

**D R A F T**  
**Advisory Committee on Student Assignment: Meeting Summary**  
**Meeting #9, May 29, 2014**  
**Thurgood Marshall Center, 1816 12<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, 5:00-8:30 p.m.**

**Welcome and Introductions**

Deputy Mayor for Education, Abigail Smith, welcomed the group and asked people do a round of introductions starting with Scott Pearson, Executive Director of the DC Public Charter School Board who was sitting in for Clara Hess, Advisory Committee representative from the Charter Board, who is not available for this meeting or the next.

**Meeting Goals and Agenda**

With respect to the revised Draft Recommendations, Ms. Smith explained that the Technical Committee wants to capture the Committee members' comments; she asked them to engage and raise issues so the Technical team would find ways to take note and act. The goal is to have these Draft Recommendations in final form about a week before the next round of Community Meetings so that the document can be publicly circulated electronically in advance of public discussion. The whole point is to continue to refine the Recommendations with public input.

At this meeting and the meeting planned for Monday the object is to narrow the set of things that the Committee hasn't come to agreement on. Agreement does not have to be 100% but rather the Committee may come to a general consensus that also invites all voices to be expressed and then determines how to move forward. The goal is not unanimity but a strong sense of consensus so the Committee can get to a Recommendation.

**Boundaries Will Be Reviewed with Individual Members**

She explained that the agenda does not include review of the individual boundary lines because that would not be efficient. However, the Technical Team wants and needs feedback on boundaries and would be happy to hear more from individual Committee members about boundaries in their areas.

**Council Education Committee Hearing June 26<sup>th</sup>**

There will be a Council hearing on the Student Assignment and Boundaries Review process before the Education Committee on June 26th. The DME's office has had regular meetings with Council Education Committee staff and also expects to be briefing all of the Council members as well as the State Board of Education. Note that at least one Committee member received a call from the Council Education Committee. Committee members are welcome to have conversations with Council members and Council staff and community members as they desire but members needn't feel pressed to respond.

**Meeting Facilitation**

Abigail Smith introduced Kevin Miller, partner with Reingold LINK, the communications partner working with the project. He explained that he would be helping to facilitate the meeting which would consist primarily of making sure everyone is heard and keeping the group moving forward within the agenda in a timely manner.

**Review Revised Draft Recommendations: Introduction and Framing**

### **Members Questions and Comments Revised Draft: Introduction and Framing**

- Since there is still a lot of the substance of the Draft Recommendations that the Committee still needs to deal with this evening, I would suggest that we come back to the framing and focus on the substance.
  - Agreed; general agreement from the Committee.

### **Review Revised Draft Recommendations: Core System of Neighborhood Schools**

The Technical Team thanked the Committee members for their substantive, inspired and thoughtful input so far on the current version. There are four main sections:

1. **Access to DCPS Early Childhood Education**
2. **By-Right Access to DCPS Schools through Attendance Zones**
3. **Access to Transportation**
4. **By-Right Access to DCPS Schools through Feeder Pathways**

The organization of the Draft Recommendations starts with a statement of the current policy, then a framing of the current “problems” - - but possibly this should be described rather as a rationale because all these issues should not necessarily be described as “problems”. Finally there is a statement of the draft recommendations. The impact analysis is just starting to be incorporated (please see the Draft Recommendations of May 28th attached for the numbered list of recommendations).

### **Review Revised Draft Recommendations: Access to DCPS Early Childhood Education**

There is an error in #2 which should read: “Children of families residing in the District of Columbia who are 3 years of age by September 30 of the program year **and who reside in non-Title I school boundaries**, shall have access by lottery to DCPS PK3 and PK4 seats based on program availability and capacity, with priority given first to in-zone children.”

### **Members Questions and Comments about Access to Early Childhood Education**

- My understanding was that the idea is to prioritize Title I schools so there is no substantive change; it is all about presentation.
- I would flag this for implementation; would the changes all be in year one or just PK3 or PK4?
- This would be based on program availability?
  - Yes, for non-Title I schools. The benchmark year is 2015-16.
- What about siblings if there are not enough seats in the lottery?
- What about notifications to families - - do we iron that out now or later?
  - The Technical Team has reviewed the DCPS schools to try to find out extreme circumstances. We can estimate that at certain schools, classes for PK3 or PK4 would flip with respect to program availability because of an influx of in-boundary students; families would have to be notified quickly about reduced availability.

