

D R A F T
Advisory Committee on Student Assignment: Meeting Summary
Meeting #8, May 19, 2014
Thurgood Marshall Center, 1816 12th Street, NW, 5:30-8:30 p.m.

Welcome, Review of Agenda and Meeting Goals

Abigail Smith, Deputy Mayor for Education and chairperson for the Advisory Committee welcomed everyone and noted the anniversary of Brown vs. Board of Education, noting that the occasion helps everyone to focus a bit. She thanked the group for all their feed-back on policies.

Finalize the draft Advisory Committee Recommendation: This is the main work of the meeting. It is unlikely the Committee will get to everything on the agenda so the group may want to plan for targeted conference calls or the possibility of another meeting.

June Community Meetings: It is hoped that the next round of Community Meetings will start the week of June 9th but dates have yet to be finalized.

Ongoing Impact Analysis: Impact analysis is included in the Committee packets; another batch of analysis is coming.

Council Hearing June 26: The Council Committee on Education has scheduled a hearing on the Student Assignment Initiative for June 26th.

Revisions to the Advisory Committee draft Recommendations: The Committee will come together to revise the final recommendation based on what we hear from the community and learn through the analysis.

Final Advisory Committee Report goes to the DME in August. The DME makes recommendations to the Mayor and the Chancellor.

Members Comments and Questions on the Agenda and Meeting Goals

- When will the final draft have to be released?
 - If Community Meetings are the week of June 9th the release should be Wednesday or Thursday of the previous week, or the 4th or 5th of June so people can come to the Community Meetings ready for conversation.

Review Format of draft Advisory Committee Recommendation

The Technical Team submitted the Introduction of the Recommendations as a broad framing to put the Recommendation into the larger planning context. The Committee was asked to take a few minutes to read the document to see if it captured the spirit and tone of the Committee and note if something substantial was missing.

Members Comments and Questions on the Format of the draft Recommendations

- The piece appears to be comprehensive; it reflects the values of the Committee. It is simple but sophisticatedly presented -- palatable and well done. However, I don't see the commitment to do this on a regular, on-going basis.

- I'm not sure "humbled" is the correct word. I see the statement about bridging between the charters and DCPS in policies has moved up in the batting order; I'm hearing a lot of clamoring about the insanity of this current arrangement.
- Coordinating DCPS and charters more has always been 4th on the list but this framing really over-steps. I see it as really unacceptable to have that here in the preamble. I expect we will discuss this.
 - The concern about lack of coordination with two separate systems has been a very strong sentiment in the community discussions.
- There is a letter today from charter community members who may not have been well represented in the community discussions.
- I'm fine with where the concern about charter/DCPS planning is. This was clearly a high-level concern.
- It really comes up constantly. We have skipped it up in the order and I'm fine with where it is.
- Is there any analysis on how this reaches toward getting children to high-performing schools?
 - Rather this point is about how the city has responsibility for its supply of schools and their proximity to students.
- It is very important to make a comment about the general insanity of the huge needs of the students and having two different systems that are completely un-coordinated when we could focus support on educational programs. This is the elephant in the room. This is worded tactfully.
- People are looking for quality which is not inconsistent with the efforts toward fair funding. We have to acknowledge what we've heard from people. This calls for a significant increase in investment where there is the greatest need.
- I don't want to be naive but at the same time if we don't acknowledge what we've heard we'll be doing an injustice. I would hope to see a bit more favor toward using "student" and "family"
- I agree that I've heard a call for coordinated planning. Choice seems to have been substituted for having a functioning healthy system of schools. We need a bow to some kind of rational planning.
 - Thank you all for these helpful comments. I hope you see them reflected in the next draft. If not, let us know.

Access to DCPS Early Childhood Education

- (1) Families residing in zones for Title I DCPS schools shall have access by right to PK3 and PK4 seats in their zoned DCPS school, provided they register by March 1 (or by the first round deadline for My School DC)
- (2) Families residing in zones for Non-Title I DCPS schools shall have access by lottery to PK3 and PK4 seats based on program availability and capacity.
- (3) Families residing in zones for Non-Title I DCPS schools shall have access by right to PK4 seats in their zoned DCPS school.
- (4) Families shall have access by lottery to out of zone DCPS PK3 and PK4 seats based on program availability and capacity.

