

D R A F T
Advisory Committee on Student Assignment: Meeting Summary
Meeting #10, June 2, 2014
Thurgood Marshall Center, 1816 12th Street, NW, 5:00-8:30 p.m.

Welcome, Agenda Review and Meeting Goals

The Technical Team welcomed the group and agreed that the Committee has a lot of material to discuss so careful time-keeping would be important. The aim of the meeting is engagement on the Draft Recommendations version 3 including discussion of:

- A Complementary System of School Choices
- Coherent System of Public Schools
 - DCPS and Public Charter Sector Planning
 - Adequate School Supply
- Outstanding Issues from a Core System of Neighborhood Zoned Schools
- Schedule for Implementation -- “Phasing”
- Communications and Public Engagement

A Complementary System of School Choice

The group was asked to read through the revised recommendations in this section, starting with pages 8 to 11 before discussion and note questions, issues and concerns. The idea is to make sure Committee members have a chance to look at all of the policies which include first Recommendations 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22 having to do with set-asides, proximity priority and lottery preferences. (Please see the attached Draft Recommendations Version 3 attached.)

Members Questions and Comments on a Complementary System of School Choice

- One caveat was that there was a lot of back and forth in the several days since the last meeting and there are a lot of last minute changes throughout, including in the introduction. Some items, such as Transfer Policy seem to have been dropped.

Members Questions and Comments on Set-Asides for out-of-boundary and at-risk students

- At the middle school level do these set-asides apply to just 6th grade or to 6th, 7th and 8th grades?
 - The rationale is to make sure there are other entry points for out-of-boundary students so that parents do not feel compelled to get students into a preferred feeder pattern out-of-boundary at the early childhood level. The floor is 10% at elementary, 15% for middle school and 20% for high school with a priority for at-risk students.
- Is this an additional 10% at 6th grade? More than the 10% additional overall but 10% at each grade level each year?
- So 15% plus 15% on top of that? That’s a huge change. This is how it is phased in?
- If a school is 13% out-of-boundary and this policy is for 15%, is the implication that DCPS would add 15% on top of 13% or would it be only another 2% to get up to 15%?
 - The idea is to have the total amount of OOB be 10% at ES, 15% at MS, and 20% at HS.

- In addition, the set aside for the transition grades is to help ensure that there are spaces available for new OOB families. For example, Deal is 25% out-of-boundary but the out-of-boundary is almost all from students coming in with the elementary school feeders – they are not new seats for families. Those OOB families started in elementary school. The set-aside would be at the entry grade at 6th and 9th grades; it is an addition. The expectation is that parents will not be so stressed to get children in out-of-boundary at the kindergarten and Pre-K levels. This is where the set-aside analysis comes in.
- This is a really big change; 15% more students at 8th grade is a very different guarantee of access. We have to make sure this number is in the entry grades. That would be a wise approach and would not break the camel's back.
 - We have serious capacity issues at the early childhood level.
 - I don't see the capacity issues with the one-grade-at-a-time approach which should be more manageable.
- Deal was built for 1200 but now it is up to 1275; it is 30% out-of-boundary but what is the number of at-risk students?
 - The idea is two-fold: first to prioritize and open up out-of-boundary at 6th and 9th grades and second to increase the percentage of at-risk students to prioritize them from out-of-boundary.
- We don't break down the analysis by grade.
 - We would be short a few seats.
- What was the percentage of out-of-boundary students? We don't know. What percent of out-of-boundary from the 5th grade goes on to 6th grade?
 - Is the question the mechanism for the set-aside? Will it overwhelm schools or achieve the goal of adding at-risk students?
 - Is there a way to create access at 6th and 9th grades? Is this important? That's why the recommendation is here with a prioritization for at-risk students.
- People want the percentage of out-of-boundary to go down overtime [as all the neighborhood schools improve]. With 15% set-aside in the 6th grade, at Deal with 400 students per grade that is 60 students per grade. It is an enormous change to be made at the last minute. We want to include more at-risk students but we don't want to beggar the other schools in the process.
 - So the language is fine, it is the interpretation that is the issue.
- This has to be clarified; several of us misunderstood.
- How do the low at-risk schools open more seats?
- Should we table this until we figure out the language and the impact and the Team can come back with another recommendation? We might not necessarily have the at-risk students coming in.

