the need for special education services or alternative school programs. Opportunities will be provided for high quality year round and magnet schools as viable options for families. Additional options could include vocational and alternative schools.

Student assignment plans will be based on the following factors:

- A Academic Achievement
~~In building a base assignment plan consideration will be given to avoiding high concentrations of low-performing students in a school.~~

Formatted: List Paragraph, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: A, B, C, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

A. B. Distance

Assignments should be made to avoid high concentrations of low-performing students with consideration of proximity to residence. No student should be required to travel more than the maximum time established by Board Policy 7125.

B. C. Choice

Students may apply for a school other than their base assignment. This includes calendar options and magnet programs. Enrollment may be limited based on availability

C. D. Stability of assignment

Students should be allowed to remain (stay where you start) assigned to a school at each level (Elementary, Middle & High) unless a new school is opened, availability becomes a factor or a request for transfer is initiated by the student's parent of legal guardian. A student's assignment will be grandfathered at their request subject to Board Policy 6203-Transfer of School Assignment. A periodic review of the assignment plan will occur at least every three years to monitor indicators such as population growth, demographic shifts, academic trends, and school performance data, as well as, program preferences expressed by parents.

D. E. Facility Utilization

Student assignment should seek optimal utilization of each school's capacity.

E. F. Grade Structure

Student assignment should adhere to K-5, K-8, 6-8, 6-12, 9-12 grade organization whenever possible with consideration given to logical feeder patterns within communities.

F. G. Alignment with the Magnet Schools Program

The student assignment plan should include the system-wide objectives of the Magnet Program.

G. H. Students with Higher Needs

Assignments should accommodate students with higher needs, including those identified as being Limited English Proficient (LEP) or requiring services from Special Education programs.

Footnote:

¹ Board policy regarding special education services is specified in Board Policy 6222.

² Long-range capacity is defined as the capacity of the permanent building(s) plus the capacity of the optimal number of mobile or modular classrooms for the campus.

Adopted: May 4, 1981
Revised: January 17, 1983
Revised: May 16, 1983
Revised: November 18, 1991
Revised: April 21, 1997
Revised: January 10, 2000
Revised: March 18, 2003
Revised: December 4, 2007
Revised: May 18, 2010



Wake County Board of Education Policy Committee

September 25, 2012

1:00pm

Board Conference Room, Crossroads I

Jim Martin, Committee Chair
Debra Goldman, Vice Chair

PURPOSE: To address policy issues.

OUTCOMES: By the end of the meeting, Committee Members will have:

- Approval of the August 28, 2012 Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
- Review Policy 6605: Investigations and Arrests by Law Enforcement
- Review Board Supplement 3800/4800-section 3.1
- Review Board Supplement 3800/4800-section 8.3
- Review Board Supplement 3800/4800-section 9.1
- Review Board Supplement 3800/4800-section 20.0
- Discussion of the Transparency Policy
- Discussion of Policy 6200
- Discussion of Policy 6203
- Discussion of Policy 6204

TOPIC	WHO	TIME
Welcome and Introductions Desired Outcomes	Chair Martin	1:07-
Board Members Present: Jim Martin Christine Kushner Susan Evans (deputized member of the committee) Debra Goldman (expected to arrive at 2:30 PM) Kevin Hill (will be in and out of the meeting) John Tedesco (arrived at 1:13) Chris Malone (deputized member of the committee)		
Staff Present: Judy Pepler Stephen Gainey Laura Evans (Ms. L. Evans) Edward Smith Cris Mulder Susan Pullium Cathy Moore		
Board Attorney Present: Ann Majestic		

