

FINAL REPORT

OF THE

MAGNET STEERING COMMITTEE

Presented by: JCPS Magnet Steering Committee
In Preparation for: Board Work Session (June 27, 2017)
DRAFT: June 21, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT?.....	3
Background on Magnet Steering Committee	3
Guiding Principles and Methods of the Magnet Steering Committee.....	4
HOW DO MAGNET SCHOOLS AND PROGRAMS FIT INTO JCPS?.....	5
Definition and Purpose	5
History	6
Alignment with Vision 2020	6
Current State	6
District Organization and Function.....	7
District Funding	7
Student Assignment and Admission.....	8
Magnetism, Diversity and Access, Achievement.....	10
Successes.....	11
Challenges	12
WHAT IMPROVEMENTS DOES THE MAGNET STEERING COMMITTEE PROPOSE?	14
Key System Improvements	14
Financial Resource Allocation	15
Enhanced District Coordination and Support.....	15
Magnet Program Standards, Processes, and Criteria.....	17
Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendations	18
HOW AND WHEN SHOULD IMPROVEMENTS BE IMPLEMENTED?.....	48
District Work	48
Goals for Magnet Schools and Programs: One, Three, and Five Years	48
One year	48
Three years.....	48
Five years.....	49
HOW WILL WE KNOW IMPROVEMENTS ARE SUCCESSFUL?.....	49
Expected Outcomes	49
Districtwide Team for Monitoring Progress	50
GLOSSARY	51
REFERENCES	52

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT?

This report summarizes the improvement opportunities for the magnet system identified by the Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS) Magnet Steering Committee. The report satisfies the Committee's ultimate objective, assigned to it by the Jefferson County Board of Education (JCBOE), of developing a long-term plan to "...clarify the purpose, mission, and goals of magnet programs throughout the district" in response to a recommendation from Magnet Schools of America (MSA).

The accompanying Executive Summary and Appendices are published as separate documents.

Background on Magnet Steering Committee

In January 2014, JCPS invited Magnet Schools of America to review our magnets. JCPS established a contract with MSA to conduct this review of the JCPS magnet schools and programs and to offer recommendations for improvement¹. JCPS asked MSA to focus on three essential questions:

1. Are the magnet schools magnetic?
2. Are the magnet programs diverse?
3. Are the magnet programs promoting achievement?

MSA focused its review around these three questions, and it utilized its own criteria and method for what constitutes a successful magnet school. These criteria embody what MSA calls "the Five Pillars of Magnet Schools—Essential Attributes of Successful Magnet Schools." As a result, MSA expanded its review of JCPS magnet programs beyond the three questions to provide its views of what a magnet program should be. The outcome of the MSA review was a report with 26 district recommendations and other school recommendations (MSA, March 2014)². The Committee focused on the larger 26 recommendations to maintain a systems focus, but it also examined school-level recommendations as case studies to inform proposed improvements.

One of the recommendations (MSA Recommendation 3) specifically addressed how improvements to the existing system should be implemented through a community task force:

JCPS should create a community task force with various stakeholders to determine the purpose, goals, and types of magnet programs that will serve students in the county. The goals of the task force should be to develop a five-year strategic plan, monitor implementation, and serve in an advisory capacity upon its implementation.

- MSA Report, p. v

Initially, instead of a community task force with outside stakeholders, JCPS leadership created a committee that consisted entirely of JCPS employees. That group presented a preliminary plan to the JCPS Board of Education on May 11, 2015. At the conclusion, the Board determined that additional community input would be helpful. In the months that followed, the current iteration of the Committee

¹ Magnet Schools of America (MSA) is a nonprofit professional education association. It represents magnet schools, school district leaders, principals, teachers, parents and families, business partners, and institutions of higher education. . MSA has developed its own definition of "magnet schools" and has developed its own set of criteria for what makes a successful magnet program. It also offers, for a fee, an evaluation service that will review and evaluate a school district's magnet system and offer recommendations for improvement.

² The full MSA report and recommendations can be found on the district website:
<https://www.jefferson.kyschools.us/about/accountability/msa-review>

was formed, which included not only JCPS employees but also members of the community. Those members were chosen through a selection process in which the 15th District PTA, the Governor's Commonwealth Institute for Parent Leadership (GCIPL), and Louisville Urban League reviewed candidates. The candidate review panel group developed a slate of potential members from applications received through a public applications process.

The new Committee with community members met for the first time in October 2015. Initially, the Committee was comprised of a "Core Committee" of 12, plus an additional 12 participants to form a Full Committee of 24 members. Each group included half community members and half JCPS staff. Since its formation, the Committee has lost several members (mostly due to changes in availability) and has since consolidated into a single large group. The Committee has met two times each month since its formation. It also formed subcommittees to evaluate specific issues and to focus on sets of recommendations from the MSA.

This group agreed to work as a committee under this model for a two-year period (September 2015 through September 2017). The Committee included several JCPS central office personnel responsible for facilitating, supporting, and managing magnet schools and programs, as well as community members, principals, teachers, and students.

The core work of the Magnet Steering Committee focused on the 2014 recommendations given to the district by MSA, but the review also considered potential systemic improvements beyond those recommended by MSA. Thus, the objective of the Committee was to determine whether, and how, to implement the recommendations in JCPS as part of a *cohesive school system* and to explore whether additional improvements to the system could be made. Magnet schools and programs should support greater diversity, improve student learning and achievement, and become more attractive and accessible (i.e. more magnetic) for all students. These were the same three target area questions that were intended to guide the 2014 MSA review.

MSA also noted that JCPS has repeatedly received national recognition as a large urban school district for its efforts to achieve diversity, equity, and excellence through a system based on maximizing student and parent choice. The magnet system plays a crucial role in meeting these objectives by providing students with unique learning opportunities that engage students' interest and challenge them to reach their full potential. The Steering Committee's tenure over the past 20 months has confirmed that there is much to be proud of when it comes to the magnet system, but they also acknowledge that multiple opportunities exist for improvement and expansion.

Guiding Principles and Methods of the Magnet Steering Committee

For the most part, the Committee focused on a high level review of the MSA recommendations to improve magnets as a cohesive system within JCPS as opposed to proposing changes to individual schools. The Committee came to this approach after working together to describe a common mission for magnets in JCPS.

This Mission statement for JCPS captures key elements and functions of all programs called *magnets* across the nation.

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

– JCPS Magnet Steering Committee, 2015

This mission statement describes the purpose of magnet programs in JCPS, and it has guided the Committee's work. In particular, agreement on this statement helped clarify the need to focus on larger, systems issues in order to achieve this mission, such as developing more consistent and transparent practices across magnet programs aligned with the district's strategic vision.

Committee members adopted a guiding framework to define how they would move forward starting with systems-level work (What are we trying to do?), strategies for addressing these priorities (How are we trying to do it?), and processes and data for ensuring strategies are implemented and priorities met (How will we know it's working?). Committee proposed common magnet program standards for schools to work toward demonstrating magnetism, diversity, and academic excellence as well as suggested general criteria and practices for how and when to introduce, evaluate, and replicate programs. The Committee has examined larger issues affecting improved diversity including increased transparency and access. It has also considered the potential competing interests of equitable access and sustained excellence. The Magnet Steering Committee guiding framework can be found in Appendix A.

The Steering Committee has reviewed individual schools and programs as case studies to understand how issues and challenges play out at the school and district levels. However, the Committee has avoided proposing specific changes to specific schools because this is beyond the scope of their role; instead, the standards and processes proposed by the Steering Committee should allow district offices to move forward with decisions on individual schools.

Finally, the Committee developed its own Charter to solidify the Magnet Mission and Committee guiding framework. The Committee Charter describes their purpose, roles, scope of work, and processes for prioritizing work and receiving feedback from various groups. This document served to anchor the Committee to ensure work aligns with priorities, and it clearly defines their purpose and methods for non-Committee members. The Charter of the JCPS Magnet Steering Committee can be found in Appendix B.

The Magnet Steering Committee has tried to suggest change only where it saw such changes fitting in with the magnet system as it actually exists within JCPS. The Committee also has remained cognizant of the need to avoid suggesting change that could have a negative effect on the goals of supporting diversity and excellence.

HOW DO MAGNET SCHOOLS AND PROGRAMS FIT INTO JCPS?

In this section, we describe the history and mechanics of how the magnet system operates currently within JCPS, the successes and challenges of using this educational model in JCPS historically, and how magnets support and align with Vision 2020.

Definition and Purpose

A *magnet* is a public school with specialized, theme-based curricula intended to “attract” a diverse body of students from a wide array of backgrounds, experience levels, and school boundary areas (e.g., U.S. Department of Education, 2009, 2016; Magnet Schools of America, 2016). These programs “...are typically more ‘hands on – minds on’ and use an approach to learning that is inquiry or performance/project based” (Magnet Schools of America, 2016).

The focus on diversity always has been a core tenet of the magnet model nationally. As described by the U.S. Department of Education (USED), the objective of increasing racial and socioeconomic diversity is

not simply to put people together, but to enhance the learning environment for all students. As an outcome, USED point to research showing that attending an integrated school contributes to improved academic and life outcomes for students (e.g., Ayscue, Levy, Siegel-Hawley, & Woodward, 2017; Coleman, 2005; U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

History

Historically, JCPS has offered magnets as a means of reducing racial isolation and improving diversity by attracting students from different areas of the county starting in 1972. Since that time, magnets have been a major strategy used by the district to meet student assignment goals (e.g., diversity; equity; choice). Magnet themes attractive to families in JCPS have included programs such as visual arts, performing arts, Montessori, international baccalaureate (IB), and MST (math, science, technology).

Magnets began in JCPS with the development of several *magnet schools* where all accepted students participated in the magnet theme/curriculum (e.g. traditional programs; J. Graham Brown school). Over time, the district also implemented *magnet programs* in some schools. Schools with magnet programs within them accept students who apply to participate in the magnet theme while remaining students assigned to the school participate in the comprehensive program (e.g. Westport Middle). In some instances, all students in a school with a magnet program can participate in magnet theme offerings.

The specialized learning environments in magnet schools or programs are devoted to a particular academic area or theme. For example, the theme at Brandeis is science, technology, engineering, art, and math(STEAM), and the theme at Lincoln is performing arts. A particular academic approach or philosophy may also form the basis of magnet schools like the Montessori programs at Coleridge-Taylor and Kennedy, or the traditional program schools. All of these are considered “magnets” within JCPS.

