

Board Member Questions

<p>Duncan 5/11/26</p>	<p>Y - SPPG -</p> <p>When will all three levels be adopting the 9-week grade reporting schedule?</p> <p>Is waiting until the last two weeks of the grading period to alert parents of grade issues too late for students to recover?</p> <p>In our standards-based grading, how are we explaining to parents what "developing an understanding of standards" means?</p> <p>Is the Program Service Plan the same as the ILP?</p> <p>How are we improving the use of the PSP?</p>	<p>It has been proposed by the committee that all levels move to a 9 week reporting schedule during the 2027-28 school year.</p> <p>The policy requires that notifications of significant deficiency be made with families <i>at least</i> two weeks in advance. For most of our families they receive this information with far more notice via progress reports at the midpoint of the grading period.</p> <p>Schools that utilize Standards Based Grading provide detailed information to parents regarding what each indicator means and how the process works. This is included in Parent/Student Handbooks, a school-based SBDM policy, and through specific rubrics. The SPPG provides common language in order to ensure districtwide coherence.</p> <p>PSPs and ILPs are not the same.</p> <p>We have increased training to targeted role groups that are stakeholders of the PSP with the goal of increasing awareness around how to implement the instructional accommodations for each ML. Additionally, the revised language in the SPP section for ML considerations is more specific to direct any stakeholder working with MLs to the location in Infinite Campus so that he/she can find the specific supports for the MLs they are working with. This information in IC comes directly from the Program Service Plan (PSP) platform. OML Specialists and leads continue to coach and support ELD teachers with PSP implementation but have also built in strategies for helping classroom teachers implement the supports as well. In addition, increased access to the intake portion of the PSP has been given to Mental Health Practitioners (MHPs) so that they can better support the SEL needs of MLs which provides a more holistic approach to support.</p> <p>Significantly below standards can be assigned to an ML but should not be based solely on their English proficiency levels. For example, if a student is receiving appropriate scaffolds of support and accommodations, but still does not meet the modified assignment expectations then the student should be assigned the grade that is in alignment with their performance with the expectation that a teacher would follow up with the student to provide additional opportunities to demonstrate standards mastery. For example if the assignment required a student to produce a 5 paragraph essay and based on the student's English language proficiency level (that are grounded in the WIDA Can-Do</p>
---------------------------	--	---

Board Member Questions

	<p>If we don't use "Significantly below standards" for ML students, how will we know when they are "Significantly-below standards" in order to get help?</p> <p>What do we do when "appropriate modifications" are not helping students reach competency?</p>	<p>descriptors) an appropriate modification is to produce a one paragraph essay, the student would not be penalized (or given “below or significantly below standards”) based on his/her output of producing a 1 paragraph essay.</p> <p>In addition to “modifications” that are outlined in a PSP and/or IEP, any student should be provided differentiated instruction that includes scaffolds to increase their access to core content. If after providing all of this, students are still struggling, teachers should discuss within their collaborative team meeting (to include ELD and ECE teachers and district leads/specialists) to determine the cause of gaps in student competency.</p>
<p>Everett 5/11/26</p>	<p>Competitive Negotiations for High School Assessment The C/N Optional coaching is a very large contract and I can't find any deliverables tied to it, what am I missing?</p>	<p>These are two separate RFPs.</p> <p>High school assessment is based upon the state required college entrance exam. Deliverables include preparation and support for individual students in grades 9-12. Previously, the metrics for this assessment were tied directly to the district’s goals and guardrails. This is an integral part of progress monitoring and vital signs for high schools.</p> <p>There is a dollar amount provided for optional coaching that is not reflective of the actual spend. As this is not a district-wide purchase, the coaching is optional for individual schools. Schools may choose from available coaching packages based on their individual budgets and school improvement goals. Deliverables are specific to meeting the school’s improvement goals as aligned in their individualized coaching plan.</p>
<p>Everett 5/11/26</p>	<p>All of the approvals for org chart changes, if we move forward will we have more people in central office</p>	<p>For Accountability, Research and Systems - no increase to central office.</p>

Board Member Questions

	and spending more money than we currently do?	<p>The affected position was downgraded to a director level in the reorg. The employee in that position served as the interim chief of this department until her retirement. This action is to expedite filling the position at the July 1 grade, by moving up the effective date.</p> <p>Academics - decreasing central office by 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adding one specialist K-12 Literacy, deleting 2 regional academic coaches - this is a general fund cost savings • deleting one school psychologist and adding in its place an MTSS school psychologist - no additional cost and not general fund dollars • deleting a reporting relationship for the director of library media to the executive director of curriculum and instruction • deleting a secretary V position and replacing with a technician data research/management - cost neutral. <p>Strategy and Innovation and Student Support and Family Engagement-increasing central office by 5 positions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adding two grant funded positions to meet requirements of Louisville Metro opioid grant • adding 2 instructional leads and 1 resource teacher back after reorg reduction, general fund positions <p>Student Support and Community Engagement - increasing central office by 3 positions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adding on psych nurse practitioner and four social services support positions to meet requirements of Louisville Metro opioid grant • deleting 2 nurse practitioner positions
Everett 5/11/26	Will we receive the excel doc style org chart before the meeting?	<p>I am working on the updates you and I discussed last week. The salary updates are complete. Updating the Direct Service chart, with details on types of positions by department, is not complex but is time consuming. It requires contact with every page of the org. chart. I've talked with Dr. Yearwood regarding the updates I am making. When complete, he will review it, and we will share with all 7 Board Members. The organizational structure and data for next school year are all already Board approved, so will not impact any upcoming votes, etc.</p>

Board Member Questions

Duncan
5/11/26

C - Racial Equity Policy -

Can we continue to have a policy based on race?