- The whole notion of the September 30 deadline bothers me. Children are getting older when they graduate - - should the cut-off date be birthdays in December?
  - It used to be December and changed to September in part because the system started to serve 3-year-olds who can be very young with December birthdays.
  - I would not put that in the scope for this conversation.
- How would the mechanics work with a March first deadline for registration?
  - We can work that out with available options.
  - With the current MySchoolDC lottery for some families it would change the rankings if they did prefer the neighborhood school.
  - It would work differently if it is a major right or if it is a qualified right.
- Wasn't the intent to have by-right the first choice schools?
  - For some families it is simple but for others the neighborhood school might be the 10<sup>th</sup> choice.
- But you still have a right after March first?
  - These details are not worked out, but the thought is that PK families would have to express intent by March first. You don't want families to be holding two seats and make it impossible to add in-boundary families.
- So after March first you lose the spot for PK3? What happens if someone moves into the boundary after March first? Can people walk in to register in August?
  - That's a problem.
  - If there is space you could register, or if not you could be wait-listed but you would not be guaranteed space. This relates to planning for staffing and the limits of opening up additional classroom space.
- But on May first, for instance, that would still allow time for staffing and getting classrooms ready.
  - This right is different from the K-12 rights.
- What is the impact of this? How many Title I schools do we have?
  - The potential number has been worked out judged by demand in the MySchoolDC lottery for SY 2014; there is another set of numbers with the Title I students that are wait-listed. PCSB would have reasonably good guidance as well.
- Would there have to be a lottery for preference?
  - If families apply that year they would guaranteed seats. That's why the deadline is important.
- Is there that much capacity?
  - At non-Title I schools there is not additional capacity, but most Title I schools have capacity.

- I have three concerns 1) phasing in 2) deadlines 3) the presentation over-all and the point about notification to families.

### **Review Revised Draft Recommendations: By-Right Access to DCPS Schools through Attendance Zones**

Currently you have the right to go to your zoned school but the questions may be why the current zones are over-lapping and how having multiple rights may present problems.

### **Members Questions and Comments on By-Right Access to DCPS Schools through Attendance Zones**

- It is a problem. We need one matter-of-right school based on address, among other things because of real-estate values.
- Currently some have more rights than others.
- I'm from Ward 8 and I had to research the best schools and there are not many in Ward 8. You don't even need to be doing this: just get better teachers.
  - School systems have to be able to do many things all at once.
  - Yes, it is a problem. We are describing a multi-layered system where you would still have one school by-right.
- We can tie this problem to lack of predictability where 22% have multiple rights.
- We are trying to align attendance zones; we need geographic boundaries.
  - We don't eliminate multiple rights when we have dual-language schools that have programmatic feeders, for example.
  - There are programmatic feeder rights and attendance zone rights determined by residence; families have a right to one.
- We have not talked about phasing in these rights; there are places where you might want to have dual rights.
  - The rationale for being explicit about this is that in ten years we do not want to find ourselves with overlapping maps again looking just at attendance zones and boundary lines.
- We need to acknowledge the reality of multiple rights; that they should be appropriate in some cases.
- Are we saying that we are eliminating multiple rights because we are dealing with a legacy of closed schools which has happened because boundaries have not been addressed and we have closed many schools.
- As in Montgomery County, we could consider how to initiate a process that manages potential boundary and utilization problems on a regular basis.

