Joint Equity Advisory Council and Parents of Color Advisory Team  
Meeting Minutes  
October 5, 2021  
5:00 PM – 6:40 PM

Members Present (EAC)  
Chair: Jessica Beeson  
EAC Members: Annette Dabney, Bill DeWitt, Jeff Harkin, Kevin Harrell, Danica Moore, Lois Orth-Lopes, Mark Preut, Jayci Roberson, John Rury, Chris Tilden and Sylvia Trevino-Maack  
School Board Members: Melissa Johnson, Paula Smith

Members Present (POC)  
Chair: Kay Emerson  
POC Members: Cassie Eanes Brown, Janine Colter, Kim Fuller, Adrineh Mehdikhani, and Njeri Shomari  
School Board Members: Carole Cadue-Blackwood

District Staff: Michelle Hunter and Dr. Cynthia Johnson

1. Welcome:

Dr. Johnson welcomed everyone and let them know that each and every person would always have a seat at the table.

2. Equity Policy Review:

The Equity Policy review was adopted by the Board on May 10, 2021. We are currently reviewing our Equity and Inclusion Framework. Julie Boyle is doing the final review and we hope to have it uploaded on our website by Friday. Our Equity Policy has aligned all five statements to our Strategic Plan. Please find the approved Equity Policy attached.
3. E Team Expectations and Areas of Focus for 2021-2022:

Our equity policy aligns all five statements on the last page with our district's strategic plan. Our September meeting was just the beginning of our team work and will continue beyond our Courageous Conversations. There will be no activities that are not directly aligned with our strategic plan. The board will hold us responsible for the work we do. Each person on our Teaching and Learning Team as well as Team IEB (Inclusion, Engagement, and Belonging) is championing safe and supportive schools. We are meeting with each school principal to ensure the building level plan and goals are in place. Every district employee has a role in the work we are doing that is directly from the equity policy. Three expectations have been communicated to Principals.

4. Upcoming Microaggression Workshops:

Members are welcome to attend our upcoming Microaggression workshops. The first one is on Tuesday, October 12th, 8:30 am to 11:00 am in the Boardroom at the ESC. The second one will be Tuesday, October 19th, 8:30 am to 11:00 am in the Leadership and Legacy Center (old Boardroom) at the ESC. There was a question as to whether this could be attended virtually, and the consensus was that it should be in person. The topic is really heavy and is very powerful and impactful. Carole Cadue-Blackwood is a social worker and she said she would be available to help.

5. Student Equity Council Workshop:

There is one student group from Free State High School and one student group from Lawrence High School. Dr. DeWitt will reach out to students at the Career & College Center and provide student names to Dr. Johnson. All of these students will be in a workshop training on October 15, 2021 at the ESC.

Dr. Johnson said we want students to know that we have an equity policy and what that looks like and sounds on the ground. Everyone will have a place at the table—we want full representation.

6. Black Leaders of America Conference (BLA):

Dr. Lewis and Dr. Johnson accompanied Lawrence High School and Free State High School students of color to the Kauffman Center in Kansas City, Missouri to attend the Black Leaders of America Conference on Friday, October 1st. A Piper student had reached out to Dr. Johnson about this. She is a student monitor for the Equity Conference. Her mother is a Deputy Superintendent at KCKS Public Schools. A speaker was Cornell Ellis, the co-founder of Amplify: Empowering KC's Teachers of Color. This was a powerful presentation. The students shared that they loved having the opportunity to attend this conference.
7. **Tier 1: Restorative Practices Update:**

Middle school staff and high school staff have completed Restorative Practices training. The middle schools are ahead of the high schools as they started last year. The high schools are seven weeks into doing this work. We are partnering with Oakland Public Schools. They have the most effective Restorative Justice planning units in the United States and they receive guidance from KIPCOR in repairing the harm.

We are staying the course with our implementation plan. If we have to do a reset until we get on the right road, we will do a reset. All schools except West have had conversations about behaviors. This is not an excuse, just a truth. We have had to help our students get settled back in. In middle school we have been focusing on what we have to do to reset. We scrapped the Professional Development we had planned and did a new one to support administrators in helping students to build relationships. We are making sure our schools, our faculty and staff are doing what we need to do. This is not a Lawrence Public Schools thing—Wichita is experiencing the same thing. We are continuing to work through what we have been thrown in the midst, including Tik Tok challenges. 80 Lawrence High School students stayed to help the custodians clean up last week.

