Advisory Committee on Student Assignment: Meeting Summary
Meeting #3, December 17, 2013
Thurgood Marshall Center, 1816 12ᵗʰ Street, NW, 6:00-8:00 p.m.

Introduction

Advisory Committee co-chair and Deputy Mayor for Education Abigail Smith welcomed the group and introduced three new members: Sharona Robinson, Secretary/Treasurer of the Ward 8 Education Council and parent of three students in DCPS schools; Eboni-Rose Thompson, Chair of the Ward 7 Education Council; and Martin Welles, Amidon/Bowen PTA President in Ward 6. Additionally, Kimberly Driggins, Deputy Director of the DC Office of Planning will no longer be serving on the Advisory Committee. Instead, Christopher Delfs, Senior Citywide Planner will represent the DC Office of Planning on the Committee. All members of the Advisory Committee and attending staff members introduced themselves.

Agenda and Meeting Goals

The Deputy Mayor reviewed the agenda and goals of the meeting:
1. Understand the methodology used to analyze feedback from focus groups
2. Become familiar with the preliminary focus group findings
3. Identify the pros and cons of the student assignment and choice systems of other school districts, as they might be applied in the District of Columbia
4. Understand the major elements of the forthcoming analysis on current patterns of student enrollment and demographics

Focus Groups

The technical team described the focus groups as one way for parents and residents to voice concerns about the principles and values that will guide the Advisory Committee, while also capturing why people hold the beliefs/opinions that they do. These are conversations about what people think, without tables or charts of data. The technical team noted the limitations of the process as well, and pointed out that focus group participants are a self-selected, non-representative sample of the city. Certain areas of the city had more participation than others, so additional outreach is still required in specific areas of the District.

Dr. Jennifer Woolard was introduced. She is an associate professor, Department of Psychology, Georgetown University and Co-Director of the University's Graduate Program in Developmental Science and Adjunct Director of Georgetown's Center for Social Justice. Dr. Woolard, with the help of two graduate students from Georgetown and one from New York University, are guiding and assisting the technical team as they conduct focus groups as well as collaborating on formal analysis of this public input.

Dr. Woolard explained that focus groups are not meant to represent a comprehensive community perspective, but instead are intended to capture in-depth conversations that go beyond a simple yes/no rating. Thus, with this process the Advisory Committee is able to attain

more detailed insights into what people are thinking and why they hold certain opinions/beliefs, which are systematically categorized and analyzed.

Focus Groups through December 17
During the months of November and December, 18 focus groups will be held at seven venues throughout the city (this excludes the upcoming Capitol Hill focus group event): a focus group venue was located in each Ward, although participation has not been ward-specific. The focus group in Ward six is scheduled for Thursday of this current week. So far, 143 people have participated. Overwhelmingly, participants have been highly educated and parents of young children.

Focus Group Protocol
The following common protocol was adhered to within each focus group:

- Description of Student Assignment Review Process and questions from participants about the process.
- Brief introduction to the policy issues associated with student assignment and DC's current student assignment and school choice policies.
- What are your experiences with student assignment and choice in DC?
- What issues and or concerns do you have about student assignment and choice?
- Discussion of Guiding Principles from the rating sheet (participants were given time to fill it out).
- What recommendations do you have on how this process can build community in DC?

Participants first discussed what is working and not working about the current system and then discussed the Guiding Principles Draft, which rated elementary school, middle school and high school students as they are separately affected.

PRELIMINARY Examples of Themes from Focus Groups
The Advisory Committee was cautioned that the examples given during the meeting are preliminary and that a complete analysis has not been completed yet. However, certain themes are already starting to emerge across most of the discussions. The following preliminary themes are:
- Make program improvements in schools before changing boundaries or feeder patterns.
- ALL neighborhood schools should have high quality teachers, program and facilities—if I could send my child to my neighborhood DCPS school then I would—this would be the best option.
- Don't limit my out-of boundary options; However many participants acknowledged that some people had more options than others.
- Don't change my boundaries or feeders because I already made decisions to secure certain schools for my children.

- I want to do what is best for the city, but I also have to be responsible for securing what is best for my own child first.

Much of the focus group discussions were about school quality and how that drives and affects the student assignment process; many issues circled back to disparities of quality. Participants talked about the need to establish quality programs across the city *before* any re-drawing of boundaries can be successful. A strong commitment to neighborhood schools was expressed while at the same time participants recognized the value in the opportunities available for out-of-boundary placement through lotteries. People also favored grandfathering if changes are to be made.

