

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

**JAMES F. NOTTER
SUPERINTENDENT**

Telephone (754) 321-2600

Facsimile: (754) 321-2701

**School Board Workshop
June 16, 2008**

Homework Policy 6306 Revisions

At the March 11, 2008, School Board Retreat the School Board Members reviewed the proposed Homework Policy and gave specific directions for additional policy language and asked staff to provide an opportunity for public input. This information was brought back for the School Board for further review at the June 16, 2008, workshop.

A matrix was developed to show the proposed language the Board had suggested. Also included in the matrix were the ELT recommendations on the language. The following are the School Board Members' recommendations:

-Page 2, Note. *Note: assignments that require going to the public library will include a weekend to accommodate working families.* The Board requested that the word "require" be underlined.

-Page 2, Item d – *Coordinate projects so that all students have access to research and resource materials including textbooks and digital tools such as flash drive, electronic textbooks, and websites.* No change to this item.

-Page 3 of the policy, Item l, *be sensitive regarding the assignment of homework due the day after religious holidays and district assigned school breaks and weekends.* The Board Members had a discussion regarding "*be sensitive*" and suggested deleting "*be sensitive*" and change to "*be considerate when assigning homework due the day after religious holidays and district assigned school breaks and weekends.*" The Board suggested that further clarification for teachers should be added to the procedural manual regarding this statement. What is most important to the Board is the homework that is assigned is meaningful, reviewed, graded and feedback is given to the student. Board Members do not want busy work assigned and want teachers to be sensitive to the time when students are with their families.

-Page 3, Item m. The Chair wanted teachers to be sensitive to the amount of homework that is assigned over school breaks and to have teachers at the middle and high school level collaborate on the total amount of homework given. This is noted on page 3 of the policy, items l, *be sensitive regarding the assignment of homework . . .* and item m, *Collaborate between teachers at the secondary level . . .* After the discussion, it was decided on page 3 of the policy to change the order of "l" and "m" by reversing them, listing item "l" first and then "m." The Board stated that if collaboration between teachers is to take place, then collaboration time must be provided. This will be directed by the Principal and should be placed in the procedural manual.

-Page 3 Item n. *Review and grade homework.* The School Board stated what is most important is the homework that is assigned is meaningful, reviewed, and feedback is given to the student. This is more important than a grade. The Board agreed with the ELT statement "*Ensure that students receive feedback on each assignment so that students comprehend their level of understanding of the learning.*" The Board requested to delete "*Ensure that an appropriate number of assignments are graded.*" This statement can be clarified in the procedural manual regarding the difference between homework and projects.

-Page 3 Item o. *place homework assignments on teacher's website for further clarification.* This is changed to, *if appropriate and accessible place homework assignments on teacher's website for further clarification.* At this time not all teachers have websites. The Board Members did want teachers, who do have websites, to use them to show homework assignments. It is the School Board's goal that all teachers have websites. This would allow students to get their homework assignments even if they are home, sick, or on vacation. The School Board requested that General Counsel look into the Board's request or expectation that all teachers have a website. This may be a union negotiation item for teacher contracts. With General Counsel approval, this can be placed in the procedural manual regarding the School Board's expectation.

-Page 3 Item q. *Allow ESE and ESOL students more time to do their homework.* No change to this item.

The Board had a further discussion regarding noting time limits needed to do homework and separating the school levels for homework. There are other school districts that have time limits set for doing homework and separate levels. The Board instead went through the policy and noted different levels when appropriate.

The Board's recommended changes to the policy.

-Page 2, 3. Responsibilities: Administrators shall: item d. *Support the collaboration among teachers, students, and parents in the effective implementation of the homework policy.* The Board added after *Support* and allow time for the collaboration among teachers, students and parents in the effective implementation of the homework policy.

Page 2, 3. Teachers shall: item e. *Assign homework that is academically challenging and appropriate to the student's level of competence.* This was changed to read *Assign homework that is academically challenging and developmentally appropriate to the student's level of competence.*

Page 2, 3. Teachers shall: item f. *design quality homework, which is relevant to the curriculum and tied to mastery.* The Chair requested this statement to read: *design quality homework, which is relevant to the curriculum and/or tied to mastery.*

Page 2, 3. Teachers shall: item h. *provide students with a reasonable estimate of the amount of time necessary to complete each homework assignment.* This will be clarified in the procedural manual giving examples of the appropriate amount of time.