- Recommendations 8 and 9 deal with triggers at 90% utilization and 60% utilization for individual schools. Would there be a capture rate on a comprehensive city-wide basis that would trigger a process to examine boundaries?
- I'm still not sure where the Eastern issue fits in here. We have to do something in places where there's no good way for students to get to school.
- There are obligations of schools to take a child after the charters' October purge. Right now it seems to be the principals who decide. This should simplify the obligation of schools to accept children.
- We all need a common understanding of the document: outline the policies then list exceptions by how the agencies operationalize this. It is important for the Committee to align on what the document represents. It is problematic if the document says the policy is a single right and it is problematic if that is NOT received as policy. It has to be explicit but addendums can co-exist for exceptions.
- Eastern should iron-clad have both rights [for feeder schools and addresses east of the river that are most accessible to Eastern].
  - This goes to phasing in rights - - but during phasing in it is a dual right.
  - We are trying to get a basic system in policy: under- and over-capacity and school closings should have triggered this process earlier. Is transportation policy also a trigger or could there be permanent dual rights for some communities? Are we good to go with by-right designations as in points 4, 5, 6, and 7 (one elementary school, middle grades and high school grades zone per address, and a comprehensive boundary review every 10 years)?
- A number of charter middle schools start in 5<sup>th</sup> grade and there have been questions of alignment with the DCPS system. Operators have good educational reasons to start at 5<sup>th</sup>; would there be a chance that DCPS would start earlier for some middle schools too?
- DCPS did explore 5<sup>th</sup> grade in middle school and have set that idea aside.
  - The notion of separating out [5<sup>th</sup> grade] upsets the notion of nesting feeders but you could provide some flexibility.
- Are we getting rights and the need for uniformity confused in what the lead paragraphs say. Is this a point of view; are we being neutral? We need to be strategic and explore it. I worry about the slippery spaces. It can be a clearly encapsulate-able context up front with caveats, in-adequacies, and implications. Have people look at appendices for exceptions. We need to be consistent.
  - That's right. The intention is to link things back to values and principles to maintain that thread around predictable schools, minimizing travel distance and maximizing the family/school connection.

- I appreciate that but where can this be short-cut in something like a check-the-box on values and principles? The document is too technical and heavy and will create a burden for the public.
- One other approach is to invite the public to brain-storm where we can't check the boxes; where can we mitigate the down-sides that would be useful.
- But we need consensus first.
- With # 8 and 9 (90% and 60% utilization as a trigger for boundary processes) certain schools immediately are triggered by this. We should step back and look more closely at those. We need to be clear that there are concerns around about 20 schools - - we need to acknowledge that to people.
- Should this be schools at 90% capacity - - or higher to trigger a review?
  - There are 23 schools now at 100% utilization or more.
- We would want to see a consistent pattern rather than just hitting 90% once to trigger a review.
- 90% may be OK; mostly populations don't change that quickly unless there are school closings. Maybe watch for consistent over/under utilization for three years?

#### **Review Revised Draft Recommendations: Access to Transportation**

The issues here are accessibility and in part they are issues of choices people are making, not the rights they have. The walk-distance impact analysis can be seen in the impact analysis ppt. (see the Impact Analysis attached).

The walkability graph shows how far students in different wards travel to school. There is a range of travel and average travel.

The Technical Team will summarize the charts in the impact analysis. This is based on the April boundary version. Approx. ~250 students are closer to an active and open boundary school than the school they are assigned to. The question first is how to address this in the boundary lines. For instance, there are lots of students who are currently in-boundary for Key who are more than a mile and a half from school. But this hasn't been an issue but where it is an issue, how does the Committee want to address such problems?

#### **Members' Questions and Comments on Access to Transportation**

- With the Key boundary they are begging to stay; it is not a problem. Policy solutions are not universal; it is different in Wards 5, 7 and 8.
  - Narrowing down the real challenges has to be at the community level. With the transportation issue we are working with WMATA on significant long-term transportation issues around consolidated schools.
- We don't want transportation to circumvent walkability; we really value walkability.
  - It is a terrain issue; working with WMATA could help address access in general.

- Of the Approx. ~1900 students, approx. ~250 are more than a mile but by serving them with transportation would that be a new right to go to the closest school? Those are only 250 families. From my perspective that is consistent with having a framework for neighborhood schools.
  - It would not be a right it would be a preference in the lottery.
- I don't understand why we don't just change the boundaries?
  - It might be capacity issues or a major road that has to be crossed - - but it is worth drilling down into these instances.
- As a transportation planner I would caution that the likelihood of getting WMATA to change routes is small other than for schools that are on a major street.
- I would second that.
  - DCPS was successful after the 2008 closures in getting some bus route changes.
- Usually agencies have to pay on top of the standard allotment. However, DDOT has the Safe-Routes-to-Schools program that might be helpful.
- Drilling down to walkability is urgent for high density and low density areas. We need a solid policy that can be customized.
  - Providing transportation for zoned schools is off the table?
- DCPS should not be off the hook for providing schools that are accessible. Transportation should be a last resort.
- Are we talking about yellow busses or just getting on a Metro bus?
  - Yellow busses.
- Three and four-year-olds are getting to school on a yellow bus (or a private contracted bus) at Thomas at 8:45, 3:15 and 6:00 to get students to River Terrace and Kenilworth.
  - Possibly the policy should not address outliers but should address the system and the provision to trigger a more formal transportation study for school openings and closings that involves some system response.
- At 1.1 miles or 1.5 miles walkability is the goal - -we really value walkability.
- I agree. With 250 students covered by a blanket policy . . .
- Or 1900 students.
  - There is a huge value in having students at the closest school.