Alignment with Vision 2020

While Vision 2020 does not identify magnets explicitly, the magnet education model serves as a clear strategy for directly supporting several major district strategic priorities: deeper learning, improving choice, and reducing opportunity gaps. By design, magnets should bring together a diverse range of students and families by offering theme-based choices with deeper, personalized learning environments.

These are exactly the core purposes of *magnets* – access, diversity, and choice to enhance student opportunity and success. The new JCPS Magnet Program Standards developed by the Steering Committee highlight best practices that all magnets should strive to provide, including attracting a diverse student body.

Conversely, magnets should benefit directly from other Vision 2020 priorities such as improved infrastructure. Magnets often require resources above and beyond those needed to achieve missions of comprehensive schools, such as additional visual arts equipment and media, music facilities or instruments, or technology labs to support their theme appropriately. These resources are the lens through which learning occurs across the curriculum in magnet programs. As such, magnets should receive appropriate infrastructure (equipment, instructional support, and staffing) to create appropriate learning environments to attract students.

Current State

JCPS currently has 66 magnet schools and programs (see district website for Choices [brochures](#)). To understand how JCPS can better use magnets to enhance overall student achievement and diversity, it is important to recognize the role magnets play within the larger choice-based system. In this section of

the report, we describe the current state of magnets within JCPS regarding organizational structure, funding, student admission and assignment, and meeting magnet objectives (magnetism, diversity and access, achievement). From this current picture, we highlight successes and challenges relative to the magnet mission and JCPS district priorities.

District Organization and Function

Magnet schools and programs play an important part in a system of managed choice within JCPS. Ideally, such a system allows families to choose a school that meets their particular interests and needs. The choice-based system also allows JCPS to ensure a level of diversity within our schools that we have not yet been able to achieve in the community.

A choice-based system, however, necessarily adds complexity and responsibility for families. Magnets operate *within* the choice-based system and further contribute to the complexity of the school system. Families sometimes find it daunting to navigate. Ironically, the system created to ensure diversity as a means of increasing equity in educational opportunity creates for some a barrier to full participation in that system.

At present, two central office staff coordinate and oversee approximately 66 magnet schools and programs across the district. The Coordinator of Optional and Magnet Programs works with schools to develop and expand magnet curriculum, review new proposed magnets, and assist with access to professional development opportunities. JCPS also has an Optional and Magnet Program Coordinator who works with schools and families on student admission to magnets and transition to and from magnet programs.

District Funding

The Steering Committee reviewed district and individual school funding from information provided by the Budget and Finance Office, the Magnet Office, and the district website. Based on this review, the Committee found the following funding circumstances.

- The district does not designate funds separately for special programmatic needs of magnet schools and programs (other than the two district magnet coordinator positions).
- The district has provided funding for *some* magnet schools and programs across school levels (approximately 40%) in the past two years through the annual budget process.
 - Add-ons funds (e.g., upcoming magnets in 2017-18 Elementary= 56%; Middle = 26%; High = 37%) for resources such as magnet teachers, coordinators, teachers for small class size at elementary redesign schools, some organizational fees, and some materials/supplies. NOTE: Some elementary redesign schools are no longer magnets but still receive funding for small class size; these schools were not included in estimates.
 - Small funds for conference participation, curriculum materials from grants/Title II funds received through the Magnet Office [e.g, 2016-17 ES = 54%,(\$16,768.32); MS = 46% (\$14,326.15); HS = 0, (\$0.00)]
 - Startup funds for new magnets and expanded programming via budget request allocation process (e.g., upcoming 2017-18 Olmsted North STEM; Central Montessori; Western Middle visual/performing arts)
- A rough estimate of 20% of magnets receive other funds through grants, community partners, or Perkins funds (only available to high school certified Career and Technical Education programs).
- The majority of magnets also use funds within their standardized yearly budgets to cover some portion of magnet-related costs (varies widely) in addition to other school needs.

- The Magnet Office budget covers its own personnel and operational office costs as well as event costs and materials for *Showcase of Schools* (the Communications Office funds publicity for Showcase).

Student Assignment and Admission

Elementary. Under the current Student Assignment Plan, students in grades kindergarten through five apply to schools within the cluster based on where they live ³. Each cluster is comprised of several (five to eight) schools. Each student has a designated resides school based on the student's address. When completing the cluster application, families must rank each school in the cluster in their order of preference. In addition to cluster choices, families may apply to a magnet school or program. All kindergartners and students new to the district must apply for admission to schools, either through the cluster system or the magnet system. Students who live within a school's resides area in the cluster are generally given priority based on available seating within the school. JCPS will assign each student to a school and that student can remain at the school throughout the student's elementary career unless the student moves. Transportation is guaranteed within the cluster, except for students who attend optional programs outside of their cluster.

JCPS elementary traditional schools are magnets which have their own boundary areas independent of the cluster system. Those schools are Audubon, Greathouse-Shryock, Schaffner and Carter. Foster and Shelby are traditional schools that serve students districtwide, but also enroll students assigned within the cluster system. Admission to all traditional schools occurs through a *lottery*, or random draw, based on the application pool. Families submit their applications through the district website to enter the traditional school lottery to the particular school that serves their address.

Other than traditional schools, elementary magnet *programs* within schools generally use lotteries or a combination of lotteries and criteria in selecting students. In comparison, Brandeis and Lincoln are whole school magnets that use criteria to choose their students. Brown uses both criteria and a random draw process when selecting students. This selection process is based on published criteria such as recommendations, attendance at a tour, evaluations from pre-school teachers regarding student reading, writing, counting and other academic abilities.

Magnets differ from optional programs offered in JCPS in that: (1) diversity is not necessarily a primary objective of the optional programs, and (2) optional programs are open to admissions from across the district but transportation is not provided districtwide. Hawthorne Elementary, for instance, offers an optional Spanish immersion program that is open to students districtwide, but Hawthorne also enrolls students assigned within cluster 13. All students, regardless of entry point, participate in the same Spanish immersion educational experience.

Middle School. Middle school students outside the magnet system are assigned to the middle school that serves the area in which they reside. For some students, transfer opportunities may also be available.

For students who wish to participate in the magnet system, the specific options for middle school magnet programs depend on the particular magnet in which the student is involved. For traditional schools, interested families apply for admission to the middle school that serves their address - Jefferson County Traditional Middle School, Barret or Johnson. Students in the Math Science and Technology (MST) program may apply to one of three middle schools depending on where they live - Meyzeek,

³ The current student assignment plan was approved by the BOE on December 15, 2014. A copy of the Student Assignment Plan is attached at Appendix C.

Newburg, or Farnsley. Districtwide magnet programs are offered in the following areas: Aerospace (Academy @ Shawnee), Digital and Global Leadership (Thomas Jefferson), gender specific program (Olmsted Academy North (boys) and South (girls), Gifted and Talented (Noe), International Studies (Highland), Montessori (Westport), Self-Directed Learning (Brown) and Visual and Performing Arts (Western and Noe).

With the exception of the traditional middle schools and the Brown School, there are no whole school magnets at the middle school level. The middle schools that house magnet programs also serve resides students. In most cases, resides students may also have access to the learning opportunities provided to the students admitted through the magnets. Some resides students at Noe, for example, may attend the same arts classes as the students admitted through the Visual and Performing Arts Magnet.

Students who have been promoted from a traditional elementary school can enroll at the traditional middle school that serves their home address without submitting a new magnet application for middle school. Traditional middle schools usually have additional seats to offer families interested in the program and fill those seats through the random draw process conducted at central office. JCPS central office staff facilitate the random draw process, and provide the lists of students to the middle schools who then notify parents of selection based on available seats.

Applicants to the middle school MST programs at Newburg, Meyzeek and Farnsley are chosen using academic criteria.

The Gifted and Talented program at Noe requires students to achieve a 24 on the COGAT test and satisfy other academic and attendance criteria. The application process to Noe's visual and performing arts program requires applicants to submit additional materials used to evaluate students and admission is based on these submissions. The schools oversee the selection process. The Brown School also uses academic criteria to admit new students at the middle school level.

Applicants to Western Middle School's performing arts magnet are selected following an audition and based on academic criteria. Admission to The Academy at Shawnee requires a minimum score of 18 on the Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT).

High School. Similar to the assignment plan for middle school students, there are several choices as entry points to access high schools. JCPS high schoolers can be assigned to their resides school based on home address; they can apply to schools within a region (called networks at high school); or, they can apply to a magnet.

There are six districtwide magnets (Brown, Central, DuPont Manual, Youth Performing Arts School (YPAS), Male, and Butler). Students from across the district can apply to any of these schools. The magnet offered by the J. Graham Brown school offers a self-directed learning environment, while Central, Manual, and Youth Performing Arts School offer multiple programs within their schools. Applications to the various magnet programs housed at Manual are evaluated at the school level based on academic criteria and work product. Applicants to the performing arts programs also go through an audition process. Students applying to the MST, Visual Arts (VA) or performing arts programs coming from MST, VA or performing arts middle school programs are given first consideration. Applications for the various magnet programs housed at Central are evaluated at the high school level based on essays, recommendations and students records, including grades, attendance and test scores.

Eighth grade traditional middle school students can choose to enroll at Male or Butler without submitting a new magnet application for high school. Families of students not enrolled in a traditional middle school can apply to either Male or Butler via a JCPS magnet application. Male enrolls more students from the three traditional middle schools than it usually has spaces to accommodate. Therefore, it is unusual for students coming from outside the traditional middle school programs to be

admitted to Male. Conversely, Butler fills approximately half its seats with students coming from traditional middle schools and the remainder of its enrollment comes from the new applicant pool. Admission for new applicants is based on the random draw process. Unlike traditional elementary and middle schools, traditional high school magnets (Male and Butler) allow districtwide applications so that any student living in the district can apply to either school.

There are also a few district wide magnet *programs* available at high schools that also serve resides students (Atherton, Fairdale, Iroquois, Jeffersontown, Seneca, Southern, The Academy at Shawnee and Western). Some schools offer a mix of magnet programs and 5-Star programs, not all of which are magnets.

