

From: Corbett Sanders, Karen (School Board Member) <kcorbettsan@fcps.edu>

Sent: Sunday, August 22, 2021 10:28 AM EDT

To: Williams, Lisa N <lnwilliams2@fcps.edu>

Subject: Re: Equity Update and SOL Update

Thank you for your response

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 22, 2021, at 10:03 AM, Williams, Lisa N <lnwilliams2@fcps.edu> wrote:

See below

Lisa Williams, Ed.D.
Chief Equity Officer
Fairfax County Public Schools
571-205-4571

On Aug 21, 2021, at 10:49 AM, Corbett Sanders, Karen (School Board Member) <kcorbettsan@fcps.edu> wrote:

Thank you for all the materials attached. I continue to have significant concerns about the fidelity of the data collected by the Leadership Academy Survey and Focus Groups. As contained almost 5,000 of the 15,000 surveys received came from outside of Fairfax County or had multiple entries from a single IP address.

Additionally, the focus groups did not reflect all of the constituencies and were limited in number. I would be hard pressed to believe that 9 staff members is statistically relevant. The religious representations seemed to replicate the representation of the group that was put together in the past and does not represent the plurality of faiths and I would like to know of the focus group members how many of them were also on the religious committee.

Although the slides were well done there seems to be a disconnect in what was in the slides and what was in the memo. Why was there a delay in sending the slides? I sent very specific questions on the earlier memo to Scott and was assured that all of my questions would be answered. The outstanding questions are highlighted in yellow.

1. The work of the Leadership Academy is a bit surprising. It is not clear how this corresponds to the 2x2s that we had. I am perplexed that this memo is dated June 2nd and the board is only just seeing this now. Does this mean that the work that is outlined for the summer is underway.

Response : The team is continuing to meet but I have asked them to not advance the second round of planned focus groups until we can achieve clarity about process concerns.

It was planned that LA and the FCPS team would present data findings (internal and external) as the backdrop to policy recommendations. This has not happened.

The documents submitted in this communication should be understood as sources of data. There have been no formal presentations of this information outside of core team workgroup sessions.

I would ask, given all that we have experienced relative to this work, that there is extensive planning before presenting as we originally organized.

1. If so, I am particularly concerned about drafts of a policy or curriculum being shared with community members that the board has not seen or been briefed on. The focus groups which included a total of 41 people are not statistically relevant for a system this size and the recommendations for the policy and curriculum are reliant on this small sampling rather than the data gathered in the surveys.

Response: I understood this as a concern from our discussion. The core planning team is aware as well. I've conveyed concerns with the idea of "representative sampling" in assessing the experiences of marginalized populations. However, if it's the feedback of the board that additional focus groups from these communities are convened, I'll work with the group to achieve this end.

This action will lengthen the process, yet given this policy's complexity, I think it is beneficial to take more time to ensure that we're able to apprise the community in a more detailed way.

I'm attempting to ascertain feedback on all areas of concern so that as we move forward, we are able to address

each issue. It is important to note that we are at a place where we can invite more feedback.

1. The data in the latter part of the document does not support all of the recommendations on the curriculum.

Response: As there are 4 documents, I would request clarification on which document you are referring to. Pls advise.

1. The data collected via the survey is not provided in the level of detail that was alluded to in the 2x2s, how many surveys were received, how many were from IP addresses outside of Virginia, how many were repeat entries from the same IP address.... The summer work references additional focus groups reviewing the draft policy. To my knowledge the board has not seen a draft of the policy. If it is being shared with focus groups, we are likely to hear about it. The document also references an internal anti-racist, anti-bias working group of staff members. Who is on this working group. The document references that the survey questions were developed in coordination with this working group.

Response: I understand that any public engagement on the development of this policy is likely to cause a flurry of questions to which SMBs, Region teams, and school staff will need to respond. It is in this recognition that the 2 by2s were engaged. The attempt (in those meetings) was to explain process and access feedback. Again because there have (and continue to be) unresolved concerns, none of the planned public facing work is occurring. I want all to be well-positioned before we take another step in this direction.

The following members constitute the core planning team:

Alicia Hunter
Colleen Eddy
Leona Smith
Claire Silva
Nina Thomas
Kasey Cain
Renee La-Huffman-Jackson
Kathleen Thomas
Deborah March
Armando Peri
Deb Scott
Robert Falconi
Noel Klimenko
Shannon Anderson
Ellen Kennedy
Shannon Merriweather
Catherine Carroll

Lidi Hurdi has served as a liaison to this core team to assist at various points in accessing data.

Leadership Academy serves as our external partner.

I am the primary champion of the AR/AB efforts, though because of its close proximity to the work on the Controversial Issues policy updates, Sloan and I confer often.

I continue to receive questions about when the survey results will be released. It is very important for this board to have a public work session on this work and we need to be very transparent about the work we are doing. I think there is a lot of good work being done and other work that needs to be improved upon including ensuring more voices are included in our discussions. The statistical representation in the work thus far is limited.

SOL Data: Although the data contained in the update on Friday is encouraging it is also a bit alarming when we have concentrations of the poverty, ELS and Hispanics in areas of the county and thus the narrative will be that one's zip code does matter to achieve a quality education. How will we ensure that our efforts will be concentrated in those areas. I am already hearing about de-staffs.

I continue to be concerned that the raw data is not being made available to school board members. I have been advocating for this. It has been provided in years past and allows for more intentionality in how we approach our work in support of students and schools. I know that neighboring district board members have been provided this information. I have principals whom have anecdotally mentioned the data they are seeing and others whom are not.

Finally, the data looks positive for our performance in science. Why are we not including this in the press