- I see two problems. There is a sort of policy sleight-of-hand in responding to the need to open up schools that are highly in demand to students from across the city. But no one really has access. Some schools may be perceived as high quality but what does it get you?
- I think in the near-term we will have more at-risk students coming into middle schools from elementary schools and the student mix gradually changes.
- I thought you identified students coming in at the 6th grade but it changes for the early grades of the elementary schools too. This would be bringing in students at 12%, 18%, 24% if pegged to the entry point.
- How is at-risk defined?
 - It is specific to the child; there is a new funding formula this year that defines at-risk of academic failure as students who are eligible for 1) TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families), 2) SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program), homeless or in the foster-care system, and 3) over-age for grade level in high school. This is about 40% of DC students.
- We are presuming that all at-risk out-of-boundary students in elementary schools will matriculate up with their classmates to middle schools. Will they still be counted at-risk at the middle school or will there be another 15% on top? Or will the 10% coming from the elementary schools be accounted and only 5% more students will be added at the middle school and another 55 at the high school level?
 - There is not a 100% matriculation rate.
 - There are potential issues that remain to be fleshed out. One is the notion of access at various entry points. Deal is 30% out-of-boundary; Wilson in 45% out-of-boundary now.
- 10% at-risk students who are out-of-boundary or 10% out-of-boundary? The number of out-of-boundary students in the pipeline will not include that many at-risk students.
- Experience with Murch, for instance, would indicate that it is not a correct assumption to expect that the 10% would not be possible as enrollments drop off at 4th and 5th grades and that provides some access.
 - From a capacity perspective, many schools don't have space.
- That last point is important. Should the policy include a statement about where seats open up?
 - I hear support for having an access point. Support at the elementary level and support to prioritize at-risk students especially at schools where there are few at-risk students.
- But we don't want to knock out the feeder schools; there may be caveats to apply.
- We may want the policy to mean 15% at-risk or 15% out-of-boundary.
 - We will look at the language and do additional technical analysis.

Members Questions and Comments on Walking Distance and priorities in the lottery, Recommendations #21 and #22 [#21 Elementary grade students more than 1 mile from their school get a proximity priority in any DCPS school that is closer; #22 Lottery preferences in order of priority.]

- The Charter Board sent a letter about not including charters in these two items preferring language to incentivize charters to opt in. What happens if DCPS has dramatically different policies than the other LEAs? We need to find a way to have as cohesive a policy as possible.
- We've heard about neighborhood portfolios - - the charter board did a study last year. Thousands of students travel. A neighborhood preference that is not careful would freeze out these traveling students. We assume LEAs want to opt into the lottery. We would want a body to decide this.
 - Could at-risk children in the common lottery have preference to any school?
- That's probably too broad.
- Charters are all lottery - - so a set-aside would not apply. But you could have a 10%, 15%, 20%, preference at charter schools for at-risk students.
- Do we need to add something about multiples (twins, triplets).
 - We can put a pin in this and return.

Members Questions and Comments on #23, #24, #25 [distribution of specialized schools, boundaries for specialized schools, developing boundaries for the five new schools proposed]

- This needs to be much tighter language; it is too broad to be useful. Are specialized schools determined by the number per ward, the total number citywide. It also needs a time-line for creating specialty schools.
 - This may belong in the planning section.
- There are no specialized schools in Ward 7.
 - This needs more specific recommendations.
 - Student assignment is spelled out in the programmatic feeder chart.
- How does a school get designated as specialized? The Chancellor gets to decide.
- We wanted more specialized programs embedded in the comprehensive high schools; this is what we heard from the working groups. Roosevelt's recent announcement as a comprehensive high school with a specialized program in global languages is an exception.
- A different way to approach selective programs (application schools) within comprehensive schools might be to provide a guaranteed entry for the top 10% of students from any school in the city at the specialized programs.
- I think we were rather talking about non-selective academies in comprehensive high schools.
- I don't think we want any more selective high schools with more entry by specially qualified admissions.

