

DRAFT ONLY
Tuesday, March 28, 2017
6:00-8:00pm
Cross-Sector Collaboration Task Force
Meeting #12

Attendees:

- Amanda Alexander | Deputy Chief of Elementary Schools, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Shanita Burney | Deputy Chief, Community Engagement, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- John Davis | Interim Chancellor, 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)
- Kemba Hendrix | Elsie Whitlow Stokes PCS parent; former public and public charter school teacher
- Irene Holtzman | Executive Director, Friends of Choice in Urban Schools (FOCUS)
- Faith Gibson Hubbard | Chief Student Advocate, State Board of Education (SBOE); former member, Student Assignment Committee
- Hanseul Kang | State Superintendent of Education, Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE)
- Melissa Kim | Chief Academic Officer, Secondary Schools, KIPP DC; former principal, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Mary Levy | Independent education analyst, former Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs, Parent of DCPS alumnae
- Claudia Luján | School Turnaround and Performance Division, Office of the Chief of Schools, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Alejandra Vallejo | Bancroft ES parent; Chair, Bancroft ES Local School Advisory Team (LSAT)
- Karen Williams | Ward 7 Representative, State Board of Education (SBOE)
- Antwan Wilson | Chancellor, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- 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

Co-Chairs:

- Jennifer Niles | Deputy Mayor for Education

Facilitator:

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

Members on the Phone:

- Emily Lawson | Founder & CEO, DC Prep PCS
- Carlie Fisherow | Executive Director, Scholar Academies and DC Scholars
- Bethany Little | Murch ES, BASIS PCS parent; Education policy expert

Members not in Attendance:

- Evelyn Boyd Simmons | Francis-Stevens parent; W2 Education Network; former member, Student Assignment Committee; President, Logan Circle Community Association

- 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
- Erika Harrell | DC Prep PCS parent; Member, My School DC Parent Advisory Council; member, DC School Reform Now; member, PCSB Parent & Alumni Leadership Council (PALC)
- Scott Pearson | Executive Director, Public Charter School Board (PCSB)
- Ariana Quiñones | Duke Ellington HS, Cesar Chavez PCS parent, education and human services policy consultant, Otero Strategy Group LLC, former member Student Assignment Committee
- Anthony Williams | CEO & Executive Director, Federal City Council; former Mayor

Staff:

- Jennifer Comey | Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Alex Cross | Special Advisor, Education Facilities Planning, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Hannah Holliday | Leadership for Education Equity Public Policy Fellow, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Ashlynn Profit | Communications Specialist, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Richelle Russell | Data Analyst Fellow, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Aurora Steinle | Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Ramin Taheri | Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)

Meeting Summary:

Ramin Taheri opened the meeting with the goals of this evening's whole Cross-Sector Collaboration Task Force meeting.

- Break into Working Groups:
 - Discuss the working groups' identified issue areas
 - Clarify issue areas in working groups
 - Decide what further information is needed to advance the work of the working groups
- Discuss Vision Statement

Deputy Mayor for Education Jennie Niles presented a new feature of the monthly Task Force meeting: the Cross-Sector Collaboration Spotlight. This part of the meeting will feature the celebration of an achievement or milestone in cross-sector collaboration that has occurred during the month preceding the meeting. This month, Deputy Mayor Niles celebrated Common Accountability (Slide 4).

Facilitator Jim Sandman introduced the agenda of the meeting, noting that there would be a brief discussion of the vision statement at the end of the meeting to provide more time for working group discussion. He also noted that in the Task Force's conversations this evening should see itself as a "board" that provides direction and should task DME staff and others to determine how to operationalize it – those others can act on a more "management" level.

Mr. Sandman also emphasized that the group's purpose is not to change the governance of the sectors and is instead to focus on finding common ground on issues that they work together to solve.

Working Groups Introduction:

Mr. Taheri reintroduced the working groups' goals for the evening and the process that working groups will eventually go through to create recommendations (Slide 10).

The working groups broke out for an hour, with the at-risk group moving to a room next door and the facilities working group remaining in the main meeting room.

(See other documents for individual working group notes)

Whole Group Discussion:

Mr. Taheri introduced the group discussion and asked the groups to share-out main takeaways from their hour-long discussions.

Facilities Working Group Report-Out:

- We articulated the group's goal, which is one of the five main goals of the Task Force: "Develop a framework for coordinating processes on school openings, closings, and facilities planning."
- The group used a worksheet to think of what we wanted to solve. The worksheet identifies DCPS and PCS's issues with and perspectives on facilities. We discussed the need for the worksheet to include the public's issues and perspectives as well.
- We think that the "middle area" of the Venn diagram is where we can find what we want to solve: transparency from each sector on how they decide to open, close or locate schools and community input and involvement in the process.
- We also spent time thinking through data we would like to examine, including examples from Denver and Oakland, and what information we want to start gathering from the community.