Participants also commented on the fact that focus group participation was not particularly representative of the city and that there is a need for greater outreach across the city in order to obtain feedback that reflects citywide experiences.

PRELIMINARY Focus Group Ratings of Guiding Principles
Focus group worksheet ratings (ratings used a 1-5 scale; 5 most important and 1 least important) on the draft of thirteen Guiding Principles show some interesting preliminary results. With the 18 focus groups so far (out of 21 total) and also without applying a standard deviations or variability analysis, the top three rated Principles for elementary school students were:
- Equitable Access (4.58)
- Predictable Access (4.58)
- Strengthening Neighborhood Schools (4.44)

The bottom three Principles were rated as:
- Academic Diversity (3.28)
- Maximum Choice (3.21)
- Flexibility for Local Education Agencies (2.75)

Analyzing Focus Group Input
Dr. Woolard explained that the detailed notes and transcripts from the focus groups would be systematically examined using a grounded theory approach in order to identify important themes. This is an iterative process where the material is uploaded into coding software (Dedoose.com) and statement-by-statement and line-by-line is coded by the technical team. The transcripts will be coded by more than one person for reliability purposes and any differences between the coded versions are reconciled. This way the larger issues and conflicts, values and principles can be sorted and allow for key themes to emerge in a way that can be understood quite accurately.

Members' Commentary and Questions on Focus Groups

- A member asked if there are preliminary focus group ratings available for middle school and high school as well as for elementary school?
  - The technical team stated yes, and that they will be included in the final report which will be finished by February, 2014.
- A member stated that a number of Advisory Committee members have been asked to take part in local discussions about student assignment. Committee members were requested to share notes from these conversations. How will this information fit into this focus group analysis?
  - The technical teams stated they will code these notes and upload them into the qualitative analysis software. We will do this not only with notes from community meetings, but also with feedback received online when we launch EngageDC.org
- A member asked whether there is a more effective and appropriate way to reach out to all audiences throughout the community. DCPS has pushed the word out through as many channels as possible but there is no way to control who shows up. However, we can change how we approach people and give them different options to provide feedback.
  - The DME noted that balanced participation has been an on-going challenge; we can get information out but may need to be more pro-active about bringing people in. Focus groups sound bigger than they are---it really is a small discussion, which can happen in living rooms or other venues in order to gain more diverse input. However, we are at the front end of a long process with multiple avenues for feed-back all along the way.
    - The DME stated how it has been helpful that a number of Committee members have gone out to groups who have invited them to participate. We all need to continue this outreach and continue to share our experiences along with ideas on how to gain additional feedback from communities.

Understanding Student Assignment and Choice in Other Cities
The technical team explained that reviewing how student assignment is managed in other cities will help provide examples of possibilities for the District, and also highlight examples of what might not be appropriate here as well. It was noted that the overwhelming majority of the 15,000 school districts in the country assign students simply by boundary, and often have few limited exceptions for magnet schools. Thus, this policy brief includes cities that are similar to DC, with a more complex environment that includes charters. Only a few urban centers have other methods for student assignment, which the team has described as the five basic approaches for allocating access to schools:

1. Neighborhood schools (by residence of students in conjunction with geographic attendance zones)
   - *Applied by neighboring Virginia and Maryland counties within the DC Region*

2. Neighborhood schools plus out-of-zone seats allocated by city-wide lottery with defined criteria and weighting
   - *Applied by D.C., Seattle, Denver*
3. Neighborhood elementary schools and citywide middle and high schools with seats by city-wide lottery with defined criteria and weighting
   - *Applied by Baltimore*
4. Assigned choice sets of schools, with seats allocated by lottery with defined criteria and weighting
   - *Applied by Boston*
5. City-wide lottery with defined criteria and weighting
   - *Applied by San Francisco, New Orleans*

Seattle

The Supreme Court recently ruled on Seattle's efforts to achieve racial diversity, and ruled that their efforts were not permissible. (At this point, most cities in the nation are out from under court-ordered desegregation.)

Seattle closed schools - - and then experienced quick growth, and are now trying to manage the consequences. Seattle uses assignment by residence and attendance zones and has substantial diversity only in pockets. Some choice is available but transportation costs and traffic are definitely factors. They have 10% set aside at every school to encourage diversity. Both sibling preference and proximity preference can trump zone boundaries.