The overall recommendation is to extend access by right to PK3 and PK4, acknowledging that the cost is daunting. Note that to have access by right families must be part of the lottery. For non-Title one schools, access would be phased in based on planning and capacity.

Members Comments and Questions about Access to Early Childhood Education

- What if the Title 1 school is over-capacity?
 - The stipulation of registering by March 1st means that DCPs can be required to add capacity for pre-kindergarten. We can do a relatively good approximation of demand for Title 1 schools from the lottery. We can see where problems may be created.
- What happens to people enrolling after March 1st?
 - There will be lots of policy accompanying the roll-out. In this draft there is a lottery for the extra seats.
- What if a family moves in after March 1st?
 - That's a problem. With MySchoolDC now, you are on a wait list and still have a preference for your in-boundary school.
- We are adding a right that does not currently exist. This is a real obligation on the part of DCPS.
- In Title 1 schools now the whole school gets the benefits of the Title 1 funding if low-income students are a certain percentage of the student body. Would this policy change anything?
 - If after March 1st there is space then in-boundary students would be able to simply enroll in their neighborhood school. This policy may increase the in-boundary participation rates.
- In gentrifying neighborhoods with a Title 1 school, poor students are often concentrated. If the zone changes out of Title 1 status the school may remain a Title 1

school because of the poverty of the students who attend, not because the neighborhood is impoverished. The concern is around the ability of schools to attract high quality teachers more than about seat availability.

- I'm responding to an earlier comment about how many schools are affected by this problem, practically speaking, if so many students are already going out-of-bounds. How many schools are affected: two or three, possibly up to thirty? I am not sure. Perhaps this would change the psychology and behavior of families. What about the fairness of non-Title 1 schools having access by right. In a totally ideal world this would work but maybe we should guarantee PK4 in higher-income schools but we might not want to provide PK3.
- This should not be a priority for two reasons: 1) providing PK3 to higher income families is not the highest and best use of the District's resources 2) it might be the stick that breaks the camel's back in trying to solve boundary issues. We would have to create some new early childhood centers in some areas so it worries me that we should state this as a goal.
- In some schools we would need to build 12 new classrooms for all who are on the wait-list? How many classrooms for 4-year-olds will we have to be built by 2020?
 - *I would take out the [non] Title 1 schools. The Technical Team looked at the number of classrooms that would be needed for PK3 and PK4 at Title 1 schools figuring from the number of classrooms required for the present Kindergarteners. It was about 15 schools that would need one or two added classrooms.*
- For Title 1 schools it would be great for students to have priority - - but not for the others.
- But the policy should be applicable to all equally.
- Now, out-of-boundary rights go to those who have the resources to make use of them. If people get into a PK3 program out-of-boundary they don't necessarily come back to their neighborhood school.
 - There would be no cap on access to charters in the lottery for PK3 and/or PK/4 and there would be no income limit at all for charters. And in fact, Ward 3 families travel furthest for PK3 and PK4, but then they come back to their neighborhood schools. DCPS is putting a cap on PK3 and PK4 by income.
- This should stay [provision for PK4 by right to all in neighborhood schools]. Maybe it should be phased or a long-term grandfathering plan so that as modernized schools come on line, there will be space available for more PK4 classes. Having PK4 is an easy entry way to convince parents that DCPS is worth going for.