Approval of the August 28, 2012 Policy Committee Meeting Minutes	All	1:10-1:11
<p>Dr. Martin raised the following issues with the minutes: The discussion of homework issues are not noted in the minutes. The extra credit issue was raised by Dr. Martin and Dr. Steidinger weighed in on the discussion as well. It was recommended that the minutes are sent back to staff to be revised and approved at the next meeting.</p>		
Review Policy 6605: Investigations and Arrests by Law Enforcement	Judy Pepler Russ Smith	1:11-1:15
<p>Ms. Majestic modeled the policy from other districts. Mr. Smith shared that the policy will provide guidance to the administrators and covers issues that Security office receives on a daily basis. Ms. Majestic stated the policy is about how to manage off-campus law enforcement in the school. Dr. Martin suggested cross referencing other relevant policies within a policy. Ms. Kushner moved to take the policy out of the committee to the full board. Ms. Evans seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.</p>		
Review Board Supplement 3800/4800-section 3.1 Review Board Supplement 3800/4800-section 8.3 Review Board Supplement 3800/4800-section 9.1 Review Board Supplement 3800/4800-section 20.0	Stephen Gainey	1:15-1:19
<p>Dr. Gainey explained that the board supplement is a set of rules and procedures used to interpret the state benefits manual. Dr. Gainey explained the changes to the policies. Ms. Kushner moved to accept the board supplement policies and carry them to the full board. Ms. Evans seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.</p>		
Policy Committee Discussion of the Transparency Policy	All	1:20
<p>Mr. Malone requested that the discussion be postponed until Ms. Goldman arrives. Dr. Martin sought and received the consent of the committee to move the item to the end of the current meeting or to the next meeting agenda so that Ms. Goldman could be present for the discussion.</p>		
Review revisions to Policy 6200	Laura Evans	1:21-2:50
<p>Dr. Martin shared that the goal of the board and community should be to try to tackle student assignment in a logical, rational, and objective manner. He stated that the goal is to provide stability. Dr. Martin apologized that the current maps do not provide the expected stability. He encouraged the board to look for mechanisms to enhance stability. He stated that all information that is out is draft and not board reviewed. The committee waited for Ms. L. Evans to retrieve color copies of the revised policies. Dr. Martin suggested that the committee move on to Policy 6203. Ms. Evans suggested, and Mr. Tedesco agreed, that it may be premature to look at policies 6203 and 6204 without having an approved plan. Dr. Martin called a recess until the color copies were provided. Ms. Pepler explained that staff took the current Policy 6200, the directive, and the modified plan and developed the suggested changes in the policy. Ms. Majestic explained that virtually all of the bullets are almost verbatim from the directive. Mr. Malone questioned the striking of the community schools language. Ms. Majestic explained the staff tried to eliminate buzz words that could be embraced differently by different people. The committee discussed whether the bullets were prioritized, equal, or "pillars." The committee discussed defining the pillars. Dr. Martin raised the question of what goes into policy or R&P? Mr. Tedesco shared that there has to be some definitive language in policy. Dr. Martin stated concern with the redundancy of the statements in the preamble; he offered his draft (he previously shared) into consideration. He suggested achievement, stability, proximity and distance be defined and let the definition be reflected in the preamble as a strategy for working on the policy. Ms. Majestic questioned the use of the term "preamble" and explained that the bullets are substantive points. The committee agreed to address each bullet individually. Dr. Martin suggested noting the points of overlap and sending them back to staff to integrate. Ms. Majestic suggested sorting the bullets under the pillars and then seeing where the outliers are. The committee sorted the bullets. The committee discussed the safety</p>		

component of assigning students. Dr. Martin explained the use of the term operational in sorting the bullets. Ms. Evans suggested having more specific language in the 7th bullet. The committee discussed the availability of choice in the current plan (8th bullet). Ms. Evans shared that she is conflicted knowing that capacity keeps the system from making choice a reality for families. Ms. Kushner pointed out that the directive was not intended to be a policy and choice is valued and needs to be a part of the policy. The committee questioned the inclusion of the 12th bullet. Mr. Tedesco raised the question as to whether the 13th bullet is contrary to the 3rd bullet. After discussion, Dr. Martin suggested the 3rd and 13th bullet be integrated. The committee clarified that the 12th bullet was redundant.