The School Board requested staff to bring back the revised policy with the procedural manual to a future workshop. This presentation can be found on the eAgenda June 16, 2008, workshop.

Policy 1001 Policy and Rule Making

The policy and rule making policy was review at a training session, which the School Board attended with Dr. Mathis. This review brought out several points and suggestions.

-Board sponsored policies will work with the appropriate staff member in the development of that policy to ensure intent was met.

-All policies will come to a workshop with the appropriate procedures and guidelines associated with the policy before approval. These procedures and guidelines will be appropriately referenced in the policy.

-All policies will have an attorney review.

-All policies will be looped through proper committees and, where appropriate, strategic plans when policies address the plans.

Policies 1001 and 1001.1 were merged to create the new Policy 1001. The summary of recommended changes were presented to the Board Members accompanied by a chart, which explained the process a policy would be reviewed.

The Superintendent conferred with General Counsel and suggested that, with the Board's direction, an outside source, recommended by FSBA, would review the Districts policies and bring them up to date in a short length of time. The Board requested that this would be discussed at a later time.

The School Board Members went through the policy with their recommendations.

-It is recommended that all district policies be reviewed annually to determine if updates are required.

-Policies that refer to Florida Statutes shall be automatically amended to reflect any subsequent amendments made to the cited statute.

Staff informed the School Board Members the Executive Leadership Team (ELT) would become the new Policy Review Committee instead of the existing Policy Review Committee. Board Members had a discussion regarding the new ELT Policy Review. With the current looping process in place, which includes parent advisory and union groups, the policies could be reviewed properly with the appropriate staff sponsors of the policy.

The Board requested that this policy come back to a workshop for further discussion after the revisions recommended were completed and the proper looping was done.

The material for this presentation can be found on the eAgenda June 16, 2008 workshop.

Comprehensive Boundaries Discussion Part I

Staff began this discussion about the standards for overcrowding and needed the Board's direction on the individual factors that drive its calculation.

Board Members wanted staff to compile a list of definitions for gross capacity, fish, concurrency, level of service, and any other terms needed for this discussion.

Since 2003 the Enrollment and Facility Planning Inventory (EFPI) was used to provide a way of looking at enrollment in light of capacity. The EFPI is outdated given the recent school concurrency (Level of Service) and class size requirements.

In November 2001 Broward County Schools set a standard as part of the current Educational Plan Survey: Elementary 1,092, Middle 1,766 and High 2,852. These numbers financially allow schools to offer a wide range of programs and services.

The Board Members were asked if they want to stay with the standard numbers. The Board was in agreement with the existing numbers.

February 2008, the Broward County School Board approved school concurrency. This means that all schools must have a plan to achieve 110% of permanent capacity with each 5-year capital plan (i.e. District Educational Facilities Plan (DEFP)). Relocatables are used to temporarily help schools over 100% permanent capacity meet class size requirements, however, relocatables can not be used to satisfy school concurrency requirements. Schools above 110% permanent capacity will have to plan to provide for additional capacity through school capacity conferences. Schools that are significantly under enrolled may choose to discuss Policy 5000 options to obtain enrollment.

Board Members requested a color coded map that would show the core numbers of every school, fish number, class size, their boundaries, if there is room for an addition or to add portables, and if they are over enrolled and under enrolled schools. This would enable the Board to look at the entire county at one time and know the size of each school and which school has the greatest need to meet class size.

The comprehensive boundary discussion will continue at the June 24, 2008 workshop. Material for today's discussion can be found on the eAgenda June 16th workshop.

Realign Areas

The area offices maps showing schools in those areas were given to the Board Members for this discussion. The Superintendent wanted a preliminary discussion with the Board to find out the information the Board will need for a further discussion, such as the number of students, number of schools, programs in each area office, and what cities are in the areas. The Board feels that the areas are not in balance and would like to equalize them.

The Superintendent was requested to establish a task force to further explore the realignment this year and come forward with a plan to the Board. The Board Members made a few recommendations regarding realigning the four areas.

- Divide the county into four quadrants.
- Look at the areas geographically.
- Look at the location of the area offices.
- Boundary changes must be considered.
- Look at the number of schools in each area.

The Superintendent needed to clarify the expectation of the Board on when the realignment would take place. The structures of each area must be looked at. Some areas have fewer schools, but have other programs under their direction. Also the ESE, psychological, social support programs, feeder patterns, and boundaries should be considered.

The Superintendent will organize a task force and bring back a proposal for the Board to review after the first of the year.

JFN:jd