

## **Cross-Sector Collaboration Task Force Meeting**

Tuesday, June 28, 2016

6:00 – 8:00pm

EducationCounsel LLC

101 Constitution Avenue NW, Suite 900

### **Attendees**

---

#### **Co-Chairs:**

- Jennifer Niles | Deputy Mayor for Education

#### **Facilitator:**

- Jim Sandman | President, Legal Services Corporation; former General Counsel, DCPS

#### **Members:**

- Amanda Alexander | Deputy Chief of Elementary Schools, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Lars Beck | CEO, Scholar Academies and DC Scholars
- Evelyn Boyd Simmons | Francis-Stevens parent; W2 Education Network; former member, Student Assignment Committee; President, Logan Circle Community Association
- Shanita Burney | Deputy Chief, Community Engagement, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Caryn Ernst | Watkins ES, Stuart-Hobson MS parent; former PTA president, Capitol Hill Cluster School; member, Capitol Hill Public School Parent Organization (CHPSPO)
- Faith Gibson Hubbard | Chief Student Advocate, State Board of Education (SBOE); former member, Student Assignment Committee
- Kaya Henderson | Chancellor, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Kemba Hendrix | Elsie Whitlow Stokes PCS parent; former public and public charter school teacher
- Hanseul Kang | State Superintendent of Education
- Anjali Kulkarni | Deputy Chief, Strategic School Planning, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Bethany Little | Murch ES, BASIS PCS parent; Education policy expert
- Scott Pearson | Executive Director, Public Charter School Board (PCSB)
- Karen Williams | Ward 7 Representative, State Board of Education (SBOE)

#### **Not in Attendance:**

- Anthony Williams | CEO & Executive Director, Federal City Council; former Mayor
- Rod Boggs | Executive Director, Washington Lawyer's Committee
- Angela Copeland | Stuart-Hobson MS parent; public affairs specialist
- Charlene Drew-Jarvis | Graduate, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS); Senior Advisor, KIPP DC PCS; former Ward 4 City Councilwoman
- Irene Holtzman | Executive Director, Friends of Choice in Urban Schools (FOCUS)
- Melissa Kim | Chief Academic Officer, Secondary Schools, KIPP DC; former principal, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)

- Ariana Quiñones | Duke Ellington HS, Cesar Chavez PCS parent, education and human services policy consultant, Otero Strategy Group LLC, former member Student Assignment Committee
- Alejandra Vallejo | Bancroft ES parent; Chair, Bancroft ES Local School Advisory Team (LSAT)
- Darren Woodruff | EL Haynes PCS, Benjamin Banneker HS parent ; Chair, Public Charter School Board (PCSB)
- Shantelle Wright | Founder & CEO, Achievement Prep PCS; Chair, DC Association of Public Charter Schools

**Staff:**

- Erin Garratt | Public Policy Fellow, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Claudia Luján | Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Kristen Moore | District Leadership Program (DLP) Fellow, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Aaron Parrott | Data Manager, My School DC (MSDC) team, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Catherine Peretti | Executive Director, My School DC (MSDC)
- Richelle Russell | Education Pioneers Fellow, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Aurora Steinle | Policy Advisor, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)

**Support Staff:**

- Amber Saddler | EducationCounsel, LLC
- Terri Taylor | EducationCounsel, LLC

**Meeting Summary**

---

**Goals; Group Norms & Expectations**

While they were not explicitly discussed, the Task Force goals, group norms and expectations were again shown to the members as a reminder of the purpose and importance of the work of the committee.

**Purpose of Discussion**

Prior to beginning small group discussions on the data presented in the slide deck, Mr. Sandman grounded the discussion to come in several points.

**Small Group Discussions**

Given the data-heavy nature of the information presented in this meeting, Task Force members were sent an electronic copy of the slide deck for their advance review. To start, Task Force members were asked to work with partners to reflect on the information they viewed.

*Member Comments*

- One Task Force member questioned whether or not a focus on student mobility makes a mountain out of molehill and suggests that, moving forward, the group use a “scalpel” approach to solving this problem.
- In addition, another member raised the point that because the relationship between churn and poverty is inextricable, student mobility is a cross-sector issue, adding that the disproportionate impact on certain DCPS schools means that this is not insignificant.
- Building on this comment, another person stated that there is a need to look at historic DC data to determine if this issue is indeed across sectors.
  - Interjecting to clarify, Deputy Mayor Niles reminds the Task Force that this process does not assign blame; even if the sectors themselves did not create the problem, it still needs to be solved on level of city.
- Again raising the question of how much mobility should be focused on, another person wonders if this the right approach, as opposed to addressing the in- vs. out-of-state figures on mobility.
  - To this point, Claudia Luján clarifies that from the perspective of student exit, there is no data to pinpoint why this is happening or where these children are going; the exit code analysis will not be available until the end of summer 2016. With entry and exit happening across sectors, Ms. Luján prompts the Task Force to consider what processes can deal with entries and what solutions can solve this problem.
- Adding another perspective, one member asks if it is possible to think about this from the entry and exit perspective.
- Addressing the issue of factors that affect churning of students, the possibility of putting a pin in making a decision on mobility until more information is gathered and more contributing issues are examined is raised.
- On the topic of further spheres of focus, the impact of mobility on student achievement (specifically with regard to performance and performance in specific subset; e.g., the information presented on slide 20) is shared as a potential topic.
- Speaking in rhetorical questions, another person asks what gets measured and what gets done, how much incentives can influence behavior and policy, and how far the team is willing to go.
- Again citing a need to be “laser-like” in solving this problem, one Task Force member stated that it would also be important to acknowledge the cross-sector nature of this issue, as DCPS accepts exits from PCS because of the structural and cultural factors that make DCPS the default for students changing schools mid-year. Wondering aloud, this member also asks if it is okay to possess a set of policies that are meant to support school achievement if those policies are good for one sector and not another.

