

## **Cross-Sector Collaboration Task Force Meeting**

Tuesday, April 26, 2016

6:00 – 8:00pm

The John A. Wilson Building (1350 Pennsylvania Avenue NW)

### **Attendees**

---

#### **Co-Chairs:**

- Jennifer Niles | Deputy Mayor for Education

#### **Facilitator:**

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

#### **Members:**

- Lars Beck | CEO, Scholar Academies and DC Scholars
- Evelyn Boyd Simmons | Francis-Stevens parent; W2 Education Network; former member, Student Assignment Committee; President, Logan Circle Community Association
- Charlene Drew-Jarvis | Graduate, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS); Senior Advisor, KIPP DC PCS; former Ward 4 City Councilwoman
- Caryn Ernst | Watkins ES, Stuart-Hobson MS parent; former PTA president, Capitol Hill Cluster School; member, Capitol Hill Public School Parent Organization (CHPSPO)
- Kaya Henderson | Chancellor, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- 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)
- Hanseul Kang | State Superintendent of Education
- Melissa Kim | Chief Academic Officer, Secondary Schools, KIPP DC; former principal, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Anjali Kulkarni | Deputy Chief, Strategic School Planning, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Bethany Little | Murch ES, BASIS PCS parent; Education policy expert
- Karen Williams | Ward 7 Representative, State Board of Education (SBOE)
- Darren Woodruff | EL Haynes PCS, Benjamin Banneker HS parent ; Chair, Public Charter School Board (PCSB)
- Shanita Burney | Deputy Chief, Community Engagement, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Angela Copeland | Stuart-Hobson MS parent; public affairs specialist
- Shantelle Wright | Founder & CEO, Achievement Prep PCS; Chair, DC Association of Public Charter Schools

#### **Not in Attendance:**

- Amanda Alexander | Deputy Chief of Elementary Schools, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Rod Boggs | Executive Director, Washington Lawyer's Committee
- Faith Hubbard | Chief Student Advocate, State Board of Education (SBOE); former member, Student Assignment Committee

- 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
- Alejandra Vallejo | Bancroft ES parent; Chair, Bancroft ES Local School Advisory Team (LSAT)
- Anthony Williams | CEO & Executive Director, Federal City Council; former Mayor

**Staff:**

- Jennifer Comey | Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Erin Garratt | Public Policy Fellow, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Rebecca Lee | Policy Advisor, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Amy Lerman | Senior Policy Advisor, MySchoolDC (MSDC) team, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Claudia Luján | Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Aaron Parrott | Data Manager, MySchoolDC (MSDC) team, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Richelle Russell | Education Pioneers Fellow, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Naomi Watson | Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Margie Yeager | Chief of Staff, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)

**Support Team:**

- Amber Saddler | EducationCounsel, LLC
- Terri Taylor | EducationCounsel, LLC

**Meeting Summary**

---

**Goals; Group Norms & Expectations**

While they were not explicitly discussed, the Task Force goals, group norms and expectations were again shown to the members as a reminder of the purpose and importance of the work of the committee.

**Guiding Principles Discussion**

In preparation for this meeting, each of the Task Force members received written copy of the summary notes generated in the guiding principle discussion activity performed in the March meeting. Also included in these preparatory materials was a survey that asked members to assess their level of agreement with the relevance and necessity of each guiding principle to the overall mission of the group.

Twenty one members completed the survey; based on the responses received, it was determined that there is a high level of agreement among Task Force members regarding the draft set of guiding principles. There was most consensus around principle #2 (“Authentic public input and participation in policy development”) and #4 (“Equitable access to high quality schools”). Based on this, the break-out group discussions focused on the remaining four principles.

### **Guiding Principles – Breakout Group Discussions**

Task Force members were then divided into smaller groups to refine the language of each of the remaining guiding principles. The groups were asked to:

- Review and discuss the list of definitions they were sent prior to the meeting and
- Review the guiding principle their breakout group was assigned

See Breakout Group Discussion Summaries for the summary of each discussion.

### **Guiding Principles – Full Group Report Out**

Following the breakout discussions the members of the Task Force reconvened to share the comments, changes, and concerns generated by their small group conversations.