The remaining high schools in JCPS are structured as either 5-Star programs or Talent Development Academies. Both models are career-focused, but 5-Stars are programs to which students can apply based on their network area while Talent Development Academies are strictly resides-based (no application required).

General Admissions Process. Students applying to a magnet school or program may designate a first or second choice on their initial application. Popular schools with a large applicant pool usually can only select students who apply to their schools as their first choice. Consequently, they are unable to consider students who select them as a second choice because they do not have enough space. This system does not allow for a true second choice for magnet applicants.

Magnetism, Diversity and Access, Achievement

Elementary. Based on application, acceptance, and achievement data from the 2015-16 and the 2016-17 school years, it appears that the whole school magnets are, indeed, magnetic. In contrast, district data show that many elementary magnet programs within schools are not magnetic. For example, the four traditional whole school magnets regularly are oversubscribed, meaning there are more applicants than available spots. Similarly, Brandeis, Brown and Lincoln all had more families trying to gain admittance than they were able to accommodate. A summary of 2016-17 application and enrollment data for elementary magnets can be found in Appendix D.

Some magnet programs within schools are popular but not always oversubscribed, such as the Montessori programs at Coleridge-Taylor and Kennedy. In comparison, several programs showed single digit numbers of applicants, such as the MST program at Wheatley, the Technology program at Roosevelt-Perry, and the Gifted and Talented Program at King.

The *diversity index* (see glossary) of elementary whole school magnets ranges from 1.8 (Schaffner) to 2.5 (Greathouse) relative to the district average (elementary = 2.0). Note that JCPS does not currently publish the diversity index for magnet programs separate from the school in the Data Books. However, district data showed that elementary schools with magnet programs tend to have a lower diversity index than whole school magnets. This outcome likely is because these schools can only draw students from within a defined set of clusters instead of districtwide. This can still be relatively homogeneous in race/ethnicity and socioeconomic background.

Student achievement data show similar patterns for whole school versus within-school magnet programs. Student achievement data in whole school magnets, as measured by the percentage of proficient and distinguished students on the KPREP test, ranged from 70.3 % to 90.9 % in 2016-17 (district average = 62.8%). In comparison, proficiency rates for schools with magnet programs range from 10.5% to 58.6%. As with the diversity index, JCPS does not publish achievement data for individual magnet programs within schools separately in the Data Books.

Middle School. The whole school magnets at the middle school level are also very popular. All three traditional middle schools have more applicants than spaces available. The middle school programs within schools serving resides students are also generally popular. Noe's visual arts program received nearly four times as many applications as it had available spots for the 2015-16 school year. The three MST middle schools generally receive near capacity or more applicants than they have spots available. However, two magnet programs received relatively few applicants and were discontinued after the 2015-16 year.

The diversity indexes of the whole school magnet middle schools range from 1.7 (Johnson Traditional) to 2.5 (Barrett Traditional). The diversity data for the specific programs within schools is not available.

Achievement scores, as reflected by proficient/distinguished KPREP scores, were higher for whole school middle schools than the district average, ranging from 52.7% to 73.9%.

High School. The whole school magnet high schools are all popular. Male usually fills all available seats with students applying from the three traditional middle schools. Each year Male receives hundreds of applications from students who did not attend traditional middle schools, and many cannot be accepted because there are no seats. Butler Traditional High School currently is able to accept some new students to the traditional program, but they also receive more applicants than it has seats to offer students who apply to their program. Manual High School tends to receive at least twice as many applications as there are spots for each of its five magnet programs. Programs such as the IB program at Atherton also draw many more applicants than they can accommodate. Central High School received more applicants than spaces for some of its 10 programs.

The diversity index of the whole school magnets range from 1.4 (Central) to 2.4 (Manual).

Most of the high school magnets perform well in terms of test score data (KPREP end-of-course exams). For example, based on 2015-2016 testing data the average proficiency rate at Manual was 83.9%; Male (71.8%), and Butler (62.3%), all above the district average. In addition, students in magnets achieve college-career readiness (magnet average = 72.79%) and graduate (magnet = 89.28%) at slightly higher rates than the comprehensive high schools (CCR = 69.34%; graduation = 87.89%). We did find a substantial gap in proficiency rates between Central (29.3%) and Manual (83.95). The two traditional high schools both have proficient/distinguished percentages above the district average, with Male at 71.8% and Butler at 62.3%.

Successes

Many magnet schools and programs are very popular with JCPS parents and students. Approximately one-quarter of all students in the district attend a magnet program or Five Star school.

As noted in the above section, a number of district magnets are oversubscribed and show high achievement, especially the whole school magnets. Manual High School, Atherton High School, the J. Graham Brown School, traditional schools, Lincoln Elementary and several others all receive applications from more students than they can accommodate. The achievement scores for students in the popular, whole school magnets tend to be among the highest in the district. Schools with district wide magnet programs are within the district goals for their diversity index. Schools such as Brandeis, the Brown school and Manual have been successfully magnetic, meaning that they draw students from various race/ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds from across the district. High school magnets tend to show higher college and career readiness rates and graduation rates relative to non-magnets.

In 2015-16, the Student Assignment Office partially implemented MSA Recommendation No. 11 when it made technical system changes to the student application process allowing families to submit a single

set of materials (instead of hand delivering materials to each separate magnet to which they applied), which led to better access for families.

Challenges

Although many JCPS magnets show strong records of academic excellence and diversity, the Committee observed significant areas for improvement in both of these areas across the districts. Some of these same issues were identified in the Magnet Schools of America report, but the Committee tried to focus on these issues through the specific lens of how magnets fit into and support the JCPS system. In this section, we highlight key challenges that make it difficult for some magnets to be fully “magnetic”.

District Systems Support. A leading challenge identified by the Committee is the current lack of a consistent ***systems approach*** for the funding, support and evaluation of magnet schools and programs by the Board, Cabinet, and district central offices. Evidence of this lack of a systemic approach includes the following: (1) district financial resource allocation is not designed to sustain magnet themes, (2) there is no coordinated effort to develop school program information and marketing materials to forward the magnet mission, such as funding and coordination for Showcase of Schools, (3) the ad hoc manner in which the district has historically started new magnets and mirror programs, (4) the decentralized and inconsistent magnet application process, and (5) the absence of regular program evaluation against an established set of standards.

Regarding financial support, the Steering Committee found the following funding challenges as a result of a fiscal analysis:

- It is not clear why some magnet schools and programs receive district funding while others do not for similar resources, such as add-on funds or through the budget request process.
- The Magnet Office faces considerable challenges in providing professional development and curriculum support for 66 schools and programs with only one staff person. Regular district curriculum specialists currently offer limited professional development support on magnet theme-based curriculum.
- The Magnet Office currently does not include an annual budget component for curriculum and professional development support to magnet schools.
- Magnet schools and programs do not have access to a designated source of funds to provide magnet-related resources in addition to their non-magnet basic resources. Thus, sometimes magnet schools and programs must choose basic resources over magnet program resources.

As a comparison, the Committee investigated magnet funding allocations in other districts that offer magnet schools and programs. For example, in Wake County Public Schools (North Carolina), the Director of Magnet and Curriculum Enhancement Programs reported that yearly 1.5% of the district’s total budget goes to magnet schools for theme-related support, and approximately \$20 million of local funds also go to support magnets. In the Clark County School District in Las Vegas, Nevada, their Director of Magnet Schools and Career and Technical Academies indicated that the yearly operating budget includes approximately \$700,000 for magnet-specific expenses, plus staffing positions for three licensed staff members and four support staff members.

All of these findings led the Steering Committee to conclude that JCPS provides inconsistent financial support to magnets currently to sustain their specialized programs and services.

Additional points of improvement for the district student application process are warranted as well to increase transparency and access. For example, as explained above the current system does not really allow families a true second choice for magnets based on the way applications are processed at the district and school levels. Currently, families rank their choices (e.g., 1st choice, 2nd choice), and these application choices are processed sequentially (all first choice applications, all second choice

applications). This method actually reduces the likelihood families can be considered for their second choice in some schools because enrollment for this alternate choice often fills up with students who selected a program as their first choice. Therefore, if a student does not get his or her first choice, the student is left to attend his/her reside, or assigned, school or pursue a student transfer. An alternative approach could function more like the college application process – applying to one college does not affect the likelihood that you will get into another college.

Varied Purposes for and Access to Magnets and Other Choice Programs. The biggest challenge families experience is that the many magnet options and access differences make the admissions process extremely complicated and difficult to navigate. This circumstance also constrains the district's ability to achieve a cohesive, equitable student assignment plan, which further results in real hurdles to access for families.

The reason this challenge exists is because the district has seen a shift over time in purposes of magnets and other programs of choice in JCPS. As noted above in the History section, the original focus of magnets in JCPS was to reduce racial isolation and promote diversity with attractive programs. The district drifted from this focus in that some magnets developed as pop-up programs, or one-off solutions for schools with persistent problems. The largest wave of these programs developed in 2009 when the district created 21 separate magnet programs. Some magnets started as an attempt to support struggling schools but were not properly supported. Several magnet programs have been discontinued because they received fewer than 10 applications each year.

Magnets often are confused and conflated with other types of programs the district offers, such as optional programs, 5-STAR programs, and the new Talent Development Academies. Some high school magnets also are 5-STAR programs, but not all 5-STAR programs are magnets. Nevertheless, the entry point for any student selecting a “choice” aside from their reside is through the “magnet application process”, which seems to confuse families and even district staff into calling every choice a *magnet*.

Some magnet programs are available districtwide, while other magnets only admit students in certain clusters or regions. Some schools mix students admitted through a magnet application process with students admitted through the resides/cluster. Some magnets use criteria for admission and some use a lottery. For some magnet schools, there is a delineated pathway throughout the grade spans, but this is not consistent across the district. The JCPS web site and in Choices brochures outlines the general process for admission, but the specific criteria used by individual schools for admission are not available for many schools.

Several magnet schools/programs in JCPS have been in priority status in recent years. In some cases, a school became a magnet with hopes of improving student achievement in that school. Some schools have improved with the magnet, and others have not. The question is not whether the school should offer a magnet on top of trying to get out of priority status. Rather, we should examine from the start whether the magnet program is a good match for the school, whether the school fully embraces the program, whether the program fills a need within the larger district-wide magnet system and whether it receives sufficient support to improve the success trajectory of its students.

