

#1

Shirley Ann Hill

Retired Teacher

I have followed the public hearings regarding the unfair treatment of former Montessori teacher Ms. Stephanie Lapine by principal Kellie Meyer. Throughout my 41-year career with PPS, I too was subjected to toxic principals like her. In December 2023, Ms. Stephanie Lapine was removed from her classroom by Kellie Meyer. After many attempts by parents/guardians, Kellie Meyer did not offer an explanation for Ms. Stephanie Lapine's removal. Ms. Stephanie Lapine was cleared in February 2024 but was "conveniently transferred" to another school that does not have a Montessori program. Why was Ms. Stephanie Lapine not reinstated at Montessori where she belongs? Why is Kellie Meyer not being held accountable for her unfair treatment of Ms. Stephanie Lapine (the only lead black teacher)? Some Montessori teachers have filed grievances and still nothing has been done. Toxic principals like Kellie Meyer put fear in teachers who speak up by sabotaging their teacher evaluations. I question how students are first when toxic principals are not held accountable.

Carrick High School has a very small percentage of black teachers. "Black teachers are crucial for students in 2025 because they provide a vital role model, foster a stronger sense of belonging, and can significantly improve academic outcomes for Black students." (Artificial Intelligence Overview) **BLACK STUDENTS AT CARRICK MATTER!!**

Computer Applications should be a mandatory business elective class for all incoming freshmen. During my time at Carrick, some English teachers, CTE ITL, and CTE Director have indicated the importance of this class. Freshmen are not getting the necessary skills in middle school. When it is time to do a project, some of them are lost. While at Carrick, I have helped students many times navigate through the necessary software to complete their projects. Quite often teachers



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

require students to do projects that utilize Microsoft Word, PowerPoint, and Excel. These skills are beneficial to students beyond high school.

#2

Karen Sloan

Parent

Looping.

What comes to mind with the word "Looping" ?

In terms of education practice,  
extensive, repeated studies show -  
while Looping involves no additional significant cost,  
it makes happier teachers,  
and higher student test scores.

Links to this data can be found in my written testimony.

[ ... "In North Carolina, economists examined data on several million elementary school students. They discovered a common pattern across about 7,000 classrooms that achieved significant gains in math and reading performance.

Those students didn't have better teachers. They just happened to have the same teacher at least twice in different grades. A separate team of economists replicated the study with nearly a million elementary and middle schoolers in Indiana — and found the same results."

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0272775717306635>

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0272775721001096>

from an October 22, 2023, New York Times article "What Most American Schools Do Wrong"

[https://www.nytimes.com/2023/10/22/opinion/education-us-teachers-looping.html?unlocked\\_article\\_code=1.-0w.z07-.r99EG7iwkXzX&smid=url-share ... \]](https://www.nytimes.com/2023/10/22/opinion/education-us-teachers-looping.html?unlocked_article_code=1.-0w.z07-.r99EG7iwkXzX&smid=url-share ... ])

As you continue to work on district facilities utilization planning,  
I pray that expanding Looping will be a part of the plan.

Tonight let's dig deeper on the topic of Looping,  
beyond just preschool and kindergarten as I highlighted last month,  
Looping is also a strength for elementary grades.

In educational terms, Looping,  
means keeping students with a teacher  
for at least a second, if not a third, year.

Such already happens in high schools,  
when students end up taking several grades of a subject,  
with one teacher.

At the elementary level,  
PPS already utilizes Looping extensively at Montessori.

In fact, at this PreK to 5 school,  
it is quite common for a student  
to progress through 8 years of education  
with a total of 3 lead teachers the entire time.

Such has been the circumstances for one of my children.

And, if siblings are spaced far enough apart,  
younger siblings are most often placed with the same teachers.

This has also been true of my family.  
We spent 6 years with one combo ECE/Kindergarten teacher.

Looping is a simple, inexpensive educational model,  
with versatile use.