8. **ECAP Update:**

We have three focus areas: 1) Student Engagement and Outcomes, 2) Assessment and Instruction, and 3) Continuous Improvement and Inquiry. This information will also be used by the building equity teams to help write goals and focus at the building level. At our next meeting we will focus on the area of instructional coaches working on the ground in a student engagement school connectiveness role resulting in a greater likelihood to be successful. We will have a Board Report on October 25, 2021. ECAP data is from the Spring, 2021 and the Thought Exchange for high school students.

9. **EOS Update:**

The work is continuing from last year ensuring mid-October surveys are completed before the Board Meeting on October 25, 2021. All data that needs to be updated has been submitted. EOS reached out yesterday and will meet on Monday.

This has been a great process. KIPCOR bringing on elementary articulation is huge when students transition. EOS is just for high schools. Conversations will be at middle level, 5th and 6th grade—this is where we see a great divide. Students deciding on what classes they are taking and understanding how middle school classes have ramifications for high school.

Annette Dabney shared how elementary level morning meetings are like middle school, using three tiers. In Professional Development and grade level meetings, teachers are using the compass in their communications and are talking about how they can assist students, increase accountability and increase relationships with students to see what we can do to improve.

There was discussion about responsive classrooms and transitions in the school environment. The work the Principals have done at other schools makes them perfect partners with Restorative Justice. This is powerful work. Dr. Johnson said this is the perfect way to start a day.
10. Social Emotional Curriculum Review:

Representatives from EAC as well as POC will join a team for Curriculum review for Social Emotional Learning. Please be a part of this and sit at the table as we go through the next steps. The Curriculum review process will be in partnership with the Teaching and Learning team and Team IEB (Inclusion, Engagement and Belonging). As we go through this process, we will use our CSRC looking at the curriculum as it relates to social emotional learning.

Student and parent handbooks need eyes to review as well. Kristen Ryan and Rick Henry are leading the work. The Board has approved the framework for all levels (district elementary handbooks, district middle school handbooks, and high school handbooks). All schools in each level will be following the same handbook.

The CSRC has been pushed out to all staff. Celebrate and highlight when teachers use this tool.

Notes taken by Michelle Hunter.

From the Office of Dr. Cynthia Johnson, Executive Director, Inclusion, Engagement, & Belonging
CBA-Equity Policy

I. PURPOSE AND STANDARD

Lawrence Public Schools recognizes the importance of making and supporting significant shifts in mindset and practice to provide and sustain equitable outcomes for all students. Children, regardless of race, socioeconomic status, and/or other minoritized identities, will be able to access freely the resources and supports necessary to reach their fullest potential. Current and past federal, state, and local failures to act urgently in the pursuit of educational equity contribute to reduced access to academic opportunities, and to disparities in graduation outcomes and disciplinary actions for students from historically marginalized communities. These disparities contradict the beliefs and values the Lawrence Public Schools community articulates about what students can achieve and the adults’ role in ensuring conditions for success. To disrupt systemic racism and other forms of injustice that profoundly impact students’ current and future quality of life, the board commits to advancing educational equity by applying a systemic change framework to school governance and resource allocation.

The board, district administrators, certified and classified staff will work together to aggressively and efficiently eliminate inequitable practices, systems, and structures that create advantages for some students and families while disadvantaging others. School and district staff at all levels are encouraged to raise issues of inequity and offer solutions to remedy them. Lawrence Public Schools employee behaviors shall contribute to a school district 1) where students’ educational outcomes cannot be predicted by race, socioeconomic status, and/or other historically marginalized identities; and 2) where all students and staff are engaged in a positive and academically rigorous environment where educational equity is woven into every single department or division.

II. Key Terms

A. Educational Equity—when educational policies, practices, interactions, and resources and are representative of, constructed by, and responsive to all people so that each individual has access to, meaningfully participates in, and has positive outcomes from high-quality learning experiences, regardless of individual characteristics and group membership (Fraser, 2008; Great Lakes Equity Center, 2012, p.2).

