

## 22-23 MCCPTA Advocacy Priorities - Capital Funds and Facilities Section

I propose the following Amendment for consideration Bannockburn's 12/6 PTA General Membership meeting.

### Current Advocacy Priority Language:

In furtherance of equity, the socioeconomic makeup of the school population should be a factor in prioritization of projects, along with the condition and overutilization of buildings.

### Modified Language

Projects for remediation of issues related to accessibility, health and safety (including condition and utilization of buildings) should be equitably identified and prioritized.

### Rationale:

Facilities are a measurable item. If existing facilities have been measured and shown to have a lack of identification and prioritization of projects from low socioeconomic communities relative to those in higher socioeconomic ones, then I believe what MCCPTA wants to be asking MCPS is to uphold the ideals that socioeconomic status of the community's population should NOT be a factor when identifying and prioritizing facility maintenance projects.

The way it is currently worded is to shift the inadequate facility burden (created by the way projects are identified and prioritized) from one community of people in our county to another and not actually provide an equitable long-term solution to the root cause of the issue.

The language related to "identification" of projects was added to help ensure that project identification and visibility is not strongly influenced by a vocal community population and is instead done in an equitable manner.

On the day Advocacy Priorities were distributed to local PTAs, questions were submitted to the MCCPTA CIP Chair to attain clarity on the original intent of the advocacy priority language. It was confirmed the questions were received, however as of 12/4, no response has been given.

David Hecht