Those magnets with a more extra-curricular approach, as opposed to an embedded philosophy and curriculum within their comprehensive programs, have not always fared well. The data show that many (again, not all) whole school magnets in JCPS have been more successful overall at developing a schoolwide focus and curriculum where the theme is used as a means of teaching core subjects.

Another consequence of this drift in purpose has been uneven access to magnets districtwide. This circumstance likely emerged from good intent to offer schools and their site-based councils flexibility in developing programs as well as a means of balancing the JCBOE Guiding Principles for student

assignment practices. However, the unintended consequence over time has been less equity for students instead of more in many cases, especially at the elementary school level.

Finally, the varied purposes of magnets and other choices in JCPS has led to inconsistent messaging out to families and inconsistent understanding even among district and school staff.

Difficulties in Placing Magnet Programs in Schools Serving Resides Students. One particular point related to magnet programs, theme, and enrollment process is that certain themes may be valued by many, but not necessarily all families in a resides area within an elementary cluster. Kennedy and Coleridge-Taylor Elementary schools are examples of school-wide magnet curriculum (Montessori) with a mix of application-based and resides-assigned admission. Students who apply value these non-traditional teaching styles, while some students assigned based on address have struggled to adapt if their learning styles do not match the environment. This circumstance may contribute to confusion, surprise, and dissatisfaction among families assigned to these schools without the necessary understanding or experience to fully acclimate and succeed. If magnets are intended to attract families, it is at least as important to consider those families in close proximity to schools not interested in the magnet offered.

Tracking Magnet Program Success. While we can point to some common factors for magnet success, an accurate evaluation of the impact of individual magnets on achievement and diversity is challenging without published program-specific data. Many JCPS magnets are programs within schools, and the district does not currently report a separate diversity index for magnet programs within schools. For example, the district calculates a single diversity index for Meyzeek Middle School, which admits students from its resides area as well as through applications to the Math, Science, and Technology (MST) magnet. This approach can mask underlying differences in the diversity of a school's student population, which makes the diversity index less useful in telling us whether the magnet is doing a good job of promoting diversity. Similarly, achievement data (e.g., percentage of students scoring proficient or distinguished on the KPREP test) are reported publicly only at the school level, not for programs within a school.

If Magnets Matter, Say So. A final challenge for JCPS magnets as a whole is that, while we can cite clear examples of how and why this educational model should help the district meet strategic priorities for deeper learning, improving choice, and reducing opportunity gaps, magnets are not mentioned at all in Vision 2020. If JCPS truly accepts that the magnet system provides a useful tool for increasing diversity and student achievement, it must incorporate the magnet system within its larger vision. Only then will the district provide the funding and structural support needed to maximize the contribution magnets can make to the development of JCPS students.

WHAT IMPROVEMENTS DOES THE MAGNET STEERING COMMITTEE PROPOSE?

This section presents Committee proposals for improvements to the JCPS magnet system in two ways. First, we point to several key system-wide improvements that would move JCPS magnets to greater equity, transparency, and coherence and complement the larger school system. These system improvements link together many of the individual recommendations from MSA. Second, we present each of the 26 MSA recommendations with the Committee's proposals to the district for whether and how to implement them.

Key System Improvements

The system improvements presented below align directly with the Challenges outlined previously.

Furthermore, Steering Committee members agreed that many MSA recommendations could be addressed collectively by making systems changes to increase coherence. As such, the Committee proposes that the district focus on the following areas as key changes needed to ensure JCPS magnets are magnetic, diverse, equitable in access, and focused on student success. Several MSA recommendations connect to each improvement area and, thus, are intentionally duplicated.

Financial Resource Allocation

The Steering Committee views more *effective* and *efficient* financial support as one the largest areas of need across magnet schools and programs. The MSA recommendations 5, 6, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, and 22 all point to issues requiring financial resources (refer to report section Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendations for descriptions of each one).

Based on these reviews, the Committee concluded that JCPS currently does not provide consistent financial support to magnets to effectively sustain their specialized programs and services. Perception among some schools and community members suggests that magnets receive “special funding” beyond the district’s comprehensive programs. Committee review of district budgeting procedures and school resources found this perception to be largely invalid for a substantial number of magnets. Many schools support their magnet programs by adding responsibility to existing staff and working within their regular yearly budgets. As with any JCPS schools, magnets can apply for additional allocations for programs and expenses exceeding the regular yearly budget; however, applications are competitive and funds are not guaranteed.

The Steering Committee believes that, if the district truly values equitable access, diversity, and choice and offers magnets as a means of achieving these goals, magnets should receive more financial support to forward the JCPS Magnet Mission and district strategic priorities. The Committee’s response to **MSA Recommendation 22** in particular provides **specific proposals** for how financial support can be addressed at the district and school levels.

Enhanced District Coordination and Support

The Committee saw several areas for expansion of district central office support to schools. The MSA recommendations 2, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, and 21 highlight the need for greater district **professional support** to magnets such as professional development training, theme integration with curriculum, developing comparable curriculum between magnets with the same themes, and cultivating community partners and relationships. These recommendations also demonstrate the need for better **coordination between various central offices** (not just the Magnet Office) to support the unique challenges of magnets associated with planning and program evaluation, diversity monitoring, admissions, identifying mirror magnets, and clarifying choice for families (especially for high school).

The last point in particular on clarifying choice speaks directly to a core recommendation from MSA:

JCPS should clarify the purpose, mission, and goals of the magnet programs throughout the district. All stakeholders, including parents, business partners and principals should know the purpose they serve for the entire community, not just individual schools.

-MSA Report, Recommendation 2, p. v

If the Board and district offices (Magnet Office, College and Career Readiness Office, and Student Assignment Office) could define *why* each choice exists, the outcome will be improved coherence, messaging and shared understanding about the choices for families and schools at each level, not just magnets. Furthermore, we could demonstrate explicitly how magnets and other choice programs serve as a strategy to support district goals and targets in Vision 2020.

Committee review of data, existing processes, and conversations with school and district staff indicated that a major reason for disconnect among magnet programs in needs and practices stems from limited capacity in the Magnet Office to provide support. This point does NOT suggest in any way that current staff are incapable; rather, they are spread too thin. One staff member offers magnet-specific curriculum and instruction support and one staff member offers magnet student placement support to approximately 66 magnet schools and programs across school levels districtwide. A specific consequence is widely varying curriculum expectations between schools with similar programs (e.g., visual and performing arts). This problem can be resolved in part with additional magnet staff, which is a proposal from the Steering Committee (see proposals in response to MSA Recommendation 22).

Improved cross-departmental coordination would be an efficient means of providing better support to magnets without requiring additional resources. For this reason, the Steering Committee highly recommends the development of a cross-departmental magnet team to include leaders from the following departments: Magnet Office, Curriculum/Instruction, Student Assignment, Planning/Evaluation, Operations/Facilities, Transportation, College and Career Readiness, Budget/Finance, Communication, and at least one Area Superintendent.

Focus on Conditions for Program Success. An examination of successful magnets over those who have struggled shows that, while no single factor is responsible, several trends are common. Specifically, those JCPS magnets exhibiting more than one of the following factors have been more successful over time.

- Whole-school magnet (i.e. curriculum/learning environment offered to all students at a school)
- Districtwide enrollment access (i.e., students from across district may apply)
- Desirable themes (i.e., valued by students, families, community)
- Consistent support (i.e., school leadership, resources for curriculum and instruction, theme-based resources for students, magnet-trained teachers)

If we look back to the 21 programs started in 2009, many of these were magnet programs as opposed to whole school magnets. Some programs have seen modest enrollments over the years, which led several to programs to be phased out. Theme desirability, scope of access (cluster-based versus districtwide), and continued support for quality theme-related curriculum and resources have been noted by school and district staff as contributing factors.

Note that school location is not on the above list of common factors. A school's location by itself doesn't necessarily affect whether families find a magnet attractive as evidenced by the success of schools such as Brandeis, J.Graham Brown, DuPont Manual, and any number of traditional programs. The district should weigh school location alongside the whole school environment and districtwide enrollment factors when creating new magnets to gauge impact on the greatest numbers of students. However, access to the magnet seems to be more critical overall, including which parts of the district are allowed to apply, transportation availability, and simply knowing that programs exist at all.

Magnet Program Standards, Processes, and Criteria

The third area of improvement primarily focuses on establishing common district processes and criteria for developing, evaluating, and supporting magnet programs. MSA recommendations 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 19, 20, 23, 25, 26 make multiple references to words and phrases such as create a process, criteria, evaluate/analyze, consistency, transparency, access, and inclusion.

One means of ensuring equitable, consistent, and effective practices across a field or organization is to establish a set of standards and expectations. The Steering Committee took this approach with magnet programs and schools by developing the *JCPS Magnet Program Standards*. These standards provide individual schools and the district central office with indicators of magnet program quality and success based on national research in five areas: diversity, innovative curriculum and professional learning, instructional quality and leadership, student achievement and support, and family partnerships and access. The Magnet Program Standards should guide the district and schools in developing or duplicating new magnets as well as offer existing magnets model practices that these programs should strive to achieve. The Magnet Program Standards are presented in Appendix E.

The Magnet Program Standards align with the JCPS strategic priorities (Vision 2020) and the Magnet Schools of America (MSA) Standards of Excellence. In addition, they link well with the AdvanceED Standards for Quality, which form the basis of the Consolidated School Improvement Planning (CSIP) process required yearly by the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE).

The Committee also developed processes, criteria, and tools for implementing the program standards.

1. Document entitled "Guidance: Processes for Assessing and Developing JCPS Magnet Programs" (Appendix F)

This document describes the processes for assessing the effectiveness of JCPS magnet programs and for proposing new magnet programs relative to the Jefferson County Public Schools Magnet Program Standards. The intended audience is schools and district offices.