- This would mean, for instance that there would be no lottery; no PK3 classrooms at Shepherd before there were PK4 programs in all other schools.
- We are talking about limiting rights, limiting access for some.
- We might compromise by talking about currently available seats with a long-term goal of having space for early classrooms at all schools.
- If a Title 1 school needs space then add classrooms if there is a waiting list; otherwise parents will wander off. Isn't it our goal **not** to have parents leave DCPS?
- I don't agree with the language of "limiting". People have no right to PK in-bounds now. We're not talking about taking something away -- we're just not adding something new. I don't see a problem there, except that we'll be spending a lot.
 - It's not a financial argument. There are other early childhood facilities that are not in schools.
- We are expanding the right to PK3 and PK4 at Title 1 schools. We keep lottery access for all other schools. We need to add aspirational language around early childhood rights but the long-term goal should be reflected here.
 - I agree with #1, #2, #4 and pulling back on #3.
 - We can test this at the Community Meetings.
 - By right access to DCPS schools for early childhood should specifically be associated with DCPS schools.

Right to Access Through Attendance Zones

With attendance zones the aim is for proximity and walkability to incentivize the rights to the zoned school and encourage people to be engaged with their neighborhoods. This is not easy given the rivers, Rock Creek Park, the Capitol, the National Mall and the highways -- these are major geographic barriers. Difficulties with public transportation also often make it hard for communities to get around within their zones. Where a zoned school is not within a mile we propose that the District provide transportation, provide free Metrobus for a parent or guardian to accompany an elementary age student to school. For elementary school age students we would designate a preference for children farther than 1 mile to have a preference for any public school in the common lottery, if it is closer.

(5) Kinder through 5th grade students shall be zoned for and have access by right to a single DCPS PK-5 or a DCPS PK-8 school.

(6) Where the zoned DCPS PK-5 or PK-8 school is not within 1 mile walking distance from the family's residence, then the District of Columbia shall either:

- a) Provide transportation to the zoned school;
- b) Provide free Metrobus for a parent or guardian to accompany the elementary age child to school; or

c) Designate a proximity preference to these children to any public school in the common lottery, if it is closer.

(7) 6th through 8th grade students shall be zoned for and have access by right to a single DCPS school offering 6-8th grade,

(8) 9th through 12th grade students shall be zoned for and have access by right to a single DCPS high school.

(9) DCPS and public charter school students in PK through 12th grade shall have free use of Metrobus to travel to and from school.

(10) 9th through 12th grade students shall have free use of Metrorail to travel to and from a public school (currently students already have reduced Metrorail fare).

Members Questions and Comments on Access through Attendance Zones

- When did we have this conversation before? This is new.
- If Van Ness does not open, then Brent is the closest school for many students in the Amidon boundary.
 - There are just shy of 2,000 students that need to travel because they are more than a mile from a DCPS school; approx. 1,100 are DCPS families. The question is how to tweak the boundaries so we can address this problem of proximity.
- Do we know how many are already attending schools that are more than a mile from their boundary school?
 - About 500 are zoned for and attending elementary schools west of the park.
- The boundaries in Ward 5 are very challenging. Some of the residential areas near the Arboretum are zoned for Langdon, across New York Avenue. I would not walk there as an adult because of the traffic. We heard last meeting about the difficulties of getting around in Wards 7 and 8 because of the terrain and the way the roads are in-direct. Brookland at Bunker Hill has a particularly spread-out boundary.
- Does the point about middle school students having access to a single DCPS school offering 6th-8th grade (#7) deal with the alignment issues?
 - No. It is a place-marker.
 - #6 seems to be controversial (policy for what happens when a student is more than a mile from an elementary school). Can the group agree on #10 - - providing all high school students with free Metrorail?
 - This would be free Metrobus for students, not for any accompanying parents.
- Do all elementary schools have PK4?