The technical team reviewed Seattle's student assignment goals, approaches, and preferences (see presentation for full details, located within meeting #3 materials folder).

Denver

Denver is much larger geographically compared to other jurisdictions reviewed within the policy brief.   Transportation costs are a substantial concern since they bus and have a strong neighborhood system. The effort is to manage growth and capacity. There is assignment by residence and school boundaries along with some choice with a few magnets and a large number of charter schools - - but Denver Public Schools is the chartering authority.   Mobility is constrained by the fact that if a student opts out of their neighborhood school they forfeit their right at that school.

The technical team reviewed Denver's student assignment goals, approaches, and preferences (see presentation for full details, located within meeting #3 materials folder).

Baltimore

Baltimore is a fairly straightforward system with strict boundaries for elementary schools, which are almost all K-8 schools. However, their middle schools and high schools are citywide lottery schools that include feeder, sibling and proximity preferences. Baltimore struggles as a

high-poverty city, with a high concentration of African Americans, so it has less opportunity to deal with diversity and focuses more on increasing quality across all schools.

The technical team reviewed Baltimore's student assignment goals, approaches, and preferences (see presentation for full details, located within meeting #3 materials folder).

Boston
Due to years of court-ordered bussing aimed at desegregation, Boston has a robust choice system, but as a result, is now suffering from very large transportation costs. Boston just recently finished an extensive student assignment review process that will be implemented over the next decade which includes sizable and generous grandfathering. There are a few charters authorized by the State as well as substantial magnet schools at the secondary level, including Boston Latin.

Boston families have a choice set of six or more school options developed by an algorithm based on proximity to home address, the lottery choice set input by the student and the school's academic performance. A school within one mile is always included as an option. However, the old zone system still remains as a back-up. Grandfathering comes with a cost in continued transportation expenditures. Assignment to all secondary schools is lottery based and feeder patterns are being instituted for middle schools.

The technical team reviewed Boston's student assignment goals, approaches, and preferences (see presentation for full details, located within meeting #3 materials folder).

San Francisco
San Francisco uses a city-wide lottery for every child with a complex set of preferences. The goals are diversity, reduced racial isolation, transparency, predictability and efficient use of resources. Nothing is considered with respect to walkability.

The technical team reviewed San Francisco's student assignment goals, approaches, and (see presentation for full details, located within meeting #3 materials folder).

New Orleans
There are some elementary school boundaries, but almost 70% of public school students attend charter schools through a city-wide lottery. Currently, 50% of charter schools provide a proximity preference.

The technical team reviewed New Orleans' student assignment goals, approaches, and (see presentation for full details, located within meeting #3 materials folder).

> **Members' Commentary and Questions**
> - A member asked whether charters in Denver have zones similar to the traditional public schools.

- The technical team stated that admission to Denver charter schools occurs through a citywide common lottery. However, some charter schools provide a strong neighborhood preference to students in the lottery.
- Another member asked whether Denver has schools of right?
  - The technical team explained that they do have schools of right. And a student can lose the right to their zoned school if they choose to attend another public school. And then their out-of-boundary school or charter school they chose over their zoned school will then become their new school-of-right.
  - A member stated that a policy that provides forfeiture of a school of right if they decide to attend an out-of-boundary or charter school is something that should be considered for the District.
- A member stated that some are advocating for a system similar to San Francisco's city-wide lottery for DC and see the common lottery as a first step. It is all about the preferences selected and the algorithms used.
- A member stated that the memo made it clear that San Francisco's number one goal in student assignment policies was diversity, but the goal was not completely achieved through their process since San Francisco is still very segregated. Different racial and ethnic groups still remain isolated.
- A member asked whether there is a working definition of diversity within most school systems.
  - The technical team stated how Hobson vs. Hanson defined racial isolation as a school that is 85% one race or another. However, other cities haven't defined diversity explicitly, and the term is relative to the landscape of the city. There is no one single definition for diversity.
- A member stated that in DC we have an anomalous situation where there is no bussing except for special needs students. Transportation is a big cost driver in other cities' student assignment policies.
- Another member stated that there are logistical problems for families where transportation is not provided; even families that can afford private or public transportation may not have the required time available to travel.