2. Criteria

- New Magnets (see Committee proposals in response to MSA Recommendation 6)
- Mirror Magnets (see Committee proposals in response to MSA Recommendation 6 and 7)
- Whole School Magnets (see Committee proposals in response to MSA Recommendation 9)
- Probationary Magnets (see Committee proposals in response to MSA Recommendation 5)

3. Tools

- New Magnet Proposal form (Appendix G)
- Rubric for Self-Assessment and District Review with JCPS Magnet Program Standards (Appendix H)
- Framework for Assistance to Magnet Schools on Probationary Status (Appendix I)

This document is intended as an ancillary to the *Guidance* document in cases where magnet programs are placed on probation. The document can serve to assist with developing

improvement plans for schools, and it identifies the level of support the district will provide schools who are struggling.

Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendations

In the following pages, the Magnet Steering Committee proposes actions to the Board, Cabinet, and central district offices in response to each MSA Recommendation. MSA Recommendations are presented one-per-page with corresponding Committee proposals.

DRAFT

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
1	Magnet schools should analyze student achievement data by demographic groups and conduct ongoing research and evaluation of student outcomes in magnet schools and programs, and develop plans that address ways in which the magnet program can become more inclusive, accessible and equitable. The district should explore ways to make programs within schools, schoolwide.	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees magnet schools should analyze student achievement data and conduct ongoing research and evaluation of student outcomes.</p> <p>Recommendation 1 duplicates language in MSA recommendations 9, 14, 19, and 26. The Steering Committee's reply to recommendation 1 is addressed in the responses to these specific recommendations.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
2	JCPS should clarify the purpose, mission, and goals of the magnet programs throughout the district. All stakeholders, including parents, business partners and principals should know the purpose they serve for the entire community, not just individual schools.	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees JCPS should clarify the purpose, mission, and goals of magnet programs.</p> <p>The Steering Committee and district personnel developed several documents or items that affirm the common purpose of magnets in JCPS including - a mission statement, magnet school policy, magnet program standards, and communication materials (ex. <i>Choices</i> brochures, magnet webpage).</p> <p>The Steering Committee recommends district personnel use the mission statement and supporting documents to develop a communication plan that clearly differentiates JCPS choice options for families and the purpose magnets serve in our district and community.</p> <p>The Magnet Steering Committee recognizes the strategic importance of Vision 2020 in determining district priorities. Magnet schools are an integral part of providing school choice options for families and should be a critical piece of any potential changes to the Student Assignment Plan. As such, the Committee recommends that magnets be identified explicitly as a strategy for reaching district goals and targets within Vision 2020 and the Student Assignment Plan.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
3	JCPS should create a community task force with various stakeholders to determine the purpose, goals, and types of magnet programs that will serve students in the county. The goals of the task force should be to develop a five-year strategic plan, monitor the implementation, and serve in an advisory capacity upon its implementation.	<p>JCPS created a community task force with various stakeholders to help determine the purpose and goals for magnets. The task force offers a strategic plan to offer guidance to the district in monitoring and developing magnet schools and programs in the future.</p> <p>NOTE: Recommendation 3 was implemented with the Magnet Steering Committee development.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
4	<p>The Traditional School model should be reviewed and updated to reflect current research, and examine the following: purpose, philosophy, goals and expectations of the Traditional Program, academic program, student discipline and removal policies and practices, and feeder patterns.</p>	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agreed the traditional school model should be reviewed and updated.</p> <p>The Traditional School Guidelines were updated and approved by the Board on July 20, 2016. In addition, the student exiting process was reviewed in depth for all magnets including traditional schools. The review included both a community survey and a community forum to gather information relevant to the exiting policy. The Steering Committee recommendation is to retain the current policy but to refocus the policy and process to emphasize student support. The Steering Committee further recommends additional attention be paid to more effectively gathering data from families affected by the policy and to improve transparency and consistency in the manner in which the exit process is carried out.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
5	<p>The district should create a process to eliminate redundant, undersubscribed, and low achieving magnet schools and programs within one year. This process should require affected schools to submit a plan that specifies how the school will address theme integration, targeted student recruitment, and professional development and training. JCPS should determine which schools, based on their plan, have a viable chance of success and provide them with adequate resources to meet their goals, granting an extension on an annual basis if significant progress is being made. Those that are not making progress, fail to submit a plan, or for whom the plan is deemed inadequate, should be discontinued by the 2015-16 academic year.</p>	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees JCPS should create a process to eliminate redundant, undersubscribed, and low achieving magnet schools and programs.</p> <p>The Steering Committee analyzed recommendations 5, 6, 7, and 9 in concert as they are closely related. The Steering Committee developed a protocol by which schools will conduct a self-assessment and undergo a district level review every three years. The self-assessments will be based on the <i>JCPS Magnet Program Standards</i> (Appendix E) developed by the Steering Committee (NOTE: A draft was presented to the Board May 24, 2016).</p> <p>The <i>JCPS Magnet Program Standards Rubric</i> will be used by schools and the district Magnet Office to determine areas of strength and improvement needs for existing magnet schools and programs, including those on probation. The Magnet Office currently is working with the schools on probation identified by MSA to provide programmatic support. The <i>JCPS Magnet Program Standards</i> now will be used to identify growth areas for magnet schools and potentially those whose programs may need to be significantly revised or discontinued after supports have been provided.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
6	<p>JCPS should create a process for establishing any new magnets or replicating “mirror” magnets based on the following tenants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Schools should have a research base that supports their development; b. Building capacity and adequate facilities must be available to accommodate the theme; c. Professional development for principals and staff must be around the theme and instructional focus that supports the theme; d. Demonstrated demand and need should be shown for such a program due to waiting lists or void in offerings; e. Evidence must demonstrate that student achievement and diversity can be sustained, and f. Reasonable and cost effective transportation should be offered. 	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees JCPS should create a process for establishing new magnets or mirror magnets.</p> <p>The Steering Committee and district personnel developed a new application for magnet program proposals and a revised process to be utilized for schools interested in becoming new magnets or those wishing to significantly revise their magnet theme. The revised process is substantially more thorough to ensure new magnets are appropriately resourced and supported for long-term sustainability.</p> <p>To ensure the full intent of this new process is implemented adequately, however, the Committee recommends JCPS suspend the process for accepting proposals for new magnets districtwide for at least one year for several reasons. Committee conversation in the last six months increasingly has pointed to the challenges presented by continuing to increase numbers of magnets in the district in the absence of having finalized clear criteria and plans for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) providing adequate support to current magnets, especially those on probation (MSA rec 5) (2) potentially moving some schools to whole magnets over time (MSA rec 9) (3) securing a revised, systemic funding approach for magnets (MSA rec 22) (4) aligning the new magnet process with the district budget allocation process (5) ensuring any upcoming changes to the Student Assignment Plan explicitly account for magnet school choice, future magnet development, and location selection to improve student access and program success. <p>Linking the new magnet proposal process with the district budgeting process, as well as laying out some general parameters to schools on the types of magnets that are most likely to be supported, better promotes a systems approach to improving magnets that the Committee considers critical for magnet success. Location, transportation, potential reassignment of non-magnet students to other schools, and drawing students away from other district schools are all complex and significant issues that affect whether a program can be truly <i>magnetic</i> and whether it supports the district’s vision and goals. The district cross-departmental should be a part of the process of making these determinations.</p> <p>Magnets serve the particular purpose of promoting student diversity and access and reducing socio-economic isolation by attracting students districtwide (or those not in a school’s immediate resides area) to interesting, theme-based learning environments. Given this purpose, there would seem to be a limit to the number of magnets needed to achieve this goal. Magnet programs should be high quality, but high quality programs do not have to be <i>magnets</i>. The district review Committee should take a broad look at schools across the district to determine magnet themes that are viable and where new, or mirror, magnets will support district priorities and goals.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
7	<p>Develop mirror magnets, or replicate popular and successful schools where students apply to the theme, and are then assigned to a school with consideration for distance and diversity. These mirror programs may be split between upper and lower campuses that serve continuous grades at nearby campuses.</p>	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees JCPS should consider developing additional mirror magnets IF it helps to meet district priorities for magnet schools and goals for student assignment. At this juncture, the Steering Committee does not believe it necessary to split programs between schools and maintain upper and lower campuses between grades.</p> <p>JCPS currently has several existing mirror magnets, which replicate popular themes with consideration for diversity within geographical boundaries (elementary, middle, and high school traditional programs; middle school MST programs; elementary Montessori programs).</p> <p>This process for schools becoming mirror magnets should be district-initiated as well as school-initiated to maintain a cohesive approach to replicating magnets.</p> <p>The new magnet application process should be utilized for consideration to become a mirror magnet.</p> <p>The district cross-departmental team will review and determine if schools can become mirror magnets.</p> <p>The district cross-departmental team will use district guidelines and criteria for replication when considering the potential development of new mirror magnets that will include – (1) district priorities for magnet schools, (2) current enrollment at existing magnet schools, (3) number of applications/interest in theme, (4) availability of transportation, (5) school locations, (6) cost, (7) impact on enrollments at other schools, (8) diversity.</p> <p>Additional considerations and direction for the cross-departmental team and JCPS :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> schools identified to become mirror magnets by MSA should be reviewed during the 2017-2018 school year new, board approved magnets should be provided monetary support, resources, and professional development so stakeholders ultimately view them as valid choices for students

