

# EXCELLENCE IN STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING

November 13, 2018

Attending: Commissioner Sheppard (Chair); Commissioners White, Powell, and Elliott (arrived 5:51PM)

Parent Representative: Toyin Anderson

Student Representative: Malik Jaff

District Staff: Superintendent Barbara Deane-Williams; Dr. Cecilia Golden, Deputy Superintendent for Teaching & Learning; Karl Kristoff, General Counsel; Beth Mascitti-Miller, Deputy Superintendent of Administration; and Joe Capezutto, Director of Student Placement

Commissioner Sheppard convened the Excellence in Student Achievement Committee Meeting of the Whole at 5:30PM.

## **I. Review Minutes of September 4, 2018 Excellence in Student Achievement Committee Meeting**

**Motion** by Commissioner White to approve the minutes of the September 4, 2018 Excellence in Student Achievement Committee Meeting. **Adopted 2-0.**

## **II. Board of Education Student Representative Projects**

Commissioner Sheppard announced that she invited the Student Representative to the Board of Education, Malik Jaff, to attend this evening's meeting to discuss two projects that he plans to conduct over the next year. The first project involves developing a policy to establish the right of all students to participate in student government. Mr. Jaff reported that only three or four schools are currently represented in monthly Student Leadership Congress meetings.

Mr. Jaff stated that he would also like to gather student input regarding school meals and opportunities for improving the menu and food quality in the District. Commissioner Sheppard has offered to provide assistance to Mr. Jaff, specifically regarding Food Services financing and the process involved in implementing changes in school meals.

When asked about methods for obtaining student input in this project, Mr. Jaff discussed his participation in the GIS scholars program. This program teaches students methods for collecting and utilizing data using ESRI, one of the largest mapping companies in the world. He explained that ESRI also offers a survey tool, which he plans to use to gather student input about the school meal program.

Commissioner White recalled that students protested several years ago about the quality of school meals in the District. He reported that the District has made substantial changes, such as upgrades to equipment in the Central Kitchen, installation of hybrid kitchens in elementary schools, and

establishing an internal Food Services Department to prepare school meals instead of contracting with an outside vendor. Commissioner White noted that the RCSD Food Services Director initiated improvements by conducting a number of taste tests and involving students in redesigning the menu to be more responsive to their needs and tastes. He suggested that Malik meet with the Director of Food Services to learn more about the efforts that have been made to date. Commissioner White pointed out that a complicating factor involved in making changes in school menus or meals is that specific federal nutritional requirements must be met.

Malik Jaff reported that he has informally asked a number of students for their opinion about school meals, but many could not respond because they do not eat the food at school. He added that some students and teachers have also expressed concern about the use of Styrofoam plates because of the harm caused to the environment.

Commissioner Elliott suggested that the District consider investing some funding in improving food quality and expanding the types of food offered to students, especially since District funds would not be subject to federal requirements.

Dr. Cecilia Golden noted that students should be able to earn academic credit for conducting this type of project because of the skills and knowledge involved in survey design, data collection and analysis, and presentation of findings and recommendations. Mr. Jaff stated that this project could also be used to fulfill the community service hours required in some schools.

### **III. Comprehensive Review of RCSD Curriculum Plan (Topic on Agenda) Overview of District Professional Development Plan (Actual Presentation)**

Dr. Golden stated that the District Curriculum Plan was developed by administrators and teachers, but was submitted to the state after the deadline (end of August/early September). She explained that the Plan was based on a needs assessment and data collected from school report cards and other measures related to instruction and student academic performance.

The Plan is organized according to the tenets of the state Diagnostic Tool for School and District Effectiveness (DTSDE):

#### Tenet 2: School Leadership

Dr. Golden noted that this tenet is applied in the Professional Development (PD) Plan through training on the use of data for decision-making, strategies for student engagement, and review of the *Dignity for All Students Act*. She stated that the Plan includes a description of the training, the target audience, timeframe, and ways in which it is linked to the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) and other performance measures.

#### Tenet 3: Curriculum and Supports

Dr. Golden reported that a major change in the PD Plan is to incorporate a greater focus on equity and African American studies to enhance understanding of racism, implicit bias, and cultural responsiveness.

#### Tenet 4: Teaching Practices

This tenet pertains to the ability to understand curriculum development and to implement the curriculum in a highly effective classroom.

