Attendees:
- Faith Gibson Hubbard
- Alejandra Vallejo
- Darren Woodruff
- Hanseul Kang
- Kemba Hendrix
- Amanda Alexander
- Emily Lawson

Ramin Taheri began the conversation recapping last month's meeting about at-risk preferences and weights.

Cat Peretti, Executive Director of My School DC, explained the process for priority preferences and weighting. Key points and questions from the Task Force:
- The proposal wouldn't create a new priority preference; it would give students a better random lottery number if they were an at-risk student.
- There would still be a sibling or non-sibling preference, but the weighting would give them a better position.
- At-risk student would move to a better position but stay in preference group.
- Out-of-boundary students can never move into the in-boundary group.
- Therefore, the impact is limited by the number of seats at each school with seats for out-of-boundary students.
- Right now, do schools rank the preferences they currently have?
  - No standardized order, each LEA can rank.
- Are there schools that have no out-of-boundary?
  - A: Yes, some have students with siblings on waitlist. If K-12, it's their by-right school.
- Would be convinced the weighting would have an impact if it was a priority preference on top of everyone's list. If at-risk was the top of the list, would be significant. Other turned-down preferences, lower priority, doesn't really make an impact on demographics.
- 20,000 students are placed by lottery and 10,000 are placed post-lottery
- MSDC used a list of 40 schools serving fewer than 25% at-risk students, none of which are in 7 or 8.
- Despite small impact, there are still reasons to do it, and it could get better over time.
  - First at-risk kids get in and then their siblings get in. When parents learn seats are available, maybe more likely to apply.
  - Then, allow any school to offer the preference. Good data around schools 50/50% and serve a representative group. This is one of the key things we could do that's politically viable. Could have a meaningful impact over time.

- Schools aren't closed to the students we want to provide the option to. Sibling is one thing, but in-boundary – still have a large portion of people who may want to go to in-boundary school. Above in-boundary would be really hard. In looking at the schools, if we're putting more burden on students of risk to get to those schools, will they be ready to support the needs the student has in a meaningful way?
  - Can we tackle those issues if we don't change the distribution?
- OSSE tracked student migration across the city. Is there any data point – students who had success did travel across the city? Affected closing projections. Could we track kids who are traveling to NW and what happened to those students? What were the patterns? Were those students actually at-risk?
- People rank schools closer to their homes more highly. There are students who are at-risk around the city, like Ward 5.
- Other strategies, like opening magnet schools in Wards 7 and 8, could make a big difference without doing political upheaval.
- Group agreed to broadly use the lottery as a tool to redistribute students who are at-risk.
- The lottery cannot become a tool to limit at-risk student population. Currently, schools do not know which applicants are at-risk.
- Every school would agree to their preferences before they run the lottery. No at-risk preference allowed for charters, but DCPS preferences is pretty standardized. Dual language has a programmatic one. More palatable for DCPS to allow a school or neighborhood level.
- We can't control how many at-risk students apply for a specific school.
- Mid-year mobility recs spawned two working groups, considered implementation details not in front of the task force. Same thing could happen with a recommendation like this – top level rec to do no harm.
- Other practices and policies that can improve outcomes in the schools they're already in.
- Currently no way to ID pre-K at-risk applicants. They are the biggest applicant pool. How to address and ID kids earlier? Self-identification is not ideal.
  - Could we set up a filter to figure out if pre-K applicant is at risk if their relatives are in schools already? Vast difference in definition of siblings across the district.
  - Family account but application for each student.
  - How many of the students in the at-risk group aren't receiving support like child care voucher?
  - USI (student ID number) isn't assigned until they get to school, matching with data about TANF and SNAP.
- TF members are interested in opening the preference to all schools; the schools that serve the lowest amount of at-risk have the highest impact.
- How did we select 25% as a threshold?
  - From the boundary and feeder pattern taskforce. Tipping point. The working group felt that subset of schools wasn't pulling their weight in serving the population of the city. Those schools will not change if the preference is below in-boundary. For those DCPS schools, only relevant for Pre-K4. K you only get in if you're in-boundary.
- What can we do more aggressively in the schools they're located? Bringing programming to communities that doesn't put the burden on students of color to bring diversity somewhere else.

- Package a lottery recommendation with something else. Even if it's small, it's all the more reason to do it because there's political pushback no matter what. If we don't do it now, we won't ever.
  - Statement of what our priorities are. This is an important statement.
- Commute is hard, even though we've gotten students around, what about tardiness?
  - We could think about transportation. Lottery recommendation is one piece, but there can also be an information gap. How schools reach out to families. NYC Diversity Plan.
- Granting space to schools that are willing to replicate in areas with need.
  - Families having an experience of the school to understand how it is – word of mouth is usually the way families learn about schools.
  - OSSE soon launching family engagement process to develop school report cards, make it relatable and accessible. Discussed the differences in how families can assess schools. Simplicity and accessibility of information.
  - Need multiple ways parents can find out information, but need to streamline and be consistent.
  - People making decisions based on people in their circles. Ex. Federal housing navigators – think outside circle and move to opportunity, tailored counseling about the best choices
  - DC School Reform Now, parent advocates, virtual school tours
- Missing a level of expertise in schools with highest need, like rock star teacher who can move kids up in literacy really fast; experts in highest-performing schools
  - Charter school teacher could send to DCPS teacher and train them, vice-versa, share personnel and resources
  - Good experience in both sectors, want to beat the odds for DC as a whole
  - Collaboration within the community, support students where they are