

Austin ISD *Plans*  
**Long-range**  
●●● **Planning**  
Long-range Planning Committees  
**APPROVED Meeting Minutes**  
January 22, 2021 (9:00 am - 12:30 pm)

---

## Joint Work

### Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:06 am by Karla Rivera-Figueroa

### Public Comment

No public comments.

### Equity by Design Process Check-in and Meeting Goals

The meeting goals were explained to the committee, as well as where we are at in the Equity by Design process.

### Reflection and Recap

The connections of the Jan.11 meeting in relation to tonight's root cause analysis meeting were discussed.

## Committee Work

Refer to attachments for Root Cause Analysis on Priority Unmet Needs Statements

## Joint Work

### Approval of Joint Committee Minutes from November 30, 2021; December 14, 2021; and January 11, 2022

- November 30, 2021: Approved
- December 14, 2021: Approved
- January 11, 2022: Approved

### Next Steps and Future Agenda Items

- Tues., Feb. 15 (6-8:30 pm) - History of Racial Inequities
- Facility Tours

Approved March 5, 2022

Austin ISD *Plans*  
**Long-range**  
● ● ● **Planning**

**Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:42 pm Ali Ghilarducci

Austin ISD *Plans*  
**Long-range**  
●●● **Planning**  
**Academics & CTE Committee**

**Members in Attendance:**

Angela Schneider, Cuitlahuac Guerra-Mojarro, Lisa Flores, Michael Franco, Valerie Turullols, Sachi Edson, Tara Bordeaux, Crosville Williams, Gail Maduro-Johnson

**Members Absent:**

Lucienne Cannata, Sandy Chilton, Maria de Los Angeles Desantos Quezad, Micele Freeman, Brent Hasty, Lisa Heflin, Pamela Jesse, Heather Masters, Yenni Rosales, Aiden Woodruff, Laura Martinez

**Staff Support in Attendance:**

Elizabeth Casas, Tammy Caesar, Creslond Fanin, Miguel Garcia III

**Approval of Individual Committee Minutes from November 30, 2021 and December 14, 2021**

Due to time constraints minutes were not approved for the Academics Committee.

Austin ISD *Plans*  
**Long-range**  
● ● ● **Planning**  
**Athletics Committee**

**Members in Attendance:**

Barbara Spears-Corbett, Clint Small, Jacob Anderson, Abdul Mustafa, Donetta Dean-Gibbs, Eric Wright, Jennifer Shuttlesworth

**Members Absent:** Rodney Greene, Veronica Fernandez, Joe Frank Martinez, Sanchit Rai, Jessica Cardenas, Allison Baldwin, Erin Zehr, Shalanda Byers

**Staff Support in Attendance:**

Anthony Mays, Leal Anderson, Tracilynn Wright

**Approval of Individual Committee Minutes from November 30, 2021 and December 14, 2021**

Minutes were reshared with committee members. A vote to approve the minutes was taken, with the agreement that members that had concerns would follow up with the project manager.

Austin ISD *Plans*  
**Long-range**  
● ● ● **Planning**  
**Visual & Performing Arts Committee**

**Members in Attendance:**

Devereaux Morkunas, Brian Benavides, Nadia Khan, Ruth Lim, Gabriel Estrada, Charles Mead, Valerie Tyler

**Members Absent:**

Ines Pia Gahr, Prince Pen, Antonio Ross, Charlotte Branch, Jennifer Church, Nhi Lieu, Para Agboga, Ted Barnhill, Elisabeth Wilborn, Luzvic Backstrom, Mohneesha Washington, Zachary Gibson, Alan Lambert

**Staff Support in Attendance:**

Suzanne Newell, Matias Segura, April Glenn

**Approval of Individual Committee Minutes from November 30, 2021 and December 14, 2021**

Minutes from November 30 and December 14 were approved as presented.



## Facilities

### **Members in Attendance:**

April Clark, Kelsey Campbell, Ryan Turner, Sara Alicia Costa, Andrew Rottas, David Contreras

### **Members Absent:**

Nyeka Arnold, Will Louis, Steve Wilsons, Darrick Norton, Demo Odems, Noelia Oquend, Sarah Macomber Happ, Zachary Lyons

### **Staff Support in Attendance:**

Carlecia Wright (Epic), Taryn Kinney (DLR), Abby Weiss, Beth Wilson, Melissa Laursen, Alejandro Delgado

### **Approval of Individual Committee Minutes from November 30, 2021 and December 14, 2021**

Minutes for November 30 were approved as presented, December 14 minutes were not approved due to lack of activity attachment.

Austin ISD *Plans*  
**Long-range**  
● ● ● **Planning**  
**Safety, Security, & Resiliency Committee**

**Members in Attendance:**

Lyssette Galvan, Daniel Dawer, Amanda Mortl, Annette Palacios, Erica Leak

**Members Absent:**

Gabriel Keller, Felicity Maxwell, Francisca "Tina" Cruz-Schindler, Leah Kelly, Lindsey Baker, Margaret Zapata, Wes Aycock

**Staff Support in Attendance:**

Darien Clary, William Easley, Assistant Chief Gus Barrera, Lt. Beverly Freshour, Jessica Conant, Bethany Shaw, Charles Brant (DLR), LaTonya Pueges (Epic), Gloria Vera-Bedolla

**Approval of Individual Committee Minutes from November 30, 2021 and December 14, 2021.**

The November 30, 2021 minutes were approved. The committee did not approve minutes from December 14, 2021 as PDF showing past work was not included in the document.

**Committee members shared additional information in the chat specifically related to the resiliency conversation.**

From Jessica Conant to Everyone:

<https://publicinput.com/X8455>

From Erica Leak to Everyone:

Displacement Risk areas near Project Connect transit lines:

<https://austin.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=799dbd68b43a4d9d8c0292befe8c9b34>

From Darien Clary to Everyone:

Social Vulnerability overlaid with Environmental Hazard Risk:

<https://tmo.utexas.edu/austin-climate-vulnerability>



## Transportation, Food Services & Maintenance Committee

### **Members in Attendance:**

Anastasia Teague, Mary Selby, Amir Emamian

### **Members Absent:**

Adolphus Anderson, William Marshall, Ashley Blumoff, Diana Croll-Guard, John Green, Andrea Troncoso, Melissa Jimenez, Natalie Burtzos

### **Staff Support in Attendance:**

Christine Steenport, Kris Hafezizadeh, Louis Zachary, AJ SivaKumar- DLR Group, Nevin- EPIC, Rebecca Cohen

### **Approval of Individual Committee Minutes from November 30, 2021 and December 14, 2021**

Due to a lack of quorum, the committee did not vote on the minutes.



Austin ISD *Plans*  
**Long-range**  
● ● ● **Planning**  
**Technology Committee**

**Members in Attendance:**

Nevin Hall, Joseph Thompson, Stephanie Perrone

**Members Absent:**

Austin McElroy, Caroline Tipton, Matthew Holzgrafe, Jenna King, Jessica Mraz, Lyria Zeh, Alexandria Diaz, Sarah Ruttan, Jayden Ashford, (*Charlie Jackson requested to be removed*)

**Staff Support in Attendance:**

Andrew Kline (DLR), Yvonne Harris (Epic), Sean Brinkman, John Kohlmorgan, Oscar Rodriguez, Jon Hurley, Daniel English, Samantha Dula, Ed Hill

**Approval of Individual Committee Minutes from November 30, 2021 and December 14, 2021**

Consensus to approve November 30, 2021 (*add Joseph Thompson as attended*), and December 14, 2021 as written.