Dr. Golden reported that the Rochester curriculum is being used as a foundation to develop a curriculum that aligns with next-generation standards and incorporates cultural responsiveness. The Curriculum Development Committee has been reinstated, and will be composed of five teachers recommended by the Rochester Teachers' Association (RTA) and five administrators recommended by the Association of Supervisors and Administrators of Rochester (ASAR). Dr. Golden discussed the importance of encouraging teachers to participate in this process to incorporate their insight and experience and promote greater investment in implementation of the new curriculum.

#### Tenet 5: Social/Emotional Development

Dr. Golden explained that training related to this tenet includes restorative practices, trauma-informed instruction, recognizing the effects of trauma, strategies for engaging parents and students who have been subjected to trauma, and preventing triggers of past trauma. Professional development related to this tenet also covers implicit bias training, which is provided to new and current employees.

#### Tenet 6: Parent Engagement

Tenet 6 includes professional development related to school-based planning and practices, next-generation standards, and strategies for supporting children's growth and development at home. Dr. Golden emphasized the importance of assuring parents of their ability to support their children's academic progress at home, regardless of their own personal competencies.

Commissioner Elliott stated that Paraprofessionals have not been involved in decision-making effectively in the past, and their training needs should be addressed in the Professional Development Plan. Commissioner Elliott pointed out that Paraprofessionals often work with students individually, and may have more personal knowledge or insight about a student than the teacher is able to obtain.

Dr. Golden replied that Paraprofessionals are included in the Professional Development Plan, particularly in terms of teaching practices and effective ways to engage students. She added that training for Paraprofessionals is addressed throughout the Plan.

Dr. Aquino reported that his interviews with Paraprofessionals indicated that these staff members perceive that their professional development is typically considered an afterthought. From his review of the professional development offered by the District, he noted that none of the sessions were tailored to Paraprofessional staff.

Dr. Aquino requested clarification about the agenda for this evening's meeting because it refers to a comprehensive review of the curriculum plan, but the actual presentation pertains to the District's professional development plan. Dr. Golden confirmed that her presentation this evening is of the professional development plan, and the curriculum plan is currently in the process of being updated to incorporate cultural responsiveness and next-generation standards. Dr. Golden decided to present the

professional development plan in this evening's meeting because completion of the curriculum plan depends upon providing training to staff for curriculum writing.

Commissioner Sheppard asked about the timeframe for the Curriculum Council to begin and complete their work on the curriculum plan. Dr. Golden responded that five administrators have been recommended, and she is waiting for recommendations for five teachers to serve on the Curriculum Council. She stated that she expects that the Curriculum Council to begin meeting in early December, but the work has already begun in the Teaching & Learning Division.

Commissioner Sheppard inquired about the timeline for completing the District's curriculum plan.

Commissioner White pointed out that professional development should be based on the curriculum, but the District seems to be undertaking these efforts in reverse order. He stated that he does not understand the reasons for the delays in curriculum planning and development, since these topics have been discussed for quite a while. Commissioner White declared that there still is no roadmap for the curriculum, which is foundational and elementary to the work that is done in the District. He questioned the reason for the lack of information about the comprehensive curriculum plan at this point.

Dr. Golden reported that professional development is being addressed first because of a lack of confidence among staff in the Teaching & Learning Division about their ability to develop a curriculum. She stated that approximately \$75K in unexpended funds are available to train staff on curriculum development and writing, and the training will begin in December 2018. Dr. Golden clarified that staff have to know how to create a quality curriculum that meets standards of excellence.

Dr. Golden pointed out that a District-wide curriculum did exist at one time, but was apparently abandoned. She stated that staff in the Teaching & Learning Division are currently reviewing the Rochester curriculum and using it as a foundation upon which to build. She noted that the District does not have consistency among teachers in terms of their curriculum knowledge or practice. Dr. Golden used 8<sup>th</sup> grade Math as an example to illustrate the complexity of the considerations involved in developing a district-wide curriculum. She reported that almost all RCSD 8<sup>th</sup> grade students scored at the lowest levels on NYS Math assessments (i.e. Level 1 or 2), but much higher percentages of these students scored at proficiency on the Regents Math exam. Dr. Golden explained that this raises the question as to whether the District should use the 8<sup>th</sup> grade NYS Math assessment or the 9<sup>th</sup> grade Math Regents exam as the basis for the 8<sup>th</sup> grade math curriculum, particularly since all students are required to pass the Regents exam to graduate. She noted that these critical questions have to be discussed with stakeholders as part of developing the District-wide curriculum.