- What about #26 and #27 (pairing dual-language schools with non-dual language schools as alternative schools of right; priority for DC residents in specialized or selective or charter programs).
- With #24, (specialized schools shall be neighborhood schools with boundaries) I'm concerned that those specialized schools would have to re-locate as the enrollment increases in the schools around them.
 - This would apply right now to Capitol Hill Montessori and SWS.
- It could apply to Ellington and Oyster too.
 - Oyster, Bancroft, Bruce-Monroe.
- We discussed converting specialized to non-specialized or pairing a specialized school with another nearby that is non-specialized to be available by right to families who do not want the specialized program.
- Or would the dual language schools have to offer an English-only track?
 - The issue is the city-wide, lottery schools with no boundary and how they differ from specialized zoned schools. What happens to the two schools in this category, Capitol Hill Montessori and SWS at Goding if the system needs capacity in that neighborhood?
- Lots of people wanted to move Ellington so that Western could be a comprehensive high school again but there was no process to create a place to have that conversation. What about Banneker if that area needs a comprehensive middle school? This is the moment if we want to do this as we strive to have neighborhood comprehensive schools. That's just two schools but there are others.
 - There could be a capacity trigger for specialized or selective schools that would review capacity and enrollment.
- But not at the cost of that program.
- Does this policy make these neighborhood schools?
 - No, this would trigger a review; we don't need Capitol Hill Montessori or SWS right now.
- No one disagreed about encouraging specialized **or** selective as part of comprehensive schools.
- What is the rationale to decide on specialty schools or programs within the comprehensive school? This seems to give more opportunity for programs within neighborhood schools.
- The idea is for specialized programs within a comprehensive school if space is available; add attractive programs as with recently announced plans for Roosevelt. Build it and they will come.
- What's the on and off ramp for specialized programs? What's the rationale for these programs; what is the benefit of having specialized school in the neighborhood schools?
 - This does not step back to prioritize the specialized programs it just says that they should be equally distributed.

- We are trying to get at understanding those programs already in the portfolio, asking what role they play and how they fit in with the zoned school portfolio.
- We should table #24. It is very different whether we are trying to prioritize locating them within neighborhood schools or converting them to neighborhood schools.
 - It is written in a confusing way to avoid having DCPS open up specialized schools.

Members Questions and Comments on #27 [Priority for non-residents to attend specialty schools] and Transfer Policies

- What would be the Transfer Policies that are blank here as #28 and #29? Would that be #4 and #5 on page 5?
 - That has to do with current policy if students move and requirements to change schools.
- What happens if a child's family always goes to Jefferson; do they go on to Eastern but their brother or sister may not?
- What about homeless students; do they get to finish the year at their school? If a student moves out of the neighborhood, do they have to move to their new neighborhood school? Do students retain their feeder rights if they finish out the year? What if families lose their homes and have to move?
 - The clarification would be that if you were in kindergarten and moved you could finish out the year; if you were in 5th grade and moved you would finish out the year but not feed to the next school with your classmates.
- This policy will be gamed if it is left as it is.
- McKinney Vento rules protect homeless students.
 - There would be two classes of situations: out-of-boundary students have their rights to continue on with their cohort whereas people who move out of the boundary do not have that right.
- There would be a single access point.
- If a student move out of a school and they want to remain they would have to apply out-of-boundary to get back in.
- Children need stability. If they move they should be able to continue that whole school year; the next year they would have to move to their new neighborhood school.
 - They would be able to finish the school year and then apply out-of-boundary if they wanted to continue.
- What's the research on this? Children who move schools often are more likely to drop out.
- This gets to stopping the bouncing between schools but this is too gray.
 - Recommendation #5 gets to student mobility (students may voluntarily return to their neighborhood school before Oct. 1).

- If you move residences after October first you can't move to your new school in the middle of the year?
 - That would be similar to Denver's policy where you lose your right to return to your neighborhood school if you chose to go elsewhere.
- If you leave a charter, then where would you go? This is a big issue and we have to be careful. This may be too blunt. There are hundreds of students more in DCPS by the end of the year that were in charters. Where would they go?
- This might get to changes in the nature of payments from the city to schools. The payment is on a single count on Oct. first but it might be based on multiple counts through the year or an average daily attendance.
- This would help take care of charter school purging.
- There is really no purging.
- At my school there are students coming back from charters after October first and before testing.
- The Charter Board does not tell schools what to do, but rather provides incentives.
- We can't solve this tonight.
- We have to count students more than once; there are serious truancy issues. This is a big concern as some schools would take huge hits.
- I would strongly caution against changing the financial structure mid-year.
 - The solution to the payment system is really outside of our purview but there is an interest in the LEA's coming together to address this policy.
- We still haven't addressed the need to look at a structure dealing with mid-year mobility.
 - We would want to be flexible with the language. We need to look at mobility and incentives to reduce it. We should note the need to return to #5 to discuss this.