- Parking spaces for the drop-offs and pick-ups is the biggest problem at a number of schools now.
- Communities have a right to trigger transportation study . . .
- Right to a solution, not a study.
- We can't be shifting the burden to the community. This is not a neighborhood trigger. People need to know their rights.
  - There is a fine line here. We want walkability but with busses we get to take you where we want to take you. . .
  - Sorry we didn't have school-level data for you; we could flag the individual boundaries that are particular problems for distance and difficulties of transportation at the micro-level. This conversation is totally dependent on local information and knowledge.
  - To clarify, are we to retain the current transportation policy?
- That depends on how many students are affected and where.
  - It is no more than 1900.
- Could we get a list of schools most affected? Are there 10? 6? We need to solve the problem as the policy is to keep walkability under a mile. It may require some transportation.
- We could state the goal and then work closely with communities most affected.

**Review Revised Draft Recommendations: By-Right Access to DCPS Schools through Feeder Pathways**  
 Feeder pathways are possibly the most critical part of this policy. We'll show the feeders on one screen and the long chart of school attributes on the other. The question is whether there is capacity at the middle school and high school level. We are trying to figure that out. We'll go down the list of feeder comprehensive high schools starting with Anacostia.

#### **Members Questions and Comments on By-Right Access though Feeder Pathways**

##### **Anacostia:**

Changes to the Anacostia feeder are with CW Harris and JC Nalle feeding into Sousa rather than Kelly Miller both because Kelly Miller is adding demountables and because DCPS administration considered East Capitol Street a firm demarcating boundary.

- Students will not have to cross East Capitol Street but they will now have to cross Benning Road, which are about the same with respect to traffic.
  - It does not add much to the distance either way.

##### **Woodson:**

- Woodson is under-enrolled.
  - Woodson's boundary is tiny. Its enrollment is forecast to increase in the future.
  - Eastern loses Ward 7 feeders and its enrollment goes down.



- Kelly Miller is a school on the move?
- They are not knocking on doors to get into Kelly Miller. The explosion in enrollment there is because Ron Brown was closed.
- There are also students who returned; who chose to go to Kelly Miller.
- The principal of Kelly Miller has questions about the capacity assigned because they have added special education classes which are mandated to have a very small enrollment.
- It is still below the 60% trigger - - has in-boundary participation grown?
  - Woodson's current boundary is very tiny.
- There is a big difference between the current 825 students and the future estimated 2,500.
- A lot of geographic space has been added to the Woodson boundary.
  - There is a huge difference in the alignment of the feeder schools.
  - Many of the prospective Woodson students are at Eastern now and there is still room at Eastern for out-of-boundary students.
  - Kenilworth feeds better to Sousa and Davis to Anacostia.
- Can we revisit the capacity at Thomas and Kenilworth?
  - We see that Kelly Miller is at capacity and it is over capacity with the out-of-boundary set-asides proposed. Do we look at re-opening closed schools?
- We school look at the closed middle schools. We should say consider re-opening a near-by middle school to help alleviate all this crowding.
- Kelly Miller is 86% full with 647 students living in the boundary; the forecast goes up to 1600.
- Schools currently feeding Kelly Miller don't all currently have a right to go there by the boundary.
- That's not fair.
  - Elementary schools currently feeding Kelly Miller, if we apply all the same participation rate, Kelly Miller would be 143% utilized. Even assuming some don't attend, it is still a problem.
- Is Ron Brown the location for the application middle school?
- Hillcrest has been pushing the application middle school for a location at the south east side of Ward 7 but Woodson is at the far north in the opposite direction. Locating the

application middle school at the north makes sense but they have talked about using the old Randle Highlands School.