Commissioner Powell observed that at least one urban school district in New York uses 9<sup>th</sup> grade Regents exams to evaluate student academic progress in 8<sup>th</sup> grade. She noted that changes have been made in NYS regulations to remove penalties for using the Regents exam instead of the NYS 8<sup>th</sup> grade assessment. Commissioner Powell added that use of the Math Regents exam as the standard for measuring progress in 8<sup>th</sup> grade would also introduce students to algebra and geometry.

Dr. Golden pointed out that modifications are needed for vertical alignment of the curriculum to ensure that students are prepared for the next course in the sequence and that teachers are equipped to

teach a Regents level course in 8<sup>th</sup> grade. She emphasized the importance of thoughtful curriculum planning and decision-making to ensure that the final product addresses student needs and District goals.

Dr. Aquino observed that the term “curriculum” has been used interchangeably in the District with the terms “standards”, “curriculum maps”, and “textbooks”, and clear, precise definitions are needed. He asserted that the Board should be informed of the plan and status of curriculum development for each subject area, suggesting that the Administration begin by providing information of the curriculum and textbooks used in each school. Dr. Aquino pointed out that this information is necessary for the Board to plan for budgeting purposes and to prioritize among various funding allocations.

Parent Representative Toyin Anderson inquired about the effectiveness of the curriculum currently used in the District. She pointed out that the District seems to be in the development process constantly, while implementation is lagging. Ms. Anderson discussed the urgency in putting an effective curriculum in place because students are losing valuable instructional time. Dr. Golden replied that there is currently a great deal of variation in the curriculum used in schools, with nine different ELA programs/curricula in RCSD elementary schools. Dr. Golden noted that pedagogy and teacher practices have to be examined to ensure that teachers have the capacity to provide the instruction necessary to implement the curriculum.

Commissioner Elliott pointed out that the Board may have to examine the degree of autonomy given to schools because of inconsistencies in curriculum implementation and instruction. She stated that methods for providing uniformity in curriculum and foundational skills (e.g. reading, critical thinking) must be considered.

Commissioner Sheppard noted that staff seem to be ready to begin developing the curriculum but the delay is due to a lack of confidence in their abilities. She stated that she does not understand how staff members in the Teaching & Learning Division can have such a lack of confidence regarding curriculum knowledge or development, since this is their entire job function.

Dr. Golden explained that work on curriculum development and writing has proceeded in the Teaching & learning Division, despite the need for professional development. She reported that staff have been working on curriculum writing for the last several weeks, but expressed concern about ELA because it is foundational for students’ learning in other subjects and in subsequent grade levels.

Commissioner Powell commented that the discussion regarding curriculum development seems to pertain specifically to ELA and reading, since District-wide textbooks have been adopted in the core subjects of science, social studies, and math. Commissioner Powell noted that District-wide textbook adoption has been used to ensure that a high-quality curriculum is provided for every student. Dr. Golden confirmed that the curriculum inconsistencies are in the District’s ELA and reading programs. She added that an inventory must be taken in each school to ensure that there is an adequate supply of the textbooks that have been adopted.

Commissioner Powell referred to the issue of student mobility in the District, noting that a decision has to be made whether to allow students to remain in the same school through the terminal grade. She noted that every RCSD school has students from every zone, which should not happen if the

District has been adhering to the *Parent Preference/Managed Choice Policy* (5153). Commissioner Powell requested a study to map the schools attended by each student from the time that they first enrolled in the District. She questioned the extent to which cross-zone student placement is due to administrative convenience, rather than an actual issue arising from family mobility.

Ms. Anderson questioned how different curricula and textbooks came to be used in different schools specifically for ELA. Dr. Golden replied that School-Based Planning Teams have the autonomy to determine the curriculum and textbooks to be used in their school. She stated that she will advocate for a District-wide curriculum and textbook adoption in the new collective bargaining contracts because these decisions should not be left to the School-Based Planning Teams.

Commissioner Elliott asserted that the Board should re-evaluate the value and authority of the School-Based Planning Teams, particularly in schools with poor performance. She emphasized the need for a systemic examination of the obstacles keeping the overall District from making progress.

Commissioner Sheppard stated that while she supports conducting a systemic examination of barriers impeding progress, she is concerned that the function of School-Based Planning Teams is largely defined by law. Karl Kristoff replied that much of the role and function of the School-based Planning Teams is established in NYS law and in several of the District's collective bargaining agreements.

