

## **AAC 2017 - Constructive Feedback**

Phase	Opportunity for Improvement
Administrative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCPSS should host a meet and greet for the AAC committee prior to beginning the work of the committee. Introductions and background information should be shared at that meeting so committee members have an understanding of their committee mates prior to beginning the work process.</li> <li>• AAC members should have received an individual orientation/training prior to the first AAC meeting to familiarize the AAC member with the procedures and tools included in the process (e.g., Whiffer and all output reports: FARMS, pre/post measures, Assessment reports).</li> <li>• AAC members should have been educated on the intended procedures for obtaining constituent feedback (e.g., survey, verbal, emails) and obligations for representing constituent preferences during committee deliberations (per the charter verbiage).</li> <li>• OSP should create an email address for each AAC member (e.g., <a href="mailto:Sam.Smith@hcpss.edu">Sam.Smith@hcpss.edu</a>) or a single shared email address (<a href="mailto:AAC@hcpss.org">AAC@hcpss.org</a>) to ensure all community feedback is provided in a transparent manner that is accessible by each AAC member to mitigate the potential for either intentional or inadvertent censoring of community input.</li> <li>• OSP should clarify for AAC members exactly “who” their constituents are (e.g., region, county, school, neighborhood) since the charter specifically indicates that AAC reps do not solely represent the views/preferences of their own neighborhood etc.</li> <li>• OSP should require AAC members to acknowledge and sign-off that they accept the duties as described to them during orientation and will ethically serve the county with both independence and objectivity in all decision making.</li> <li>• HCPSS should upgrade their software and tools to ensure AAC members have remote access in order to increase real-time contributions to the boundary adjustment process and that the final work product of the AAC is the best possible for the entire county.</li> <li>• AAC members should be clear on the extent of planned redistricting (e.g., ES only, comprehensive ES/MS/HS) prior to the application/interview process.</li> <li>• AAC meetings SHOULD NOT be videotaped and live streamed. This negatively impacted the committee’s ability to have productive verbal dialogue due to personal safety concerns.</li> <li>• The AAC membership should strive for as much diversity as possible.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given regarding each AAC member’s home residence during the actual work of the committee. To ensure that no actual conflict of interest occurs when working on a particular area, all members of the committee should know where all other AAC members reside, and then as a committee, a decision should be made about whether members residing in that area should be allowed to (or restricted from) work on that region. There are differing opinions on this point that include either: 1) restricting AAC members from working in their home region/polygon altogether, 2) having the member serve as more of a consultant to the rest of the group (being able to share communal norms, history, etc.) without actually defining the solution in their immediate area, or 3) allowing all members of the committee to work on all areas of the county as long as home polygon/regions are transparent to the entire committee.</li> <li>• That the human element of this process should be removed, and that it all be done through computer algorithms OR that the actual polygon move work be done by a third party that doesn’t have personal ties to Howard County. The AAC committee would then serve as first review of the product submitted by the third party prior to submitting a recommendation to the Superintendent.</li> </ul>

## AAC 2017 - Constructive Feedback

<p>Planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both the Superintendent and BOE members who are ultimately the decision makers, should conduct a Planning Meeting to introduce themselves to the volunteer AAC committee members, thank them for their service, and describe their ideas/concerns/limitations/requirements of the boundary adjustment process to ensure the AAC has clarity and direction from the recipients of their deliverable.</li> <li>• Local elected officials, to include the BOE, should be specifically asked by the Superintendent to refrain from speaking publically about their personal opinions about the AAC process until it is appropriate based on the timeline of the larger redistricting process AND a strongly worded statement from HCPSS and the BOE should be made public stating that “bullying, threats, etc. to AAC members will not be tolerated, will be sent to the proper authorities, and if from a HCPSS parent or child, could deem them being banned from HCPSS properties, to include their children’s school(s) and the student will be disciplined.” This is a volunteer position, and trying to influence committee members through intimidation tactics is unacceptable. In addition, HCPSS should put out the ground rules of attending the meetings at the beginning, and anybody showing up who breaks the rules should be escorted from the building, identified, and banned from attending any further meetings.</li> <li>• The first two meetings should not be used to cover the Policy 6010 and Feasibility Study Report. This content should have been reviewed at the AAC member’s individual orientation to ensure the AAC member is clear on the material and does not have any specific questions that require clarity before proceeding.</li> </ul>
<p>Fieldwork</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSP should abide by their own ground rule and equitably reply to all AAC member calls and emails consistently and timely. “Equity of voice” did not appear to be abided by in responding to questions/concerns/suggestions of each AAC member as was evidenced by the percentage of email replies received by some committee members versus other members whose emails were ignored.</li> <li>• OSP should be adequately staffed throughout the AAC process and NOT have to rely on an “intern” work force for this significant process.</li> <li>• Draft proposals should only be shared with the public for specified small amounts of time for feedback.</li> <li>• All drafts posted should always be publicized in a comparison format that allows clear and concise comparison of the current state, the DRAFT AAC proposal, and the Feasibility Study proposal.</li> </ul>
<p>Reporting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OSP should never expand the timeline of the AAC meetings and/or survey timeline without asking for and receiving approval from the AAC committee membership.</li> <li>• OSP should redesign the mechanism in which it receives all community feedback and how it presents that information to the committee in a much more efficient and effective manner. The format should allow for AAC members to see the raw input (actual emails), be able to sort input by polygon number and by similar word structure, so AAC committee members can sort through large volumes of information efficiently and effectively. The new format should also be the only OFFICIAL way for input to be taken and considered. Personal emails to AAC members should not be allowed in this process to support personal safety of the committee members.</li> <li>• AAC committee members should be part of the presentation of their final recommendation to the Superintendent as the authors of the proposal.</li> </ul>