- The needs and programming puts the application middle school at the north.
  - There is an opportunity to align when we actually have real pressures and programmatic planning from DCPS. We should be looking at where the students and the pressures are for the application middle school and also at the idea of having it at a Metro stop.
- Ron Brown is at a Metro; Smothers is nearby.
- It can't only be an application middle school - - it has to be within a comprehensive middle school.
- I wonder if it fits in the chart as "look into re-opening Ron Brown as a specialty middle school to feed Woodson." It is a little tentative as it is.
- It would be in the feeder chart in the same way the re-opening MacFarland and the new Ward 4 north middle school are on the chart.
- You could put it on the feeder chart but not feeding into any particular high school.
- I agree we should put it on the chart so people don't feel anxious about it not being there.
  - It is in the Capital Improvement Program budget as Ron Brown.
- It needs to be asterisked in some way.
- Maybe it just says to Ron Brown.
- Ron Brown otherwise would go on the chopping block.
- An application middle school is in the CIP but it does not say Ron Brown.
- We should put an asterisk on it because we really need Ron Brown in the same way that we really need MacFarland.

**Ballou:**

Ballou added 76 students; there are 2550 living in the boundary. We looked at participation rates and rising grades attending from out-of-boundary to estimate. Ballou would be half full with out-of-boundary alone in the future. Also, there is likely to be a big jump in attendance after the new school opens. There are no major capacity issues at Ballou or Anacostia with the required set-asides.

**Eastern:**

Eastern's capacity could be a problem in the future because there are so many feeders.

The Ward 7 ANC talked about Eastern's boundary; they were concerned that when you re-draw the feeders it will soon flip to White.

- None if the middle schools would flip.
- But I remember Deal and Wilson in the past. Ward 7 was concerned that if the Ward 7 community were out of the Eastern feeder pattern people would behave differently.
- Much of Amidon now is in-boundary for Wilson. Jefferson is 90% African American. Their argument to remain in Wilson is as a way to provide diversity for Wilson.
- The new Eastern is currently 100% African American.
  - In the spiral bound publication from the Working Group Meetings there is a chart that shows where feeders from the 9<sup>th</sup> grades went to each high school. Kelly Miller and Sousa sent only a handful to Eastern.
  - The idea of dual rights is one thing we have struggled with in taking the east-of-the-river schools out of the Eastern feeder and its impact on Woodson. It takes away from Woodson and we also want to grow Woodson.
- Marshall Heights goes to Sousa now - - they have been moved to Anacostia and out of Eastern.
  - We will look at that split and how it may affect Woodson and Anacostia and how that area may exercise a right to Eastern.
- If there is a pocket where everyone goes to Eastern then just put them into Eastern.
  - Why propose a different policy; why not provide high school students a transportation preference?
- Jefferson has lots of Ward 7 and 8 students; but Eliot-Hine has so much capacity.
- Also look at how we developed SWS and Capitol Hill Montessori going into Eliot-Hine. If they know they can get to Eastern it might substantially change the in-boundary percentages that go to those schools.

**Coolidge:**

Coolidge has 1100 students living in the boundary but little in-boundary participation from the feeders.

- We need programming to re-vitalize DCPS high schools and add to this mix - - we need something more.
- DCPS focused on elementary schools last year and middle schools this year; the focus next year will be high schools.

- The Coolidge community is working hard to develop a program. There is lots of population pressure on the PS-8s at the lower grade levels. They want the middle schools to be able to relieve the over-crowding at the elementary schools.
- Paul PCS middle school is the only conversion from DCPS to charter. Now they are expanding to the high school level. But Coolidge would be delighted to have coordinated a program with Paul.
- It is not that there are not enough children in the area.
- Shepherd parents are working with us about Coolidge - - that's where we are trying to head and we are working with the younger parents. They don't want to short-circuit that effort but they are not there yet.
- We don't want the Anacostia or Rock Creek Park to be a barrier. Some day we want Shepherd to choose the new Ward 4 middle school. Dual rights make sense there. Let them invest in the planning process. Deviate from the stance of no dual rights in order to give them an incentive.
- Crestwood is willing to consider giving up rights to Deal.
  - That's not what I heard.
- Crestwood is fighting for rights to Powell which does not go to Deal.
  - The feeders to Coolidge look really small.
  - Deal – including Shepherd - - brings it way over capacity.
  - Even to indicate here that Crestwood goes to the new north middle school at a trigger point, we have to be consistent.
- We could say that Shepherd would get feeder rights to the new north middle school and put that marker down - - why not?
  - Eaton wants to keep dual rights to Hardy and Deal; what's different for Shepherd?
- It is different because Hardy is new and modernized.
- How does Shepherd contribute to the diversity?
  - We need to look more at diversity.
  - How can we best understand the decisions around Shepherd, make a matrix for diversity and capacity . . .
  - Look at Wilson and Deal where capacity is the immediate issue for Shepherd.
  - Deal is at 114% capacity; but it is forecast to lose 200 students in its geographic boundary. Four to ten-year-olds are not projected to increase a lot in that boundary.
- Including the Reno addition will bring Deal's capacity up to at least 1200.