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
8	<p>JCPS should evaluate the Five Star Schools to determine to what extent programs are being duplicated, undersubscribed, overenrolled, etc. in conjunction with magnet program offerings.</p>	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees that JCPS should evaluate the Five Star Schools to determine to what extent programs are being duplicated, undersubscribed, or overenrolled in conjunction with magnet program offerings.</p> <p>The Magnet Steering Committee acknowledges recommendation eight is an example of the general confusion surrounding the purpose and distinction between Five Star high schools and magnet programs. Five Star programs were implemented in 2010-2011 to meet the needs of students in areas of college and career readiness. While not all Five Star programs are magnet programs, students complete a “magnet application” to access these programs. Some Five Star programs were already designated as districtwide magnet programs adding to the complexity of our system. Talent Development Academies further compound the intricacies of high school choice.</p> <p>JCPS should revise the high school application to (1) make connections with students’ Individual Learning Plans (ILPs), and (2) clarify and define the types of choices available at high schools – Talent Development Academies, Five Star programs, and magnets.</p> <p>JCPS needs to clarify the similarities and differences between these educational models (Talent Development Academies, Five Star programs, and magnets) and access points (resides, network, or districtwide programs) for families through our website(s) and other published district materials related to school choice.</p> <p>JCPS should task the district cross-departmental team with reviewing Five Star programs, Talent Development Academies, and high school magnet programs to determine if these educational models meet district goals and family and student needs. Where these models, or components therein, do not meet district priorities, they will be recommended to be phased out or replaced.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
9	Eliminate programs within schools and either make them whole school magnets or consider phasing them out.	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee does not categorically agree that, for all magnet programs, JCPS should either make programs within schools whole school magnets or phase them out.</p> <p>JCPS has several highly sought after magnet programs within schools that are successful in terms of applicant pool, academic achievement, and diversity goals. Conversely, there are magnet programs within schools that do not have large numbers of applicants, fall outside of the district's diversity guidelines, and struggle academically.</p> <p>JCPS should task the district cross-departmental team with reviewing magnet programs within schools to determine which should become whole school magnets, continue as programs within schools, or be phased out. The criteria for making these determinations, where applicable, should include (1) self-assessment and evaluation process, (2) academic achievement, (3) diversity index, and (4) magnetism (number of applications).</p> <p>Additional considerations and direction for the cross-departmental team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the district's capacity to accommodate new whole school magnets (ex. pulling elementary schools out of clusters and potential impact on other schools and magnets by level – elementary, middle, and high) whole school magnets should be a priority versus placing programs within schools when considering new magnets in the future review schools identified by MSA during the 2017-2018 school year to determine if becoming whole school magnets is viable in the future phasing out magnet programs should start with a review of the schools on probation the district should establish priorities for magnets as part of a long-term plan for district goals related to student assignment

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
10	Require all magnet schools to submit to the Magnet Office for review and approval an annual, publicly available plan that addresses student recruitment, curriculum, instruction, and professional development.	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees that magnet schools should make available an annual plan that addresses student recruitment, curriculum, instruction, and professional development.</p> <p>The Steering Committee agrees magnet schools should make available an annual plan with these elements. However, the Committee is concerned about adding more paperwork to school administrators' plethora of responsibilities. The Steering Committee proposes each school's annual Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) address magnet-specific elements to meet this MSA recommendation. The magnet theme and goals should be embedded within the school curriculum, instruction, and student recruitment strategies as a means of achieving improvement priorities.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
11	<p>JCPS should adopt a centralized application process and conduct lotteries for all magnet schools that take into consideration existing factors. This central process should also determine eligibility of students if academic criteria is used. Essays and letters of recommendations should be discontinued as a part of the selection process. Academic records should not be transferred by the families.</p> <p>a. Dupont Manual High School should remain a selective school, however, the student selection process should be made available to all families and students via the website and other sources.</p> <p>b. Students should be aware of the score given to their application, cut scores should be made publicly available, and students should be notified where they stand on the waiting list if placed on one.</p>	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees with portions of recommendation 11, but disagrees with its wholesale adoption. This response first addresses the recommendation broadly and then breaks it into its component parts and responds as follows:</p> <p><u>Over-Arching Goals:</u> The Committee recommends that the district develop a framework for how schools can use criteria-based admissions or a combination of lottery and criteria application processes. At a minimum, criteria used by schools should be: (1) developmentally appropriate, (2) directly connected with the magnet theme, and (3) accessible to families (i.e., not an obstacle to some families).</p> <p>Possible improvements to the current process may include the use of common cut scores or a common application for similarly themed programs. The Committee recommends that district consider placing more ESL units with intentionality/systemically in magnet schools, with the requisite supports allocated as necessary. The Committee recommends consideration for this at both the elementary level, and the middle/high school levels, including the Traditional magnet schools. In addition, the Committee recommends that schools be encouraged to take reasonable steps to ensure that applicants understand the nature of the magnet and the academic and behavior expectations for the school or program. Schools should also have in place a plan to help families assess whether the particular magnet school or magnet program is a good fit for their student. The Committee recommends that the district work focus on creating an application and admission process that is easy for parents to understand and navigate.</p> <p><u>Components:</u></p> <p>CENTRAL APPLICATION PROCESS</p> <p>With respect to centralizing the admission process, the Committee recommends that schools that want to maintain control of the application and admission process be permitted to do so. However, to ensure access and equitable processes for students, the district should establish overarching processes requiring schools to make available a detailed and easily understood explanation of steps in the process, the criteria considered, the weight given to each criterion, the cut off score, the number of applicants from the previous year, and the number of accepted students. In addition, schools should be required to generally improve transparency, actively recruit students from beyond their usual “feeder schools”, and take additional intentional steps to increase diversity.</p> <p>LOTTERIES</p> <p>With respect to mandating the use of random draw lotteries, the Committee has looked at this recommendation separately</p>

		<p>from the perspective of elementary schools, middle schools and high schools. Both the Committee members and the community participants in our survey and public forums have expressed the view that the analysis and points to consider in deciding between a lottery-based selection process a criteria-based selection process differ at the elementary, middle and high school levels.</p> <p>ELEMENTARY MAGNETS: The Committee recommends elementary schools institute a lottery-based selection process. Schools should be permitted to require some demonstrated interest in the magnet theme/program by the student and family as a prerequisite to participation in the lottery. The primary factors supporting the use of lotteries at this level are the difficulty in fairly evaluating children entering kindergarten and the desire to avoid pigeon-holing students at such a young age before they have had the opportunity to even begin to reach their academic potential. In selecting the method to judge demonstrated interest, schools must provide ample opportunity for students and their families to demonstrate such interest and must make allowances that take into account the obstacles that students from lower socio-economic backgrounds may face.</p> <p>MIDDLE AND HIGH MAGNETS: The Traditional magnets shall continue to use a random draw process for admission. However, the Committee recommends that all other middle and high magnets consider whether a combination of criteria and lottery admission methods are appropriate to enhance student accessibility and diversity. The Committee believes that schools should be permitted, but not required, to use a criteria-based system. The Steering Committee, and community feedback, identified benefits to allowing some middle and high school magnets to use criteria for admission, including creating and maintaining a culture of high expectations. However, the Committee also contends that schools must actively and aggressively pursue strategies that will enhance diversity, including recruiting students from beyond the usual “feeder schools.” The JCPS diversity index data suggest that some magnets are moving towards the upper edge of the diversity target zone (i.e., more homogeneous, less diverse). We encourage these schools to aim for diversity representative of the district as a whole.</p> <p>For magnets continuing to use admission criteria, one option for improving diversity would be to be for the admission process to take place <i>within</i> each of the three diversity categories. For example, students from Category 1 would be compared with other students from Category 1 instead of the entire pool of applicants.</p> <p>USE OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND ESSAYS</p> <p>The Committee understands MSA’s concerns in their report that recommendations and essays may disproportionately benefit students from families with more economic resources and education level. Families with the means to involve their children in multiple clubs and activities may obtain recommendations more easily from the adults who oversee those clubs and activities. Parents with higher education levels often are in a better position to assist their children with</p>
--	--	--

		<p>essays, thus giving them some advantages.</p> <p>To overcome potential unfair advantages, the Committee suggests that magnet schools limit the weight of recommendations and essays among all criteria they use, and that essays focus primarily on demonstrated student interest in the magnet subject area. For example, a student who could not attend an open house at a school might be allowed to use an essay to demonstrate his or her interest in the magnet focus. Similarly, the use of recommendations could be used to help qualify a student who might not have the test scores or grades to otherwise gain admission but who may have unique circumstances.</p> <p>TRANSFER OF ACADEMIC RECORDS</p> <p>JCPS implemented this recommendation in October 2016, to the relief of a great many parents. Parents now can select the option to have academic records electronically submitted to the schools.</p> <p>DUPONT MANUAL</p> <p>MSA explicitly included DuPont Manual under Recommendation 11 in their report; thus, the Committee is responding to this recommendation. The Committee recommends that Manual continue to use criteria as the basis for admission, which corresponds with our proposal for middle and high schools admissions processes (see above). However, the Committee also believes that Manual should adopt intentional practices that enhance diversity as suggested above in the discussion of lotteries versus criteria. In addition, the Committee strongly suggests that Manual, and any other schools using criteria-based admission, take affirmative steps to be as transparent as possible by publishing details of the admission process and a description of the relevant criteria on the school website. This need for additional transparency was one of the most common points of feedback from families regarding admission to magnet schools.</p> <p>TRANSPARENCY AND TRUE SECOND CHOICE</p> <p>The Committee agrees that schools should publish cut scores if this is a criterion used, and schools should use waiting lists to let students know where they stand.</p> <p>The Committee also encourages the district to consider changes that would allow students to have a true second choice in the application process. The Committee recommends that families select several school choices but NOT rank them to improve true choice. This change would greatly improve transparency and student access. For this reason, the Committee strongly recommends the district allocate resources at both the school and district levels as needed to make the technological changes necessary to implement a true second choice process.</p>
--	--	---