# January 22<sup>nd</sup> - Root Cause Analysis

## Academics & CTE

The following pages provide a summary of the root cause analysis conducted by committees during the January 22<sup>nd</sup> Committee Meeting. The visual documentation of the fishbone protocol used during the meeting to conduct the root cause analysis will be provided as an attachment to this document, for reference.

**A&CTE #1 - All AISD students at all grade levels and all campuses need access to baseline, fundamental, and necessary academic programs and the district is accountable for equitably resourcing and funding those programs**

### Prioritized Factor:

#### **District Strategies/ Practices/ Systems/ Protocols/ Policies (7)**

- The way that district practices/policies ENABLE historical racism
- Disconnect between practices & policies
- Unbalanced enrollment due to feeder patterns
- No global vision for what AISD education needs to be from leadership
- No baseline approach to literacy, SPED, teacher training
- Separate campuses are islands-- in delivery of literacy, programs & staffing (the way candidates are pulled seems to vary), campus turn-over culture
- Lack of support for student basic needs that must come before academic programs
- No baseline/ uniformity around baselines
- Lack of academic programming that support students social-emotional needs (with rough situations/ little support at home)
- Lack of support staff-- teachers have too many hats
- Lack of uniformity of implementation of programs
- Insufficient planning time for teachers
- Lack of programs that are interesting/ engaging for students of this generation
- Lack of high-quality instructional materials grounded in best practice (i.e. science, reading)

- Issue with relying on private funding-- issue with providing basic needs for students
- On-going training
- Unequal training for providers/ educators
- Lack of/inconsistent curricular support for teachers
- Lack of consciousness around teaching to different kinds of populations
- Lack of incentives for teachers to work at struggling schools--serves against schools with lower SES
- No clear district vision/ focus for education (focused on #s or on producing properly trained young people for society)
- Lack of district goal setting (ambitious or equitable)-- Ex: AP access
- Lacking consensus around fundamental & necessary programs
- District policies have prioritized autonomy of campuses over equitable access/ strategy
- Policies/ funding behind campus-level staffing supports
- Lack of support for student basic needs that must come before academic programs
- Funding/ budget for staff to recruit & retain high quality teachers
- Broken funding formula that doesn't address high need elementary schools (aiming for max class sizes isn't always right with high-need populations)
- Class sizes to have effective programming
- Cost of highly trained staff for programs-- in order to entice staff we need appropriate pay to live in Austin
- Secondary-- no standards for teacher-student ratio to make sure classes survive
- Budget to have the RIGHT number of staff-- to allow teachers to appropriately differentiate instruction (work load analysis of teachers!)
- Access to dual-language programs
- Imbalanced enrollment
- Racist strategic staffing formulas
- Lack of uniformity in literacy amongst populations-- 35% of teachers understand science of literacy

### Additional Factors:

#### State Policies (2)

- Mandates/ assessments for teachers doesn't allow teachers to use their talents & caring or ability to discern where students are

- Recapture-- knowing so much of our funding is going back the state
- SPED funding weights (allocated by state) haven't changed in 30 years-- depend on the more segregated the more \$\$\$ you get
- Lack of support for teachers- State mandated requirements (assessments) don't allow teachers to differentiate instruction/ not rely on testing
- Policies-- state policies causing a lot of inequities (policy that decides how much states pay in to recapture, etc.)
- State Funding
- Recapture
- Unfunded state mandates for teachers

### **Historical Racism/ Ableism (1)**

- Historic racism

**A&CTE #3 - Learners, teachers, campus administrations, and campus-based staff, at every school, need the district to adequately and appropriately staff and support campuses, so that all academic and social-emotional needs of students are met.**

### Prioritized Factor:

#### Flawed Staffing Formulas/ Funding/ Unbalanced Enrollment (4)

- SPED, dual-language staffing formulas weights
- Lack of understanding around how staffing works-- no vehicle to studying how to staff correctly (needs not considered)
- unbalanced enrollment due to feeder patterns
- Flawed staffing formulas
- Staffing ratios are based on numbers of bodies and not complexities of needs
- Unbalanced enrollment
- Definition of "what is appropriate staffing" is different between district & communities/ families
- Racist strategic staffing model
- District/community definition around what is "appropriately staffed" (considering work load, etc.)
- Need definitions around what responsibilities belong to Floater staff vs campus based staff
- Recapture—Funding
- Inadequate funds in budget for staffing (budget formula needs to account for more staffing)
- Oversized classrooms

### Additional Factors:

#### District Vision/ Policies/ Practices/ Communications (0.5)

- SPED, dual-language staffing formulas weights
- Lack of understanding around how staffing works-- no vehicle to studying how to staff correctly (needs not considered)
- unbalanced enrollment due to feeder patterns
- Flawed staffing formulas
- Staffing ratios are based on numbers of bodies and not complexities of needs

- Unbalanced enrollment
- Definition of "what is appropriate staffing" is different between district & communities/ families
- Racist strategic staffing model
- District/community definition around what is "appropriately staffed" (considering work load, etc.)
- Need definitions around what responsibilities belong to Floater staff vs campus based staff
- Recapture—Funding
- Inadequate funds in budget for staffing (budget formula needs to account for more staffing)
- Oversized classrooms

### **Teacher/Staff Resources/ Support/ Compensation (3)**

- Lack of resources to support basic needs of students
- Lack of culturally proficient instructional materials
- Insufficient planning time for teachers
- Educating teachers on staffing formulas
- Teacher burn-out-- too much on their plates
- Teachers don't have time to plan/differentiate for all students
- Lack of understanding cultural needs & differences of student populations-- having education for staff
- Lack of training for teachers in SEL and in cultural proficiency
- \$\$\$ for compensation
- Inconsistent curricular support
- District is top-heavy, so need more campus-based positions for on-the-ground support
- Over-burdened teacher force that sees no light at the end of the tunnel
- Lack of resources (counselors, teachers, teachers trained in SEL, etc.)
- Lack of support staff-- teachers taking on too much
- Overburdening already over-stretched teachers with more training
- Lack of operational support for campus leaders
- Educator shortage (even before COVID)
- Teacher prep programs
- Adequately training staff: district provided training
- Teachers aren't compensated for professional learning (and they should be)

- Competitive pay for ALL staff
- More compensation depending on specific responsibilities/ load of staff
- Teacher pay is insufficient to retain/attract teachers
- overburdening requirements--Constant district visits/walk-throughs

### **Campus Level Leadership (1.5)**

- Disfunction between school leadership & teachers-- leadership doesn't listen to teachers
- Campuses don't appropriately engage parents (at times that work for them, etc.)
- Issue with school leadership retention
- Issue with school leadership expertise
- Lack of checking campus administrators-- some don't adequately fit the role/cultures they serve