- Remember with regard to Coolidge that Walter Reed is planned for a lot of housing in ten years.
  - There is lots of growth to be seen in Cluster 18. Shepherd is less a capacity issue than a diversity issue for Wilson and Deal and a capacity issue for Coolidge.
- Why is diversity coming up in this discussion and not other areas?
  - If you are disproportionately cutting out students of color because Deal and Wilson are over-capacity, over time we should have more. . .
- Another principle is “make as few changes as are absolutely necessary.”
- The discussion about Paul PCS middle school is important. The people in that area are wishing that Paul would work to coordinate with Coolidge on planning. Coolidge is happy to work with Paul in co-locating or capital planning. Coolidge has been willing. With all the charter expansions, there are now 7 high schools in northern Ward 4 all within a mile and a half of each other.
- The Charter Board would be happy to be an honest broker to initiate discussions and not just around Paul. This is particularly important as Coolidge got its start as a conversion from a traditional middle school to a charter. This part of the discussion is planned for Monday.

#### **Roosevelt:**

- Without a middle school at MacFarland we won’t have enrollment at the new Roosevelt because there will effectively be nothing feeding in to it.
  - West PS-8 makes sense as it could revert to a PS-5<sup>th</sup> grade school.
- There are some who strongly want West to remain a PS-8<sup>th</sup> grade school but many of those supporters are parents of students now in the middle school grades at West.
  - West has modernization funding but a PS-5<sup>th</sup> grade configuration is very different from PS-8<sup>th</sup> grade planning.
- This decision needs to be made soon because West is planning for modernization and whether it is planned as a PS-5 or PS-8 is critical.
  - Timing is critical in planning advantageously for West.
- With respect to conversations around McKinley Middle School and opening Brookland Middle School the transition time will be important in its impact for those feeder PS-8s.
- Brookland is planned to open in SY 2015?
  - Yes.

#### **Wilson:**

- Oyster has moved around a lot in this feeder process.
  - Oyster is back in as a Wilson feeder with a programmatic feeder to the dual language strand at Roosevelt. The dual right is programmatic until options exist [at Roosevelt]; it is too difficult to move it now. Oyster-Adams is no longer in-boundary for Deal which helps to solve the crowding issue at Deal

but it is still feeding to Wilson. Moving Eaton to Hardy as a feeder will be controversial.

- That needs to be clarified.
- Oyster no longer has an English option for middle school?
  - Bancroft, Bruce-Monroe and Oyster for their in-boundary populations can opt out of the dual language program because they would have a non-dual language school assigned by right.
- For Oyster, Eaton has been brought up as the English elementary school but what about an English middle school?
- Francis-Stevens would be a possibility.

**Dunbar:**

Dunbar currently has 1400 students living in its boundary. Enrollment is 600 with capacity at 1100.

- Langley feeds to the McKinley Middle School along with Wheatley.
- DCPS is assuming that Wheatley remains a PS-8<sup>th</sup> grade school because they recently got a grant for it; they won't be changing.
- What does that mean for McKinley Middle School? Do they need another middle school feeder? It is odd to have only one feeder. Browne will also remain a PS-8. Maybe the other middle school feeder would be Langdon?
  - There is a concern that Wheatley's boundary is very large already with lots of growth predicted.
- Marshall elementary closed near the growth around CostCo. Having a school there would be a boon to that community which has started to work to re-open it; they were told that the school might be scheduled to re-open. Langdon's boundary and Bunker Hill's boundary are also very large. It would be good to see another school re-opened.
- DCPS is providing transportation to those consolidations.
- If the Chancellor has made a statement about those schools let's be sure that it is reflected in this document. Those areas are very isolated.
- Langley and Langdon want a more direct route into McKinley Middle School. The Bloomingdale community wants to send children to Langley from Pre-School through to McKinley.
- With that aspiration, what does it do to feeders into Dunbar? If you assume success there will be a problem with capacity.
  - We added two additional schools to the Dunbar feeder pattern.
- Although this is somewhat in the long term, if the MacMillan Filtration site develops the 1600 units expected and the housing going up near the Metro at Catholic University provides growth and the Walter Reed development includes younger children . . .
- If the Brookland development takes off and walkability is addressed for Bunker Hill, that might trigger something else opening in that area. The need for those areas is not as immediate a concern as is dealing with the area growing around CostCo. Bunker Hill is pretty empty.