B. Culturally Sustaining—“sustaining the cultural and linguistic competence of [staff and student] communities while simultaneously offering access to dominant cultural competence...[it] has as its
explicit goal supporting multilingualism and multiculturalism in practice and perspective for students and teachers (Paris, 2012, p. 95).

C. Historically Minoritized students &/or Marginalized Identities—includes people who hold identities and/or characteristics that have historically been underserved and/or neglected by the public education system (e.g., People of Color, people from the LGBTQ+ communities, people who are immigrants or refugees, Indigenous peoples, people with mental or physical dis/abilities, people with low socio-economic status, women, etc.) (Great Lakes Equity Center, 2019).

D. Meaningful Participation—agency and voice are afforded to all members of a community, by intentionally centering members who have been historically on the margins including, but not limited to, people living in under-resourced communities, people with dis/abilities, as well as racially, ethnically, and linguistically diverse individuals (Mulligan & Kozleski, 2009; Chen et al. 2014).

E. Race Equity—the condition that would be achieved if one’s race identity no longer influenced how one fares. Race equity is one part of race justice and must be addressed at the root causes and not just the manifestations. This includes the elimination of policies, practices, attitudes, and cultural messages that reinforce differential outcomes by race or fail to eliminate them.

F. Systemic Change Framework—reform work that operates within systemic levels of a unified reform effort, and what needs to occur at each level to comprehensively transform within and across the system(s) (Kozleski & Thorius, 2014).

III. IMPLEMENTATION

The board directs the superintendent to develop and implement system-wide equity and justice strategies for Lawrence Public Schools.

1. The strategies shall contain clear accountability measures and metrics, which will result in disparity improvements for minoritized students.
2. The strategies shall include resource allocation that accounts for educational equity.
3. The strategies shall include measurable workforce considerations. The district shall actively work to recruit, support, promote, and retain a workforce that reflects racial, gender, and linguistic diversity, as well as culturally sustaining and racially conscious administrative, instructional, and support staff.
4. The strategies shall include the development, implementation, and ongoing review of culturally sustaining teaching and learning practices and curriculum, sustained via continuous professional learning opportunities.
5. The strategies shall include social-emotional learning frameworks and behavioral health approaches that connect to equity and culturally sustaining classroom practices, and protect students’ dignity in discipline.

IV. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

1. Each school and district leadership team shall develop annual priorities that align with district strategic planning and that are outlined in annual School Improvement Plans. All priorities shall account for equity and inclusion.
2. District and building equity advisory committees and programs- on an ongoing basis, will meaningfully participate with district staff on progress towards School Improvement Plan and
district-wide strategic plan implementation. Equity advisory committees and programs, along with district leaders, shall utilize disaggregated data to analyze trends, identify gaps, and develop racial and other equity priorities for schools and district offices.

3. District employee behaviors shall concentrate on elimination of opportunity inequities, particularly those that are predicted on a student’s marginalized identities.

V. BOARD MONITORING

1. The superintendent and/or the superintendent’s designee shall report progress and outcomes at least quarterly to the board, district and building equity committees, and the broader Lawrence Public Schools community. Reports shall go beyond state and other standardized testing outcomes and shall include race equity explicitly.

2. Building and district administrative leadership performance evaluations shall incorporate clear equity and justice accountability and metrics.

References


School Equity Policies Frequently Referenced in Policy Development

Baltimore Public Schools
Denver Public Schools
Kansas City Missouri Public Schools
Midwest and Great Plains Equity
Minneapolis Public Schools
Public Equity Group
Saint Paul Public Schools Policy
Tennessee Leaders for Equity

Approved: May 10, 2021
D. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT AND INQUIRY

The district engages in inquiry using multiple types of data to make explicit the links between student outcomes, policy and adult practice. Data-informed inquiry and continuous improvement processes are used to determine who is not benefiting from current policies, practices and structures, and on improving learning opportunities and outcomes for all students, with particular attention to addressing inequities faced by historically marginalized students (Friere, 1970; Kozleski & Thorius, 2013; Thorius, 2014).

D.1. There is ongoing support for professional learning and growth for all educators, staff members, administrators, and parent/caregivers that is aligned with strategic improvement efforts, is job-embedded, and includes coaching and mentoring (Access).

---

Percent of Responses that Responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" or "Yes to D.1 Items

Staff Survey, n=735

Percent of Responses that Responded "Yes" to D.1 Items by Parent Demographics

Source: Parent/Caregiver Survey, n=2377

---
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D.1 Are there opportunities for professional advancement in the district for all members of the district staff?