**A&CTE #7 - Students who require specialized instruction need high quality, inclusive instruction that is not dependent on centralized placements and programs, but instead relies on supporting their individual needs at their home campus, in order to improve outcomes for all students.**

### Prioritized Factor:

- None identified

### Human Resource Issues

- Are the right people employed in right position at the campus level (boots on the ground)
- Not competitively recruiting/ retaining specialized SPED/ GT teachers
- Funding for SPED teachers (stipend is not enough)
- Not competitive for specialized teachers (compensation, resources, etc.)
- Broken staffing formula
- Staffing issues-- this area is always understaffed (with staff that is properly trained)
- Staffing/recruitment issues
- Who is doing what for specialized instruction
- Staffing formulas based on #s of bodies and not complexities of needs
- Not enough funding from state to pay for enough staff
- Inadequate compensation for special education staff
- Not enough resources to help
- High turnover/burnout in special education leads to inexperienced staff and high vacancies, which makes it difficult to develop and sustain high-level services
- Teacher burnout from lack of support
- Insufficient staff (and staffing allocation based on instructional setting)

### Training

- Lack of inclusion training for admin, principals & teachers
- Training on programs needs to be ongoing-- not just at beginning of school year-- reminding teachers special populations need extra support
- Teacher prep-programs to understand how to work with SPED students
- Education/ training programs at higher ed level (on inclusive instruction)



- Largest barrier for students with disabilities are leadership at campus level-- if they don't understand needs, students suffer
- Lack of ongoing, consistent, high-quality training for EVERYONE (central office all the way to subs & bus drivers, and families/community)
- SpEd staff often lack robust instructional coaching due to insufficient training/understanding by admin and other instructional coaching staff

### **Factor Lack of physical resources for SPED**

- Lacking space/ facilities for all SPED supports

### **Issues with SPED Systems/ Services/ Practices**

- Extreme delays in SPED
- SPED/ GT/ Dual-language programs have never been studied for efficacy/ outcomes/ fidelity/consistency/ grade alignment (K-12)
- System funnels students based on diagnosis, not on needs-- students treated at "transitional" once diagnosed without considering siblings, ability to make friends, etc.
- No equal access to SPED programs-- have normalized busing
- Compliance-based model for SPED
- Insufficient GT models
- Parents don't understand their rights
- Don't Consider or try continuum of least restrictive environment
- Lacking specialized independent courses (GT, etc.)
- In self-contained classrooms teachers are often expected to serve students from huge age/grade gaps
- NO transparency on how much district spends in legal fees compared to special education
- No communications from district to parents, community about SPED
- Parents treated like litigants\* if they know too much about legalities of SPED programs
- SPED staff are first to cover other classes, so SPED students sacrifice for sake of others
- Decades of under-investments in certain schools-- smaller campuses have additional obstacles (SPED & GT programs)
- Lack of robust continuum of services from early childhood to post-secondary transition

- Special Education is often focused on putting out fires/band-aiding vs. reimagining the systems and service models in place

### **Disjointed Mentalities/ Definitions/ Culture around special education**

- Caseload approach vs workload approach (doesn't consider complexities of needs)
- No clear vision for greater goals of SPED students
- Lack of belief that these students can go much further than they're pushed
- Lack of ability to identify positive inclusion models
- Need baseline of SPED programs that every campus should have
- Students who require specialized instruction, not seen as equally deserving of resources-- why SPED teachers are first to get pulled
- District mentality that support staff are not essential
- SPED students exposed to culture of low-expectations & high-standards
- Ableist framing of sped students as more difficult
- No clear understanding of how specialized instruction programs are chosen
- No published plan to improve SPED
- No clear district-level understanding of inclusion-- we rely on centralized programs
- Unclear/ inconsistent vision for intervention
- Mindset of educators-- don't understand SPED/GT students can learn just as well just need certain supports to access information
- CAC's don't have plans to improve outcomes for SPED
- No definition of support staff in relation to supporting students with diverse needs
- Mindset around inclusive practices

# January 22<sup>nd</sup> - Root Cause Analysis

## Athletics

The following pages provide a summary of the root cause analysis conducted by committees during the January 22<sup>nd</sup> Committee Meeting. The visual documentation of the fishbone protocol used during the meeting to conduct the root cause analysis will be provided as an attachment to this document, for reference.

**ATH #2 - Underserved families need information and support to overcome barriers to athletics participation (including health screenings, academic requirements), which could serve as a catalyst for greater engagement in school.**

### Prioritized Factor:

#### **Lack of communication and accessibility (4)**

- What are the requirements to join and stay in athletics?
- Disseminating information over only tech is not the best, there should be information on paper as well (digital divide)
- It is important that academic requirement be made clear to parents as they currently appear unaware
- Language and communication, Multiple languages for different communities

### Additional Factors:

#### **Healthcare Accessibility**

- Students do not have access to MRI's, Inequity in healthcare/health access
- Health Screenings, Consistent access to healthcare
- AISD Policy does not match UIL Policy
  - This comes down to policy priority
- Lack of screening a major barrier
  - How do we address it?

#### **Lack of systemic approach (1)**

- There is a lack of class periods for athletics (especially middle school)

- There is no opportunity for athletic coordination because there is no athletic period (feeder to HS)
- Vertical alignment (having consistency in athletic offerings and communicating between grade levels)
- A lot of MS are split, some will go to different HS (the way boundary lines are drawn leads to which school you go to)
- No systemic approach to address vertical alignment (many local based decisions and not enough of the system deciding)
- It is individualized and not systemic

### **Lack of funding (1)**

- Some schools are able to acquire money in ways that other schools are not (booster clubs)
- The lack of money (>2% of total budget) gets in the way of providing faculty and students what they need
- To what extent are we seeking outside funding/revenue for athletics?

### **Lack of transportation**

- Transportation, getting kids safely to and from school (lack of school buses)
- Being able to practice and being able to arrive to games
- A safe way to get kids to/from home in the evening
- AISD no longer busses kids outside the district
- Parents may not feel comfortable having their kids walk and this may limit participation

**ATH #3 - All students need equitable access to state of the art athletics facilities to support student and staff engagement, grow existing programs, and enable competition with neighboring districts.**

### Prioritized Factor:

#### Athletic funding is not prioritized in the district (4)

- A disparity in booster clubs
- Lack of seeking outside funding/resources
- Athletics is one of the few programs that can actually generate money (ROI)
- AISD no longer looks to compete in every aspect but just simply participate
- "I don't understand the athletics budget" (A better understanding of how money is dispersed? Why do certain school athletics have what they have while others don't?)