Advisory Committee Small Group Assignment

The Committee was divided into four small working groups with each assigned to two of the comparison cities to discuss. Each group had thirty minutes to discuss goals and approaches in the other cities and identify one or two possibilities that might successfully be applied to the District. Each group selected a member to report out.

Group 1: This group looked for one goal that could be applied to DC and pointed out caveats for the District. First they discussed the idea that having access to excellent schools is a necessary prerequisite to dealing with boundaries. The issue of equitable quality must be approached and recognized as an iterative process. The best we can hope for is to

highlight a number of key local issues such as strengthening Roosevelt high school as a way to deflect overcrowding at Wilson. This will not be the final solution but can help drive quality across the city.

Such an approach would point to where DCPS needs to focus resources but doing that isn't the only solution available. We need to look at elementary schools, middle schools and high schools very differently in terms of proximity and neighborhood coherence when applying student assignment policies.

Group 2: This group discussed the importance of values, and how we should make sure diversity is part of our goals. However, the goal of equitable access to high-quality schools close to home is a value DC could strive for since it symbolizes the need to balance quality and proximity as top goals simultaneously, as in Boston. However, they also recognized the need for an exit strategy for students assigned to low performing in-boundary schools, allowing them access to high quality schools elsewhere. An example they provided of how this could be achieved is by setting aside a certain percentage (perhaps 10%) of school enrollment for students who don't have quality schools nearby. Then a school's enrollment could be recalibrated if their enrollment fell below the target percentage the school set-aside for out-of-boundary students.

The District should not sacrifice diversity for quality. The group was favorable toward considering choice sets for proximal zones but also wanted to use values to strengthen choices in neighborhoods - - while also taking into account what has been heard thus far from focus groups about the high value of predictability.

Group 3: This group referenced that proximity, equity, predictability and strengthening neighborhood schools were values that DC should consider in their student assignment policies. They noted how New Orleans has some predictability because the city controls and allocates all of the school facilities - - which is very different from the District, and probably desirable. They looked favorably at the possibility of setting-aside a certain percentage for out-of-boundary students so that schools would not be solely neighborhood schools; the Committee would have to look into what the right percentage would be for the District.

The group also stated that in regards to predictability, the new policies should not be harder to understand than the current system and ideally, easier to navigate. Feeder patterns, geographic location and facility modernization should all be predictable.

Strengthening neighborhood schools should come from vertical alignment among and between feeders so that at the middle school and high school levels in particular, feeders are compatible. If people are opting out at the 6th grade level or earlier due to vertical alignment issues then we'll never be able to get them to continue on to high school.

While it was outside of the task of the small group work, they discussed the need for out of the box thinking when dealing with such problems as the portfolio of programming, quality, equity and management of facilities.

Group 4: The group's views echoed many of those addressed by the other groups. However, a value or goal that was not discussed yet and that the group felt DC should consider is the value of stability. They found it interesting that the Denver school system requires families to give up their absolute rights to their neighborhood school of right in exchange for gaining options to attend a charter or out-of-boundary school. They discussed how this policy may help the rapid mobility changes that are happening in the District right now, and that this policy could perhaps get people to invest more in their neighborhood schools. They stated how parents may be more cautious to go to a charter or out-of-boundary school if that meant that they would lose their right to their neighborhood school. Moreover, this may encourage stability at both DCPS and charter schools, including cohort stability and feeder pattern stability.

The group understood that choice is currently a significant part of the city and that some choice would have to be retained in any re-design - - would choice within a mile radius be a possibility, or maybe choice sets? Clearly in some areas, there are families who prefer not to have their children attend neighborhood schools at present. Thus we should look at the data to understand where people are going or the natural feeder patterns that currently exist.

They also discussed how "quality" does not mean the same to everyone. Those attending a school might not perceive it to be "bad". Problems can arise from simply labeling schools as "good" or "bad," and sometimes when you label the school as "bad" then you stigmatize the school by labeling it as such. Providing more program resources may help schools generally regarded as low quality, and we want to figure out ways to increase investments in order to have high quality schools everywhere. Thus we may want to find another indicator besides test sores to measure the quality of a school. It also may be possible to use family income in addition to test scores as a way to index quality. We don't want to design a system that says "these are bad schools" and "these are good schools" but rather we want quality all around. This is a difficult goal to achieve but we believe the District can get there.

Members' Commentary and Questions
- A member asked what is going to happen with this exercise.
  - The technical team stated that they are taking notes to capture the Committee's discussion. These conversations will serve as building blocks to the development of policy scenarios over the next two to three months.

