DAC Meeting Minutes

PSD Boardroom
Wednesday, May 13, 2026
6:30 – 8:30 p.m.

Present

Erin Austin Ashley Barrett Erica Daniell Jess Ellis Hagman Jamie Forde Tena Green
Courtney Rickard Ian Rutherford Scott Schoenbauer Michael Werner

Welcome and Introductions

Dr. Traci Gile welcomed the committee members.

Preview Meeting Design– Ashley Barrett

Ashley previewed the meeting design.

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made and seconded to approve the April 15, 2026, meeting minutes as amended.

Family Engagement Policies KB and KBA (– Autumn Aspen)

The primary purpose of the topic was to introduce and review two specific policies, one new policy and one containing updates—and to gather feedback from the committee. Prior to diving into the documents, Autumn provided an overview of the Legal Department's new, global review process designed to systematically update all district policies over a multi-year cycle.

The district is transitioning to a more structured, inclusive policy review process starting this school year. A newly formed Policy Review Committee will oversee the work. Membership includes a Board member, district staff, and representatives from various committees. The committee will meet once a month to review 3 to 5 policies per meeting. There are 113 district policies in total that will be cycled through a four-year review framework before final Board approval:

- Year 1 (Current): Focused entirely on School/Student Policies.
- Year 2: Focused on Staff and Charter School policies.
- Years 3 & 4: Focused on the remaining operational and budget-related policies.

The process for moving a policy from conception to adoption is standardized as follows:

1. The Legal Department conducts the initial review and creates a redlined draft.
2. The draft is brought to the Policy Review Committee for initial feedback.
3. Depending on the policy's subject matter, it is routed to specialized groups for targeted input.
4. Policies are posted publicly on the district website. A specific feedback survey is attached to each individual policy to gather community and staff input.
5. Following community feedback, policies are presented to the Board for two readings prior to final adoption.

Committee Feedback:

Policy KB: Parent and Family Engagement in Education Policy (New)

- This is a brand-new policy required under state law. State mandates dictate that this policy must be reviewed by the Advisory Committee.
- The policy is designed to set clear, district-wide expectations and goals for meaningful engagement between schools, the community, and parents.
- The document was distributed to the group for collaborative revisions. Autumn projected specific guided questions to direct the group's feedback.

Question 1: Is the policy language understandable and accessible?
Yes, the draft is generally accessible and free of confusing legal terminology ("legalese"), utilizing strong, effective descriptions to illustrate its points. However, the committee noted several key areas for improvement to ensure total accessibility:

- The text needs to be simplified further to target a 3rd-grade reading level so that it is easily digestible for all audiences.
- The document must be translated and made available in multiple languages to reach the entire district community.
- The language needs to be audit-checked for consistency. The committee recommends shifting away from "parents" to more inclusive, universal terms like "families" and "caregivers," as well as standardizing the use of "students" and "children."

Question 2: Do you see any unintended consequences of harm in adopting this policy of the language within the policy?

- Using community-first language makes respect feel like a shared project everyone wants to be part of, rather than a restriction imposed upon them

Question 3: Do you have any other feedback for the policy?

- Cross-reference the policy generally rather than explicitly listing "AE."
- Change the phrasing from *"seeking opportunities to provide input"* to something more active and receptive, such as *"taking advantage of opportunities provided."*
- Clarify how "culturally responsive" is determined. Ensure it includes a common and consistent practice of communicating with families in their home language.
- Clarify who is teaching these practices to staff. Specify details around annual training on these practices and how the district will communicate culturally sustainable practices to employees.
- Consider explicitly naming PTO (Parent Teacher Organization) and SAC (School Accountability Committee) as concrete ways parents can get involved, perhaps listing them under general volunteering opportunities.
- Define what "opportunities to be sought after" means, as the current phrasing implies it takes a lot of unnecessary effort for parents to find them.
- Include specific examples of how parents can engage, such as:
    - Reading monthly newsletters and acting on listed opportunities.
    - Responding to surveys.
    - Attending designated listening sessions.

Policy KPA: Parent Engagement for Title I Schools (Existing)

- This is an existing district policy. Unlike the new, universally applicable Policy KB, KPA is strictly specific to district schools that receive federal Title I funding. The goal is to ensure both policies complement one another effectively.

Question 1: Is the policy language understandable and accessible?