#### **IV. Action Plan for the Path Forward Initiative**

Deputy Superintendent Beth Mascitti-Miller explained that the presentation this evening focuses on the following questions and requests for information that Board members have submitted regarding the Path Forward Action Plan:

1. Specific problems/gaps in implementing the *Parent Preference/Managed Choice Policy* (5153);
2. Corrective actions to be taken to address each particular problem/gap, and the staff member responsible for each corrective action;
3. Timeline for completing all of the necessary corrective actions; and
4. Consequences for future violations in implementing the *Parent Preference/Managed Choice Policy*

Joe Capezutto discussed the *Parent Preference/Managed Choice Policy*, which went into effect in 2004 after completion of a study conducted by Dr. Michael Alves and Dr. Willies. Research indicated that one zone was needed for every 15,000 students to provide sufficient access and school choice for families. In 2004, the District had over 30,000 students enrolled and therefore three zones were needed. When the policy went into effect, each zone had more than eight schools. The zone boundaries were also created to provide a more equitable distribution of students across the District in terms of race and socioeconomic status.

Mr. Capezutto explained that the school choice system enables parents to rank order their top three school choices within their zone, and an algorithm was created to maximize opportunities for students

to be placed in their first choice of schools. In addition, the policy provides preference in placing students in a school in which their sibling is enrolled, and students who choose to attend a neighborhood school (i.e. within a ½-mile radius of their home).

Mr. Capezutto presented an analysis of a sample of 257 students in the 2014-15 Kindergarten cohort who participated in the school choice lottery, which represents approximately 20% of all lottery participants:

- All of the students sampled who participated in the lottery were placed in their first-choice zone school.
- In 2017-18, 26% of the students sampled were still enrolled in the school in which they were placed in kindergarten. (In 2017-18, these students were in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade at the school)
- Of the remaining 74% of the students sampled, three years later (2017-18):
  - ❖ 25% had moved out of the District or state;
  - ❖ 23% transferred to a charter, private, or parochial school or participated in the Urban-Suburban program by third grade;
  - ❖ 7% were placed in Special Education within their zone;
  - ❖ 7% were placed in Special Education outside of their zone; and
  - ❖ The remainder transferred voluntarily to a school within their zone, a city-wide school, or a school in the new zone where they were living.

Commissioner Elliott expressed concern about staff in the Placement Office directing families' selection of schools, rather than allowing them to make their own decisions. She described a situation in which a parent requested that their child be placed in School No. 25 to attend a special program. Commissioner Elliott stated that the parent reported being directed by staff in the Placement Office to enroll their child in School No. 46 instead, and this is the school in which their child was ultimately placed. Commissioner Elliott asserted that staff in the Placement Office advocated for a particular school placement based on race. She emphasized the need to address and rectify these issues in the Placement Office.

Mr. Capezutto reported that the Placement Office had over 23,000 address changes for RCSD students last year, including those attending charter, parochial, and private schools and students who are schooled at home.

Commissioner Elliott acknowledged the difficulties in managing such a high volume of changes throughout the school year, but asserted that the District has to improve its ability to manage these processes and allow parents to make genuine choices about their children's school.

Commissioner Powell observed that the maps illustrating the geographic distribution of students for each RCSD school reflect the boundaries used *before* adoption of the *Parent Preference/Managed Choice Policy*. The policy established a ½-mile radius for determining preference for placement in a neighborhood school, and the former boundaries should not have been used. The former boundaries are not necessarily within ½-mile or walking distance from the school.

**ACTION ITEM: The maps illustrating the geographic distribution of students for each RCSD school will be revised to show the ½-mile radius, rather than the catchment boundaries used prior to adoption of the *Parent Preference/Managed Choice Policy* (5153).**

Commissioner White observed that the students attending each RCSD school are scattered throughout the District, impeding the ability to shift to a neighborhood school model.

Dr. Mascitti-Miller pointed out that the clusters on the map reflect the District's efforts to place students in a school within their zone.

Commissioner Powell discussed problems with the initial implementation of the *Parent Preference/Managed Choice Policy* because the code for the lottery program was not rewritten to give placement preference to neighborhood students living within a ½-mile radius of each school. Mr. Capezutto reported that rewriting the code for the lottery program was problematic because some families did not reside within ½ mile of any RCSD school.

Commissioner White pointed out that the data of the percentage of students in each RCSD school who reside within the zone indicates that the District has made efforts to adhere to the *Parent Preference/Managed Choice Policy*.