Admin. Survey, n=45

D.1 Are there opportunities for professional advancement in the district for all members of the district staff?

Staff Survey, n=516

D.2. Professional learning experiences are collaborative and center perspectives across grade and content teams, grade-levels, and schools (Meaningful Participation).
D.3. Educational equity is centered as a cross-cutting tenet in all professional learning experiences (i.e., across content and topic areas) (Representation).

D.3 Approximately what proportion of your staff have participated in professional development experiences designed to increase their capacity to provide culturally responsive and inclusive learning opportunities for all students?
Admin. Survey n=29

---
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Equity Context Analysis Process (ECAP)
Lawrence Public School
Stakeholder Survey Data Summary

Reported Frequency of Equity-Focused Professional Learning
Administrator Survey, n=33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>No Sessions</th>
<th>1-3 Sessions</th>
<th>4 or More Sessions</th>
<th>I'm not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Instruction</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ+/Homophobia</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Bias</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Equity</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Responsive Teaching/Practices</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights/Anti-discrimination</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying and Harassment Prevention</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reported Frequency of Equity-Focused Professional Learning
Staff Survey, n=310

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>No Sessions</th>
<th>1-3 Sessions</th>
<th>4 or More Sessions</th>
<th>I'm not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Instruction</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ+/Homophobia</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Bias</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Equity</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Responsive Teaching/Practices</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights/Anti-discrimination</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying and Harassment Prevention</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Equity Context Analysis Process (ECAP)
Lawrence Public School
Stakeholder Survey Data Summary

Reported Effectiveness of Equity-Focused Professional Learning
Administrator Survey, n=28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Instruction</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ+/Homophobia</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Bias</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Equity</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Responsive Teaching/Practices</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights/Anti-discrimination</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying and Harassment Prevention</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reported Effectiveness of Equity-Focused Professional Learning
Staff Survey, n=349

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Instruction</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ+/Homophobia</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Bias</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Equity</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Responsive Teaching/Practices</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights/Anti-discrimination</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying and Harassment Prevention</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Equity Context Analysis Process (ECAP)
Lawrence Public School
Stakeholder Survey Data Summary

School professional development about educational equity increased:

Administrator Survey, m=33

- My colleagues' ability to lead others in demonstrating equitable practices
- My ability to lead others in demonstrating equitable practices
- My colleagues' ability to lead others in learning about equitable practices
- My ability to lead others in learning about equitable practices
- My colleagues' ability to demonstrate equitable practices
- My ability to demonstrate equitable practices
- My colleagues' understanding about equitable practices
- My understanding about equitable practices
- My colleagues' awareness of equitable practices
- My awareness of equitable practices

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
- I don't know/Neither Agree nor Disagree

School professional development about educational equity increased:

Staff Survey, m=349

- My colleagues' ability to lead others in demonstrating equitable practices
- My ability to lead others in demonstrating equitable practices
- My colleagues' ability to lead others in learning about equitable practices
- My ability to lead others in learning about equitable practices
- My colleagues' ability to demonstrate equitable practices
- My ability to demonstrate equitable practices
- My colleagues' understanding about equitable practices
- My understanding about equitable practices
- My colleagues' awareness of equitable practices
- My awareness of equitable practices

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
- I don't know/Neither Agree nor Disagree
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Stakeholder Survey Data

34 | Page
D.4. Multiple, relevant data sources and types are regularly shared, reviewed, and used in classrooms, and in team, building, district, and community meetings (Meaningful Participation).
D.5. What counts as data is broadly defined by diverse stakeholder groups to include both student and systems data, with an emphasis on centering historically marginalized groups. (Representation)
Equity Context Analysis Process (ECAP)
Lawrence Public School
Stakeholder Survey Data Summary

D.6. Data are routinely disaggregated by student groups (e.g., race/ethnicity, ability, gender etc.) to reveal indicators of inequity in classrooms, schools, and across the district. (Representation)
D.7. The selection of improvement strategies is the result of collaborative inquiry processes and data-informed decision making. (Positive Outcomes)
Equity Context Analysis Process (ECAP)
Lawrence Public School
Stakeholder Survey Data Summary

D.8. District and school improvement efforts focus on changing policies, systems, and adult practices to better support students, rather than 'fixing' students, and are coordinated such that efficiencies are optimized and redundancies are minimized. (Positive Outcomes)

[Bar graphs showing percent of responses that responded "Yes" to D.8 items by race and gender, with differences highlighted for White, People of Color, Men, Women, and Total.]