- Do we give people three choices, either transportation to elementary school, Metrobus to the parent and child (elementary school) or provide a proximity preference to any DCPS or PCS in the common lottery.
 - We thought the Advisory Committee would make that decision.
- I would question the advisability of the Advisory Committee picking one for people - - it is complicated.
- All parents would want free bus service, door-to-door; rather it would be about what DCPS wants.
- The idea of designating a proximity preference to children to any public school in the common lottery is a radical idea. Even in these boundaries you may not be that close to another school. Would this be a proximity preference or a weight in the lottery?
 - For about approx. ~1900 families, walkability is an issue. Can we address that problem here?
- The problem exists because we closed a whole bunch of schools. Instead of opening these schools again we are trying to address it in these ways. I would rather seek to open those closed schools.
- If we have real coordination we would see some of those schools re-opening.
- This gives students the ability to access a closer charter school.
- It is odd to me that you would want to send students to charter schools - - it says that DCPS can't manage this.
 - It is a way to address the inequities around distance. This is giving a preference to have a right to a nearby school. This would be the strongest preference after sibling preference.
- I could be 1.1 miles away and demand to get into BASIS or Latin?
- I agree with the proximity preference; it gets us some what we want. We would want more information about the transportation cost impact - - OSSE's costs for Special Education transportation are huge. Usually people are near to public transit but not everyone may be close to a bus stop.
- A lot of the Special Ed transportation has been cut back lately.
- Which communities have charters nearby?
 - We'll share the data on that. Remember this would only be if students are more than a mile.

- I would like to see that one mile reflect the safety of the walk with appropriate parameters where judgment is applied - - not a cookie cutter approach. We need really thoughtful parameters. We need a wise decision in stewardship of resources that is cost efficient and best for families.
 - Would we want to take this question back up at a later date? Shall we put a pin in this discussion and come back to it with more analysis? [Hands went up to signal yes.]

Feeder Pathways

These pathways hope to provide an opportunity for students to move as a cohort through the system while at the same time meeting some of the challenges of diversity. Designation of feeders has been in practice not in policy. Right now, feeder patterns don't entirely align - - having them nest or pyramid up from elementary through middle school to high school would be new throughout most of the District. We will look at the specific feeder patterns and the plan for specialized programs later in the meeting.

(11) DCPS elementary students shall have access by right to the middle school designated as a next level school in the geographic feeder pattern for the elementary school they complete, regardless of whether the students live in the attendance zone of the designated middle school.

(12) DCPS middle grade students shall have access by right to the high school designated as a next level school in the geographic feeder pattern for the middle school they complete, regardless of whether the students live in the attendance zone of the designated high school.

(13) DCPS students shall have access by right to the designated next level school in the programmatic feeder pattern for the specialized program/school they complete.

Members Questions and Comments on Feeder Pathways

- Would separate feeder patterns for specialized programs constitute a dual right?
 - We would be getting rid of one dual right while adding a programmatic right.
- Who defines which programs?
 - DCPS would decide the programs for programmatic alignment.
- I suggest we put some criteria in as to what qualifies as a program.
 - Right now the consideration is for dual language, and International Baccalaureate; that could change but it gives us an idea of the thinking.
- There is a concern for forcing parents to decide on a specialized program for three-year-olds. I would like to see new entry possibilities at the middle school level; it needs an on-ramp.
- With #12 you see the notion that students have the right to stay in their feeder pattern.
 - But students need the on-ramp to get in.
- If you have a programmatic right to a school do you still maintain your geographic right to a zoned school?

- Yes, this is not like Denver policy example.
- If my child is in a dual language school and does not want to learn Spanish any more, is there an off ramp as well as an on ramp?
- What about rights to two schools as with Ross and Francis-Stevens?
 - That would no longer be the case. There would be no grandfathering of those sorts of rights; we would have to weigh which rights to maintain, but this needs clarification.
- What happens when the geographic area of a middle school is not in the geographic boundary of the high school but the middle school feeds to the high school - - are there many such situations?
 - Right now, only Anacostia and Ballou work as solid pyramids. There are many such situations where Shepherd and southwest feed to Wilson even though they are in-boundary for Jefferson. It is thousands of students.
- How do we address the problem of over-crowding in the high schools? Crestwood is one example - - it is now not in the Wilson boundary.
 - We have a pyramid of boundaries but dual rights for specialized programs such as dual language, International Baccalaureate and STEM.

Access through Lottery

The language here aims to describe other ways to get access to zoned schools:

(14) Families have a right to apply for seats in out of zone DCPS and charter schools through a unified, fair and transparent lottery process.

(15) Families of students designated “at risk” shall have priority in the lottery for DCPS and PCS available seats.