Members Questions and Comments on A Coherent System of Public Schools, pages 12 and 13.

- I think people agree with this general point that we need to put a marker down about having a coherent system of public schools.

Members Questions and Comments on #32 (Joint charter/DCPS policies on discipline and student enrollment (pages 12 and 13) [#31 - #36 Coordination between sectors on school opening/closing; student discipline; ensure a Master Facilities Plan; review for over/under utilization; process for feeder changes])

- This is also related to #5 (voluntary return to zoned school before Oct. 1) but we need to look at this section as a whole: # 30-36.

- We pinned neighborhood preference to come back in this section.
- Do specialty schools go in this planning section?
 - Yes.
- This needs more than two and a half minutes discussion.
- In the second paragraph dealing with lack of coordination, now the task is not to provide space for operators of LEAs. This is about having a foundational system for families. It is not our problem to solve for the school operators.
- I would be glad for the change after three years; then we should revisit. #31 – DCPS or charters? Or just DCPS? The same process or a different process? The distinction is important.
 - DCPS and charters. It is important that the stakeholders- -the public - - has to be at the table.
 - We would look at both sectors and all stakeholders.
- #35: with all options, this seems to be a path to closure. We need program investments. Where I live there are more closings and relocations and new charter sites near under-enrolled schools.
 - We will help. We are opening because we are the committed system of right and we need program investments to figure it out.
- If Bunker Hill were to close, where else would children go to school? They would effectively have no matter-of-right school.
 - We will flesh it out.
- I'm concerned about the title "A Coherent System of Public Schools". It is very different and is "dog-whistle" language for the charter people who do not think of themselves as part of any system. It raises fears for their autonomy and will generate opposition. I wrote something different. Using the word "system" will freak people out. I take issue with the statement in the second paragraph "nor is there city-wide public engagement". Discussion of such things is publicly announced, meetings are held in the Ward where the decisions are being made and generally there is a robust public process.
- A last minute e-mail to the ANCs is not really sufficient and there are Ward level Education Committees that are often left out. I'm on the Ward 8 Education Council and I got no notice. There were two meetings in Ward 8 last week and that notice went out to 35 ANC's. However the ANC's are not enough; they don't represent me, for instance. The people in the community need to be engaged. I would very much like to sit down and talk with you about this.
- I take issue with saying that DCPS is serving more at-risk students than are the charters. 39-40% are served and many of the level 3 and 4 special education students; a higher percentage of students eligible for free and reduced lunch and many English language learners. Many of the charters were set up to serve at-risk students: Maya Angelou, Monument, Options, etc.
- The bullet about ensuring that school supply decisions make sense is a concern. A city-wide process on relocation might make sense if there were a city-wide zoning board. Most of the charter board

would be very opposed to this. How many charters would be open if there were a city-wide process? Take out “ensure” and use “promote”. That should make better sense.

- I am confused by the reference to city leaders. Who? I’m a city leader, so do I get to decide? This gets to the crux of what we stumble over in trying to consider coordination of the sectors. It gets to the Mayor’s responsibility for the entire system. It is an invitation to the Council to make changes.
 - Do people support #31 generally?
- I don’t think we are there yet.
- City leaders? Who decides?
- Who might this be, the mayor, the DME, the Council?
- It should be the mayor.
- Say it is the Council. They would need a legislative change.
 - What does the Committee want this to say?
- I’m agnostic but this is vague.
- What would the Public Charter School Board planning position entail?
- The PCSB is not really part of the mayor’s responsibility and they would worry about the Council.
- In the current policy who is responsible now – is it the Council?
 - The Council is only responsible for the Master Facilities Plan.
- #31. I think -- and I don’t want to offend representatives of the PCSB – but the PCSB has a process but lots of people do not think that process for engagement works, especially on the front end.
- Could we get specific?
- I’m an ANC Commissioner so I know that contacting the ANC Commissioners is not always effective. Some ANC members are very good but others are missing in action. Not everyone has an ANC Commissioner who is effective. Connecting with the ANC’s just doesn’t work. With respect to #31 it seems to say there should be one process for everyone. Is that what we want? But how do we get there in a real way? It requires legislative change. That should be clear; say that #31 is the direction but that it needs legislative change.
- We don’t have to jump to legislative change. Something has to trigger it. We can’t settle that here but we have to be clear about the city leaders.
- If it is based on local needs but we define need differently for the charter leaders.
- We closed McGogney and now Eagle is there; we closed MC Terrell because it was under-enrolled and immediately Somerset took over the building. Hart and Ballou and now Friendship SE and DC Prep all are building around the new high school. That is ridiculous! Honestly there is no thought to

how these schools are located. We are over-saturated with charters in Wards 7 and 8. There should be no co-locations. I went to MC Terrell, to the DGS “hearing” just as it was closing. That meeting flew in under the radar. The deal was clearly done and we were really just to meet with DGS. And the Somerset people get the short end of the stick because of how they were brought in. This is our home; this is where we live.