In the elementary grades at Montessori,  
the curriculum IS our district wide curriculum.  
And teachers at Montessori are an amazing resource  
for anyone to learn how to do a Looping elementary  
with our current district curriculum, for higher test scores!

As you all well know,  
my heart breaks for the circumstances of a specific Montessori  
teacher  
who has not been at our school for over a year now,  
Miss Stephanie Lapine.

What I realized you do not know,  
is how personally impacted I am by her removal from Room 202.  
Not only is our family on track for 6 years in Room 202,  
up until last year, I had been the lead classroom parent.  
Handling not only PTA announcements and teacher gifts,  
but also planning parties  
and many learning get togethers during the pandemic.

Now, in the March 2023 PPS Executive Committee transcript,  
there is mention of a clergy person, in a collar,  
described as being more of an organizer in opposition to the  
principal,  
not connected to Miss Stephanie Lapine's classroom.

I have guesses as to who would have misled all of you  
with this false impression of no direct impact to my family.  
Honesty often goes missing with the administration at Montessori.  
The school's leadership is underskilled,

and as your own HR records document  
there are times where moral compasses appear to just be broken.

Such continues to break our school.

How might you be curious,

towards repair,

towards growth

beyond the enrollment "doom loop" our school is stuck in?

Thank you!



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#3

Michele Kelly

Teacher/Staff



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#4

Jessica Porter

Teacher/Staff



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#5

Valerie Webb-Allman

Parent, Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#6

Lily Allman

Student

Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#7

Dr. Dan Holland

Community Member

Dear President Walker, Superintendent Walters, and the Pittsburgh Public School Board: My name is Dr. Daniel Holland, PhD, and I am the 2025 Post-Doctoral Fellow at the Center for Africanamerican Urban Studies and the Economy, or CAUSE, at Carnegie Mellon University. I am also a proud graduate of Taylor Allderdice High School, class of 1987. For the past 32 years, I have been working with the residents of Manchester and documenting changes there as the community revitalized itself from a neighborhood slated for demolition to one which is an internationally-recognized example of African American self-determination. Over the past year, I have been assisting Manchester Neighbors with understanding the financial, social, and demographic implications of developments surrounding the neighborhood. The most consequential of these is the Esplanade project, a \$740 million virtual “new city” situated adjacent to the city’s largest historic district and the largest African American historic district in Western Pennsylvania. Since the 1960s, Manchester residents have been working to revitalize their neighborhood. They have been so successful that the median home price is now \$220,500, making it the most expensive Black neighborhood in the city. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, there are 3,110 people in Manchester (2023 ACS), of which 817, or 30%, are white residents, and 1,731 (63%) are Black residents. But its Black population has been shrinking over the past several decades. Since 2000, Manchester has lost 40% of its Black population. In just the last ten years, 2010 to 2020, Manchester’s Black population declined by 24%, while the White population increased by 69%. In 2010, Manchester was 79% Black; in 2020, Manchester was 63% Black. These demographics mask vast inequalities. While Manchester’s overall median income is \$62,383, the White median income is \$94,250. For African Americans, the median income is \$30,205. Eleven percent of all Black families are below the poverty level, while no white families are below poverty. 1 Serious consideration should be taken to understand the Esplanade’s impact on such a sensitive neighborhood. This is especially relevant for the School Board, one of the city’s three taxing bodies which has an annual operating budget of \$716 million, substantially larger than the city’s operating budget and nearly as much as the Esplanade development is projected to cost. I join Manchester Neighbors in calling for the School Board to hold a public hearing about the Esplanade project to better understand its impact on Manchester.