### Additional Factors:

#### Turf fields and lights (9 teams on 1 practice field as well as community use) (1)

- This could lead to an increase in injuries
- It would allow for more practice time (better access)
- A space for JV team to compete and alleviate scheduling issues

#### Maintenance and repairs

- What are we doing to hire more workers?
- We are forced to convert football fields to soccer fields
- Restriping of the practice fields that need to be restriped every other week
- Both previous statements take time away from coaches working with the kids
- Repairs can take a month to get a work order done

#### People often do not know or understand how beneficial it can be to invest in athletics

- It leads to a lack of prioritization
- People making decisions often don't understand/have the knowledge about athletics and athletic programs

**Antiquated fields, gym, locker rooms which gets in the way of students thriving and do not fit the needs of contemporary students**

- Interior weight rooms have yet to be addressed (public private partnerships only way to acquire things needed)
- Limited access to weight room and lockers due to size
- Multiple sports are sharing one storage room
- Supplemental gyms are not regulation size
- Limited hosting of events
- AISD needs improved streaming of athletic events
- There is a lack of adequate facilities to support various types of programming

**ATH #6 - Elementary school / 6th grade students need earlier access/exposure to athletics programming and opportunities to develop athletic skills that prepares them for competition in middle and high school.**

**Prioritized Factor:**

- (4) Are district decision-makers aware of any of the community placed value on early (K-6) athletic programming

**Are district decision-makers aware of any of the community placed value on early (K-6) athletic programming? (4)**

- Overall prioritization of athletic programming
- Lack of vertical alignment
- There is no district buy in on 6th grade athletics because they do not value all of the positive impacts
- Look at funding across all departments to see how it is dispersed

**Additional Factors:**

**Bond funds inequitably distributed historically. Underserved groups are not listened to by AISD in the same way as other groups.**

- It costs too much for these young kids to be in the program (facilities, coaches, time etc.)
- Does race play a part in how athletics is perceived by district officials or others?
- Institutionalized racism and better understanding of its effect on decision making

# January 22<sup>nd</sup> - Root Cause Analysis

## Facilities

The following pages provide a summary of the root cause analysis conducted by committees during the January 22<sup>nd</sup> Committee Meeting. The visual documentation of the fishbone protocol used during the meeting to conduct the root cause analysis will be provided as an attachment to this document, for reference.

**FAC #1 - All students and staff/educators need access to functional, program-specific, age-appropriate, and user-appropriate facilities to support current, high-performing teaching and learning**

### Prioritized Factor:

#### Inequitable distribution of resources (3)

- COA has influence on school district even when not in best interest of students
- distribution of resources, some communities are given access to certain resources and not others
- lack of funding from the district - historically schools in Eastern Crescent have not been prioritized
- inequitable distribution of funds and resources based on lobbying from parents/PTAs

### Additional Factors:

#### Space Flexibility Definition

- spaces are not flexible enough to accommodate changing needs
- traditional educational model expects students to be in desks and rows - does not accommodate diff. forms of learning

#### Policy around Capacity

- flexibility ties to how many kids are in a space
- system behind how many students are assigned to each teacher
- capacity impacts functionality



*\*connected to One-size Fits All Solutions*

### **One-size fits all Solutions (1)**

- Lack of knowledge around adapting historic facilities to needs
- influence of industrial construction complex - reliance on consultants - emphasis on brand new buildings
- one-size fits all hurts individual student needs

*\*connected to Policy around Capacity*

*\*connected to Transfer Policies*

### **Transfer Policies**

- boundary/transfer system is not clear
- strategy is static, not dynamic - not able to deal with new, dynamic challenges

*\*connected to Policy around Capacity*

*\*connected to One-Size fits all Solutions*

### **Funding Policy (1)**

- Robin-hood tax system
- lack of funding from the state, don't prioritize public ed

### **Prioritization process (1)**

- what is system to decide which spaces are needed
- parents haven't had input in to prioritization
- lack of accountability around prioritization
- lack of communication/ transparency around why decisions are made
- bureaucracy, district to large, need bottom up approach, campus committees need more autonomy
- lack of clear prioritization of what desired teaching and learning spaces require
- use changes, therefore spaces don't work or aren't available
- prioritization, check-lists need to be customized to needs of each campus for their community and students

**FAC #3 - Students, staff/educators, and community need access to appropriately sized, well-maintained, functional, and culturally sensitive common spaces to support full-range of everyday use and campus and community events in partnership with community resources and voice.**

### **Prioritized Factor:**

#### **Lack Of Prioritization As School As Community Resource (5)**

- Ed spec propose that every campus needs every space, not customized
- lack of full understanding around importance of schools to cohesion of community
- AISD buildings have not been updated to keep up with changing needs
- organizationally school district is too large to customize for individual campuses
- outdoor spaces are not adequately improved as gathering spaces

*\*connected to Lack of Appropriate Communication*

*\*connected to Lack Of Operational Understanding Of Managing/Building Partnerships*

### **Additional Factors:**

#### **Lack Of Operational Understanding Of Managing/Building Partnerships (1)**

- community doesn't know how to contribute or engage campuses
- pace of decision making-ability to execute with quickly changes needs
- lack of understanding around how to do community partnerships
- community doesn't know what community partnerships or other resources are available
- difficulty with operationalizing partnerships with district
- no central collection of what community uses are needed or exists

*\*connected to Lack of Prioritization as School as Community Resource*

*\*connected to Lack of Appropriate Communication*

#### **Lack of Appropriate Communication**

- no central methodology or process to hearing community voice
- guarding knowledge within district and city, which leads to campuses hoarding resources
- communication system inconsistent per grade level and school
- poor communication/language barriers lead to low involvement

- lack of connection with community
- lack of transparency around maintenance and status of things
- not knowing specific campus needs - what is culturally sensitive needs

*\*connected to Lack of Prioritization as School as Community Resource*

*\*connected to Lack Of Operational Understanding Of Managing/Building Partnerships*

**FAC #5 - Students and staff/educators need facilities and district strategies that can accommodate future enrollment growth in a structured, equitable, and systematic way, accounting for the full-range of campus uses while remaining student-centered.**

### **Prioritized Factor:**

#### **Lack Of Boundary Re-evaluation Process (5)**

- education and Austin has changed, but district has not changed kept pace
- systematic racism
- same practice gets same result
- transfer policy causes under and over-enrollment
- economics valued over educational success
- look externally, don't use dynamic best practices for allocation and attribution of students across district
- lack of process for boundary/ feeder pattern discussion to happen regularly
- lack of political will/personal sacrifice to make changes
- district does not have process to reevaluate boundaries and population changes
- campus feeder patterns and boundaries are not flexible to population changes
- vertical team alignment is not correct
- **redistricting system that prioritizes home values over educational values**

*\*connected to Demographic Projections Processing*

*\*connected to Lack of Transparency/Communication*

### **Additional Factors:**

#### **Lack Of Transparency/ Communication (1)**

- lack of transparency/ understanding around what feeder pattern is
- specialized programming in different locations
- lack of belief that quality education was equitable across district
- lack of support to school from the district to get community accurate info

*\*connected to Lack Of Boundary Revaluation Process*

#### **Demographic Projections Processing**

- district lack of knowledge about real estate
- demographic reports is consistently inaccurate

- COA planning density changes is not considered
  - data limitations, real estate info. is changing too quickly
  - too many district presumptions on where families will live
- \*connected to Lack Of Boundary Revaluation Process*

# January 22<sup>nd</sup> - Root Cause Analysis

## Technology

The following pages provide a summary of the root cause analysis conducted by committees during the January 22<sup>nd</sup> Committee Meeting. The visual documentation of the fishbone protocol used during the meeting to conduct the root cause analysis will be provided as an attachment to this document, for reference.