**Cardozo:**

- Should we wait for the Cardozo discussion until Monday?
- Would people stay a bit longer to talk about Cardozo?
  - Cardozo is predicted to reduce compared to the current by about 500; people are not choosing Cardozo.
  - There have been some creative off-line discussions around the Cardozo feeders and the possibilities around a new Shaw being incubated at Francis-Stevens for the time being with Francis-Stevens picking up students from the Cardozo feeders at 6th grade and growing a strong program. This would include Ross, Garrison, Cleveland, Marie Reed, Seaton and Thomas (Columbia Heights would continue to take Tubman and H.D. Cooke). Those constituencies could work together to plan the new Shaw and then move out of Francis-Stevens, leaving it as possibly as PS-5, PS-6<sup>th</sup> - - or a High School.
- At the Francis-Stevens site we don't want people to think that the elementary school is going away.
- There has been little support for the combined 6<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grades at Cardozo; enrollment has been low. This plan acknowledges that and captures the middle grades with a neighborhood feeder that could work. The concept is to incubate the program before you build the building. Shaw has been in and out of favor for capital funding. This would build the core constituency.
- What are the triggers to get Shaw built as a whole separate program?
- Would there be separate academies at the middle school?
  - It is envisioned as one school.
- Cleveland and Marie Reed would have dual rights to Roosevelt, so there are lots of questions.
  - Cardozo has 680 students including 146 middle school students.
- Cardozo currently has neighborhood students. This solution draws more of those students to Francis-Stevens.
- There would be no middle school students then at Cardozo?
- Cardozo would prefer to be a high school, not a 6<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup>.
- What about Garnet-Patterson?
  - That building is now swing space for Ellington.
- How does the 6<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> work at CHEC?
- There are many middle school students at CHEC that attend CHEC for high school but the two schools are separate.

- This is so cobbled together I don't see how it works.
  - These are all good questions. Francis-Stevens has capacity for 440 so if this scheme were successful there would be capacity issues. There is the whole question of educational campuses. We hear a lot about that and I have my own views. There are lots of concerns for the little children mixing in with the 8<sup>th</sup> graders. There could be a reaction at the elementary school level.
- Would Francis-Stevens convert back into an elementary school?
  - There are very few families in the Stevens boundary. It was built as a Jr. High School and has lots of capacity.
- It is supposed to house Ivymount students on a temporary basis.
- In the best case scenario it would get Francis-Stevens up to capacity.
- Potentially the capacity at Francis-Stevens could be increased by adding demountable classrooms; the space would be ideal for that.
- The incubator would have to get over-capacity or building the new Shaw will never happen. Currently the neighborhood trusts the leadership at Francis-Stevens now and could build on that.
- This seems a hopeful plan; these people need a middle-school.
- If Shaw is planned for 2020, that gives five years to grow the incubator and justify the construction.
- There is not much to rally for now.
- Are the Columbia Heights feeders, Tubman and H.D. Cooke sufficient for CHEC? What about Bancroft? Bancroft adds diversity to Deal but is there dual language at Columbia Heights?
- CHEC has a dual language program for the 6<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> but it is aimed at native speakers. It is not a continuation of the dual language program at Bancroft. There is no dual language program at Deal.
- Maybe parents don't really want dual language at the middle school level.
- Oyster is apoplectic right now because of the impact on Adams with students jumping to Deal.
- They will know in a week.
  - Oyster has been very much in mind. They intentionally developed a middle school; this plan institutionalizes that program.



- At one recent meeting Oyster parents raised the problems with Deal rights being lost but their anxiety was really about losing rights to Wilson.

### **Next Steps and Upcoming Community Meetings; Dates, Times & Locations**

The Technical Team will craft a second draft revision for Monday. If folks want to go back into the document they will be happy to take comments.