Dr. Mascitti-Miller pointed out that one of the measures used to evaluate the impact of student placement is the percentage of students attending an RCSD school within their zone. She stated that certain schools (e.g. School No. 29) have a unique program to meet students' needs, which creates apparent anomalies in the percentage of out-of-zone students attending the school. Dr. Mascitti-Miller explained that there is a rationale underlying each of these apparent anomalies, citing School No. 8 as an example of a school with a lot of self-contained classrooms for Special Education.

Commissioner Powell noted that Board attention is needed to address highly specialized programs and schools with high percentages of students from outside the zone. She stated that some schools do not take their share of self-contained classrooms, which forces students to attend a school that is farther away. Commissioner Powell asserted that there is a problem with school leadership if the school is not accepting students that live within the ½-mile radius.

Dr. Mascitti-Miller reported that she and Dr. Golden are collaborating to develop a plan to improve the distribution of students across the District to address needs for next year.

Mr. Capezutto acknowledged that cross-zone placement and transportation remain issues in the District, but maintained that parents often select a school in their zone based on transportation needs. He estimated that 20% of families have a pre-determined plan for their child's transportation at particular times of the day because of parents' work schedules. An even greater percentage of families (over 50%) select a school some distance away to ensure that transportation will be provided because of their concern about their child's safety in walking to school. Mr. Capezutto reported that approximately 88% of K-8 students are transported to school by bus.

Commissioner Elliott emphasized the importance of understanding the reasons for parents' school choices to obtain a holistic perspective of family needs. She requested detailed data regarding the

factors affecting families' selection of schools, specifically the percentage of families that select a school based on programming, transportation needs, or some other factor.

**ACTION ITEM: Data will be provided to the Board of the percentage of families that select schools based on:**

- **Programming**
- **Transportation needs:**
  - ❖ **To accommodate parents' work schedules**
  - ❖ **Due to safety concerns in having their child walk to school**
- **Other considerations**

Commissioner Sheppard pointed out that this level of detailed data is critical to the Board in considering the placement of programs in schools for before- and after-school care and in adopting a neighborhood school approach.

Dr. Mascitti-Miller noted that the data can also be used to examine the specific programs in community schools and the extent to which families can access the services that are offered.

Mr. Capezutto presented data regarding the 2018-19 Kindergarten lottery process, noting that 1417 out of a total of 1960 students participated in the lottery (~72%) and 87.9% of lottery participants were placed in their first-choice school. He noted that the school choice process is more restricted for 7<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grade because compacts, auditions, and interviews are used for admission into some of the RCSD secondary schools. Mr. Capezutto reported that the following schools will be brought back into the centralized placement process: School of the Arts, School Without Walls, Rochester Early College High School, Wilson Commencement Academy, East High School, and World of Inquiry School No. 58. He discussed the entry requirements for these schools:

School of the Arts: Audition

School Without Walls: Interview

World of Inquiry School No. 58: Participation in enrollment activity and meeting with the principal to ensure a good fit

Rochester Early College High School: Academic requirements and meeting with family

Wilson Commencement Academy: Meeting to discuss expectations and criteria for the International Baccalaureate program

Mr. Capezutto pointed out that these school compacts present an obstacle for some students, citing World of Inquiry School No. 58 as an example. He stated that students whose parents are not available on a Wednesday evening or a Saturday will not have the same access to the school as other students. Mr. Capezutto stated that bringing these schools into a centralized process is intended to address and ameliorate these obstacles.

Dr. Mascitti-Miller observed that the centralized placement process will enable data to be collected for these schools to improve accountability regarding access and admissions practices.

Mr. Capezutto reported that 75% of families of students entering 7<sup>th</sup> grade in 2018-19 participated in the school choice process, with 51% of these students choosing to remain in their K-8 school and 34% being placed in their first-choice school. He added that the School of the Arts and World of Inquiry School No. 58 have greater capacity to accept incoming 7<sup>th</sup> grade students than those entering 9<sup>th</sup> grade. World of Inquiry School also has greater capacity at the 7<sup>th</sup> grade level than at the Kindergarten level.

The families of 81% of students entering 9<sup>th</sup> grade in 2018-19 participated in the lottery process. Of the participants, 59% elected to remain in the same school and 22% were enrolled in their first choice of schools.