**TECH #1 - Parents and staff need official ongoing tech. training regarding software platforms and clear communications if/when the platform changes to better facilitate learning at home/school and maintain proper district-to-parent communications.**

### Prioritized Factor:

#### Technology Learning & Instruction (2)

- Accessibility to technology & information on varying platforms.
- Dissemination of emerging technology resources needs structured roll-out & curricula integration.
- Acclimation timeline due to varying platforms from ES-MS-HS
- Lack of sufficient technology training for district staff to properly function in technology ecosystem.

### Additional Factors:

#### State Mandates / Outside Forces

- State mandates to technology platforms creating learning & accessibility barriers.
- Extending technology support to families for changing technology platforms due to State mandates

#### Communication of changing technology by District

- Lack of communication regarding changing platforms, accessibility, and user interface.
- How changing technology is managed within the District & how change is conveyed to community.

- Older methodologies of disseminating information need to be streamlined for district consistency.

### **Available Technology vs. Available Support Resources**

- Over-dependence on technology which may function better without.
- Necessity to support more platforms than Tech Department can effectively support.
- Difficulties due to varying platforms from ES-MS-HS
- Balance of Autonomy vs. Standardization in technology platforms District-wide.
- Curation of available & supported technology platforms by the District.

**TECH #3 - Schools & district facilities where teaching or training occur need technology that is appropriate for the facility and the mode of education to support learning & district communication.**

### Prioritized Factor:

#### Funding (2)

- Program Fidelity: Lack of consideration of "Total Life-Cycle Cost" which goes far beyond up-front device cost.
- Bottom Line Cost of technology from initial cost, infrastructure & support/education.
- Funding which is appropriate to support technology upgrades & necessary on-going maintenance/training.
- Gap between available technology and required hardware to effectively support or use technology.

### Additional Factors:

#### Space considerations for Technology Flexibility

- Enlarged classrooms to offset space taken by large format technology.
- Consideration of true flexibility of technology devices. (IE: Moving large screens).

#### Lack of Standards & Inequity

- Creation of and/or adherence to technology standards (both hardware & software) across district facilities.
- Concern over inequity through providing technology which varies by facility.
- Consideration of mode of education in a given facility & required associated technology for proper support.

#### Building & Infrastructure (1)

- Constraints of existing facilities & downstream impacts on effective utilization of technology.
- Lack of physical space for Technology Staff & device storage.
- Additional barriers due to lack of space for IT Staff & device storage.
- Understanding or consideration given to future technology needs & impact on District facilities & resources.



- Insufficient building infrastructure (HVAC, ELEC, DATA, Etc.) to appropriately support educational devices.
- Insufficient electrical infrastructure in older facilities to power needed devices.
- Constraints of existing facilities & downstream impacts on effective utilization of technology.

**TECH #4 - Students of all ages need integration of technology in all learning curricula in order to be prepared to use and learn evolving technologies throughout their education and lives.**

**Prioritized Factor:**

**Standardization (Creation & Adherence) (3)**

- Creation of a standardized technology support ecosystem to effectively serve all when issues arise.
- Lack of standards creating inequity in access to technology focused curricula.
- District oversight & school adherence to developed technology standards.
- Alignment of technology with District goals/requirements.
- Cyber Safety (Policy / Funding / Training)
- Lack of standardization creates barriers for all who interface with the District.

**Additional Factors:**

**Technology integration into Curriculum**

- Integration of technology into academics & the necessary training to function in a digital learning environment.
- Incorporation of technology into curriculum & creation of a standard of measure to track progress in comprehension.
- Intentional application of technology into curricula and facilities.
- Balance of tangible vs. digital delivery of information & interaction.
- Where is the line of technology being a tool vs. a distraction?
- Appropriate integration of technology & thoughtfulness about amount of screen time for students.

**Training & Support**

- Teachers are key component of meaningful technology integration & need to be fluent in District offered systems & platforms.
- Disconnect between divergent timelines of technology roll-out & technology training / adoption.
- Digital literacy allows students to thrive beyond the classroom & are necessary skills to thrive in today's society.

# January 22<sup>nd</sup> - Root Cause Analysis

## Transportation, Food Services, and Maintenance

The following pages provide a summary of the root cause analysis conducted by committees during the January 22<sup>nd</sup> Committee Meeting. The visual documentation of the fishbone protocol used during the meeting to conduct the root cause analysis will be provided as an attachment to this document, for reference.

**TFSM #1 - All students need access to equitable transportation services to provide consistent, reliable, and safe access to school facilities.**

### **Prioritized Factors:**

#### **Statewide Funding Policies (ie Recapture/Robin Hood) (1)**

- Are there inequities in our funding policies (recapture is well intentioned but positions urban school districts at a disadvantage for serving needs)
- State Recapture/Robin Hood policies are limiting funds the district has access to for providing services
- Elected Officials/Decision Makers for policies are not aware of AISD's needs and challenges

*\*connected to TEA Funding Controls*

#### **Physical Infrastructure around the Campus Site (1)**

- Not enough safe bike routes
- Transportation infrastructure is not always in the district's control
- Not all campuses are built with connection to neighborhood to support that
- Limited bus stops/bus access in some neighborhoods
- Lack of transportation infrastructure surrounding a school/ Cheapest land (where a school is built) is not always the most connected
- Real estate decision making around where land is available or affordable not connectivity

*\*connected to Neighborhood Conditions*

*\*connected to Campuses Lack On Site Support for Alternative Routes*

*\*connected to City Traffic Conditions*

*\*connected to City Transportation Planning Practices*

### **TEA Funding Controls (1)**

- Different funding sources limit/control our policies and practices (TEA, Federal Funding)
- TEA's funding policies are blanket policies and don't respond to the needs of urban districts vs. rural districts vs. suburban districts
- Reliance on TEA for partial funding (14%) of Transportation Services limits practices with complex and not visionary rules (rules not very practical or support the bare minimum)
- TEA transportation formulas are from 1988 (outdated)

*\*connected to Practices Governed by TEA*

*\*connected to Statewide Funding Policies (Robin Hood)*

### **Practices Governed by TEA (1)**

- Hazardous Routes Policy - does it address neighborhood conditions accurately/holistically for Austin today?
- 2 Mi Radius Rule from TEA limits bus service
- TEA transportation formulas are from 1988 (outdated)

*\*connected to TEA Funding Controls*

### **Additional Factors:**

#### **Family Constraints**

- Not all families have a car or way to get their kids to school if they miss the bus

*\*connected to Scheduling Practices Conflict with Family Needs*

#### **Scheduling Practices Conflict with Family Needs**

- Timing of transportation conflicts with parent work schedules - can we better understand how that timing works out
- Scheduling to get to school doesn't always align with families' needs - both to and from school

*\*connected to Family Constraints*

### **District Planning Practices Need to Consider Campus Needs**

- Need more integrated reviews during construction (ex: Bear Creek is too far from the street/neighborhood, and Safe Routes had to step in to help ensure students could walk to school)