Preview of Policy Brief #3

The policy briefs are the foundation of the final report that will come from the Advisory Committee. The technical team received some comments from the Committee for Policy Brief #2. These changes will be incorporated in the final draft.

Policy Brief #3 is on The Landscape of Student Assignment and Choice and will describe school-year 2012-13 enrollment patterns of public school students including access to school quality and diverse environments. It will also take a detailed look at student proximity to schools. We will send you the brief in mid-January and offer an optional conference call/webinar to review the memo prior to next January's Advisory Committee Meeting. The DME will follow-up to poll Committee members on their availability for the conference call.

Next Steps
Technical Team:
- Secure more input on student assignment from parents and community members, particularly from Wards 7 and 8
- Complete coding the notes/transcripts from each focus group
- Share draft focus group summary with participants
- Prepare Focus Group Report for January meeting
- Complete Draft of Policy Brief 3: The Landscape of Student Assignment and Choice by mid-January

Advisory Committee Members:
- Review meeting notes before public posting on www.DME.dc.gov
- Read Policy Brief #3 before January's Advisory Committee meeting
- Optional conference call that will be held sometime between January 14th-17th to discuss Policy Brief #3

January Meeting Goals
- Explore the cause and effect relationships described in Policy Brief #3 and current policies
- Begin formulating approaches to student assignment and choice recommendations that address problems highlighted in Policy Brief #3
- Become familiar with Boundary Planner application

Members' Commentary and Questions
- A member asked whether in the next meeting we will look at specific schools, such as Wilson, and then try to understand whether a certain set of policies that addresses Wilson's overcrowding issues will cause problems for other parts of the city.
  - The technical team explained that over the course of January, February and March we will develop policy scenarios for public consideration.
  - The technical team continued and stated that the Committee will get Policy Brief #3 in January. The Technical team also encourages members to read it alongside the first two memos. The goal is to build off what we know about the District's current policies, examine the range of options for student assignment policy and then in the upcoming meeting the Committee will

understand the mobility patterns based on student enrollment data. This will show what parents are actually doing versus what we are hearing from communities in the focus groups. By February, the Committee can start thinking about crafting scenarios. But it is important for us to start looking forward at projections. This will be difficult and we will need to use the data to understand what is happening and build in assumptions within the scenarios.

- The member stated that there seems to be no window into understanding what is causing mobility. Is it parents' collective anxiety to get children to the best schools as possible? Understanding mobility has to be part of what informs the Committee.
  - The technical team stated how the member's point on mobility is well taken; Policy Brief #3 will have some choice data but it won't be complete, and the cause and effects on why people choose or change schools is still unknown. Current national research attributes a lot of student mobility to problems with housing stability. We may assume that mobility is due to people seeking better choices, but in low-income communities it is possible that the driver of mobility is something completely different.

- A member stated how they may be working from a biased set of values. We need the public's perspective. Committee members do not want to be called out because we have viewpoints that are too narrow or too different from that of the public. Thus, we need to gain more input from community members that we are currently not hearing from in order for the Committee to have a more balanced set of feedback.

- A member asked whether the data will include considerations of income. A few years ago Free-and-Reduced-Price-Meals (FARM) data was based on applications, but now schools are allowed to claim a 100% FARM based on community eligibility rules. Ballou high school has not measured FARM for the past few years. What indicator will help us distinguish income levels?
  - The technical team explained how they are working with OSSE and looking at different measures of assessing income including Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) levels and rates of homelessness since these programs are still application based.
- The technical team also discussed how they will look at proximity since it is complex issue within DC and many students are counted as out-of-boundary when in reality they are only a short block out-of-boundary. There will be some basic administrative boundary clean-up necessary to properly incorporate school closings. The Committee will need to focus and hone in on the goals and approaches they think may work best for the District, which will allow the technical team to run the scenarios based on that. The scenarios will then be reviewed by the community working groups, who will look at them to fully understand what the proposed

changes/scenarios mean for their communities and whether each scenario makes sense for their area of the city.

- A member asked whether the working groups will get maps, data or principles.
    - The technical team discussed how the working groups will get maps, data and principles but it depends on the baseline policy recommendations and scenarios presented: using algorithms on the one end of the spectrum might involve no maps versus an absolute boundary system at the other end of the spectrum, based on maps.