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
12	<p>Redesign the Math, Science and Technology (MSP) programs to include engineering and emerge as comprehensive STEM programs that have K-12 articulation between schools and grade levels.</p>	<p>Having consulted with current MST program principals, the Magnet Steering Committee agrees moving these programs to comprehensive STEM programs is reasonable and will promote K-12 options for students.</p> <p>The Steering Committee received feedback from current MST program principals about interest and challenges they foresee in moving to comprehensive STEM programs. These principals agreed that such a move is reasonable, and it will promote K-12 articulation options for students.</p> <p>The Steering Committee suggests that the Magnet Office work with these MST programs to identify and implement comparable, model STEM curriculum at each site.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
13	Align the Fine, Visual, and Performing Arts programs K-12 and provide clearly articulated pathways.	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees JCPS should align the fine, visual and performing arts programs and recommends the district take two approaches:</p> <p>(1) curriculum focus - work with schools and district curriculum specialists to ensure mirror programs offer comparable, quality curriculum to ensure equity</p> <p>(2) feeder articulation focus – The Committee suggests the district consider curriculum pipelines between school levels so students receive greater consideration if they choose to continue the program at the next school level. However, this should not guarantee a seat all the way from kindergarten through 12th grade.</p> <p>In addition, JCPS should determine whether current programs at each school level are sufficient (e.g., space, assignment options) to meet projected student demand to ensure access in both the short term and long term.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
14	All JCPS students should have access to magnet programs, and transportation should (continue to) be provided at all schools with the addition of Brown.	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees all students should have access to magnet programs; however, based on practical considerations, it does not agree transportation should be provided for students at Brown.</p> <p>Based on information provided by the transportation office, the Committee has determined that JCPS offers transportation to students for all magnet schools and programs with the exception of the J. Graham Brown School. The only circumstance that changes transportation availability for magnet students is a change in student residential address where a bus route does not exist. The issue for Brown, in particular, is that buses cannot come in and out of the property and no safe drop-off location exists that would not also adversely affect city traffic significantly during morning and afternoon hours at its current location. Therefore, the Committee finds the current transportation policy to be appropriate for magnets. However, the Committee highly encourages the district to take into account location and transportation viability when considering new magnets or reviewing existing magnets so that they are accessible and desirable to all students.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
15	Industry standard equipment specific to the theme should be provided to students in all magnet programs, especially at the secondary level.	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees that industry standard equipment specific to magnet themes should be provided to students in all magnet programs.</p> <p>The district, through the office of college and career readiness, is awarded federal Carl D. Perkins grant funds, which are allocated to all high school career and technical education pathways based on their enrollment regardless of classification (Five Star, Talent Development, magnet, etc.). High schools are permitted to spend up to 65% of their Perkins funding towards equipment based on advisory board recommendations and district priorities, as outlined in the Comprehensive District Improvement Plan (CDIP).</p> <p>Schools at any level proposing other types of new magnets (non-career/technical) that require financial assistance to support the theme must go through the revised new magnet application process in conjunction with the budget request allocation process.</p> <p>Relative to this revised process for developing new magnets, the Committee makes two recommendations on equipment support. First, if the district approves a new magnet program concept, the district should then raise the priority level of the associated budget request for magnet equipment and materials. In other words, the district should NOT approve a new magnet that it cannot afford to support. Second, the district should explicitly develop a long-term sustainability plan for any program requiring industry standard equipment to support the theme. A school certainly can share ownership over long-term sustainability by procuring financial support via grants or business partnerships, but the school should not hold sole responsibility for updating this equipment long term.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
16	JCPS should conduct a facilities assessment to determine the capacity, ability to accommodate the theme and students, and attractiveness to families.	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees facilities assessments should be conducted to determine the capacity and ability of schools to accommodate magnet themes.</p> <p>Related to Recommendation 15, proposals for new magnets must address facility needs that will be reviewed by the district cross-departmental team that will consider capacity, sustainability, attractiveness to families, etc.</p> <p>Existing magnets with facility needs will be reviewed in two - ways - (1) through the magnet self-assessment and evaluation process (3-year cycle), and (2) as part of the annual budget request allocation process if facilities changes or additions are needed to sustain the magnet theme that are not covered through other means (e.g., grant; business partnership).</p> <p>The Committee also suggests that the district facilities assessment should include a maintenance schedule for facilities critical to sustain any magnet themes (e.g., laboratories; performance studios).</p> <p>Regarding CTE facilities in particular, the office of college and career readiness makes recommendations according to Kentucky Administrative Regulation 705 KAR 4:231 to provide general program standards for secondary career and technical education programs. This ensures all CTE facilities are of adequate size to accommodate the work of their respective <i>pathways</i> regardless of their classification (Five Star, Talent Development, magnet, etc.).</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
17	<p>Adopt the Career Academy model at the following schools to ensure greater preparation of students for college and careers: Southern, Central, and Iroquois High schools.</p>	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee notes here that Southern, Central, and Iroquois high schools currently are revising their program offerings for students to better prepare them for college and career.</p> <p>Southern High School will become a Talent Development Academy (TDA) school in 2017-18, and by doing so, has adopted the National Career Academy Coalition (NCAC) model.</p> <p>Iroquois is a Five Star school that offers CTE pathway programs, and it does not offer any magnet programs.</p> <p>Central is neither a Five Star school nor Talent Development Academy. It is a districtwide magnet school that offers 10 unique programs including a Montessori magnet program to begin in 2017-18. All Central students choose a career program/pathway in their sophomore year to ensure greater preparation for college and career readiness.</p> <p>Regarding the phrase “...ensure greater preparation of students for college and careers...” in Recommendation 17, the Committee contends that this should be an objective of any high school, even with non-career or technical magnets. Not doing so is inconsistent with the district’s vision and goals.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
18	JCPS central office staff responsible for magnets should be organized to collaborate more effectively with Curriculum and Instruction staff to give these areas greater leadership and support within schools.	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees that JCPS central office staff responsible for magnets should be organized to collaborate more effectively with the curriculum and instruction office.</p> <p>The Superintendent reorganized the Magnet Office in the summer prior to the implementation of the Magnet Steering Committee. The Director of Options and Magnets was reassigned to work under the Academic Services department with Curriculum and Instruction, while the Magnet Program Coordinator stayed under Student Assignment with Data Management, Planning, and Program Evaluation.</p> <p>The recent reorganization of Academic Services may or may not continue to promote this collaboration with magnets. Regardless of organizational chart structure and staff reports, the district (via the cross-departmental team) should ensure that relevant staff are involved in key decision points around magnet schools and programs in the same way as any other JCPS schools. This approach positions magnets <i>within</i> the JCPS system, not as a separate set of schools, which should provide more integrated support to magnets.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
19	Magnet schools should analyze student achievement data by demographic groups (race, socioeconomic status, linguistic, etc.) and conduct ongoing research and evaluation of student outcomes in magnet schools and programs.	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee generally agrees that magnet schools should analyze student achievement data and conduct ongoing research and evaluation of student outcomes in magnet schools and programs.</p> <p>JCPS already tracks achievement data by demographic group at every school as required by KDE. However, yearly results for students enrolled in magnet programs within a school generally have not been reported separately from the whole school results. JCPS should consider disaggregating achievement data by demographic group for each magnet program yearly for a clearer picture of magnet impact on student success.</p> <p>In addition, the Steering Committee included standards (<i>JCPS Magnet Program Standards</i>) for measuring student learning and success beyond standardized assessments, such as project-based learning and performance-based assessment. As the district adopts other measures of deeper learning to meet Vision 2020 priorities, these measures should be considered for magnet schools as well.</p> <p>JCPS should identify clear 3-5 year milestones specific to magnet schools for targeted improvements in student learning and achievement of various demographic groups. These milestones should be key strategies for achieving the JCPS vision for diversity and excellence with equity.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
20	Provide teachers and magnet coordinators with professional development around the theme and curriculum development.	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees JCPS should provide more professional development for magnet teachers and coordinators around theme and curriculum development.</p> <p>The Steering Committee identified several overall themes related to the improvement of magnet schools and programs in JCPS, one of which is funding. Currently, few funds are allocated specifically to support professional development for magnet schools and programs. The standards developed by the Steering Committee recognize that professional development around magnet themes is a crucial element of successful magnet schools or programs. The Steering Committee recommends that the Magnet Office be allocated funds annually to support professional development for magnet schools and programs.</p> <p>Teachers and staff in magnet schools should participate in magnet program professional development when offered.</p> <p>The district should make every effort to provide some type of professional development annually for magnet schools and programs.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
21	JCPS should support a full time position with significant responsibility, resources, and autonomy to coordinate and provide professional development and training to magnet school teachers and principals, as well as coordinate purchasing and oversee all marketing and recruitment efforts.	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees JCPS should support full-time positions to provide professional development and training to magnet schools. Marketing and recruitment efforts should be left to schools and the JCPS communications office.</p> <p>The Steering Committee wholeheartedly supports the addition of a minimum of three full time positions in the curriculum and instruction office to coordinate and provide professional development to magnet schools and programs.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
22	JCPS should conduct a fiscal analysis of magnet programs to determine what impact program elimination, duplication, and reinvestment would have on the district.	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees that a comprehensive fiscal analysis of magnet schools and programs is necessary; however, the focus should be to ensure magnets as a whole are funded properly for sustainability.</p> <p>The Committee conducted a fiscal analysis of district and individual school funding with the following findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There currently are no funds earmarked exclusively for the support of the magnet schools or programs. • The district provides funding for some magnet schools at all three levels – elementary, middle, and high (approximately 40% of magnets). • It is not clear why some magnet schools are provided funding in specified areas while others are not. • The Magnet Office faces considerable challenges in providing professional development and curricular support for 66 schools/programs with only one person. • The Magnet Office currently has no annual budget for professional development to support magnet schools. <p>The Magnet Steering Committee proposes the following based on findings from this fiscal analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JCPS should fund a minimum of three district magnet specialists (e.g., by school level or by theme groupings) to work with the magnet coordinator to begin properly supporting regular professional development in magnet schools relative to magnet theme and curriculum. • Allocate \$500,000 through the budget process as a starting point in 2018-19 to the Magnet Office annually for professional development and other resources needed to support schools with magnet themes⁴. • The cross-departmental team should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – conduct an in-depth review of current allocations and other data for magnet schools to determine if reallocation of resources is needed. This conversation should begin with magnet schools currently on probation. – develop a district model for supporting magnets financially that is (1) equitable, (2) linked to the proposed evaluation process (also noted with MSA Recommendations 5, 6, 7, and 9), (3) linked to the district budget process, and (4) holds schools accountable for outcomes tied to these resources. <p>Regarding probationary magnets, the Committee suggests the cross-departmental team review next steps for these schools (including a phase out option). Some programs would require significant changes to transportation, school boundaries, facilities, staffing and curriculum to be viable. As noted for</p>

⁴ This dollar estimate is based on standard training costs multiplied by current number of themes/programs and staff per school.