### **Staff Shortages**

- Not enough bus drivers to support all the routes that are needed

### **Cultural and Social Values around Urban Living**

- Austin has urbanized by the mindset of citizens hasn't
- Many folks have misconceptions about safety or urban places when it comes to public transit

### **Neighborhood Conditions (Beyond Immediate Surrounds of Campus)**

- Hazardous Routes Policy - does it address neighborhood conditions accurately/holistically for Austin today?
- Neighborhood conditions contribute to absenteeism (unsafe neighborhood conditions make alternative routes to school unsafe)

*\*connected to Physical Infrastructure around the Campus Site*

### **Campuses lack on-site support for Alternative Routes**

- Not all campuses are built with connection to neighborhood to support walking/biking
- Campus entrances (not enough, not oriented to neighborhoods, not accessible from sidewalks)
- Not enough safe bike routes

*\*connected to City Traffic Conditions*

*\*connected to Physical Infrastructure around the Campus Site*

### **City Traffic Conditions**

- Hazardous Routes Policy - does it address neighborhood conditions accurately/holistically for Austin today?
- I-35 and high volume traffic roadways - causes challenges with transportation
- Proximity to high volume traffic makes alternative transportation unsafe

*\*connected to Campuses lack on site support for Alternative Routes*

*\*connected to Physical Infrastructure around the Campus Site*

### **Bus Service for Non-Neighborhood Schools is Limited**

- 2 Mi Radius Rule limits bus service
- Transfer students don't have full bussing per district policy (logistically not feasible within current practices)

### **Federal Policies and Funding**

- No federal funding for transportation
- Federal Transit Authority made it illegal for public transit organizations to provide school routes
- CapMetro is not allowed to provide dedicated school routes - students HAVE to ride public routes

### **City Economic Policies**

- CapMetro is exempt from Tolls but AISD buses are not
- Elected Officials/Decision Makers for Policies not aware of AISD needs/challenges

### **CapMetro Policies**

- CapMetro makes K-12 riders free

### **City Transportation Planning Practices**

- Limited bus stops/bus access in some neighborhoods
- Some areas of Austin have no service from CapMetro (CapMetro is working on making those connections)
- Not enough safe bike routes

*\*connected to Physical Infrastructure around the Campus Site*

**TFSM #5 - Students across all campuses need sufficient time to eat and equitable access to sufficient food portions for breakfast, lunch, and snack/dinner because hungry kids can't learn.**

### **Prioritized Factors:**

#### **Time to Eat (1)**

- Not all kids make it to school in time for breakfast
- Time to eat is controlled by the campus master schedule as well
- Large differences between secondary and elementary lunch scheduling (ES typically 30 min, but secondary is all over the map)
- Same amount of time is allotted for all grade levels (because of logistics) - doesn't align with age needs
- Number of serving lines to number of students per lunch period doesn't give kids enough time to eat
- Younger kids are new to the process (need more time)
- Some kids need more time to eat than others (braces, growing teeth socialization/SEL, etc)

*\*connected to Campus Specific Practices Vary Across District*

#### **Campus Specific Practices Vary Across District (1)**

- Not all schools have breakfast in the classroom program
- Snack is not provided at all campuses (provided by teachers or parents)
- Cafeteria Monitoring is dependent on family volunteers
- Some campuses use PTA funds for monitor positions - inequitable access across district
- Time to eat is controlled by the campus schedule as well
- District encourages kids to take non-temp controlled foods to be taken with them to limit waste, but depends on campus admin
- Access to breakfast for late bus students varies by campus Idea 1
- Time of Lunch Periods vary based on individual campus facilities/practices
- *Committee Context, not root cause: Differing practices is not wholly/necessarily a bad thing - it allows schools to respond to their specific or unique circumstances*

*\*connected to Differences in Dining Facilities*

*\*connected to Time to Eat*

*\*connected to System Works Better for Louder Advocates*

## **Additional Factors:**

### **Facility/ Enrollment Misalignments**

- Not enough serving lines for students served for each lunch period
- Lunch Schedules to not meet student needs (too early or too late, too many lunch periods)

### **Family Conditions**

- Not all families are able to provide students with food during the day (rely on food provided by school)
- Not all communities/ parents are able to volunteer during the school day

### **Federal Policies**

- Snacks can't be provided via federal funding during the school day - federal policy - tied to enrichment activities
- District has to choose between snack and dinner portions during after-school enrichment per federal policy

*\*connected to Not All Dining Programs are at All Campuses*

### **Differences in Dining Facilities**

- Outdoor Dining is not always directly adjacent to cafeteria for supervision/ sightlines
- Some campuses only have picnic benches
- Not all campuses have a cafeteria that supports right sized lunch periods
- Safety/pest concerns with outdoor dining

*\*connected to Campus Specific Practices Vary Across District*

### **System Works Better for Louder Advocates**

- Why are changes dependent on parent advocacy?
- Some parents are able to provide more advocacy or donate resources - but not equitably across the district
- Some campuses use PTA funds for monitored positions - inequitable access across district

### **Not all Dining Programs are at All Campuses**

- Not all schools have breakfast in the classroom program



- Snacks provided where there are after school enrichment programs
- District has to choose between snack and dinner portions during after-school enrichment per federal policy

### **Kitchen Sizes/Facilities Vary by Campus**

- Not enough serving lines for students served for each lunch period
- Not all kitchens are right-sized

### **Staffing/Monitor Practice**

- Monitors were removed from the school budget a few years ago (not funded position)
- State regulation that Food Services staff can't also be monitors
- Not enough campus funding for monitors to ensure younger kids are actually eating/can open their milks
- Teachers have to monitor
- Cafeteria Monitoring is dependent on family volunteers
- Outdoor Dining spaces can't be utilized because of monitoring

## **TFSM #7 - Students, educators, and staff in aging facilities need funding for timely maintenance and infrastructure replacement to ensure health, safety, welfare, and educational success:**

### **Prioritized Factors:**

#### **Connection between District Funding/Budgeting Practices and Need for Transparent Communication Practices (3)**

##### **Need for Transparent Communication Practices (3)**

- Communities are unaware of how needs are prioritized
- Lack of transparency within district on how maintenance is funding
- Lack of transparency around prioritization - honest conversations around hard decisions have not been had in the past
- Causes for delays are not communicated with communities in regular newsletters
- Communities and Parents are not aware enough of WHY it takes longer for maintenance to be resolved
- Perception of not enough maintenance because some campuses have a higher volume of need

*\*connected to District Funding/Budgeting Practices*

*\*connected to Historically Inequitable Practices*

##### **District Funding/ Budgeting Practices (1)**

- Maintenance Funding is a very small share of the annual funds
- Not enough funding set aside to purchase replacement equipment (instead of waiting on bonds to replace equipment)
- Reliance on CMD and modernization/ bond plans for funding for equipment replacement
- Lack of transparency within district on how maintenance is funded
- ROI analyses around replacement vs maintenance are not impacting the decision making enough