- In addition to the aforementioned comments, many Task Force members brought up issues of residency and the flow of students across state lines; for one member, fixing the 25% figure cited in the data is not enough to combat the movement of people in and out of state. Others wondered the extent to which residency issues play a role in mobility and whether or not it is a topic for the CSCTF to tackle.
  - Claudia Luján adds that there are some policy questions that get to the other issues influencing mobility (i.e., those that address geography, residency, etc.).
- Sharing a personal anecdote regarding their children's schools, one Task Force member asked whether mobility has anything to do with space and/or capacity in buildings.
- Finally, one of the last commenters in this initial round of group discussion stated that it seems that perverse incentives seem to exist for each of these problems, creating a system that encourages bad actors or bad decisions via flawed policy.

### **Breakout Group Discussions**

Before allowing them to divide into groups to discuss mobility at greater length, Claudia Luján instructed Task Force members to center their conversations around the goal of creating policy options. More specifically, groups should keep in mind potential trade-offs that exist as a result of the options they generate and existing policies that may impact new ideas. At the end of the breakout session, each group will nominate a participant to present suggestions to the whole group for broader input.

The high level points of each breakout discussion are as follows –

- Group 1
  - “Intake schools” that take most to all students making mid-year transfers
  - Need to dig into the reasons for intra-DCPS transfers, particularly in students kids leaving or being forced out of out-of-boundary schools to return to their in-boundary school
  - There is a risk that requiring PCS to take students mid-year would lead to drawing from waitlists and exacerbating churn
  - A three year rolling average as per student funding is iffy—there is lots of support for real-time impact on schools, particularly if DCPS is able to maintain reserves and carry over funds from year to year
- Group 2
  - Understanding the “why” behind mobility is key and parent-focused policies (i.e., better engagement, etc.) can help
- Group 3
  - The LEA payment reform process has promise in reducing mobility
  - Regulations need to be evenly and uniformly applied

## Breakout Group Discussion Share Out

Upon reconvening, groups communicated the following ideas:

- Group 1
  - The Mayor and DME need to create “sticks” to go with “carrots” in enacting policy in order to ensure changes are made. In particular, any policies that are created should not shuffle kids around, but most appropriately meet their needs.
  - The lottery process should set aside seats for high-risk students in order to create options for families.
  - For the Task Force to be effective, members need to understand *why* students are moving.
  
- Group 2
  - What might be helpful is the establishment of a non-governmental agency that helps parents to decide what they want in schools; members likened this new body to DC School Reform Now, but with the capacity to serve a broader swath of the population.
  - There should exist a “counseling in” process that helps families to stay enrolled in their schools; similarly, schools should be required to hold exit counseling with students prior to leaving.
  - School choice should also include more parent/family orientation on the front end to more clearly explain what schools are all about. If parents understand their options, they may find a better fit for their student(s).
  - Another policy option could involve limiting the windows in which students are able to move.
  
- Group 3
  - Building off of the LEA payments process, reducing mobility should also include a focus on how to make sure that highly mobile, at-risk students are shared across LEAs.
  - Schools need to be incentivized to serve these students.
  - In addition, more stringent residency requirements—including tighter enforcement—would serve DC students better.
  - On a systemic level, it is crucial that any rule changes that arise as an effect of new policies apply equally and universally to all students and all schools.

## Next Steps

Before adjourning the meeting, members were given a look at the summer/fall schedule for the Task Force.

- In the short term, members should explore opportunities to work in small groups on particular areas of focus and will continue to meet with DM Niles and Facilitator Sandman.
  
- The July Cross-Sector Task Force meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 26 from 6:00 – 8:00pm in the DC Taxicab Commission (DCTC) Hearing Room (2235 Shannon Place SE, Suite 2032); this meeting will continue the conversation on student mobility by solidifying policy options to bring to the broader

community.

- While there will not be a meeting in August, there will be pre-reading to complete for September, when the Task Force moves into discussing facilities.
- Structured community engagement efforts will begin again in the fall and will solicit feedback on mobility policy options.

The meeting adjourned at 8:18pm.