- There clearly has to be a coordinated effort for out-reach.
- #32 is definitely not happening; within a one-mile radius we have seven schools in Ward 8.
- It feels like #31 needs to consider multiple process or new legislation for something more specialized, maybe talk about staffing an agency. It is provoking to have it here. It concerns the equitable distribution of students across the sectors – where does this come from?
 - This is not in current policy.
 - The idea was to loop back and make sure that the city is properly serving at-risk students.
 - Some of this needs to be pulled apart
- At risk is not the only goal. This blanket policy is not going to get us where we want to go. There is no language here to invite charters in to have a preference [for at-risk children] in the lottery. This does not go here. This deals with coordination and preferences.
 - Do you want charters to be able to opt in?
- Charters can be encouraged to serve at-risk students. Should the preference go up to 20%? It is not acceptable for them not to serve any at-risk students but both should be opt-ins. They are mutually exclusive.
- I would like to check the language; some of this is new.
 - Our large vision tends to be what we hear from the public.
- What we heard is that they want the option of a municipally operated system of schools but not precluding charters. The system should operate with the other 57 LEAs. They don't want opt-ins if it undermines the municipal system.
- I agree.
- They want to be able to opt in to a neighborhood preference – not a cap. It is different in Wards 5, 6 and 7. The concerns that the PCSB representative raised are real. But serving at-risk students should be a requirement in the lottery preferences. Joint planning is a hugely critical issue. We have to get to this. The Charter Board rep's job is to resist this but we have a public consensus. The question is how to express this in the Recommendation in a week and not have a fatally flawed discussion. We have to be careful not to get too specific. This has to be dealt with by the city. This needs a special discussion between now and when the full Recommendation goes out. Mobility is also a huge issue that we don't have a solution for tonight.
- I would like to bench the whole thing. We are not going to come to any consensus. My children are at a Ward 8 charter and it's a good school. I don't want people to tell my charter where it can be. As

long as it has good test scores and the parents are happy people should not get involved. That is how I feel about my school.

- I'm struggling with #32. I don't understand what it is - - it needs to move out to maybe focus on mid-year exit. Are early ages in this policy? There is not a lot of substance here but there are a lot of challenges.
- The perspective is to take the position of the families not the operators. The families need consistency and coherent policies for children.
- We have civil rights laws that cover this.
 - Coordinated isn't assumed necessarily to be identical policy.
 - But in case of expulsion there should be a common policy.
- We need to be careful. The DCPS sends students to another school - -that's NOT expulsion. We need to take time with this. It needs more transparency around studies of special needs students.
- It would be good to identify places where charters might benefit from coordination of facilities. We have to be careful with the formulation.
- Formulation vs. coordination – charters don't have control of funding for facilities. The way of looking at these problems together is good but this may shut down location of new middle school choices.
- "City leaders" needs to be more specific. Who would be part of this city group specifically? Not just a reference to elected officials. I have to agree with others that have talked with members of the PCSB about the great need for good planning with public dollars. This needs more engagement with the public and other agencies don't do a good job of this either. We have had consolidations because of low enrollment but now we have a charter opening up in the same location. The public needs to be a part of these decisions not just at the final public hearings and other ways for feedback at the end; these decisions need to be fleshed out more with the public.
- Another member started to get at this idea: this is supposed to be our Recommendation. If we want to support a system of neighborhood schools and access to options at the same time, then we have to be realistic about what can be accomplished. We can't walk it back because others don't see it that way. This has to be city-wide; we are not supposed to think about individual schools, we have to consider the whole landscape. Talking about the two sectors working together has to be fleshed out. I support the sentiment behind this. We don't walk back from it because we have to explore and flesh it out. We need coordination around facility planning; we need to do a good job on the front end. Neighborhood AND choice is the lens we use.
- I'm making points because I think this is the right outcome. I see hundreds of students on waiting lists for charter schools in buildings that were formerly closed by DCPS. I look at the coincidence there of need, high results and high demand. This is equally valid lens through which to view the distribution of seats. This group wants a neighborhood based system with choice but I can't share that. As for the language we need to get to I will look for a way to state something that we can all share.