*\*connected to Age of Facilities*

*\*connected to Maintenance Planning*

*\*connected to Staffing*

*\*connected to Need for Transparent Communication Practices*

## **Additional Factors:**

### **Work Orders Current Practices**

- Current practice is to focus on youngest students first or largest impact of need (total campus vs one classroom)

### **Maintenance + Enrollment**

- Perceived maintenance and upkeep impact enrollment to those campuses
- Maintenance issues disrupt learning process

### **Economic Growth In Austin**

- Growing private sector is depleting qualified staff

### **External Economic Forces impacting Resources**

- Shortages causing price increases
- Pandemic is causing lags in receiving equipment needed for maintenance/ replacement, causing them to take

### **State Recapture Policies**

- District loses funds for maintenance to Robin Hood policies

### **Staffing**

- Private sector is depleting qualified staff
  - need more staff to address volume of needs
- \*Connected to District Funding/Budgeting Practices*

### **Historically Inequitable Practices**

- Historically inequitable practices in providing maintenance to schools (Historically, some communities' needs have been prioritized over others)
- Schools in East Austin were forgotten for an extended period and not repaired, making them even further behind in maintenance
- Lack of transparency around prioritization - honest conversations around hard decisions have not been had in the past

*\*connected to Need for Transparent Communications Practices*

### **Ages of Facilities**

- Vast majority of maintenance activities is reactive (reacting to issues) when it comes to HVAC

- Maintenance does/has to perform regular maintenance on HVAC equipment
- Many campuses have aging equipment that requires constant maintenance (or better yet replacement)
- Perception of not enough maintenance because some campuses have a higher volume of need (due to the age of the facility)
- HVAC equipment costs more to maintain than repair in some spaces (ie portables)

*\*connected to District Funding/Budgeting Practices*

*\*connected to Maintenance Planning*

### **Maintenance Planning**

- Newer campuses can have more proactive than reactive maintenance – this is the desire for equipment district wide
- Variety and age of equipment makes proactive plans for all campuses challenging/a work in progress

*\*connected to District Funding/Budgeting Practices*

*\*connected to Age of Facilities*

# January 22<sup>nd</sup> - Root Cause Analysis

## Visual & Performing Arts

The following pages provide a summary of the root cause analysis conducted by committees during the January 22<sup>nd</sup> Committee Meeting. The visual documentation of the fishbone protocol used during the meeting to conduct the root cause analysis will be provided as an attachment to this document, for reference.

**VAPA #1 - All students need expanded VAPA programming, applied consistently throughout the district, to fuel student interest through VAPA experiences and/other academic pursuits.**

### Prioritized Factor:

**Systemic investment/disinvesting issues related to Title 1 campuses (3)**

**Funding Issues (esp. robinhood) (3)**

### Additional Factors:

#### **Misaligned solutions for student needs**

- Misunderstanding of wants, needs, interests and abilities at low income schools
- Schools that don't meet TEA testing guidelines feel compelled not to invest in VAPA staffing because they feel they must add teachers in other areas to bring up test scores. This can especially be a reality for Title I schools because of a lack of systemic investment across the board in academic staffing/resources, shortcomings in ELL's performance on standardized tests, and principals being measured professionally on whether their campus gets a certain rating by TEA.

#### **Staffing**

- Ratio of teachers/ students
- No minimum staffing required

**Decisions to offer are not made centrally; different verticals receive different offerings**

**Misalignment with dual language programming (all specials are taught in ENG)**

- We have Dual Language programs (required) at many Title 1 schools. (73% of all elementary schools) We struggle to have the DL teachers we need, and to get the Spanish instruction into the day and we never have the DL teachers we need at any one time. The reality that the specials teachers are teaching in English only is often noted as a challenge in getting the required Spanish instructional time into the day. We also struggle to have the VAPA teachers we need, and many of these same schools don't have strong VAPA offerings. (This root cause may lead to a suggested idea: Recruit VAPA DL teachers who can teach in Spanish and English for the 73% of schools that have DL classes. Most schools are mixed, where some classes are English-only, while others are Dual Language.) This draws funding from both departments. And builds a stronger academic program at these schools.)

**CLI is being rolled out through Verticals**

**Choice drives programming access (1)**

- admin/principals are given choice to bring to campuses
- choice sheets Drive programming and staffing, but without exposing the students to possible expanded programming students may not even think to make the choice. it's sort of systemic, or cyclical, meaning if the program hasn't been in the school students may not be able to visualize it and form a desire to choose it. in summary I see a root cause simply being the process of choice sheets somewhat driving program placement.
-

**VAPA #4 - Students of PK-12 families who require or desire after-school programs should have access to safe, quality, affordable programs, such as sports, fine arts programs, tutoring, etc.**

### Prioritized Factor:

#### There Is No District-Wide Template Or Standard For Afterschool Care (5)

- AISD promised this - quality aftercare for all in school changes 2019 - and then quickly forgot about that mandate adopted by the board.
- District is relying on PTA and advocacy by parents to drive what is where
- Principals are being relied on to set up these programs
- unreliable year to year patchwork approach, rather than system approach
- no minimum requirements for enrichment options at every school
- Up to campus to see what they can pull together
- There is no district-wide template or standard for afterschool care (or if there is one, it doesn't appear to be enforced/managed). That leaves most of afterschool solutions to be created by each school community - and communities where parents have more disposable income and more volunteer time will often be the communities that provide a richer mix of these programs.

lack of district understanding of the critical nature of this to enrollment. I know of 3 kids we lost to charters this year alone. 2 because we didn't have an aftercare option for 2 kids of parents who work at the store across the street. And other left because no extracurriculars. Our principal didn't know what the parent even meant by "extracurriculars" when the parent inquired about them.

### Additional Factors:

#### Funding (1)

- low stipends or no stipends

#### Knowledge/ Communication About Where To Sign Up And Why It Is Important For Students

- after-school has to be developed with a sense of why it is important for enrichment after

**Overworked Staff/ Expectation That Staff Fulfill This After-School Role**

- lack of energy from staff to do this long of a day

**Affordability For Participation**

**Limited Partners/Options To Come In.**



**VAPA #6 - The district must establish VPA staffing minimums in AISD's staffing formula, separate from general staffing formula, a VPA department structure that has the capacity to offer the full range of VPA programs to all students at every campus, and professional development specific for VAPA educators**

### **Prioritized Factor:**

#### **District Isn't Prioritizing VAPA Enough (4)**

- lack of knowledge/ understanding from parents and public on priority of visual and performing arts
- lack of courage at central office in implementing equity goals
- whole child discussion but not sure about the buy-in... also involves VAPA
- VAPA isn't recognized as a part of the academic programming/not valued for its part in academic growth
- too much focus on testing and that is where the resources are directed.
- hyperfocus on CTE - VAPA is tossed aside for a CTE pathway

### **Additional Factors:**

#### **VAPA Admin Team Not Advocating For Current Staff And Programs**

- lack of ability to advocate within the system
- not listening to our teachers; undercut their brilliance and thus take it away from our children.
- only see teachers as a number!

#### **Systems Never Worked, Even When VAPA Admin Had More Power**

- when VAPA had control, teacher were still without resources, assistants, etc.