Mr. Capezutto described efforts to create a more seamless process for students transitioning from PreK to Kindergarten, as part of the preparations involved in implementing the Path Forward initiative. He explained that parents currently have to complete a 14-page application packet to enter their child in a PreK program in the District, and a separate packet has to be completed for entry into Kindergarten. Mr. Capezutto stated that the application has been streamlined to enable parents to indicate their preferences when their child enters PreK in the District. He pointed out that the Home Language Questionnaire will still be required for entry into PreK and into Kindergarten because language needs and proficiency may change significantly over this period of time.

Mr. Capezutto reported that a staff member from the Placement Office travels to each of the District's PreK sites (including community-based programs) to offer assistance to parents with the Kindergarten application and school selection process. Mr. Capezutto stated that this staff member collaborates closely with Parent Leaders in PreK programs and Parent Liaisons in RCSD schools to follow up with parents. He noted that a database of all PreK students has greatly facilitated outreach and follow-up with parents, and includes information of the reason(s) for parents not participating in the lottery process.

Commissioner Powell maintained that RCSD schools that do not have PreK programs have fewer students from the neighborhood (i.e. within a ½-mile radius) in Kindergarten. She pointed out that the families residing in the neighborhood are already disconnected from the school by the time their child enters Kindergarten. She urged her colleagues to ensure that there is at least one track for PreK students in every RCSD elementary school.

Dr. Mascitti-Miller reported that one of the elements of the Facilities Modernization Program is to align the number of PreK sections with the number of Kindergarten sections in each RCSD school.

Mr. Capezutto described a number of improvement efforts currently under way in the Placement Office:

- Renovating the Office to upgrade technology and create a more welcoming environment for families;
- Developing an online school selection process for students entering 7<sup>th</sup> or 9<sup>th</sup> grade in 2019-20; and
- Creating an online school choice process for students entering Kindergarten in 2020-21

Parents will be able to participate in the online school choice process using their smart phone, home computer, a computer at their child's current school, or a Chromebook offered in the Placement

Office. Mr. Capezutto explained that parents will only need to enter their child's student identification number, and the system will match the information with District files. He reported that the online system will be available to parents when the placement books are sent to students' homes. The placement books are currently in the final stages of review.

Mr. Capezutto observed that students who do not participate in the school choice process also tend to struggle with attendance and need additional support. He noted that the parents of these students often work multiple jobs, making their availability and opportunity to participate quite limited. Mr. Capezutto asserted that these students would benefit greatly from school choice, noting that greater outreach efforts are being made through enhanced collaboration between the Placement Office, Attendance Department, and Parent Liaisons in schools.

Commissioner Powell asked whether families are informed in the school choice process of the schools in receivership or that have not met progress targets. Dr. Mascitti-Miller replied that the District is required to provide this information to families, but the NYS Education Department has not yet released information about the schools in receivership this year. As a result, the Placement Office is waiting a few more weeks to fill in this level of detail in the materials provided to parents.

Commissioner White recalled that the Board had been informed a few years ago that only about half of District parents participate in the lottery process, but the data that has been presented indicates a much higher level of participation. He inquired about placement practices for students whose parents have not participated in the school choice process.

Mr. Capezutto emphasized that students are not placed in a school without parental input. He stated that robocalls and letters are sent throughout the summer to families of students who have not yet selected a school. Mr. Capezutto noted that parents are offered as many choices of schools as are available in the District. He clarified that "non-participation" refers to the lottery process and selecting a school by a specific deadline, rather than not having any choice of schools.

Commissioner Elliott observed that parents may register late or move into the District after the lottery deadline. She asked about the reasons for parents selecting their children's school after the lottery has been conducted. Mr. Capezutto responded that many parents have plans to move to a new location or to enroll their child in a charter, parochial or private school at the time the lottery is held. Families' plans may change for a variety of reasons, which leads parents to choose a school for their children after the lottery has been conducted.

Commissioner Sheppard requested data regarding lottery participation for each RCSD school to clarify apparent discrepancies in the information that has been reported to the Board.

**ACTION ITEM: Data will be provided to the Board of the percentage of students whose parents participated in the lottery process in each RCSD school at the Kindergarten, 7<sup>th</sup> grade, and 9<sup>th</sup> grade levels.**

Commissioner Powell pointed out that the data may have been misleading to the extent that it was based on the percentage of parents who filed an application. An application may not have been filed if parents chose to have their child remain in the same school in 7<sup>th</sup> or 9<sup>th</sup> grade.

Meeting adjourned at 7:30PM.