

Enrollment Preferences Task Force Minutes: Meeting #7
Tuesday, September 16, 2014
6:30 pm- Buena Vista Conference Center

Task Force members present:

- Representative Kim Williams, Delaware House of Representatives, Co-Chair
- Senator Nicole Poore, Delaware State Senate, Co-Chair
- Senator David Sokola, Delaware State Senate
- Frederika Jenner, Delaware State Education Association
- Randall Hughes, Delaware State Board of Education
- Terri Hancharick, Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens
- Dr. Mervin Daugherty, New Castle County Superintendent
- Yvonne Johnson, Delaware Parent Teacher Association
- Chuck Taylor, Charter School Network
- Dr. Victoria Gehrt, Superintendent from New Castle County Vo-Tech
- Dr. Deborah Zych, Superintendent from Polytech
- Mark Pruitt, Magnet School Representative
- Henry Clampitt, Charter School Representative
- Dr. Terri Hodges, Parent Representative
- Elizabeth Lockman, Parent Representative
- Catherine Hegedus, Parent Representative

Staff present:

- Fran Fletcher, University of Delaware
- Mark Brainard Jr., Delaware House of Representatives

Members Absent:

- Representative Darryl Scott, Delaware House of Representatives
- Secretary Mark Murphy, Delaware Department of Education
- Susan Francis, Delaware School Board Association
- Lindsay O'Mara, Governor's Office
- Dr. Matthew Donovan, Delaware Association of School Administrators
- Dr. Kevin Fitzgerald, Kent County Superintendent
- Dr. David Ring Superintendent from Sussex County
- Dr. Allen Lathbury, Superintendent from Sussex Tech
- Donald Mell, Charter School Representative
- Julie Rumschlag, Magnet School Representative
- Gary Stockbridge, Delaware Business Roundtable

Public attendees:

- Mary Kate McLaughlin, Delaware Department of Education
 - Mike Matthews, Red Clay
 - Frank Parks, Seaford School Board
 - Bill Doolittle, Community Member
-

Meeting was called to order at 6:40 p.m.

1. Introduction

Rep. Kim Williams, co-chair, made an announcement that Diane Ruth stepped down as a member of the task force and has been replaced by Henry Clampitt. Representative Williams asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the sixth meeting. Following the addition of some clarifying language, the motion to approve the edited minutes is made unanimously adopted by the task force. Representative Williams then turned the meeting over to Fran Fletcher of the University of Delaware who facilitated the rest of the meeting.

2. Action Items and Task Force Votes

Fran Fletcher instructed the task force to open the document to the section labeled "M: Attachments with Application." Items M5 and M8 were put on hold for further discussion with a vote of 15 Yes and 0 No. A vote was taken to include item M9 on an enrollment form only. The motion was approved with 15 Yes and 0 No votes. A vote was taken to put item M10 on hold for further discussion. The motion was approved with 15 Yes and 0 No votes. A vote was taken to put item M11 on hold for further discussion. The motion was approved with 14 Yes and 1 No vote. A vote was taken to put item M12 on hold for further discussion. The motion was approved with 13 Yes and 2 No votes. A vote was taken to put item M13 on hold for further discussion. The motion was approved with 11 Yes and 3 No votes. A vote was taken to include items M14, M15, and M16 on an enrollment form only. The motion was approved with 15 Yes and 0 No votes. Item M17 was put on hold for further discussion with a vote of 15 Yes and 0 No. A vote was taken to include items M18 and M19 on an enrollment form only. The motion was approved with 15 Yes and 0 No votes. Item M20 was previously approved to be included on an enrollment form only by the small groups. A vote was taken to recommend that item M21 not be asked at any time during the application or enrollment process. The motion was approved with 15 Yes and 0 No votes. A vote was taken to include item M22 on an enrollment form only. The motion was approved with 14 Yes, 0 No, and 1 Not Voting. A vote was taken to include item M23 on an enrollment form only. The motion was approved with 14 Yes, 0 No, and 1 Not Voting. A vote was taken to include item M24 on an enrollment form only. The motion was approved with 14 Yes, 0 No, and 1 Not Voting. A vote was taken to include item M25 on an enrollment form only. The motion was approved with 15 Yes, 0 No, and 1 Not Voting.

