

Cross-Sector Collaboration Task Force Meeting

Tuesday, May 24, 2016

6:00 – 8:00pm

DC Taxicab Commission Hearing Room

2235 Shannon Place SE, Suite 2032

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
- Shanita Burney | Deputy Chief, Community Engagement, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Angela Copeland | Stuart-Hobson MS parent; public affairs specialist
- Caryn Ernst | Watkins ES, Stuart-Hobson MS parent; former PTA president, Capitol Hill Cluster School; member, Capitol Hill Public School Parent Organization (CHPSPO)
- Faith Gibson Hubbard | Chief Student Advocate, State Board of Education (SBOE); former member, Student Assignment Committee
- Erika Harrell | DC Prep PCS parent; Member, MySchoolDC Parent Advisory Council; member, DC School Reform Now; member, PCSB Parent & Alumni Leadership Council (PALC)
- 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
- Anjali Kulkarni | Deputy Chief, Strategic School Planning, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Emily Lawson | Founder & CEO, DC Prep PCS
- Bethany Little | Murch ES, BASIS PCS parent; Education policy expert
- Scott Pearson | Executive Director, Public Charter School Board (PCSB)
- Alejandra Vallejo | Bancroft ES parent; Chair, Bancroft ES Local School Advisory Team (LSAT)
- 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

Not in Attendance:

- Amanda Alexander | Deputy Chief of Elementary Schools, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Rod Boggs | Executive Director, Washington Lawyer's Committee

- 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
- Kaya Henderson | Chancellor, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Melissa Kim | Chief Academic Officer, Secondary Schools, KIPP DC; former principal, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- 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:

- Erin Garratt | Public Policy Fellow, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Althea Holford | Senior Policy Advisor, 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)
- Aurora Steinle | Policy Advisor, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)
- Margie Yeager | Chief of Staff, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education (DME)

Support Staff:

- Steve Cartwright | Vice President, Analytics & Data Strategy, Tembo
- Nick Spiva | EducationCounsel, LLC
- Katie Williams | Data Analysis Manager, Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE)

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 Update

After the guiding principles were discussed in the April meeting, DME staff revised them to more accurately reflect the comments provided in preparation for this meeting.

Using these revisions, Claudia Luján reviewed the current working draft of the guiding principles. In addition, while Ms. Luján noted that there was a great deal of agreement on the latest version, any

respondents whose answers reflected significant reservations would be reached out to directly for further information, and that online engagement and a community toolkit are forthcoming.

Enrollment Stability, Student Mobility

Claudia Luján introduced several useful concepts and working definitions for student mobility, including framing the challenge that the data indicates. Following this introduction, OSSE Data Analysis Manager Katie Williams and Tembo Vice President for Analytics and Data Strategy Steve Cartwright delivered a presentation on within year mobility for public school students in the District.

Member Comments and Questions

- Is there a way to separate students who “exit the sector” from those who make physical moves or commit residence fraud?
 - No. There is also no way of separating out exits due to parents elect to send their children to private schools.
- The information in the presentation compares data from October 1 to that from the end of the year. Other school districts examine mobility throughout the year. What about mobility that occurs in the first six weeks of the school year?
 - The movement that occurs in the first six weeks of the school year is more related to shuffling than mobility or net loss/gain. However, Massachusetts makes comparisons of “snapshots” of data at four different points in the year—OSSE can look into whether or not this type of measurement would be useful.
 - In addition, October 1 represents the first time that the data is “clean.”
 - My School DC (MSDC) has done a lot to reduce movement in the beginning of the school year by streamlining and centralizing the lottery process.
- Is withdrawal voluntary (elective movement) or involuntary (suspensions, etc.)?
 - This data is inclusive of all withdrawal from October 1 through the end of the school year.
 - This information can also include withdrawal wherein a student switches schools but remains in the same sector.
 - We do not yet have “clean” exit code information that helps to understand why students are moving. This year (SY2015 – 16) will be the first where clean exit codes are available and, as such, will allow analysis to be done at that level.
- With regard to suspension rates, why was median (rather than mean) used?
 - The use of the median figure reflects the “typical” school more accurately.
 - It is, however, worth noting that the city Equity Reports use mean rather than median.
- How come the free/reduced price lunch (FRPL) rates seem to differ from reality? Is this because of community eligibility?
 - Yes; this was also part of the reason to include at-risk percentages in the analysis.
 - The community eligibility provision allows for the use of a certain threshold (40%) of “identified” students in providing free and reduced price school meals (i.e., breakfast and lunch) to all