- A member stated that March seems to be too soon for the Committee to provide concrete policy options to community working groups.

- A member asked what would happen if the working groups just say "no"?
    - The technical team explained how the Committee will then have to come back together to re-consider or re-review the original scenarios. Focus group feedback will give the Committee a sense of the over-arching principles, which will help to inform the Advisory Committee and provide a frame from which to develop scenarios they develop. Working groups will then provide feedback on the scenarios being considered. Lastly, the whole proposal from the Advisory Committee will be presented during the city-wide community meetings; in-between each community meeting there will be lots of small group meetings and lastly numerous council hearings are scheduled as well. Thus, we are hopeful that the Committee will not get to that point since they will be receiving input from many different avenues along the way.

- A member stated that if the working groups agree that the Committee's scenarios are reasonable, it is easy for the Committee to proceed; but if not, the Committee needs to be flexible and re-consider.

    - The technical team explained how we need to assume and build in the expectation that the scenarios will come back to the Committee with some reworking to be done. This assumption will help us manage our timeline so we don't get too much off course since we can quickly lose a year by missing deadlines required for fall school-openings.

Attendees
Co-Chairs:
- Abigail Smith, Deputy Mayor for Education

Community Representatives:

- Maryam Ahranjani, American University Washington College of Law; Marshall Brennan Project
- Ed Davies, DC Children & Youth Investment Trust Corp.; Crossroads Academy Public Charter School Board
- Denise Forte, Leadership for Educational Equity; DCPS parent
- Matt Frumin, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner (ANC) 3E; DCPS parent
- Heather Harding, The Education Consortium (EdCORE); George Washington University; PCS parent
- Faith Hubbard, Ward 5 Council on Education; DC Board of Library Trustees
- Rev. Donald Isaac, East of the River Clergy, Police, Community Partnership, Inc.; Interfaith Council
- Ellen McCarthy, Urban Planning Consultant; Urban Planning Program at Georgetown University
- Sharona Robinson, Ward 8 Education Council; Ballou HS Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA); MySchool DC Parent Advisory Council (PAC); Jefferson MS Academy Parent Teacher Association (PTA) and Randle Highlands PTA; DCPS parent
- Cathy Reilly, Senior High Alliance of Parents Principals and Educators (SHAPPE)
- Evelyn Boyd Simmons, ANC 2F Education Committee Co-Chair; DCPS parent
- Eboni-Rose Thompson, Save the Children Organization; Ward 7 Education Council; Local School Advisory Team (LSAT) for Plummer Elementary School
- Marta Urquilla, America Achieves/Results for America; PCS parent
- Martin Welles, Labor and Employment Attorney; Amidon-Bowen Parent Teacher Association (PTA); DCPS parent

District Agency Representatives:
- Josephine Bias-Robinson, DCPS Chief of Family & Public Engagement
- Christopher Delfs, Senior Citywide Planner, DC Office of Planning

Technical Team:
- Jennifer Comey, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education
- Alex Donahue, 21st Century School Fund
- Mary Filardo, 21st Century School Fund
- Judi Greenberg, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education
- Nancy Huvendick, 21st Century School Fund
- Cecilia Kaltz, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education
- Claudia Lujan, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education
- Scheherazade Salimi, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education
- Jennifer Woolard, PhD, Graduate Program in Developmental Science/Center for Social Justice, Georgetown University

Staff:
- Iris Bond-Gill, OSSE
- Clara Hess, DC Public Charter School Board

- Sharon Mar, DCPS

Guests:
- Erika Fountain, graduate student, Georgetown University
- Emily Ezell, graduate student, Georgetown University

<u>Not Attending</u>
Co-Chair:
- John W. Hill Jr., JHill Group; President of the DC Board of Library Trustees

Community Representatives:
- Wilma Bonner, Howard University; Retired DCPS Principal and Assistant Superintendent
- Faith Hubbard, Chair, Ward 5 Council on Education
- Kamili Kiros, Achievement Prep Board of Trustees; PCS parent
- Dianne Piche, Leadership Conference on Civil & Human Rights
- Bobby White, Burrville ES LSAT member; DCPS grandparent; former DCPS parent

District Agency Representatives:
- Emily Bloomfield, Public Charter School Board Member
- Ariana Quinones, Chief of Staff, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Health and Human Services

Technical Team:
- Austin Nichols, Urban Institute