- #31 -- Say we will work to develop mechanisms. . .
 - Why not “formal way to develop mechanisms . . .
- I’m concerned that “formal” needs a new decision making body.
- It sounds like the PCSB and the DME have already started to talk about this -- but not talked with any other stakeholders yet.
- “Standard” “established”? “Coordinated” is important.
- Are charters subject to FOIA laws?
- No, but the PCSB is subject to FOIA. For #3, say “develop joint guidelines (not policies) for more equitable distribution of students”. Indicate payment systems.
- Figure out how to do mid-year transfers -- who gets picked up mid-year. If a school puts out 15 more students it creates a perverse incentive to do that if the school effectively retains the per-pupil funding for them.
- I support the recommendation to coordinate education for expelled students in DCPS and charters in a single CHOICE institution.
- Suspended students can go to CHOICE too.
 - The added efficacy might be good and efficiency could be gained too.
- We don’t want perverse effects from a common CHOICE school either.
- If a student gets kicked out a charter and ends up in CHOICE, not their neighborhood school, is that better for the student? Do we have a tiered system of consequences?
- There are city-wide expulsion policies now.
- This may be the biggest issue. In the last data (2011-12) 1900 students left charters – that’s a huge number of charter students.
- And 5,000 students left DCPS -- twice as many leave DCPS schools. Most charters don’t kick students out.
- These are very big issues that we can’t solve here.
- Can we put a marker on this? This is going public without explicit language.
- I don’t think we can spell it out in detail now. There are other critical issues to deal with. This can be one ingredient to put in a list along with mobility and proximity so they don’t get lost.

- It will get lost unless it is in the proposed policy. We need to give the public something; they need to see something. We can't leave it as a marker and then come out with a final proposal that misses this.
 - We may have to deal with some issues later because they require further analysis.
- But we want to make a recommendation.
 - We've heard a lot and we will have to re-work this.
 - I've heard a strong sentiment that we have to be specific.
- And you heard the need for clarity.
- If there are too many related conversations we may not get to Boundaries and Feeders.
 - With some issues we have gotten to a consensus, with others not. We need to hear "this is what we should say".
 - But it is consistent that the Committee believes there has to be more coordination between the sectors. Some issues are at the intersection of student assignment and mobility. It was the siting and location -- it has to do with the openings and closings and the city's responsibility to provide a system that is affordable and sensible - - not investing on one side and taking away at the other.
- On the "Coherent System of Public Schools" I'm concerned about the complementary nature of the sectors. There are severe problems with having an adequate system that is effective, efficient and transparent. We want a complementary system of transparent schools. We can't talk about A without the issue of complementary - - for #31, scratch out that wording - system.
 - Mechanisms are included in #32, 33, common policy, 34, 35 and 36. For 36 we didn't talk about that. There is a hole in the policy now. Choice? There is a whole section as it relates to . . .
- That was qualified; choice was in-advertently taken out.
- There are issues still with implementation - - we need to encourage cross-sector collaboration.

Communications and Public Engagement

Members Questions and Comments on Op Ed Piece

- About the proposed op ed., there have been a lot of e-mails back and forth among the Committee half of whom wanted to co-sign or to help draft and edit. Do we want it to go out before the Recommendation or on the same day as the release? It now sounds like we want to wait until the final Recommendation comes out. We want it to share who we are, why we are doing this and invite feed-back. We are drafting the start.
- I only saw one of the e-mails. What's the timing?
- June 12th the proposal comes out to the public, the final Recommendation is when we send it to the DME.
 - The media hasn't given the process the credit due to the Committee.