(16) Siblings of currently enrolled students in a DCPS or PCS school shall have priority in the lottery for seats in that school.

(17) DCPS shall set aside at least 10% of seats in a zoned elementary school for out of zone students.

(18) DCPS shall set aside at least 15% of the seats in a zoned middle school for out of zone students.

(19) DCPS shall set aside at least 20% of the seats in a zoned high school for out of zone students.

(20) Elementary grade students who are not within 1 mile walking distance of their DCPS zoned school, shall be given proximity preference to a DCPS or charter school, if they are closer.

Some questions would be whether every school has to be part of the lottery and whether “at-risk” students get priority in the lotteries. Sibling priority remains the status quo. Are the set-aside percentages the correct ones and do we want a proximity preference?

Members Questions and Comments on Access through Lottery

- What percentage of DCPS students are at risk?
 - We’ve used the definition that applies to the budget process so it is students eligible for TANIF, SNAPS; students who are homeless or in foster care. It is about 43% citywide and 45% for DCPS.
- That’s about 90% of the students in my children’s school. We need to consider the un-intended consequences. The assumption is that 43% are competing for high performing schools?
- This is a good discussion to have here; DCPS and charters as well.
- This is the first year of the universal lottery. Before people could just walk in and talk with the principal and get in. Filling the 10% should go quickly.
 - That’s a minimum of 10%.
- There are a large number of at-risk students and not enough seats. I’m not sure I’m in agreement: we need to really address the needs of the at-risk students, not just shuffle them off across town.
- Every family doesn’t necessarily want their children to have to go across town.
- We need to discuss the percentages and account for the 43% of students who are vulnerable. We should spend more time talking about this.
- I’m concerned for the out-of-boundary students being easily labeled and ostracized.
- Educators should be able to make the effort to avoid that happening.
- What are we doing for academically at-risk students?
- The definition of at-risk is from the new funding available. The goal is to look at academic failure indicators and poverty is a pretty good proxy for that.
 - At high school it is being over age for your grade level.
- I have problems with numbers 14, 15, and 20 which make the lottery mandatory for LEAs. This is adding a lot; charter parents have not been engaged in this process nor have the principals of charter LEA’s. This has really been sprung at the last minute and has not been discussed.
- I’ve heard a lot about the two systems existing in context. It is hard to discuss them together but it is critical that we do that. I have a sense of the Committee and a sense

from the public that we deal with it. Out-of-boundary set-asides are hugely important. They are different than before and will be experienced as huge. Hearst and Eaton already have lots of middle-class families who are out-of-boundary and this flips it. It may be right but there will be lots of push-back.

- There is an inherent tension between the large framework of neighborhood schools when the neighborhood schools don't work for lots of children and families. We started with a higher percentage [of at-risk students] than now and then it came down as pressure grew on DCPS [to improve]. But how do we eventually get 100% of the students in neighborhood schools that are high performing? How do we get to a small % of out-of-boundary students in 5 years?
- Part of the fundamental theory of action around the charter system is that it will help improve neighborhood schools but that has not fixed improvement but rather has provided an exit ramp off more than pressure to improve.
- Re-segregation could come into play - - and that's not anybody's goal.
- But the framework was always about neighborhood schools. I disagree.
- We have a core of neighborhood schools and a complementary system intentionally to allow for more diverse schools.
- But we need more accountability in DCPS and the PCSB.
- We should refer to the lottery as out-of-boundary recommendations.
- I thought we had decided to give rights to multiples - - twins and triplets.
- At what point does it become a different system depending on re-distribution rather than providing quality where people live? "We can get you to where quality is" not "We can get quality to you". The butler for this issue is diversity which defines equitable access. We've avoided it long enough and have to wrestle that to the floor and figure it out.
- If we slide the funding higher or use diversity then certain neighborhoods won't have anything there. We can "let them get out" but at some point, what's left?
- 43% are at-risk. All of whom may not want to go to different schools and all at-risk students are not at low-performing schools. How do we reverse flight to northwest schools? I've been a champion of diversity but I also feel this policy is about access to quality more than diversity. How do we incentivize DCPS to work on quality quicker? We need to make investments that will be unpopular; some students may not be able to go where they want to go out-of-boundary. Where do we apply pressure for change?
- I've thought through a lot about this all day and all night and I hesitate to put it out but I think the foundation with neighborhood based schools is fine with the goal of great