- A separate Title I policy is necessary because the Community Parent Advisory Council (CPAC) is a specific federal requirement for Title I schools that must be met alongside general district policies.
- Copy the section "Engaging Parents and Families in the Activities of the Schools" from the bottom of page 3 to the KB policy section.
- Strengthen the "General" policy section to make it more robust.
- Incorporate biannual flexibility into the policy language.
- Use caution with sweeping generalizations, specifically when using the phrase "from every."
- The list of "parent/family/caregiver" is clunky; define these terms once in the definitions section and choose one consistent word to use throughout.
    - Student-Centric: Use the term "student" instead of "child."
- Holistic Student Growth (Page 2):
    - Update the final bullet to ensure focus extends beyond just academic achievement and grades.
    - Reframe the language to include student experiences and the growth of the human as a whole, rather than a single-dimensional focus on academic data.
- Review the phrase "Educate families," as it can be perceived as patronizing or potentially harmful.
- Autumn will review the specific statute to determine how the wording can be adjusted while remaining compliant.
- Change the overall title of the District Support for Parent and Family Engagement section to "District Collaboration."
- Clarify that while staff conduct surveys, the district does not currently direct or provide standardized templates.
- Broaden the definition of "input" so that any method of gathering feedback is recognized as a "survey."

Question 2: Do you see any unintended consequences or harm in adopting this policy or its language?

- No specific feedback was provided on this question.

Question 3: Do you have any other feedback for the policy?

- No specific feedback was provided on this question.

DAC Membership 26-27 – Dr. Traci Gile

The District Accountability Committee (DAC) reviewed the applications for the upcoming school year's vacancies. The candidate pools are as follows:

- Parent of an Elementary Student: 13 applications received.
- Parent of a Middle School Student: 7 applications received.
- Parent of a Charter School Student: 1 application received.
- Elementary Principal: 2 applications received.
- Secondary Principal: Recruitment is being managed by Dr. Gile.

Comprehensive Planning Committee Update and Engagement – Dr. Traci Gile

The Comprehensive Planning Committee update provided a detailed roadmap for the district's consolidation and integration process, focusing on community values, data-driven criteria, and a phased timeline leading into the 2027-2028 school year.

Phase Timeline & Roadmap

- Current Status (Phase 2): The district is finalizing the criteria that will guide consolidation. These values are being proposed as a formal board policy to ground future decisions in community-vetted priorities.
- Phase 3 (Preparing Recommendations): Expected to begin soon. The committee will form 10 Action Teams (including a Scenario Development Team) to create plans for staffing, climate, transportation, and safety.
- Phase 4 & 5 (Recommendation & Integration): A final recommendation is targeted for October 2026, followed by an integration process through August 2027.

Data & Community Input

- The district received 7,500 responses across three languages. 85% of respondents were parents/guardians.
- A new data dashboard was introduced to allow for school-by-school comparisons. It uses two primary metrics:
    - RIC (Room Index Capacity): Total potential students based on 25 students per 700 sq. ft. classroom.
    - SSC (Standard Space Capacity): A "standardized" number using an 80% multiplier to allow for building flexibility (e.g., early childhood or specialized programs).

Decision-Making Criteria

The committee identified two types of criteria based on community feedback:

- Identification Criteria (How schools are selected): Building condition and quality were the highest-ranked factors across all demographics.
- Implementation Criteria (How to maintain value): Maximizing program offerings (art, music, specials) and student experience were the top priorities. Proximity and traffic safety followed.

Key Discussion Points & Concerns

- Subjectivity vs. Thresholds: A major point of debate was whether to include "hard" numbers (thresholds) in the policy (e.g., *"any school under 60% utilization is reviewed"*).
    - Currently, the policy only defines over-utilization (95%) but lacks a "low-end" threshold to maintain flexibility.
    - Some members expressed concern that a lack of hard numbers leads to public distrust and the perception of a "predetermined plan."
- Qualitative vs. Quantitative: The committee is leaning toward a "pairing matrix" (similar to Douglas County) that balances hard data with qualitative factors like walkability and neighborhood impact.
- Program Access: There was significant discussion regarding Dual Language and Title I schools.
    - The committee clarified that specific programs (like Dual Language) aren't listed as independent criteria because they aren't in the district charter, but they fall under "program offerings."

- Concerns were raised that a "blanket" 80% flexibility multiplier might not adequately capture the intensive space needs of Title I schools or schools with specific ILS (Integrated Learning Support) programs.

Meeting Reflection and Next Steps – Dr. Traci Gile

Based on the committee's closing discussion, here is a summary of the reflections and proposed next steps regarding meeting structure and the ongoing consolidation topic:

- The committee acknowledged the challenge of balancing high-interest topics, such as consolidation, with the DAC's legally mandated topic requirements. Because these mandated discussions are the primary purpose of the committee and must be completed by law, they are prioritized on the agenda over non-required topics.
- The committee agreed to make consolidation a primary topic when meetings resume in the fall, ensuring ample time is dedicated to it rather than squeezing it into the final minutes.
- There was a suggestion to potentially start meetings earlier or proactively warn members when a meeting is expected to run long due to the plan's complexity.
- The group will look for ways to provide information ahead of time so members can arrive prepared for discussion.
- Leadership welcomed "plus/delta" feedback to continue refining how the agenda is balanced between federal/district requirements and urgent community topics.

Closing

The next DAC meeting will be on August 19, 2026, JSSC Boardroom, 6:30-8:30 p.m.

Adjourned