### **Members Questions and Comments on Next Steps**

- Thanks to everyone for all your work on this draft. As a Committee we have to remember that this has to be in our voice. We need ownership over the language; we need to own this draft recommendation in a month. People should really get into this document.
- Monday is the last meeting before something goes out to the public. This is worrisome.
  - The flyer included with your packet includes dates and locations for the Community Meetings that are planned for the third week in June, the last week before school is out. Ideally the Draft Recommendations will go out to the public the 12<sup>th</sup> of June which is the Thursday before the meetings start; we want to avoid releasing it the night before the Community Meetings.
  - We are not going to get this completely right with this draft; it goes to the public because it needs more public input.
- This goes to the credibility of the process which needs to be strong. When this was done back in 1968 there were all-day meetings to finalize boundaries. We need to take the time.
- We will have to sell the Draft Recommendations to the public.
  - We will not get the policy perfect and we need to spend time on the format and framing. We can do a lot of this with individual feed-back.
- The Committee should provide feed-back and engage in these conversations so we can revise in the next go-around. Framing and timing is important.
- We tabled the introduction today but revising it is critical.

### **Attending**

#### **Chairperson**

- Abigail Smith, Deputy Mayor for Education

#### **Community Representatives**

- Emily Bloomfield, Ward 2, Former member, DC Public Charter School Board, Charter Operator
- Wilma Bonner, Ward 5, Howard University, Retired DCPS principal and Assistant Superintendent

- Ed Davies, Ward 4, Children Youth Investment Trust Corporation
- Rev Donald Isaac, Ward 7, East of the River Clergy, Police, Community Partnership, Interfaith Council
- Denise Forte, Ward 6, Leadership for Educational Equity, DCPS parent
- Matt Frumin, Ward 3, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner 3E (ANC), DCPS parent
- Heather Harding, Ward 1, Ed. Consortium for Research and Evaluation (EdCORE), PCS parent
- Faith Hubbard, Ward 5 Council on Education
- Kamili Kiros, Ward 8, Achievement Prep Board of Trustees; PCS parent
- Cathy Reilly, Ward 4, Senior High Alliance of Parents Principals and Educators (SHAPPE)
- Evelyn Boyd Simmons, Ward 2, ANC 2F Education Committee Co-Chair; DCPS parent
- Eboni-Rose Thompson, Ward 7, Save the Children; Ward 7 Ed. Council; LSAT, Plummer Elementary
- Marta Urquilla, Ward 4, America Achieves/Results for America; PCS parent
- Martin Welles, Ward 6, Labor and Employment Attorney; Amidon-Bowen PTA; DCPS parent

#### **District Agency Representatives**

- Josephine Bias-Robinson, DCPS Chief of Family & Public Engagement
- Christopher Delfs, Sr. Citywide Planner, DC Office of Planning;
- Ellen McCarthy, Acting Director, DC Office of Planning
- Arianna Quinones, Chief of Staff, Office Deputy Mayor for HHS
- (For Clara Hess) Scott Pearson, Executive Director, DC Public Charter School Board

#### **District Agency Observers**

- Joshua Henderson, Government Relations Liaison, DC Public Charter School Board

#### **Technical Team**

- Jennifer Comey, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education
- Alex Donahue, 21st Century School Fund
- Mary Filardo, 21st Century School Fund
- Nancy Huvendick, 21st Century School Fund
- Claudia Lujan, Office of Deputy Mayor for Education
- Kevin Miller, Partner, Reingold LINK Communications (facilitator)
- Sheri Rutherford, Strategic Advisor, Reingold LINK Communications

#### **Staff Members**

- Judi Greenberg, Special Asst., Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education
- Scheherazade Salimi, Chief of Staff, Deputy Mayor for Education

#### **Not Attending**

##### **Community Representatives**

- Maryam Ahranjani, Ward 1, Marshall Brennan Constitutional Literacy Project,
- Sharona Robinson Ward 8, Ward 8 Ed. Council; Ballou HS PTSA; MySchoolDC Parent Advisory Council: DCPS parent

##### **District Agency Representatives**

- Clara Hess, Director, Human Capital and Strategic Initiatives, PCSB

**Staff Members**

- Iris Bond Gill, Dir. Grants Management & Compliance, OSSE
- Shanita Burney, DCPS Office of Family & Public Engagement

DRAFT