Sincerely, Dr. Daniel Holland, PhD 2025 Post-Doctoral Fellow Center for Africanamerican Urban Studies and the Economy (CAUSE) Department of History Dietrich College of Humanities and Social Sciences Baker Hall 240 Carnegie Mellon University 5000 Forbes Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15213  
<https://www.cmu.edu/history/cause/>



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#8

Roberta Bowra

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#9

Sondra Hunter

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#10

Rev Artice Coleman

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#11

K. Darlene Wiggins

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#12

Pam Pryor

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#13

Taylor Woodruff

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#14

Tracy Turner

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#15

Elizabeth Ivy

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#16

Terrance Turk

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#17

Evelyn Mitchell

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#18

Rebekah Bowra

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#19

Ebony Evans

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#20

Iris Goshay

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#21

English Burton

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#22

Debra Blackwell Battle

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#23

Stanley Lowe

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#24

Paul Scott

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#25

April Clisura

Parent, Other School Bus Driver

Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#26

Emily Sawyer

Parent, Substitute Teacher

I am here to implore you to pass a resolution to terminate the contract with The Council of Great City Schools (CGCS) for the implementation plan regarding Student Outcomes Focused Governance (SOFG) for the PPS School Board. The proposed policy changes to the suite of 000 PPS policies are anti-democratic -significantly removing power from the 9-person, democratically-elected School Board, and putting it in the hands of 1 non-elected individual - the Superintendent; and, in some cases, contradict PA law, the specifics of which I will expound upon below.

Importantly though, before I go on with what is sure to be a thesis-length message, I have to mention that I have experienced this same governance model in our previous school district before we moved back to Pittsburgh. They were implementing a version of CGCS's Student Outcomes Focused Governance just as we moved, and it has significantly altered the way that Board functions, and not in a good way. The Board members have found even the type of questions they can ask has been severely limited. They are having to cut off discussion so they don't run afoul of the 50% rule. They have had to fight to maintain their relationship with the local community college (early college isn't in the student outcome goals, after all). They had to fight to receive disaggregated data (by race, SES, ELL status, Special Education status, et al) in the monthly monitoring reports; and even though they won that battle and receive the disaggregated data, there are no specific goals related to any such categories of students. Meaning all goals and progress are based on the students in the aggregate. Therefore, a goal can be met even if one of the student categories is making no progress or losing ground! In other words, white students could make so much progress in 3rd grade reading that it looks like we are meeting our goal even if Black students and students receiving special education services are still lagging far behind! This cannot be good enough for PPS!

I understand the impulse to reach for a system delivered to us on a gold platter with lots of shiny powerpoint presentations (even if most of them aren't for the public), neat frameworks, and nice data points about student achievement improvements. I wish fixing the dismal state of our public education systems could be simplified down to a "3-steps to success for all students" equation where we plug in inputs and pull a few levers and out come the outcomes that we want! But we aren't making nails or even sending a rocket to the moon. We are educating human beings, and frankly, also teaching them how to *be human*. "Objectively measurable student outcomes" will never truly measure the educational well-being of our children or create the joy-filled, humanity-building schools we want for our kids. It might seem easier, and is certainly well-intentioned, and it might seem like it could lighten some of the load off your backs, which I know is immense. But please do not adopt this governance model whole-cloth, uncritically, out of desperation or exhaustion. And if you truly believe in it, please look at what it will actually do, and decide if it's truly worth it. We can take the good, leave the bad, and build something together that truly works for Pittsburgh and our students. And we can do it without paying more consultants.

Before I jump into the problems, there are of course fine and noble ideas found within this governance model that may work well for PPS and be worthwhile implementing, such as:

Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

1. for agendas and relevant supporting documents to be made available to directors 10 days before the meeting instead of 3 (it would be great if the public got it sooner, too!);
2. for questions and answers to be recorded and made publicly available;
3. having a calendar for when each policy will be reviewed on a rotation of a specified number of years; and
4. there being a scheduled report for each month for directors and the public to hear how progress is going on goals.

WE could implement any or all of four changes and leave all the rest of the anti-democratic, anti-community participation shenanigans contained in the rest of it.