students within the same school. “Identified” students are those who have been deemed low-income due to their inclusion in other programs, such as SNAP, foster care, and others.

- As a result of the community eligibility provision, it is, at times, difficult to determine an exact number of low-income or at-risk students in a school building using FRPL rates; when all students are FRPL recipients, it is unclear as to which students participate in the program by via the disadvantaged status of their peers.
- Are so-called high withdrawal/low entry (Category 2) schools mostly low income? How does this relate to the admissions process?
 - This accounts for ~14,000 students, mostly from public charter schools.
 - One explanation for this is the variability among charter LEAs as to whether or not they accept students throughout the year; as of right now, some do and some do not. Unfortunately, this analysis does not capture the admissions process, so it is hard to distinguish schools whose low entry is due to a lack of mid-year admission.
- Does this data support or not support preconceptions of mobility?
 - The information presented makes it clear that cross-sector mobility (or students moving from traditional public schools to public charter schools and vice versa) is not the cause of shifting students. In addition, the scope (~8% of total public school student population) is smaller than what was initially predicted.
 - Despite those differences, it is clear that DCPS is accepting students who move throughout the year.
- How does the 92% stability rate compare to other districts?
 - To use Camden (NJ) as an example, there is a similar average withdrawal rate across schools.

Group Reflections

- One Task Force member notes that DCPS and PCS schools are roughly even in their rates of loss, but that DCPS experiences net gain because it absorbs students through the end of the year.
- Additionally, it was stated that though 8% (or ~600) students is not a large share, the Task Force needs more investigation on the grade level, school, and sector affiliation of students who are mobile. Echoing this statement, another member shared that it does not seem that the disproportionate impact of this mobility is not reflected in the overall picture of student movement.
- Another point brought into consideration is the impact of or spike in mobility that occurs during transitional grades (i.e. PK4 → K, 5 → 6, 8 → 9, etc.).
- Though this analysis predates MSDC, one Task Force member shared that it would be interesting to see the effects of the lottery on mid-year and year over year mobility rates.
- One large factor impacting net loss/gain is the impact of funding concerns on mobility, especially as it concerns public charter schools; one participant asserted that there is a chilling factor associated

with accepting at-risk, mobile students mid-year without the guarantee of resources to support their growth that prevents schools from backfilling.

- On the topic of the policy examples shared for the breakout discussion groups, one person expressed the belief that a neighborhood preference for public charter schools might reduce the loss that occurs among students who attend schools far from their homes.

Breakout Group Discussions

After doing the question and answer session and reflections, Task Force members were then divided into smaller groups to continue discussing student mobility. The groups were asked to answer the following questions:

- What are the three most important issues relative to mid-year mobility that the Task Force should tackle?
- What are the conditions and policies that contribute to the most important issues identified above?

Next Steps

Though the location of the next meeting has not yet been determined, Claudia Luján notes that it will continue this evening's conversation on student mobility. When asked for their thoughts on the meeting, several Task Force members stated that they felt the conversations in the breakout groups were productive and that they were happy to have had the opportunity to start discussing this issue.

Co-Chairs and Sandman will continue to reach out to Task Force members to schedule more 1-on-1 check-ins.

The meeting adjourned at 8:07pm.