

At-Risk Working Group: Meeting 12
(TASK FORCE Meeting 18)
October 24, 2017

Attendees:

- Faith Gibson Hubbard
- Alejandra Vallejo
- Darren Woodruff
- Hanseul Kang
- Kemba Hendrix
- Amanda Alexander
- Erika Harrell

Ramin Taheri began the conversation recapping the off-cycle call.

FACILITATOR: Who has looked at recommendations? Our goals are to continue the conversation, strike and refine the recommendations.

- Think about organizing the 26 recommendations in a different way.
- Reviewed the example from Charlotte M: what a report might look like.
- How we would style these recommendations?
- Broke them up into 5 objectives, we can talk about these and take to larger group.

TASK FORCE: Is the idea that it's in order of preference?

FACILITATOR: No, but we could.

TASK FORCE: Are there any that are redundant?

FACILITATOR: 4.1 Every Day Counts; we might be able to add momentum to the existing campaign.

TASK FORCE: Do we have a sense what are most viable/likely to happen? We want policymakers to be on board.

FACILITATOR: We can probably figure out what is politically viable. But we're of the mindset that we should come up with recommendations, politics aside. Just because it's not immediately conducive doesn't mean we should give up.

TASK FORCE: Would hate to see that 6-9 months later, nothing has happened.

TASK FORCE: We could rewrite some to improve the likelihood of implementation (leave some details out of the language).

FACILITATOR: We'll have one more column that is implementation considerations, one more with key stakeholders. At this stage, some of the recommendations are too granular

FACILITATOR: We could split up into pairs to discuss initial reactions.

TASK FORCE: Let's do it as group and move fast.

FACILITATOR: One more piece of context: on our mid-year mobility recommendation, there's a lesson learned. On Friday, a group of leaders will meet on the pilot implementation and these transfers will be limited to safety considerations; some things may not be ready to move at full scale/level. Keep that in mind as we think about these. With that in mind, dive in. Look at it at a high level for people who are going to gloss over.

TASK FORCE: Does term concentrated poverty bump up against at risk language?

FACILITATOR: This is a struggle because at-risk is for funding formula (UPSFF); the factors are CFSA, homelessness, SNAP, TANF. We want it to be broader for readers unfamiliar with those terms. Although we focus on at-risk, I don't think that captures the depth of the issues we're facing. Not wedded to it.

TASK FORCE: From a technical perspective, there is near complete overlap between at-risk and economic disadvantage. High level recommendation language doesn't get at student-centered nature of recommendations.

TASK FORCE: What is the result we seek?

TASK FORCE: If concentrated poverty is the problem, we want to use that... more understandable term. Lack of equitable access. Hope that we are very specific so we show a real commitment. Keep that or further brand "at risk." No definition of equity that we all subscribe to. Maybe this recommendation can do that; clarify what we want to do.

FACILITATOR: When I think of equity, I think of fairness. Is it fair for us as policy makers to have an education landscape of high concentrations; some are being served well, and some are not. Wording suggestions makes sense.

TASK FORCE: We can't send everyone somewhere else. People think of high-quality as somewhere else. Fairness isn't necessarily what I think of; we are making sure all students have access to resources they need.

FACILITATOR: There are 5 types of recommendations. Resources are part of it.

TASK FORCE: Is it distribution of students or of programs?

FACILITATOR: Both. Let's look at #1.

- #1: Some of this will be available through Strategic Analysis

- #2: too specific for this column but go forth and explore this. Change to "Explore"

TASK FORCE: So #2 Explore and add period after schools?

TASK FORCE: I think 1.4 and 1.6 are closely related. Combine? 1.7, 1.8, 1.9 can be condensed into one. Can we shorten recommendations?

FACILITATOR: 1.4/1.6: 1.6 in two different contexts. I've been thinking about how school choice benefits people with more information.

TASK FORCE: Through My School DC (MSDC)? In a perfect world, when you start you could get suggested schools list.

TASK FORCE: I don't think they would do that. They could refer to other places. MSDC is neutral.

TASK FORCE: In my mind it was like an automated shopping list.

TASK FORCE: MSDC is not accessible to everyone.

TASK FORCE: Families want/need more granular info than "language schools."

TASK FORCE: Some would want/need a more human component.

TASK FORCE: Right now when they call, they have some idea what they want.

TASK FORCE: 1:1s only 30 minutes. Just not enough time. Some way to make it available to everyone.

TASK FORCE: Combine 1.4/1.5 to make information more accessible; explore education navigator. For example, a mobile search function for school report cards.

FACILITATOR: 1.4/1.5 combination; 1.3 not necessary - consideration of implementing 1.2.

TASK FORCE: Data as its own recommendation? Move 1.1 into data bucket.

FACILITATOR: It could even go into 3

TASK FORCE: I like that better (3 vs 5)

TASK FORCE: Don't know that 1.1 gets us anywhere. They travel for opportunity. So what more can we do with that information?

TASK FORCE: Disagree – we need more info on specifics; identify patterns.

TASK FORCE: Programming.

FACILITATOR: Overlap with OCS; would replication work?

TASK FORCE: Replication and diversity are in conflict with each other, and we need to reconcile them; are white kids going to come to SE?

TASK FORCE: They might.

TASK FORCE: I just think there is a tension.

TASK FORCE: Good point. If focused on diversity, we are going to Ward 5.