#### **Funding/Policy Issues Associated With A "One Size Fits All" Mindset (2)**

- teachers teaching 7 out of 8 being considered...but unclear around this!
- all on block schedule
- Funding issues appear to have influenced the district to implement a "one size fits all" solution to solve staffing needs across different campuses. When applied without context, this results in VAPA positions (and by extension, subjects) being eliminated and/or VAPA teachers being misused.

**Structure Of Dept Prevents Full Offering Of Programs At Every Campus**

**Constant Siloing Of All Staff Is So Detrimental**

# January 22<sup>nd</sup> - Root Cause Analysis

## Safety, Security & Resiliency

The following pages provide a summary of the root cause analysis conducted by committees during the January 22<sup>nd</sup> Committee Meeting. The visual documentation of the fishbone protocol used during the meeting to conduct the root cause analysis will be provided as an attachment to this document, for reference.

**SSR #1 - Staff, students, and educators on secondary campuses, and buses, need additional support in order to maintain a learning environment where students and staff feel physically and emotionally safe.**

### Prioritized Factor:

#### Teachers & Staffing (4)

- staff/teacher challenges at underserved schools are higher
- high workload discourages new teachers from applying
- lack of staff
- educators are being pushed out of the profession (profession is undervalued)
- higher expectations at underserved campuses - less resources available
- teachers need more support (time, resources, tools, staff) to help create successful and safe environments
- more staff turnover at underserved campuses
- staff not distributed equitably
- more vacancies at underserved schools - harder to get staff for those schools

### Additional Factors:

#### Student Schedules / Course Load

- not enough flexible class time to focus on SEL and other student support topics
- less opportunities for students to express emotions in other ways - art, athletics, PE

- student schedules are book with state required classes and fewer electives

### **Buildings & Facilities(2)**

- Facilities are not equitable across the district
- Unmaintained and neglected Facilities
- Better maintenance of buildings and campus infrastructure.
- Not enough outdoor and other designed spaces which help students and staff feel physically and emotionally safe
- Appearance and physical integrity of facilities are not consistent across the district
- Many campuses do not have secure vestibules or other physical security items
- Some campuses are prioritized over others

### **State Funding & Policies(2)**

- Robinhood creates budget shortfalls in M&O
- 'Robinhood Program' furthers inequities within AISD
- state policy changes to support teachers and district staff (mental health, SEL, etc)
- state funding is not adequate for the needed staffing

### **Student Testing(1)**

- district prioritizes testing and curriculum over student and staff needs
- testing disrupts the student's day - saps energy and mental focus
- teaching time is too focused on curriculum and testing

## **SSR #7 - Students, teachers, and staff need access to a school environment that supports emotional resiliency, mental health, and psychological safety.**

### **Prioritized Factor:**

#### **Mental Health and Support (7)**

- lack of inclusive and tolerance education
- Lack of consistent mental health support for both students and staff
- stigma for mental health support (students get bullied or shamed)
- teachers need to be in a healthy place themselves in order to support others
- students who want support but have unsupportive families (specific to mental health support services)
- is free care available for students that can not afford it?
- access to mental health support for non-english speaking students
- Teachers and staff need more/better crisis identification and intervention training
- better communication to students of support services and 'safe places' for them to go and seek assistance
- access to mental health support for access and functional needs students
- lack of support for religious or cultural diversity
- Poor campus climate (not welcoming or tolerate)
- identify students that need help (food insecure, other help,)

### **Additional Factors:**

#### **Teachers & Staffing (3)**

- pay does not match the cost of living in Austin
- lack of inclusive and tolerance education
- staff not distributed equitably
- district wide instability (budget concerns leading to layoffs)
- lack of staff
- high workload discourages new teachers from applying
- teaching time is too focused on curriculum and testing
- teachers need more support (time, resources, tools, staff) to help create successful and safe environments
- educators are being pushed out of the profession (profession is undervalued)
- student to teacher ratio is too high

- not enough flexible class time to focus on SEL and other student support topics
- pay does not match the workload
- inequitable distribution of tenured teachers - poorer campuses typically have less experienced teachers
- teachers have too many responsibilities on a daily basis - can't be good at everything
- teacher burnout
- inadequate number of teachers and support for non-english speaking students

### **Student Schedules / Course Load (2)**

- less opportunities for students to express emotions in other ways - art, athletics, PE
- student schedules are book with state required classes and fewer electives
- Student course load and homework doesn't allow for extracurricular activities or a lack of engagement
- Students can not attend extracurricular activities because transportation is not available
- not all campus offer the same extracurricular activities and after school clubs

### **Buildings & Facilities (3)**

- Facilities are not equitable across the district
- Unmaintained and neglected Facilities
- Better maintenance of buildings and campus infrastructure.
- Appearance and physical integrity of facilities are not consistent across the district
- Many campuses do not have secure vestibules or other physical security items
- Some campuses are prioritized over others
- facilities are not adequately accessibility for mobility impaired
- not all campuses have gender inclusive spaces (toilets, locker rooms, etc)

### **State Funding & Policies**

- Unfunded State mandates
- 'Robinhood Program' furthers inequities within AISD
- state policy changes to support teachers and district staff (mental health, SEL, etc)
- state funding is not adequate for the needed staffing

### **Student Testing (3)**

- district prioritizes testing and curriculum over student and staff needs
- testing disrupts the student's day - saps energy and mental focus

### **Operational Plans**

- additional emergency operations plans are needed to support access and functional needs students

## **SSR #8 - AISD needs a clearer definition of resiliency, what it means, and how it impacts the district, underserved communities, and underserved students long-term**

### **Prioritized Factor:**

#### **Systemic Resiliency Issues (4)**

- institutionalized racism leads into resiliency issues
- more focus on the core reasons for resiliency issues (not just the short term needs)
  - fix the real problem

### **Additional Factors:**

#### **Buildings & Facilities (1)**

- resources need to be equitably distributed to all campuses
- facilities are not resilient
- special needs and disabled populations do not have adequate access and resources
- underinvested campuses may need more resources
- Facility design that doesn't perpetuate and ideally lessens environmental risk of flooding, fire, etc. to the surrounding AISD community/families.
- insufficient system redundancies in facilities
- facilities are not cultural or community sensitive

#### **District Resiliency (3)**

- Communication on AISD definition of resiliency

#### **Environmental Resiliency (1)**

- environmentally vulnerable areas are more affordable for living - not enough affordable housing in environmentally safe location
- Natural disasters disproportionately impact marginalized communities, by design. Expecting individuals who are oppressed to be "resilient" when higher-income individuals receive access to needed resources reinforces this racist dynamic.

#### **City & Infrastructure**

- lack of adequate infrastructure to support resiliency (both district, city, state)
- lack of and consistent application of standards for community planning
- lack of funding for improvements to existing
- be intentional of all groups being able to afford to live in Austin



### **Living Standards / Factors (1)**

- affordability of house
- more options and access for public transit

### **Student Resiliency**

- not enough resources for student mental health and well being
- Food resiliency for hungry students
- more investigation and engagement into what a campus/community really needs vs. an 'assumed need' which may not be accurate