D.8 How many school-wide initiatives are currently in place?
Admin. Survey, n=80

- 0-1: 18.3%
- 2-5: 16.7%
- 6-10: 9.7%
- 11 or more: 8.7%
- I'm not sure: 10.0%
- Not applicable: 60.0%

To What Extent are the Too School Initiatives Equity-Centered?
Administrator Survey, n=25

- With a Great Deal: 56%
- To Some Extent: 15%
- Not at All: 3.6%
- I don't know: 24%
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Equity Context Analysis Process (ECAP)
Lawrence Public School
Stakeholder Survey Data Summary

D.8 How many district-wide initiatives are currently in place?
Admin. Survey, n=39

- None: 7.7%
- 1-5: 46.2%
- 6-10: 11.6%
- 11 or more: 11.6%
- I'm not sure: 0.0%
- Not Applicable: 0.0%

To What Extent are the Top District Initiatives Equity-Centered?
Admin/Teacher Survey, n=37

- Not at All: 1.9%
- Somewhat: 14.7%
- Several: 24.3%
- Most: 41.8%
- Some Great Degree: 18.3%
- Not Applicable: 0.0%

D.8 How many district-wide initiatives are currently in place?
Staff Survey, n=572

- None: 14.7%
- 1-5: 74.0%
- 6-10: 1.9%
- 11 or more: 0.9%
- I'm not sure: 0.0%
- Not Applicable: 0.0%

To What Extent are the Top District Initiatives Equity-Centered?
Staff Survey, n=665

- Not at All: 6.6%
- Somewhat: 41.8%
- Several: 18.3%
- Most: 14.3%
- Some Great Degree: 14.3%
- Not Applicable: 0.0%
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D.8 How many school-wide initiatives are currently in place?  
Staff Survey, n=606

- None: 3.3%  
- 1-5: 26.4%  
- 6-10: 62.5%  
- 11 or more: 4.1%  
- I'm not sure: 2.3%  
- Not Applicable: -

To What Extent are the Top School Initiatives Equity-Centered?  
Staff Survey, n=650

- To a Great Extent: 3.5%  
- To Some Extent: 13.7%  
- Not at All: 42.7%  
- I'm not sure: 40.6%

D.9. There are standard monitoring and assessing processes and procedures that are used to inform and enhance district and school improvement efforts. (Meaningful Participation)

Percent of Responses that Responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" to D.9 Items  
Source: Admin. Survey, n=45

Percent of Responses that Responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" to D.9 Items  
Source: Staff Survey, n=735
D.10. Data summaries and annual reports are readily available and accessible to every stakeholder in the learning community. (Access)
D.11. There are multiple opportunities for stakeholders to ask questions about and process data and reports to allow for independent and alternative interpretations (Meaningful Participation).
E. INSTRUCTION AND ASSESSMENT

Curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices support all students in identifying and using tools and knowledge resources from multiple communities for critiquing the status quo and empowering students to make decisions that will lead to social change towards more just communities in and out of school (Stovall, 2006; Gay, 2010; Aronson & Laughter 2015). Instruction is differentiated to facilitate use of various modalities for acquisition and generation of knowledge or skills through experience and study.

E.1. Instruction and assessments are differentiated and adjusted to address a continuum of student learning rates, interests, funds of knowledge, and assets (Access).

---

E.1. About what percentage of instruction is asynchronous or accessible to students outside of class time, (i.e. through remote instruction such as school packets, recorded sessions, phone calls or online learning modules)?

Staff Survey, n=395

- 14.2%
- 23.0%
- 27.6%
- 1-25%
- 26-50%
- 51-80%
- 81-100%

---
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E.2. Instruction is relevant to and representative of students' lived experiences and personal identities, and builds upon students' prior knowledge. (Representation)

E.3. High expectations for learning are evident for every student; instruction is rigorous and promotes critical thinking (Meaningful Participation).
E.4. Formative and summative assessments guide adjustments to instruction (Meaningful Participation).
E.5. Lessons are co-planned with special education and English language teachers, and other specialists in order to design instruction for students with dis/abilities, English learners, and students who could benefit from specific learning supports (Access).