- We don't need to wage a media campaign now. I'm not interested in preliminarily defending myself.
- The comments from elected officials indicate they are ignorant of the process. It is critical to open the black box. People don't know the inner workings of the process. We really haven't made up our minds on this yet.
- Why do you see this as defense?
- We are reacting to politicians and reacting in defense of all the long hours here. At this point the DME's office should be defending the process, not the appointed Committee. I support signing on to an op ed when the final report comes out -- August 25.
- The June 12 draft is preliminary, August 25 is the final.
- On June 12th we will still be waiting for input.
- June 12th -- no matter what -- the reaction will be the same from some reactionary people.
- It will get people to come to the community meetings.
- That's premature. It smacks of self-serving and defensiveness. So I could write my own.
- There would be question of why didn't the others sign on.
- The op ed. would not be that controversial and would put to bed the concerns about a city-wide lottery, etc.
- I will e-mail everyone about the op ed.

Next Steps

- There are outstanding issues from the last meeting including relevant data which we will send out electronically.
- There is a schedule for implementation for the phase-in; the text was in the e-mail.
- Please send comments on the Policy Recommendations back to us via e-mail.

Members Questions and Comments on Scheduling Draft Review and an Additional Meeting

- We are making recommendations to the DME -- but I'm not sure about all the details and it is sight unseen. Can we get a new draft by Wednesday? But we have to see it by then if it is from us together as opposed to the DME's recommendation from the Committee. We need to decide now. Can we do an additional meeting Saturday afternoon? Friday morning?
 - The issue is capturing your recommendations and not trying to integrate the relevant impact analysis. We could do this fairly quickly between tomorrow and Wednesday but Thursday would be better than Wednesday.
 - We could do a day meeting and an evening meeting.

- There is a ton still on the table and we need to give the Team time to get the next draft together and then review it.
- The form of the memo I expected was by the Committee to the DME. After 10-12 years of planning projects I have never had a memo written by the Committee. It makes sense and is laid out by the DME; there will be a more formal report later.
- We're gotten pretty far with this.
- We need to try to be realistic.
- We are tasked with the Recommendations; this is OUR draft to the public for input. It isn't for us to own the language. We have not been asked to get it perfect; it is about ownership. We've had this conversation. It matters to me but we won't get it perfect but the public discussion then is one more time for engagement.
- That would be a big change now.
- This needs to be done. There is 5% that I'm not crazy about -- not much. The set-aside talk over predictability in set-asides, mobility and planning we can get close enough. We have to see the final before it goes out.
- But the agency representative is saying that it is a lot of work; we need to get there and we can all sign on. We have to get there. A Thursday meeting is OK with me.
- The Committee owns the Recommendations --- the DME owns the process.
- We have to do more on this and I can't make Thursday.
 - Monday evening? We can't split into two meetings. There will be a new draft out ahead of time -- we need to get that out.
 - We need comments by Saturday night.
 - By Thursday morning we will have the draft out and by Saturday we will have comments back. So Monday June 9 at 5:00; draft will be out Thursday morning, turn-around by Saturday evening and you will get something prior to Monday.
 - It is easier to get comments in e-mail NOT in track-changes.
 - We will look at the out-standing issues and put them in an e-mail including phase in.
 - By tomorrow morning we will have the phase-in and soft copy outstanding issues. Thursday morning we'll have the new version of the Recommendations
- So we can give comments by Thursday.

- We will be hosting an event for all your children and significant others to compensate for all the time that you have put in.

Attending

Chairperson

- Abigail Smith, Deputy Mayor for Education

Community Representatives

- Maryam Ahranjani, Marshall Brennan Constitutional Literacy Project
- Emily Bloomfield, Former member, DC Public Charter School Board, Charter Operator
- Wilma Bonner, Howard University, Retired DCPS principal and Assistant Superintendent
- Matt Frumin, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner 3E (ANC), DCPS parent
- Heather Harding, Ed. Consortium for Research and Evaluation (EdCORE), PCS parent
- Faith Hubbard, Council on Education
- Kamili Kiros, , Achievement Prep Board of Trustees; PCS parent
- Cathy Reilly, Senior High Alliance of Parents Principals and Educators (SHAPPE)
- Sharona Robinson Ward 8 Ed. Council; Ballou HS PTSA; MySchoolDC Parent Advisory Council: DCPS parent
- Evelyn Boyd Simmons, ANC 2F Education Committee Co-Chair; DCPS parent
- Eboni-Rose Thompson, Save the Children; Ward 7 Ed. Council; LSAT, Plummer Elementary
- Marta Urquilla, America Achieves/Results for America; PCS parent
- Martin Welles, 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 Staff

- 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)
- Sheena Pegarido, Reingold LINK

Technical Team 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

- 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

District Agency Representatives

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

District Staff Members

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

DRAFT