quality close to home for everyone. But I'm also worried about access to quality right now. A few things in these policies get at that. My children started at an out-of-boundary school; we found that out-of-boundary path. It is important to provide that access to students with the highest need. Without the expectation of that easy access families may be incentivized to invest in their neighborhood schools - - which would be a good investment for the city. Set-asides, geographic feeders are possibilities [to strengthen those investments]. Programmatic feeders and their parallel dual rights provide more access, hopefully, to diversity. We need quality teachers all over and high concentrations of poverty make it difficult to deliver results. But if we can dilute that concentration of poverty it would be good for kids.

- We need to know if the preference for at-risk goes to charter as well as DCPS; that we're not creating a separate class of students. If it is important for DCPS it is also important for charters.
- I agree. It makes more sense than a preference for proximity. At-risk should be above proximity in importance. In the language we should spell out what the at-risk funding should do. Students can sit in schools and not be served. We're serving the highest need and the lowest need but not those in the middle.
- Providing for the at-risk [in DCPS] gives an advantage to charters; with no requirement to serve in-boundary, charters will fill up with at-risk students (think of Latin or BASIS) 30-40,000 students are 43% at risk.
 - But not all at-risk students will apply to charters.
- Poverty would be third on the list for weights - - if seats are available.
- It would be an added weight in MySchoolDC or apply to students more than a mile away from a school; it would be a preference, not a right.
- DCPS and the charters would be treated as one sector, not parity? The set-aside would be for 10% at-risk at DCPS but for the charters it would apply to everyone. The implications for the two sectors are very different. There are real difficulties of quality in areas where there is a high density of poverty; we need to recognize that.
- I would want to see analysis for 14, 15, and 20 broken out as to DCPS and charters.
- Charters have preferences for children of full-time staff members, military families, founders children . . . it would be different.
- We need to be careful not to conflate diversity and quality as they are very different concepts. Diversity is not necessarily better quality. This is a big issue and has huge implications for at-risk students. We may need to back up a bit and not be rushed. This is complicated and we need to budget time for figuring out what it all means.
 - Clearly we've heard a need for more discussion.

- As to the issue of charter concerns, are we taking this to the charter contingent? I would request outreach to charters.
 - We need to address that with additional outreach.
 - Without another additional meeting on the last agenda item, Conditions for Success, we may need another meeting as we are getting off the agenda. Is there a sense of the group?
- We need another meeting; if it needs another three-hour meeting, so be it.
- We got stuck last time; we need a sense of what we are stuck in.
- We need another meeting.
 - Then we can use the remaining time to move through the agenda.

Specialized Schools, Continuation and Transfer Rights

(21) Students in zone for a school-wide dual language elementary school shall have the right to attend a non-dual language school designated as the alternative to the specialized school for grades PK-1. For students in grade 2 and above, they are assigned to the non-dual language school unless they are able to demonstrate proficiency in the target language.

(22) Students whose place of residence changes from in zone to out of zone shall have the right to continue attending the school through the final grade level offered by the school when the school's utilization rate is less than 85%.

This provides rights at school-wide dual language schools for students to be assigned to a non-dual language school if they prefer. Students who move out of the boundary for a zoned specialized school would have the right to stay in the school only if the school is not over-crowded.