The committee discussed the language of the policy. Dr. Martin suggested that the first paragraph be incorporated using bullet form. In the last paragraph, the committee discussed language that would include all the options of schools. The committee agreed. Dr. Martin suggested including a bullet or something about continuity. Ms. Pepler suggested modifying the last bullet to capture neighborhood and cohort continuity. Ms. Majestic suggested language that describes supporting neighborhoods by placing students with recognition of neighborhood lines. The committee debriefed Ms. Goldman upon her arrival. Ms. Goldman raised the point that some of the language in policy is more like value statements rather than policy statements. Ms. Goldman asked the committee to make sure the policy reflects what it is designed to do. Dr. Martin asked Ms. Goldman if she would prefer to move the committee discussion of the student assignment policies to the work session and move on to the Transparency Policy discussion or move the Transparency Policy discussion to the next meeting and continue to work on the student assignment policies. Ms. Goldman stated she had concerns with moving the policies to the work session without the work being done in committee due to the length of time it took to work on the policy previously. Mr. Malone cautioned about trying to rush through completing work on Policy 6200. Dr. Martin clarified that he is not asking the committee to rush, he's asking everyone to roll-up their sleeves and do hard work. The committee continued their work on Policy 6200.

The committee agreed to remove the language "to avoid high concentrations of low-performing students" from statement B. The committee discussed addressing walk-zones in relation to the transportation issues. The committee agreed that they need to look at walk-zone issues and equity issues. Ms. Pepler reminded the committee that they also asked staff to balance achievement and that could become more difficult. The committee asked for the information regarding walk zones prior to making any decisions. The committee discussed the use of the term availability verses capacity in statement C. Ms. Evans suggested that statement C is a section where the school options should be defined. Ms. L. Evans cautioned that in the choice process staff ran into issues because of the fluidity of the seat availability. Dr. Martin suggested that there should be a statement about sibling stability in statement D; Mr. Tedesco and Ms. Kushner agreed. Ms. Pepler pointed out that staff could not guarantee sibling match; staff ran into difficulties with sibling matching in the current plan because in some parts of the county it is very difficult. Dr. Martin expressed that it should be stated that staff will make every effort to keep siblings at the same calendar. Ms. Evans suggested modifying the 14th bullet. Ms. Evans is 100% committed to sibling matching; she does not want the public to misinterpret anything she says but the district does not have the capacity. She does believe sibling matching should be a priority. Mr. Tedesco suggested eliminating statement F, Grading Structures. The committee agreed. The committee reviewed and approved the remaining statements. Dr. Martin suggested since there were 10 minutes until another meeting the committee adjourn to take a break prior to the next meeting.

Review revisions to Policy 6203	Laura Evans	
Tabled until next meeting.		
Review revisions to Policy 6204	Laura Evans	
Tabled until next meeting.		

Adjournment	Chair Martin	2:50-2:55
Dr. Martin will discuss next steps with Chair Hill. Dr. Martin asked the committee to be cognizant of how student assignment impacts a variety of areas.		
Mr. Tedesco moved to adjourn. Ms. Kushner seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.		

Bulleted review of the September 25, 2013 Policy Committee discussion on Policy 6200:

1. It was suggested that Student Achievement, Stability, Proximity be used as pillars and that a fourth pillar, possibly Operational, be included.
2. The bulleted items were discussed and given tentative placements under the four pillars as follows:
 - a. Student Achievement – bullets 1, 3, 14, and 16
 - b. Stability – bullets 11, 15
 - c. Proximity – 7
 - d. Other – 2, 5, 8, 9, 10
3. The committee questioned the inclusion of bullet 12, stating that it was redundant.
4. The committee discussed bullet 13 in relation to bullet 3. It was suggested that these two bullets be integrated.
5. The committee agreed to include the language, *to the extent possible*, to bullet 15.
6. It was suggested that staff review the points of overlap in the bullet statements and bring back to staff a more integrated set of bullets.
7. The committee agreed to look more closely at walk-zones and requested staff to provide more information.
8. The committee agreed that language regarding walk-zone, rural, urban, suburban be integrated and placed under the appropriate pillar.
9. The committee agreed to remove the language, *to avoid high concentrations of low-performing students*, from statement B.
10. The committee agreed to remove statement F.
11. The committee discussed editing the first paragraph under the bullets to remove the first sentence and to use the second and third sentences as bullets under the pillars. The third sentence would be modified with the removal of the language, *promoting community schools*. The committee discussed that these two statements may be a redundant of bullets 8 and 16
12. It was suggested that the second paragraph under the bullets be moved to the beginning of the policy. It was suggested that this paragraph include all of the options of school choice available to parents.