

# DC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT ASSIGNMENT

---

June 24, 2014

Meeting #12

# Goals for Today's Meeting

- Review summary of feedback on the draft proposal
- Identify key areas of focus for revisions
  - Policies
  - Boundaries and Feeders
- Clarify process for technical team and Committee to make revisions

# Agenda

- Chancellor's video message
- Review summary of feedback
- Review and discuss areas for revision
  - Areas of confusion/need for more clarity
  - Areas of policy concern
  - Concerns about phasing in implementation
  - Specific feeder pattern and boundary issues
- Timeline for additional public input
  - Worksheets and other feedback accepted until July 21
  - Council hearing on June 26
  - Additional community meetings
- Identify process for revision
  - What happens between now and August committee meeting?

# SUMMARY OF INPUT

---

# Overview of Who Attended June 16-19 Community Meetings

	Parent	Community Member	N/A	Total
Savoy	29	31	1	56
Dunbar	44	46	4	85
Takoma	113	36	10	146
Total	186	113	15	<b>287</b>

# Feedback submitted through multiple avenues

- 74 surveys submitted at community meetings
- 125 worksheets submitted at community meetings and since
- Notes from the discussions in each breakout group
- Several formal letters from community and parent groups
- Dozens of individual emails from community members

*Survey is currently on EngageDC and the worksheet is available on the DME website.*

# Summary of Survey Results

## Submitted surveys:

- 6 from Savoy
- 32 from Dunbar
- 33 from Takoma

## Key Takeaways:

- Overall support for stacking boundaries and PK rights
- Strong support for OOB set-asides at ES/MS/HS at the Dunbar meeting
  - Inconclusive data from Savoy
- Strong support for ES set-aside at the Takoma meeting
  - Mixed results for MS and HS set-asides
- Support for at-risk preference at Savoy meeting
- Mixed support for at-risk preference at Takoma and Dunbar meeting

# POTENTIAL AREAS FOR REVISION

---

Areas needing clarification

Areas of policy concern

Concerns about phasing in

Specific feeder pattern or boundary issues



# Framing our discussion

For each concern/issue area, we want to know:

- Is this a concern we need to solve for through a change in policy recommendation?
- What are the potential solutions to address the concern/issue raised?
- Are there concerns we need to address that we have not listed?

# What needs clarification?

- Do lottery preferences apply to citywide lottery schools?
- More clearly define capacity triggers for when to open new schools or add capacity to existing schools, including who makes the determination
- Are set-asides based on enrollment or capacity?
- How will we re-examine 6<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grade set-asides in SY18-19?
- In a number of cases people pointed out specific wording that was confusing or terms that need clearer definition
- How is the at-risk preference activated and deactivated?

# Areas of Policy Concern

- Transportation
  - Support for accessing zoned schools
    - Is 1 mile too high a threshold?
  - Support for at-risk families accessing OOB
- Set-asides
  - What is the appropriate level? Feedback both that they are too high and too low
  - How will we determine feasibility for providing set-aside at 6<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grades.

# Areas of Policy Concern, cont'd

- At-risk preference in OOB lottery
  - Concerns with impact on middle class families
  - Concerns with how this will impact schools with high OOB populations (Hearst, Stuart-Hobson)
  - Concerns with how this impacts DCPS citywide lottery schools
  - How does this impact selective schools?
  - Concerns with adding at-risk students at dual language programs and providing the support they need
  - Concerns that at risk preference will not benefit at risk students due to transportation challenges
- Concern that feeder pathways need more than one specialized program

# Concerns and Suggestions about Phasing In

- Consider including charter and OOB students, so that they maintain current geographic rights through certain period of time
- Consider extending phasing beyond current proposal to ensure new middle schools are opened within the phasing in period - in an effort to promote parent investment in new middle schools
- Consider providing a preference in OOB lottery for families whose geographic rights are changing, in an effort to further support transition
- Consider delaying beginning of implementation across the board

# Specific Feeder and Boundary Issues

## **Cardozo:**

- Concerns with non-DL schools feeding into CHEC
- Should Cleveland feed McKinley MS?

## **Coolidge:**

- Concerns about lack of plans for New North MS
- Concerns about lack of feeders into Coolidge
- Should Shepherd feed New North/Coolidge rather than Deal/Wilson?

## **Dunbar:**

- Should Wheatley remain an EC? If ES, is McKinley too far?
- Concern with McKinley feeding programmatically to Woodson

## **Eastern:**

- Concerns with Tyler feeding Jefferson instead of Eliot-Hine
- Consider SWS feeding to Stuart-Hobson instead of Eliot-Hine
- Consider neighborhood preference at SWS
- Should we expand the Van Ness boundary – west of S. Capitol?

# Specific Feeder and Boundary Issues

## **Roosevelt:**

- Concerns with redistributing of old Clark boundary and families losing rights to Powell for Barnard

## **Wilson:**

- What is the rationale for Bancroft feeding Wilson
- Concerns with Crestwood losing rights to Deal and Wilson
- Concerns that proposed changes at Stoddert and Key don't resolve overcrowding issues
- Concerns with expanding Oyster boundary to incorporate Adams neighbors
- Concerns with Eaton feeding Hardy and not Deal

## **Woodson:**

- Concerns boundary is still too small
- Concerns with JC Nalle and CW Harris feeding Sousa instead of Kelly Miller – easier access to Kelly Miller
- Concerns with eliminating the cross-river rights to Eastern

# Planning Proposal Concerns

- Triggers are for studies, but can't substitute for ongoing effective educational facility planning
- No clarity in the definition of parity and how DCPS would ensure greater access to specialized and selective programs



# Cross-Sector Planning

- Support for grade configuration alignment across sectors
- Support for alignment of discipline policies across sectors
- Concern over lack of transparency by charter schools on reporting cohort data over years
- Concerns with schools pushing students out after Oct. 5<sup>th</sup> or mid-year
- Consider having funding follow the student to new school for mid-year transfers

# NEXT STEPS

---

Timeline for Additional Feedback

Process for Revising Recommendations

# Timeline for Additional Feedback

## By July 21<sup>st</sup>

- Collect additional worksheets
- Collect ideas and concerns shared via emails and letters
- Survey available on EngageDC.org
- Attend community meetings and gather additional perspectives
- Targeted outreach to specific communities as follow-up to concerns shared and revisions being considered

## Council Roundtable on June 26

- Encouraging people to testify
- Include testimonies in public feedback

# Review Process for Revisions

## Scope of Revisions:

- Revise to address policy concerns raised in community meetings
- Revise feeder patterns based on concerns and additional data analysis
- Revise elementary boundaries based on public input and continued data analysis

## Timeline for Review:

- Technical team sends Committee proposed revisions by **August 1**
- Committee sends technical team feedback on proposed revisions by **August 15<sup>th</sup>**
- Technical team sends updated report to Committee by **August 22<sup>nd</sup>**
- Committee meeting scheduled for **August 26<sup>th</sup>**