At-Risk Working Group Report-Out:

- We had a good discussion about trying to identify the problem we want to solve. Our conversation relied heavily on the resource deck. We identified a couple potential focus areas for our work:
 1. The concentration of at-risk students and the inequitable distribution of at-risk students across schools and sectors;
 2. The allocation of at-risk resources and whether or not it takes into account actual needs;
 3. Issues that could be addressed by best practice sharing, whether formally through resource sharing or informally through communities of practice.
- We also discussed the need to examine data around the following questions:
 - Is there a tipping point in concentration of at risk on academic performance?
 - What is the value of an additional dollar of funding for at-risk students?
 - Are there schools that because of their proximity to one another could come together formally or informally to find economies of scale?

Task Force member comments/questions:

- I am excited and optimistic about the conversation in the facilities working group. We have a heavy task on our group but I'm excited to dive in and discuss what we should be doing for our city.
- I am equally pleased that we are tackling these issues. I have heard anecdotal feedback that because of the skewed distribution of at-risk students (who are concentrated East of the River and in particular schools across the city), there is the perception of an uneven playing field for

students. This may or may not be true, but anything this Task Force can do to show that we are aware of that dynamic and are working to address it is really important.

Mr. Taheri noted that the working groups will meet again prior to the April Task Force meeting. He also noted that Task Force members will receive more frequent information from the DME in advance of the April meeting.

Closing: Vision Statement:

Deputy Mayor Niles began the conversation about the vision statement by proposing that the intention of the vision statement is to answer the questions:

1. What do we want to be true of DC public education in the future?
2. What should our public schools seek to achieve?

She noted that the draft vision statement (Slide 16) is not 100% perfect and that the group could spend an entire meeting discussing it. She asked that the Task Force members spend a few minutes discussing what the vision statement means to them individually.

Task Force members discussed slide 16 in groups of two or three and reported-out from those conversations:

- There is conflict between the notions of “excellence” and “innovation” in the statement. All schools should be both excellent and innovative. Families should feel like they are choosing their school even if the school they choose is their by-right school.
- The last part about innovation implies that if we do have innovative schools, we should take them and scale them so more students can benefit from their successes. Right now, we don’t see that happening.
- Certain words like “high-quality”, “excellent”, “innovative”, and “choice” can have different meanings to different people. We need to make sure we are using specific language so that people are working from of a common vision.
- We have these options and they are open to all but quality education is still not happening for all students. The inherent solutions suggested in this statement are not actually happening for all students”. Accessibility” doesn’t just mean that a school is physically accessible. That idea is missing from this vision statement. We need to always consider students who are not achieving in the vision statement.
- It is powerful that the vision statement starts by rooting itself in the student perspective. This drives the rest of the vision statement. This resonates because as we go through this process of creating recommendations, we need to remind ourselves to focus on what’s best for students, not necessarily what’s best for each sector.
- It is important to consider the use of the word “innovative” because one of the ways this can play out is that the school must have an “angle”. However, regardless of the adjectives we use in the statement, it must be something that can be well-executed and can make clear which processes need to be put in place in the city. Something that includes student success in great schools with some as by-right and some as choice. We again need to consider what happens when some schools are the default schools. This is the tension that must be resolved; we need execute a vision so that having some schools be default schools is no longer the reality.
- The statement acknowledges schools in both categories (by-right and choice) but there must be a clear commitment to having both in the statement. The word “dynamic” should also be

included somewhere in the statement so it is clear we are constantly working to make our public schools better. There can sometimes be “change fatigue” but it is important that we are working refine our schools so they best meet our students’ needs.

- If the statement is going to be used as a commitment to by-right schools and schools of choice, that is a big commitment. It should end with a statement about how these schools will ultimately lead to the success of all students. I believe the public needs to hear a commitment to both by-right schools and schools of choice as part of this vision.
- What are we doing to commit and ensure that the vision of success for all students actually happens? What is the timeline for letting a school try to do that on its own?
- Innovation does not always result in positive outcomes; sometimes in education we are attracted to novelty. This can get in the way of doing things that are evidence-based and research-based.
 - However, being innovative is also about allowing schools the room to try new things without being labeled a “failing school”.

The members each summarized their feelings about the meeting. The majority of members used words that suggested that they were energized and enthusiastic about the progress of the working groups and ready to continue the evening’s discussions during additional working group meetings before the April Task Force meeting.

Deputy Mayor Niles closed the meeting and thanked the Task Force for deep and open conversations.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00pm