~~If, instead, we turn over all this power to the Superintendent who we, the public, don't elect, then the Superintendent can make unilateral decisions about MOST of the things that affect our District day to day. If it's not "a BOARD GOAL" or a "Board policy" the Board won't be able to discuss it robustly, or maybe at all, even if their constituents bring it up; and they certainly won't be voting on them.~~

~~State law sets the requirements for what the Board can and must do, not CGCS! State law requires that the Board makes policy and the District implements it. The PSBA recommends policy to School Boards, not the Superintendent. Why would the Superintendent be implementing anything based on anything that didn't come from the elected policy making body of this school district??? How can the Board and District policies be two distinct things? That makes no sense! And it certainly wouldn't lend itself to a well-run and effective school system if a school district and its school board had different goals.~~

001

Why remove the requirement to consider the fiscal implications of resolutions? The implication to me is that there will no longer be resolutions, or else why wouldn't we want to keep considering the fiscal implications of them?

What goals are we even talking about throughout these policies? Are goals the same as priorities? Are we talking about Board goals from policy 010 (previously referenced in this policy 001)? Or are we talking about the superintendent's 5 priority goals from strategic planning? Or are we talking about the other 4 superintendent's goals that got slipped through in a resolution vote in August 2024, which also codified the 5 priority goals? How can you pass policies worded so confusingly that we can't even know what is being talked about?

003

It is problematic to change "educational goals" to "student outcome goals" because the latter is so narrow as to impede Board discussion and action on, as well as democratic, community input into many issues that affect student educational experience and fall under Board business and responsibility per state law (see policy 006 below).

Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

By establishing that goals only refers to these narrowly defined “student outcome goals” and then referring to “those” goals throughout the rest of the powers section, as in ““monitor progress towards those goals on a consistent basis,” this removes the Board’s authority to monitor progress on *any other educational goals*.

004

In the policymaking section of the policy, proposed changes would change “establish and regularly review policies” to “establish and regularly review **Board** policies,” which implies that there are some policies that aren’t made by the Board when we have state law that maintains that the Board has authority to establish ALL policy. This takes authority granted by the PA Legislature away from the Board. Who will establish and review the district policies?

005

PA already requires school board training which is administered through PDE and PSBA. These trainings are free of charge. The proposed addition of “District required training” will not only be redundant to the governance training already required and provided by the state, but will also cost the District money! There should be a fiscal note attached to this policy, per the Board’s own guideline 001-BOG-1. Why spend money on what you can get for free? And why isn’t it a conflict of interest for an organization to suggest modifying policy in such a way that it requires the school board to pay them for services only they can provide in order to follow the policy?

006

This policy is a shambles. Committee meetings are really the only place that school district issues get discussed. If the education, business & finance, and personnel committees are dissolved, the public will never hear about anything important to our school district.

The proposed changes would limit what topics are within the Board’s purview to such an extent that the policy committee would no longer have authority to review Parent Engagement policy, Student Discipline/Code of Conduct policy, Non-discrimination policy, Curriculum development policy, et al. This despite the fact that PA Statute 24 section 510.2 requires the Board to have purview of just these types of things!

“Section 510.2. Publication of Rules, Regulations and Policies.--The board of school directors of a school district shall post on its publicly accessible Internet website the following rules, regulations and policies to the extent that they are required to be adopted by the school district under Federal or State law:

(1) The following relating to students:

(i) Admission of beginners.

(ii) Attendance, excusals and truancy.

Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

- (iii) Withdrawal from school.
  - (iv) Student discipline.
  - (v) Suspension and expulsion of students.
  - (vi) Searches.
  - (vii) Audio interception on school buses or school vehicles for disciplinary or security persons.
  - (viii) Retention, maintenance and access to student records.
  - (ix) Use of personal electronic devices.
  - (x) Dress and grooming.
  - (xi) Student complaint process.
  - (xii) Parent appeal of a school district's placement of twins or multiple birth siblings.
  - (xiii) Participation by home school students in school district extracurricular activities.
- (2) The following relating to educational programs:
- (i) Curriculum review by parents and students.
  - (ii) Promotion and retention.
  - (iii) Graduation requirements.
- (3) The following relating to student health:
- (i) Communicable diseases and immunization.
  - (ii) Health examinations and screenings.”

Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

Additionally, the proposed changes seem to do away with the personnel committee even though PA statute 24 Section 1106 specifically lays out a school board's responsibilities regarding employment and personnel.

“Section 1106 Duty to Employ.–The board of school directors in every school district shall employ the necessary qualified professional employees, substitutes and temporary professional employees to keep the public schools open in their respective districts in compliance with the provisions of this act. Except for school districts of the first class and first class A which may require residency requirements for other than professional employees, substitutes and temporary professional employees, no other school district shall require an employee to reside within the school district as a condition for appointment or continued employment.”

If all committees are ad hoc committees and meet only “as-needed” who decides when it's needed? There is nothing in this policy or the associated BOG that says HOW the Board would authorize the creation of an ad hoc committee or how the decision to meet would be made!

Policy 006 also references the PA Sunshine Act, and I would contend that much of the deliberation and discussion about this governance model and the development and passing of the resolution to adopt its implementation was done in violation of the sunshine act because very little, if any, of this discussion was done in public. Multiple references have been made to all the discussions the Board has had about this previously, which doesn't help all of us constituents, many of whom had never heard about it before January 6, 2025! These are major changes, yet none of it was ever presented to the public. CGCS has a Student Outcomes Focused Governance Manual which has never been seen in a public PPS meeting! I wouldn't even be able to agree on the definitions in the definitions section of that manual, and yet we haven't had more than maybe a single public discussion about this in over a year of work! And don't tell me that directors could have started a discussion! They didn't have to because y'all were having all the discussions and getting all your questions answered behind closed doors!

007

It is great for the agendas and relevant supporting documents to be made available to directors 10 days before the meeting instead of 3 (it would be great if the public got it sooner, too!). And it is great for questions and answers to be recorded and made publicly available. We could make these two policy changes without all the rest of the shenanigans.

But that's where the good ends and the concerns begin with this policy... When are the questions and answers available along with the agenda to the public? If it still is only 24 hours before the legislative meeting then that is AFTER public comment. What good does that do the public, or the directors who are supposed to represent us? What about the use of placeholders? This very contract with CGCS was passed after it was placed on the agenda review agenda with no details only TBD. It didn't even name CGCS!

Then we have the consent agenda idea, which we basically already have, with the new and onerous requirements for pulling items to be discussed at legislative session. Now a director has to have asked a question no later than 4 days before the legislative meeting AND THREE directors have to request the item be pulled! This is unwieldy and impractical. Nevermind that anything brought up at public comment will essentially not be able to have any bearing on future

Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

discussions because it will be too late for directors to ask questions about anything brought up at public comment or request an agenda item be pulled for further discussion based on anything the community brings up in public comment! So essentially, ANY discussion will have to happen at agenda review, which happens BEFORE public hearing, AND there will be no way for further discussion to happen if new information is discovered or brought up at public hearing!! This is completely ridiculous and unacceptable!

Also according to policy 007, when a school director abstains from a vote, they have to state verbally in public the nature of the conflict. Board directors are not currently doing this.

The proposed added sentence in the conflict of interest clause is not based in state law or the Board's own policy 917, which *is* based on said state law. Who is going to cross-reference every agenda item every month with every person or entity who has made a political contribution to the campaign of any director in every election they've run in? And if the District will have to hire someone just to do this, then this proposed policy change should also have a fiscal note attached! Since broadly following this proposed policy change is almost logistically impossible, it makes me wonder who or what the target is? Might a clause like this be meant specifically to limit the power of the teachers' unions? The reason I wonder about this is because any director who had been endorsed by and accepted funds from the teachers' union would have to, it seems, abstain from ANY matters relating to the union, the contract, hiring and firing, who knows what else??? Would they not be able to vote on the CBA?!? This is not necessary. Campaign finance law already covers these issues, and the PA Ethics Act does not require this clause!