E.6. Educators are provided real-time feedback, oversight, and support on lesson plans, assessments, and classroom instruction (Access).
E. INSTRUCTION AND ASSESSMENT

Curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices support all students in identifying and using tools and knowledge resources from multiple communities for critiquing the status quo and empowering students to make decisions that will lead to social change towards more just communities in and out of school (Stovall, 2006; Gay, 2010; Aronson & Laughter 2015). Instruction is differentiated to facilitate use of various modalities for acquisition and generation of knowledge or skills through experience and study.

E.1. Instruction and assessments are differentiated and adjusted to address a continuum of student learning rates, interests, funds of knowledge, and assets (Access).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of E.1 Items Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source: Classroom Observation, n=207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>In-person</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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School Review Data Summary
Teacher Interview: E.1 How have you adapted your methods of teaching to a remote or online learning environment? (n=88)

Summary

Most educators articulated their difficulty in adapting traditional teaching methods into a usable and effective way of teaching and engaging students.

Considerations

Educators seemed to struggle in finding new ways teach students using virtual platforms. Most of the educators interviewed cited the use of traditional method of classroom instruction which may have proven effective in face-to-face contexts however, have proven difficult to adapt and incorporate into an online educational environment.

Virtual Considerations

- "This year I use breakout rooms a lot. This helps me work with individuals and small groups on targeted skills"
- "I developed a webpage that is basically a day-to-day outline of what we do in class that day complete with all of the links. They have a record of what happens every day in class as it is dated and kept in order of the class meetings"
- "Finding ways to keep students engaged and participating because it is easy for them to hide behind a screen and not participate. I use the annotation and chat to keep students engaged"

Hard Copy Assignments

- "I have paper copies of assignments as well as online or pdf versions I can give them. We work on most of the assignments as a group while we are on this online format except for the projects but, I do encourage students to work together on those they just have to turn in their own version"
E.2. Instruction is relevant to and representative of students' lived experiences and personal identities and builds upon students' prior knowledge. (Representation)

Percent of E.2 Items Observed
Source: Classroom Observation, n=207

- Online
- In-person
- Elementary
- Middle
- High School
- Total

0.0%
20.0%
40.0%
60.0%
80.0%
100.0%
E.3. High expectations for learning are evident for every student; instruction is rigorous and promotes critical thinking (Meaningful Participation).

Percent of E.3 Items Observed
Source: Classroom Observation, n=207

E.4. Formative and summative assessments guide adjustments to instruction (Meaningful Participation).

Percent of E.4 Items Observed
Source: Classroom Observation, n=207
E.5. Lessons are co-planned with special education and English language teachers, and other specialists in order to design instruction for students with dis/abilities, English learners, and students who could benefit from specific learning supports (Access).

Teacher Interview: E.5 How often do you review the Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) of students in your class who have disabilities? (n=84)

Summary
In many instances, educators indicated that they only viewed IEP’s on an annual basis.

Considerations
Educators provided varying ranges for the frequency of IEP review and most mentioned that they review annually. This was another question that was rarely responded to within the survey. This finding along with the information provided elsewhere in the survey concerning students having IEP’s and the amount of co-collaboration with other educators indicated within the survey may signal a need to greater emphasis on interact between teachers of students with IEP’s.

Annually

- "I review IEPs at the beginning of the year when I find out the students are starting in my classroom, at their annual IEP review"
- "At the beginning of the school year and during the annual review"
- "I review them once at the beginning of the year"
- "once a year"
Equity Context Analysis Process
School Review Data Summary
Lawrence Public Schools

Monthly/Regularly

- "I review them once every other month"
- "Throughout the year closer to report card time or before data meetings. Probably around 6 times a year. I frequently look at IEPS at a glance"

Teacher Interview: (E.5) what extent do you co-plan lessons with the special education teacher or specialist to design instruction for students with disabilities, emergent bilingual/multilingual learners, and students who could benefit from specific learning supports in your class? N=83

Summary

In several instances, educators reported that they co-plan frequently with other educators.