How can we make this policy broad enough to include Non- Hispanic ML students, ECE students, LGBTQ students, and any other group that doesn't have an advocacy group they can join?

In 2018, the board, including you, voted to adopt the Racial Equity Policy because the data made one thing undeniable: race was one of the strongest predictors of student outcomes and disproportionately represented in JCPS. That reality has not changed. The policy was not created to advantage one group over another, nor was it designed to divide students. It was created because the district has a responsibility to address long-standing disparities that were harming students and violating our obligation to provide equal access to opportunity.

To avoid assuming the premise of your question, I want to clarify what the policy is, what it does, and why it remains necessary.

The Racial Equity Policy is not a “policy based on race.” It is a policy grounded in data, legal obligations, and our responsibility to correct inequities that have persisted for decades.

The policy does not give special treatment to any racial group. It ensures that no group is systematically disadvantaged by our practices, policies, or resource allocation. Importantly, when we fix systems that produce unequal outcomes, every student benefits. Equity is not a zero-sum game—it is a strategy to improve systems for all.

The Racial Equity Policy does not exclude multilingual learners, ECE students, LGBTQ students, or any other underserved group. It simply acknowledges that race remains one of the most powerful predictors of educational outcomes in JCPS—a documented fact.

It is encouraging to see interest in protecting ML, ECE, and LGBTQ students. Yet, we must be careful not to use these vulnerable populations as a “shield” to avoid the difficult but necessary work of addressing racial disparities. A student can be Black, LGBTQ, and have an IEP all at once. If we erase the “race” component of our policy in favor of a broad approach, we risk failing the ECE or ML student who is also facing racial bias. We do not have to choose which marginalized group to protect; the board recites a mission statement at the prelude of every meeting that is strong enough to protect the whole child.

We absolutely can and should strengthen support for other groups. We must ensure that access and opportunity are monitored, measured, and advanced. We should examine who has fluid access to all

Board Member Questions

		<p>that JCPS has to offer. Yet, when this board approved the policy, broadening it was not the goal. The board specifically sought to address the racial disparities that still exist.</p> <p>The district can and does address multiple forms of inequity at once. What we cannot or should not do is pretend that race is no longer relevant when the data clearly shows otherwise. This board, including you, recognized this reality in 2018 when it voted to adopt the policy.</p> <p>Regarding your question—“Should consequences be assigned in proportion to the percent each group represents, or should consequences be consistent regardless of race?”—consequences should always be consistent for the same behavior, regardless of race. That is already the expectation. What the policy requires is that we examine whether our systems are producing racially disproportionate outcomes, even when the rules are applied equally. If one racial group is punished at far higher rates than others for identical behaviors, that is not a sign that we need quotas; it is a sign that our system is not functioning fairly.</p> <p>The Racial Equity Policy, and the board as a collective, does not call for different rules for different races. It calls for fairness in practice. It helps ensure that discipline is consistent, unbiased, and transparent—which benefits every student.</p> <p>The Racial Equity Policy is not discriminatory, illegal, or a threat to any group. It is a commitment—signed by the board—to fairness, accuracy, and accountability. It recognizes that ignoring racial disparities does not make the district neutral; it makes the district complicit.</p> <p>That was the purpose of the policy in 2018, and it remains the purpose today—unless the Superintendent and this board wish to move away from it</p> <p>There is no current federal or state court precedent that prohibits a racial equity policy as implemented by the Board.</p>
Duncan 5/11/26	Do we believe in assigning consequences for offenses should be done in proportion to the percent each group represents, OR do we believe in consistent consequences for the same offenses, regardless of race?	<p>We train all JCPS staff who assign consequences for violations, to operate in accordance with the Student Support and Behavior Intervention Handbook (SSBIH). If staff operate as trained, they would be assigning the appropriate consequences outlined in the handbook to any and all students engaging in activities that violate our SSBIH. Race, or any other identifier/demographic, should not be considered. The ONLY exception would be the age appropriate differences between elementary and secondary age student consequences as identified on the “dot pages”.</p>

Board Member Questions

	<p>Supreme Court just told us race can't be used as a basis for assigning anything - can't have proportionate representation of anything based on race.</p>	<p>This is not an issue for us as we do not use race as the basis of anything in terms of behavior consequences. However, we are absolutely able to pull data by demographic, analyze it, and work towards ensuring our consequences are assigned WITHOUT race, or any other demographic in mind.</p> <p>There is no current federal or state court precedent that prohibits a racial equity policy as implemented by the Board.</p>
<p>Duncan 5/11/26</p>	<p>C - Org charts -</p> <p>Will we be seeing positions eliminated to balance those being created?</p>	<p>Upon review by the Org Chart Change Committee, the Org Chart changes in Academics are cost neutral (positions being eliminated and added balance in total cost).</p>
<p>Duncan 5/11/26</p>	<p>W - SSBIH -</p> <p>Are all schools implementing a trauma-informed care approach with all students?</p> <p>Are any changes being made as consequences for being in two fights in one year?</p>	<p>As a requirement of SB1 and as a best practice the district has a Trauma Plan, as does each individual school. We do expect staff to use a trauma informed lens when supporting students. In addition, we have several training and PD offerings around trauma informed practices.</p> <p>Dr. Yearwood has asked that staff research and get feedback on a policy of this kind. No recommendation has been brought and there is no language in the SSBIH updates related to that practice.</p>
<p>Everett 5/11/26</p>	<p>On the tentative budget, can we get a line by line breakdown of the IL 80 fund.</p>	<p>Here is a line-item detail of IL 80 sorted by magnitude in Tentative Budget. Includes last two year Actuals for comparison. I have highlighted notes for further explanation of the largest expenses.</p>