009

Honestly, I'm tired and there are so many things wrong in this proposed policy language, and if I haven't already convinced you, no amount of expounding is gonna do it now.

I'll end by saying that the PSBA Code of Conduct For School Board Members, which is included in Board policy 009, says that Board members have a "civic obligation... to maintain free and strong public schools... *without surrendering [your] responsibilities to any other person, group, or organization.*" My strong contention is that this governance plan does just that, surrenders your responsibilities to the superintendent and to consultants who stand to make a buck off the whole shebang.

Please, I am begging you to terminate the agreement with CGCS regarding implementation of SOFG. If there are changes that need to be made to board governance policies and practices, let's work together as a community to make the changes that make sense for PPS. Let's take the good and leave the bad. It's not worth throwing away our democratic power. Remember, it's a lot easier to influence, buy off, remove and install one person - a superintendent - than it is to do any of the same to a 9 person governing body. Please, we need you to protect and defend our public education system. Don't throw your, and our, power away.



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

<https://medium.com/@uriahstp/a-critique-of-student-outcomes-focused-governance-sofg-1168112219c3>



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#27

Rita Porterfield

Parent



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

# 28

Jude Porterfield

Student



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

# 29

Sarah Hambrick

Parent



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#30

Allison Petonic

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#31

Lauren Stuparitz

Parent, Community Member

#32

James Fogarty

Parent, On Behalf of A+ Schools

(Please see flyer attachment)

Good evening. I ask for your help to support our most vulnerable students: 1. Protect immigrant children from ICE harassment. 2. Ensure equal learning by addressing school segregation by wealth and race. 3. Reduce absences by supporting our efforts to support schools with high student absence rates. Protect immigrant children The recent Executive Order to detain suspected undocumented immigrants causes chaos. You must make it clear that ICE officers will not be allowed on school grounds without a warrant. Whether documented or not, immigrant children have a constitutional right to public education (see Plyler v. Doe). Create a plan to inform families that it's safe to attend school. Ensure equal learning PPS schools are racially and economically segregated. You have an opportunity to address the system's current inequities through thoughtful engagement with the Superintendent's forthcoming feasibility plan for the future of our school system. If we are to serve all children well, we must be a district where access to opportunities like arts, music, world languages, and Algebra are not defined by where you live or what neighborhood you attend school. 66% of families in Pittsburgh currently are opting out of our neighborhood schools for magnets, charters, or private schools. Improving the offerings at fewer neighborhood schools that serve a more socioeconomically diverse student body is a necessary step to improving equity in the district. We know the status quo isn't working, and the current policy landscape means that federal funding is at risk. I urge you to be bold in imagining a future where all kids have the supports and opportunities that they need to succeed.

1901 Centre Avenue, Suite 302 Pittsburgh, PA 15219 [Tel] 412-697-1298 [www.aplusschools.org](http://www.aplusschools.org) Every Kid. Every School. Every Day. Reducing absences

A+ Schools is currently working closely with a few PPS schools on planning and coordinating resources to reduce absence. With the help of the Richard King Mellon Foundation, we have also proudly provided the support of Everyday Labs to provide nudges by mail and text around attendance. With your support, we will be able to save staff time and work closely with them to get students rides, clothing, and other needs more quickly as we partner to create initiatives that can remove barriers to daily attendance. We know that you face a significant set of challenges at the moment. Please know that A+ Schools and hundreds of other organizations in the city stand ready to support you in what you need to help our children thrive. Thank you for leading our District at such a crucial time. James Fogarty Executive Director A+ Schools



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#33

Moira Kaleida

Parent, Community Member, On Behalf of Alliance to Reclaim Our Schools



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#34 Pam Harbin

Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#35

Lauren Abt

Parent



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#36

Michael Cummins

Parent



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#37

Melinda Mix

Teacher/Staff



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#38

Sarah Zangle

Parent



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025

#39

Kim Daelhousen

Teacher, Staff, Community Member



Pittsburgh Public Schools Public Hearing Testimonies  
January 27, 2025