Considerations

More regular opportunities for collaboration could be provided to educators based on the responses concerning collaboration with special education teachers and and other specialists and the responses to the question above.

Frequently

- "I would say we co-plan lessons on a daily basis. For reading instruction we often make sure we are working with the same genre of texts so students can build familiarity and focus on skill growth. During math instruction I often have a special education teacher push in and help co-teach with students"
- "I plan as often as possible with other colleagues"
- "I usually plan with the SpEd team once a month to determine how to differentiate instruction for students"
Equity Context Analysis Process
School Review Data Summary
Lawrence Public Schools

- "Almost constantly. It's important to have their input, exp as a grade level that implements PBL. As stated above, we want to make sure all of our students are included and feel supported. We also get their support in regards to behaviors, and creating BIP's. They are also a great resource when it comes to the GEI process"
- "I talk weekly with the special education teacher and Title teachers about my students' progress. I try to make sure that we are aligned so students are receiving consistent instruction"

As Needed

- "I collaborate with them as needed to create any modifications. I also have a full-time para in my room that I work with in order to modify instruction for my SPED students. We collaborate during PLC time, and via email, as well as before and after school"
- "In a "regular" school year I met with the sped department as much as needed"
- "Our SPED team took FMLA after the first trimester. I periodically share ideas we are working on with our new SPED teacher"
- "I wouldn't technically say I get much time to co-plan with a special education teacher. PLCS meetings Plan and accommodate together"

Not At All

- "This year I do not co-plan at all being virtual"
E.6. Educators are provided real-time feedback, oversight, and support on lesson plans, assessments, and classroom instruction (Access).
See Stakeholder Survey Data Summary

F. STUDENT ENGAGEMENT & OUTCOMES

All students are active participants in their own learning and are engaged in high quality and rigorous learning opportunities. Students' academic, social, and personal growth all are deemed important outcomes (Whiteman, Thorius, Skelton, & Kyser. 2015).

F.1. Students are encouraged and given opportunities to participate in activities that facilitate social critique. (Meaningful Participation)

Percent of F.1 Items Observed
Source: Classroom Observation, n=207
F.2. Students critically reflect on and connect to their personal histories, identities and cultures as part of meaning making (Meaningful Participation)

Percent of F.2 Items Observed
Source: Classroom Observation, n=207

- Online
- In-person
- Elementary
- Middle
- High School
- Total

F.3. Participation in higher level Science and Mathematics coursework by student group is proportional to overall enrollment. (Representation)
See Student Data Profile

F.4. A majority of students (i.e., >80%) meet or exceed minimum state achievement standards, such that there are no observable disparities between student groups. (Positive Outcomes)
See Student Data Profile

F.5. A majority of students (i.e., >80%) graduate on time (i.e., within designated four-year term), such that there are no observable disparities between student groups. (Positive Outcomes)
See Student Data Profile
F.6. All students appear to engage meaningfully in learning experiences and regularly participate in academic dialogue (i.e., adults do not dominate discussions) (Meaningful Participation).

Percent F.6 Items Observed

Source: Classroom Observation, n=207
F. STUDENT ENGAGEMENT & OUTCOMES

All students are active participants in their own learning and are engaged in high quality and rigorous learning opportunities. Students’ academic, social, and personal growth all are deemed important outcomes (Whiteman, Thorius, Skelton, & Kyser. 2015).

F.1. Students are encouraged and given opportunities to participate in activities that facilitate social critique. (Meaningful Participation)

Percent of Responses that were "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" in Response to F.1 by Child Demographics
Source: Parent/Caregiver Survey, n=2348
F.2. Students critically reflect on and connect to their personal histories, identities and cultures as part of meaning making (Meaningful Participation)

F.3. Participation in higher level Science and Mathematics coursework by student group is proportional to overall enrollment. (Representation)
See Student Data Profile

F.4. A majority of students (i.e., >80%) meet or exceed minimum state achievement standards, such that there are no observable disparities between student groups. (Positive Outcomes)
See Student Data Profile

F.5. A majority of students (i.e., >80%) graduate on time (i.e., within designated four-year term), such that there are no observable disparities between student groups. (Positive Outcomes)
See Student Data Profile
F.6. All students appear to engage meaningfully in learning experiences and regularly participate in academic dialogue (i.e., adults do not dominate discussions) (Meaningful Participation).