- Group 1: Equitable outcomes for all students with a focus on our lowest performing students.
  - This group proposed amending the principle to read “Raising the achievement of all students while narrowing the gaps between the highest- and lowest-performing students.”
  - *Group Discussion* -
    - Others raised the concern that narrowing the gap can also be achieved by lowering the highest performing. In response, members of Group 1 state that starting with “raising all achievement,” connotes that this is the primary goal.
    - Also proposed was the phrase “accelerating the achievement of the lowest-performing students.”
- Group 2: Public education policies and planning that reflect the best interest of students and families.
  - This group discussed the tension points of a single “best interest” vs. the priorities of a diverse city of families. They proposed changing “reflect” to “yield” and “best interest of” to “positive outcomes for.”
- Group 3: Effective investment of resources.
  - Group 3 discussed what “effective” means and whether or not the Task Force can determine what is effective without equal school quality measures; they proposed putting a pin in this principle.
  - *Group Discussion* -
    - Others still see the need for a principle that will guide the group toward getting common quality measures, suggesting the principle be “effective investment of resources to reach equitable outcomes.”
    - Another comment noted that this principle seems self-evident and that the problem lie in the fact that most people already assume this is being done.
    - Likening the Task Force to a strategic planning process, one Task Force member noted that if the processes were the same, there would be metrics.
    - Others felt that perhaps the word “efficient” is missing from the phrase, so long as this efficiency doesn’t trump effectiveness.

- A member proposed adding this principle to #2 so that #2 reads “Public education policies and resource planning that yield positive outcomes for students and families.”
- Group 4: A core system of public schools of right in every neighborhood complemented by a public school system of choice.
  - Group 4 discussed the advantages and disadvantages of schools of right and how there exist a lot of tensions.
  - They proposed changing the statement to “A core system of high quality public schools of right in every neighborhood complemented by high quality public schools of choice.”
- Additional Full Group Discussion:
  - These need to stand alone and not require additional interpretation or information to be understood.
  - There is an inherent tension in principle #4, regarding schools of right. When that tension happens, it is important to have these other principles so they can be leaned on.
  - A brief overview was provided of the different “choices” available in DCPS.
  - DME staff noted that the next meeting will focus on enrollment stability and that would be a good opportunity to provide an overview of the options available across sectors. This could include pre-reading.

### **Office of Planning (OP) Presentation – Population Trends**

Office of Planning Director Eric Shaw and State Data Center Associate Director Dr. Joy Phillips delivered a presentation on trends and projections for the future population of the District.

### **OP Presentation – Q & A, Reflections**

- What factors are used to forecast the population?
  - (OP) Three types of data inputs:
    - “What’s in the housing development pipeline,” including building permits, underdeveloped capacity, and proposed development projects;
    - Birth and death trends (i.e., natural increase in population);
    - Domestic and international migration data (using the cohort method).
  - (OP) In addition, OP also takes into account national economic trends and local policies that can affect growth.
  - OP provides inputs to the Census, helping to inform the decennial Census Population Estimates
- What are the theories for why the 0 – 10 year old cohort increased while the 11 – 17 cohort remained static?
  - (OP) Millennial residents are reaching prime childbearing years and beginning to have children.
- Why are the areas in the city with “growing households” (slide 21) not the same as the areas with significant youth population growth (slide 22)?

- (OP) The largest share of OP’s household growth forecast is in areas of the city seeing large amounts of multi-family development that tend to have relatively few households with children. OP’s forecast of children takes the children born in multi-family developments of Central Washington and migrates a large share to areas of the city with single-family homes, based on market activity. This migration assumption has been supported by analysis of the most recent Census data.
- Based on projections and with regards to the Guiding Principles, should we have a principle based on delivering more schools/facilities, not just better?
  - (DM Niles) We will run out of facility space if we continue to grow in population at this pace; we just don’t know when.
- Is it possible to get the number of school-aged children by neighborhood vs. the number of school seats in that neighborhood?
  - (DM Niles) We can do it by ward within a week.
  - One CSCTF member noted that data by ward isn’t very useful for planning purposes.
  - DME Staff noted that the most recent population data by neighborhood that we have is the data used in the boundary process. OP will be updating these population projections at the neighborhood cluster level shortly, but that won’t be available for another few months.
- We need more consistency in how “capacity” is measured between DCPS and charter schools. One CSCTF member is concerned that charter schools “self-report” their capacities, and it isn’t always reflective of reality. Also, the same CSCTF member is concerned that the published DCPS capacities do not reflect the reality that school communities experience (e.g., the published capacity is higher than what the school can realistically hold, resulting in overcrowded conditions).
  - (DM Niles) DCPS also “self-reports” their capacities as it is also an LEA and reporting is done on an LEA level.
  - (DM Niles) DME is working on addressing capacity issues.
- Did you do any projections around employment?
  - (OP) While the State Data Center keeps sector-level employment information (e.g., industrial, retail, commercial employment), occupational-level employment data is maintained by the Department of Employment Services.

### **Next Steps**

Claudia Luján shared that Task Force members were provided with information on assessment data around ward/poverty, in response to a data ask from the first meeting. She encouraged members to review this information.

Co-Chairs and Sandman will be reaching out in the next few weeks to schedule 1-on-1 check-ins with members to get their feedback on the process so far, etc.

The meeting adjourned at 8:05pm.