		MSA recommendation 6, it is not just about whether these schools want to continue their magnet status but whether their location, themes, and capacity can promote diversity and attract students.
--	--	--

DRAFT

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
23	JCPS magnet school and district staff should find exemplary models of like schools to learn from immediately.	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees there is benefit to JCPS continuing to research and look to other districts for models to learn from.</p> <p>The Steering Committee generally agrees with this approach and JCPS district personnel regularly look to other districts for best practices in matters that directly affect magnets (ex. Wake County Public Schools, North Carolina). Further, JCPS has been a district member of Magnet Schools of America since 2013. This affiliation gives JCPS access to best practices from other districts.</p> <p>The Steering Committee proposes JCPS also look within to find schools with model magnet practices so that schools with similar programs can engage in professional learning with and from their peers.</p> <p>District staff should continue to examine schools in other districts to refine magnet school practices.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
24	<p>Convene an industry advisory board to provide validation, feedback and suggestions to ensure magnet schools are relevant and continually improving.</p>	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee does not agree JCPS needs to convene an industry advisory board to provide feedback to magnet schools.</p> <p>All career and technical education pathways regardless of their classification (Five Star, Talent Development, magnet, etc.) have advisory committees in place in order to meet one of the performance measures outlined in the federal Carl D. Perkins accountability. The advisory committee's function is to maintain career and technical education pathways responding to current occupational needs. The Office of College and Career Readiness oversees the work of CTE advisory committees.</p> <p>For any high school magnets with CTE pathways, the district will need to ensure that CTE advisory committee objectives align with magnet objectives to promote choice, equity, diversity, and academic excellence for all students.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
25	Marketing materials, applications and choice information should be provided in multiple languages to make them more accessible to families.	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees marketing materials, applications and information should be provided in multiple languages.</p> <p>In an effort to increase transparency and provide information to parents, JCPS has taken steps to ensure materials are available in multiple languages (ex. Spanish, Arabic, Somali) and that resources are available to assist non-English speakers in accessing the magnet system. Student Assignment, the Magnet Office, and ESL should continue to work to make applications and other resources available and accessible for ESL families.</p>

MSA Rec Number	Full Recommendation	Steering Committee Proposals in Response to MSA Recommendation
26	<p>JCPS should work to ensure greater inclusion and access for English Language Learners and Special Education students in magnet programs by providing services at all magnet schools to the greatest extent possible.</p>	<p>The Magnet Steering Committee agrees JCPS should work toward greater inclusion and access for English language learners and special education students in magnet programs and schools.</p> <p>The Steering Committee proposes JCPS consider adding ECE/ESL units to magnet schools and holding a minimum number of seats in magnet schools or programs for ECE/ESL students where it meets district priorities and goals.</p> <p>In addition, JCPS should (1) translate application and informational materials into additional languages; and (2) conduct targeted outreach initiatives to ESL/ECE families and students to enhance transparency, increase parent understanding, provide information and encourage participation.</p>

HOW AND WHEN SHOULD IMPROVEMENTS BE IMPLEMENTED?

District Work

The work of this Steering Committee set up clear points of transition so that district offices can immediately begin implementing some proposals. As such, the Magnet Steering Committee strongly recommends the district start implementing key systems improvements at the opening of the 2017-18 school year starting with the development of a district cross-departmental team. The Committee suggests the cross-departmental team include representatives from the following departments: curriculum and instruction, student assignment, planning and evaluation, finance, operations, transportation, college and career readiness, and at least one area superintendent. We propose this structure to ensure key crossing points of impact on students, families, and schools always are considered upfront and to reduce an unwieldy group size. The representatives of this group have the responsibility to work with each other and their departments to drive solutions that meet the needs of students, families, and schools.

Goals for Magnet Schools and Programs: One, Three, and Five Years

The Committee outlines broad implementation timelines for system improvements and some proposals in response to those MSA Recommendations that will take time to achieve.

One year

- **By September 1, 2017, JCPS will form the cross-departmental team** that will assume responsibility for evaluating the creation of mirror magnets, determining which programs could be transformed into whole school magnets, phasing out undersubscribed and low performing magnets, and recommending budget allocations to meet the needs of magnet schools and programs.
- **All magnet schools and programs will include in their CSIPs strategies that address student recruitment, curriculum, instruction, and professional development** specifically related to their magnet themes.
- **JCPS will begin creating a system that allows for a true second choice for students and families** who apply to magnet schools and programs. This new process should be implemented by the 2019-2020 application cycle.
- **JCPS will fund three full-time magnet specialist positions through the budget allocation request process** to work in conjunction with the district magnet coordinator to provide professional development for our 66 magnet schools and programs.
- **JCPS will begin the self-assessment process for magnet schools and programs** using the JCPS Magnet Program Standards with each school conducting the self-assessment every three years.
- **Establish annual funding for the Magnet Office** to sustain curricular needs, instructional improvement, professional development and resources for all magnet schools and programs.
- **JCPS should identify clear 3-5 year student learning and achievement milestones** specific to magnet schools for targeted improvements in various demographic groups.

Three years

- **Implement lottery-based student selection in all elementary magnets.**
- **All magnets will have adopted a transparent process for admission** and will have publicly

disclosed the components of said process that clearly articulates the criteria used in the admission process.

- **Undersubscribed and underperforming magnet schools and programs will be phased out.**
- At least **one additional mirror magnet will be created** if it meets district priorities and goals.
- **ESL/ECE units will be established within one or more magnet elementary, middle, and high schools** where it meets district priorities and goals to increase access to magnet schools and programs for these representative groups.

Five years

- **Diversity index scores** at all magnet schools and programs will be within two-tenths (0.2) of the district average.
- Establish additional **mirror magnets** if and where it meets district priorities and goals.
- Establish additional **whole school magnets** if and where it meets district priorities and goals.

HOW WILL WE KNOW IMPROVEMENTS ARE SUCCESSFUL?

The Committee believes that the improvements suggested in this report will directly lead to magnet programs that are more diverse, equitable, accessible, and engaging for students. All of these program outcomes should lead to greater success for students – the true target outcome.

Expected Outcomes

The following specific outcomes and metrics should be monitored over time to gauge implementation success.

1. Increased number of magnets demonstrating ‘established’ or ‘exemplary’ performance in each of the five domains in the *JCPS Magnet Program Standards*:
 - diversity
 - innovative curriculum and professional learning
 - instructional quality and leadership
 - student achievement and support
 - family partnerships and access
2. Increased number of magnets reporting ‘established’ or ‘exemplary’ performance by the district on *Domain VI - District Magnet Support Standards* in the *JCPS Magnet Program Standards*.
3. Increased student and parent satisfaction with their magnet programs measured through the Comprehensive School Survey.
4. Where additional whole school or mirror magnets can be created, more students in JCPS can participate in these schools/programs.
5. Increased participation/representation from ESL and ECE students in magnet schools and programs.
6. Magnet schools and programs will receive targeted professional development related to magnet theme to improve instruction and provide a more authentic magnet experience for students.
7. Students and families will have a true second choice option for magnet schools or programs when considering school choice.
8. Students and families will better understand the selection process for magnet school admissions.
9. Magnet schools and programs will more closely mirror the district diversity average.

Districtwide Team for Monitoring Progress

The Steering Committee cannot specify exactly who, how, or when district offices and schools should implement improvements. However, the Magnet Steering Committee expects the districtwide cross-departmental team to work together to implement core elements of each proposal with integrity. This districtwide cross-departmental team should track:

1. implementation progress (i.e., Are we doing what we said we would do?)
2. implementation impact (i.e., Are processes working as intended? Any unintended consequences?)
3. programmatic success (e.g., enrollment size, diversity, curriculum focus, PD received)

GLOSSARY

Category – each United States Census block group in the district is defined as a Category 1, Category 2, or Category 3 by combining the median household income, the percentage of non-white population, and the average level of adult educational attainment in the block group to yield a single category (Student Assignment Plan, 2014, p. 1)

Cluster – elementary schools grouped into clusters of five to eight schools for the purpose of exchanging students. A child's elementary cluster is determined by his or her home address, and transportation for that child is provided to all schools within his or her cluster. Most elementary school students choose to attend one of their cluster schools.

Criteria-based admission – admits students based on whether they meet or exceed certain established criteria.

Cut score – the minimum score necessary to receive a particular classification on a test, proposal, or interview. For example, students must achieve a minimum score on state achievement tests to be classified as “Proficient.”

Diversity – includes not only race, ethnicity, and gender — the groups that most often come to mind when the term “diversity” is used — but also age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, education, marital status, language, and physical appearance. It also involves different ideas, perspectives, and values. (<https://www.jefferson.kyschools.us/node/1255>)

Diversity Index- the calculated and weighted average of the number of students in each school, based on Category, using United States Census block group data.

Five-Star Program – career-focused, high school only programs

Lottery admission – also called random draw selection; admits students using computer-generated, random selection process for placing students into magnet programs.

Magnet – public school with specialized curricula intended to “attract” a diverse body of students from a wide array of backgrounds, experience levels, and geographic areas (extends across normal school boundaries).

Magnet program – offers a program within the school on a specific subject or provides a specialized learning environment.

Magnet school – offers a unique, schoolwide curricula based on theme or learning environment; embedded with standard curricula targeting learning standards and expectations in core subjects.

Mirror magnet – a magnet program (more than one) replicated based on student demand and need and on the ability to sustain additional programs effectively.

Montessori – an educational method that focuses on learning as a process that should occur when children are developmentally ready; emphasizes individuality and independence in learning process.

Professional development – a range of activities focused on earning or maintaining professional credentials or expanding professional experience for effective job performance, including formal education, specialized training, conferences, communities of practice, and coaching.

Resides – the school that serves the student’s attendance area (the area in which the student resides).

Talent Development Academy – career-focused, high school only programs offered to resides students; unique schools-within-schools offering personalized learning through career-related classes with focus on skill-sets for a chosen industry.

REFERENCES

Ayscue, J., Levy, R., Siegel-Hawley, G., & Woodward, B., 2017. Choices Worth Making: Creating, Sustaining, and Expanding Diverse Magnet Schools. The Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles. [https://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/choices-worth-making-creating-sustaining-and-expanding-diverse-magnet-schools/UCLA Magnet Manual Design Final For Web.pdf](https://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/choices-worth-making-creating-sustaining-and-expanding-diverse-magnet-schools/UCLA_Magnet_Manual_Design_Final_For_Web.pdf)

Coleman, J. (2005). Equality and educational opportunity. In R. Rumberger and G. Palardy (eds.), *Does Segregation Still Matter?*, pp.1999-2045.

Magnet Schools of America. (2016). What are magnet schools? <http://www.magnet.edu/about/what-are-magnet-schools>

U.S. Department of Education. (2009). Creating strong district school choice programs. <https://www2.ed.gov/nclb/choice/index.html>

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). School choices for parents: Definitions. <http://www2.ed.gov/parents/schools/choice/definitions.html>