TASK FORCE: I dislike "equitably distribute" - it could mean in opposite direction as city continues to change.

TASK FORCE: 1.6 should broaden beyond mental health supports

TASK FORCE: Kids left school expressing needs for in-school supports.

TASK FORCE: Parents too

TASK FORCE: The city is working towards that; recommend even though already going on.

TASK FORCE: On one hand, we are wanting to meet families where are, on other hand school may not be the best place to provide those services.

TASK FORCE: When we bring more programs into the school there is more burden on the school to appropriately manage. Example: manager of logistics (switchboard).

TASK FORCE: Some families will go if someone at school directs them. Sometimes it is a space consideration. A lot of schools don't even have the information. At a minimum we could show commitment.

TASK FORCE: What about an At risk liaison?

TASK FORCE: A lot of parents see the school as an impediment.

FACILITATOR: I want to remind us about where these go. We need to go to larger group and tell what we think, then get feedback, then go to community. We're envisioning TASK FORCE members as partners. We don't need to get this down to tee.

TASK FORCE: Go through the rest at the next call.

FACILITATOR: Calls are extra credit; don't want those who miss to feel they missed their shot. Maybe we do a paper exercise.

TASK FORCE: I like that. Are there some things that are missing?

FACILITATOR: Yes we want that.

TASK FORCE: Offers to help wordsmith, etc.

FACILITATOR: Moving to #2.

TASK FORCE: What about the anchor thing?

FACILITATOR: We can put that somewhere else.

TASK FORCE: I have a question about population. What about older kids?

FACILITATOR: We have good base of research, to the extent TASK FORCE can be useful; especially a cross-sector approach; great opportunity.

TASK FORCE: This is fairly specific - later in order? Should 3/4 be 2/3?

TASK FORCE: Can we add components (older, younger before disengagement), existing groups not yet able to scale; need more here.

TASK FORCE: Totally agree. Not appropriately leveraging neighborhood collaborative folks. Leverage/convene those folks; standard set of non-negotiable practices. Some are supportive more than others in terms of schools/principles/etc. Esp. attendance piece.

TASK FORCE: What about justice grants for programs like Show Up Stand Out (SUSO)? We've never funded them through the education pots.

FACILITATOR: We can explore coordinating authority.

TASK FORCE: Yes, Department of Behavioral Health clinicians too.

TASK FORCE: The before disengaging group feels like #3.

FACILITATOR: Let's summarize the changes.

TASK FORCE: We have manpower, it just needs to be coordinated/focused.

FACILITATOR: Let's move it to #3 (which will be #2); this is not in order of priority. It's just a list.

TASK FORCE: Can we add non-school partners/programs?

TASK FORCE: Should we be looking to incentivize or rewarding schools doing this work

FACILITATOR: Yes.

TASK FORCE: There's agreement to add that word ("incentive").

TASK FORCE: Should we combine 3.2/3.3?

FACILITATOR: 3.2 is already sort of underway, we can check with MSDC on progress. 3.3 is too granular.

TASK FORCE: We should go back/forth about which can be combined.

FACILITATOR: 3.5 is the anchor idea.

TASK FORCE: 3.5 is about attendance?

FACILITATOR: Are there other outcomes for the anchors? We should take these loose ends and think about how it works. For example, custodians could be anchors, but that is very specific, so we could fold it under another.

TASK FORCE: We could put it under the new #2 section and drop from attendance.

FACILITATOR: We should take 3.2 off until we have more information; 3.1/3.3 can be combined in some way. 3.4 is an implementation consideration so we can move to 4.

TASK FORCE: Should we strike #1?

TASK FORCE: We might have had a kick-off, but lots of people are not aware. This needs commitment beyond the kick-off. Let's leave it in.

FACILITATOR: Under 4.2: what is Every Day Counts! not doing?

TASK FORCE: It needs to be the right level and people.

TASK FORCE: There's nothing about drawing community and parents in.

TASK FORCE: It goes back to a robust commitment, awareness and connection.

TASK FORCE: Everyone gets a water bill. We should partner with other agencies to improve communication with the community.

TASK FORCE: There are lots of resources (OSSE, schools, attendane.dc.gov) that connect families to resources; we need to support students and their families.

TASK FORCE: We need acknowledgement of great attendance habits from higher level leaders. We should celebrate attendance.

TASK FORCE: And reward parents.

FACILITATOR: Every Day Counts! is thinking about tiered incentives. Part of what is highlighted is that people in this room don't even know what is happening, and we all signed pledges. We need more of a focus on community level and connection to resources.

FACILITATOR: Briefly, let's go through #5.

FACILITATOR: 5.1 already happening but we need to explore rather than, say, expand.

TASK FORCE: We need to make full use of it. What do we do with the data?

FACILITATOR: See 5.2 – maybe it's too specific.

TASK FORCE: If it's not specific enough, what are we saying?

FACILITATOR: We need to do wordsmithing - think about deal-breakers. We shouldn't make it so broad that it doesn't mean anything.

TASK FORCE: Back to attendance: is there anything there around data?

TASK FORCE: Is the Every Day Counts! Task Force already doing data?

FACILITATOR: The Task Force has been around awhile, and they have reams of data.

TASK FORCE: The accountability framework includes In-Seat Attendance and chronic absenteeism.

TASK FORCE: We should continue to look at data. We do look at data but need to see trends over time - need to share with parents.