A vote was taken to include item N1 on a supplemental application. The motion failed with 2 Yes and 14 No votes. Therefore, the task force recommended that item N1 be included on an enrollment form only. A vote was taken to include item N2 on a supplemental application. The motion failed with 3 Yes and 13 No votes. Therefore, the task force recommended that item N2 be included on an enrollment form only. A vote was taken to include item N3 on a supplemental application. The motion failed with 2 Yes and 14 No votes. Therefore, the task force recommended that item N3 be included on an enrollment form only. A vote was taken to include item N4 on a supplemental application. The motion failed with 2 Yes and 14 No votes. Therefore, the task force recommended that item N4 be included on an enrollment form only. A vote was taken to include item N5 on a supplemental application. The motion failed with 2 Yes and 14 No votes. Therefore, the task force recommended that item N5 be included on an enrollment form only. A vote was taken to include item N6 on a supplemental application. The motion failed with 3 Yes and 13 No votes. Therefore, the task force recommended that item N6 be included on an enrollment form only. A vote was taken to include item N7 on a supplemental application. The motion failed with 3 Yes and 13 No votes. Therefore, the task force recommended that item N7 be included on an enrollment form only. A vote was taken to include item N8 on a supplemental application. The motion failed with 2 Yes and 14 No votes. Therefore, the task force recommended that item N8 be included on an enrollment form only. A vote was taken to include item N9 on a supplemental application. The motion failed with 3 Yes and 13 No votes. Therefore, the task force recommended that item N9 be included on an enrollment form only. A vote was taken to include item N10 on a supplemental application. The motion failed with 2 Yes and 14

No votes. Therefore, the task force recommended that item N10 be included on an enrollment form only. A vote was taken to include item N11 on a supplemental application. The motion failed with 0 Yes and 16 No votes. Therefore, the task force recommended that item N11 be included on an enrollment form only. A vote was taken to include item N12 on a supplemental application. The motion failed with 2 Yes and 14 No votes. Therefore, the task force recommended that item N12 be included on an enrollment form only.

Section O ("Academics") deals with items similar to those discussed in Sections A and B; therefore, items O1 through O5 had already been voted on at previous meetings.

Discussion of all items placed on hold will occur at the next meeting.

****Note: A digital copy of the document can be found on***

<http://legis.delaware.gov/LIS/TaskForces.nsf/113411bdd5de74d385257b3b005e343c/49b267f532b422d185257b6c0061a658?OpenDocument>

4. Public Comment- The views and opinions expressed in this section are those of the individual speakers.

Frank Parks from the Seaford School Board distributed a handout and spoke of the demographics across the school districts in Sussex County, specifically the discrepancies of low income, minority, special education, and English Language Learner students across public schools and choice schools. Mr. Parks said school choice has been competition for high achieving students and an increase in segregation across the state. As a result, students are more segregated now than 30 years ago. Mr. Parks posed a few questions that he asked the task force to think about: Are choice schools doing a better job than the traditional district or are they doing an easier job? Is the application process the problem or is the application itself causing segregation? In reference to the lottery, should a child's future be determined by the luck of the draw? Does a minority student in poverty want to attend a predominantly white, higher income school? Does a higher income white student want to attend a predominantly low income, minority school? Is segregation by choice still segregation? How do we fix it?

Bill Doolittle expressed that any attempt to measure ability in an application process discriminates against students with disabilities. If application questions lead to a discovery of a disability, then there is a greater chance of discrimination taking place. Charter, Magnet, and Vo-Tech schools need to provide inclusive opportunities for every student. While a lottery tends to be the fairest way to allow access, the schools that have an oversubscription should be expanded to eliminate the need for a lottery.

5. Next Steps

Next meeting: To be determined

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 pm.