



Keller Independent School District Amendment to Local Innovation Plan

District of Innovation Committee Approved Initial Plan: November 3, 2016

Board of Trustees Adopted Initial Plan: January 19, 2017

District of Innovation Committee Approved Amendment: December 8, 2017

Board of Trustees Adopted Plan Amendment: February 8, 2018

I. OUR PROCESS

On November 30, 2017, the District of Innovation Committee came back together to discuss potential changes to the Innovation Plan adopted during the 2016-2017 school year. Changes under consideration related to new laws passed during the 85th legislative session. The Committee was broken into three sub-groups that rotated through discussion areas to learn about proposed exemption areas, ask questions, and provide feedback on ideas. At the end of the evening Committee members were given the option of voting on paper at that time or taking time to consider the options and vote electronically over the next week. When all votes were accounted for, the Committee voted to approve an amendment that includes three new exemption areas by a vote of 19 to 1 (95%).

II. TERM

The amendment adopted by the Board will adhere to the same term as the original plan. The KISD may not implement two separate plans at any one time.

III. INNOVATIONS

The KISD proposes flexibility and seeks an exemption in the following additional areas:

| Suspension Limitation for Students Below 3 rd Grade | |
|---|------------|
| Texas Education Code §37.005 | FOB(Legal) |
| Under the new law a student who is enrolled in a grade level below grade 3 may not be placed in out-of-school suspension unless while on school property or while attending a school-sponsored or school-related activity on or off of school property, the student engages in: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct that contains the elements of an offense related to weapons under Penal Code 46.02 or 46.05; 2. Conduct that contains the elements of an a violence related under Penal Code 22.01, 22.011, 22.02, 22.021; or | |

3. Selling, giving, or delivering to another person or possessing, using, or being under the influence of any amount of:
- a. Marihuana or a controlled substance, as defined by Health and Safety Code Chapter 481, or by 21 U.S.C. Section 801 et seq.;
 - b. A dangerous drug, as defined by Health and Safety Code Chapter 483; or
 - c. An alcoholic beverage, as defined by Alcoholic Beverage Code 1.04.

School and student needs will be best met by allowing some discretion in assigning limited OSS days. This innovation area will allow the campuses to utilize out of school suspension for students below grade 3 within clear parameters that are similar to the protections provided to special education students under federal and state law.

Innovation: TEC Ch. 12A.003(b)(1)(E) any other innovations prescribed by the board of trustees

It is foreseeable that elementary campuses and students could be adversely affected by the strict limitation on suspensions. If a student's behavior reaches a level of such disruption that the school cannot function properly, immediate action should be taken to maintain the effectiveness and safety of the educational environment for all students. There are instances in which a student needs specially designed plans and supports in order to be successful in his or her learning environment. At those times the student's needs can be met if the staff has even a day or two to prepare a plan for the child's needs. If additional staff will be needed to help control behavior, for example, central office may need a day to find and place staff for that purpose. In these limited instances it serves the best interest of the student and the campus to briefly suspend the student.

| Dyslexia Screening | |
|--|-------------|
| Texas Education Code §38.003 | EHB (Legal) |
| Under the new law students enrolling in public schools in Texas shall be screened or tested, as appropriate, for dyslexia and related disorders at appropriate times in accordance with a program approved by the State Board of Education. The program must include screening at the end of the school year of each student in kindergarten and each student in the first grade. Screening should be done only by individuals who are trained to assess students for dyslexia and related disorders. | |
| Innovation: TEC Ch. 12A.003(b)(1)(A) innovative curriculum, instructional methods, and provisions regarding community participation, campus governance, and parental involvement | |
| Exemption from this requirement will allow the district to continue using reading instruments adopted by the Commissioner or by a district level committee to screen students in kindergarten and 1 st grades. This exemption will also allow the district to continue its practice of using data gathered from the initial screening to do more in-depth testing with an individual trained to assess students for dyslexia and related disorders only after a need is shown with the initial screening. The process currently utilized by the district is largely successful and effective at identifying students who show characteristics of dyslexia at an early age. Screening every single student for dyslexia using the method newly mandated by law at the end of both kindergarten and 1st grades will have negative consequences to the students, dyslexia program, and District. | |

| Ejection of Individuals from Facilities | |
|--|-------------|
| Texas Education Code §37.105 | GKA (Legal) |
| <p>Under the new law the district must maintain a record of each verbal warning of potential removal from a school facility that is issued, including the name of the person to whom the warning was issued and the date of issuance. At the time a person is refused entry to or ejected from a school district's property, the district shall provide to the person written information explaining the appeal process.</p> | |
| <p>When an individual is so disorderly that he or she is being verbally warned that they may be removed from a building or other district facility, it will be impractical and potentially impossible to get the full name of the individual who received the warning. It is reasonable to believe that requesting that information could also escalate a situation that is already proving to be disruptive. Further, it is impractical to provide written notice of an appeal process at events like football or basketball games when the removal is only for the immediate event and there is not ready access to a computer or printer.</p> | |
| <p>Innovation: TEC Ch. 12A.003(b)(1)(E) any other innovations prescribed by the board of trustees</p> | |
| <p>Exemption from this requirement will allow the district to continue with its current processes relating to unruly individuals on campuses and at other facilities. The notice of written appeal requirement at the time of ejection is believed to be ineffective and impractical. Maintaining logs of those who receive a verbal warning may not be manageable in all instances, including athletic events. While the district rarely ejects an individual from a facility, when it does so there is personal contact with the individual. In most instances an ejection happens with a written letter from the campus after several warnings over a number of episodes that caused a disruption. Allowing the district to maintain its current practice that has proven to be effective is a better use of resources and allows the district to avoid potential escalation of already difficult situations.</p> | |