

At-Risk Working Group: Meeting 7 (Task Force Meeting 15)

Date: June 27th, 2017

Goals for meeting:

- Finalize template and/or draft recommendations for off-track
- Begin discussion of problems related to distribution of at-risk students
- Determine next steps

Meeting Summary:

Task Force Member Comments/Questions:

- New idea for a possible recommendation: allow for some government services that serve at-risk students in DCPS to be “fast-tracked” (for schools and support organizations)
 - More flexibility for purchasing/procurement
 - Move money from one category to another
 - Might require legislation
 - There could be a recommendation to create flexibility in governing structures around procurement and reprogramming
- Another idea for a possible recommendation: improved teacher retention
 - What are the teacher retention rates?
 - Staffing Data Collaborative helps look at teacher retention data
 - Hire more teachers than necessary, assuming that there will be teacher attrition (can be co-teachers)
 - What can be cross-sector?
 - What is the distribution of new teachers across the schools and are there trends in % at-risk at those schools?
 - What cross-sector incentives can exist?
 - More cross-sector teacher training for the mid-level teachers
 - How do you keep teachers with the high cost of living in the city?
 - Teacher Next Door Program (federal program)

Ramin Taheri went over the slides from the meeting deck, including slides with example report language from Charlotte-Mecklenburg and draft report language for the Task Force’s final report. He also reviewed filled-in working group templates for each of the potential issue areas that the group previously identified around serving off-track secondary students.

Task Force Member Comments/Questions:

- Templates
 - Grain size seems right for Charlotte-Mecklenburg, but Ramin’s example might be too small for the mid-year enrollment example
 - We knew that level of specificity, so that was included, but we don’t need to get that detailed for the at-risk recommendation
 - Don’t want intention to get lost during implementation due to too little detail, but also don’t want to pre-determine
 - Lens: what is the bare minimum that we want to see?
 - Implementation status is beyond the scope of this task force

- Draft recommendations and possible policy solutions may not need to be separate items
- Attendance
 - A structure for this already exists, so the recommendation should be to just support the continuing work of the Truancy Task Force
 - Possibly with an emphasis on PK-5th grades
 - Current efforts of the Truancy Task Force may not be enough; need to do more
 - Not as much school-level collaboration – LEAs were looking for best practices, not citywide data
 - Needs both breadth and depth
 - Do an LEA/School convening in the fall and share best practices and have small group sessions with those schools that have been making a positive impact
- Anchors
 - What are some examples of good anchors in school? What are their characteristics? Can those characteristics be shared with other schools?
 - What supports do at-risk students need? What schools have them? Is there a way to highlight those schools that have those supports?
 - New School Report Card required by ESSA will be released in Fall 2018
 - There will be a design period for both families and schools
 - What additional qualitative factors do families want to see?