Members Questions and Comments on Specialized Schools, Continuation and Transfer Rights

- Why is this different from out-of-boundary students' rights to the school? Number 22 needs to refer to feeder rights as well.
 - This has been a challenge to Oyster-Adams and we have three whole-school dual language schools now and we are growing a fourth. This formalizes DCPS's work-arounds.
- What if a student in a dual-language school simply wants an English-only school even though they are fluent?
 - DCPS would find a space at an English-only school. Alternatively if you move into the zone for a dual-language school and your child is not fluent but you want them to opt in anyway currently DCPS has you sign a waiver.
- We shouldn't ask at-risk students to sign a waiver to absolve DCPS of responsibility if they don't achieve. Through natural attrition you lose upper-level students so we need an on-ramp of some kind for students to enter a specialized school at the upper grade levels.

- We have world language in some form in all DCPS schools now.
- We need to struggle with this more.
- Why does this discussion just cover just dual language?
- Does #22 apply to every elementary school? Is it in the wrong place?

Conditions for Success: DC Public Education Planning

This last section of the proposed recommendation covers planning for the supply and demand for schools and includes proposals on policies to improve coordinated planning and maintaining information about schools across the DCPS and charter sectors. It also elevates certain processes that need more intentional planning. Note that there are two DC Codes that would be amended to provide for the necessary authorization. The District has a thorough master planning code but it has no authority over DCPS or the charters. Neither DCPS nor the charters are particularly amenable to coordination. The public has no formal input into these agencies and it is difficult to get the agencies to take part in a planning process. One problem for the Committee is how to get to a resolution that is more specific.

(23) Amend D.C. Code § 38-1802.03 on the process for approving or denying public charter school petitions and the Multiyear Facilities Master Plan of D.C. Code § 38-2803 to ensure that the plan and approval process includes provisions for coordinated opening, closing, relocation, siting, expansions and contractions of DCPS and public charter schools.

(24) Ensure code § 38-280 requiring a comprehensive multiyear facilities master plan for all DCPS and public charter schools is prepared by the Mayor and submitted to the Council for review and approval in accordance with the provisions of the code.

(25) DCPS shall establish a public process whereby specialized and selective schools are proposed, considered and decided, as part of a regularly developed and maintained educational plan.

(26) Public school capacities shall be evaluated annually and updated prior to submission of the next year enrollment projections for budgeting.

(27) If a DCPS school is projected to be at 90% or greater utilization according to its updated capacity and the next year projections, work with the school and community to evaluate the school specific boundary population, feeder school enrollments, where applicable, in-boundary participation rates, charter enrollments in the vicinity, and 5 to 10 year population projections for the boundary and its adjacent boundaries (or feeders) to prepare a recommendation on whether any action on boundaries, feeder pathways, building expansion, grade configuration, or other building utilization may be required within a 3-5 year time frame.

(28) If a DCPS school is projected to be at 60% or less utilization, according to its updated capacity and the next year projections, work with the local school and community to evaluate the school specific boundary population, in-boundary participations rates, charter enrollments in the vicinity, and 5 to 10 year population projections for the boundary and its adjacent

boundaries to prepare a recommendation on whether any action on boundaries, building expansion, grade configuration, or other building utilization may be required within a 3-5 year time frame.

(29) In 2022, and every ten years thereafter, the city shall undergo a comprehensive review of student assignment policies, including school boundaries and feeder patterns.

Conditions for Success: Adequate Capacity (School Supply)

(30) DCPS shall ensure that there is an equitable distribution of specialized schools and programs for STEM, arts integration, IB and dual language at elementary and middle schools as part of a regularly developed and maintained educational plan.

(31) Specialized (non-selective) schools shall be neighborhood schools with boundaries unless there is ample capacity in adjacent DCPS neighborhood schools to serve the same grades. If DCPS needs capacity for students, then the specialized school can be required to relocate, or convert to a neighborhood school and offer a non-specialized strand, or convert to a neighborhood school and pair with a non-specialized school to offer the traditional grade level program.

(32) DCPS shall increase early childhood capacity to serve DCPS zoned schools in support of expanded rights to PK3 and PK4.

(33) For the five new schools proposed in the draft geographic feeder pattern chart – DCPS must work with the affected communities on developing an implementation and capital plan for opening these sites.

Members Questions and Comments on DC Public Education Planning and School Supply

- With #24, a multi-year comprehensive facilities master plan, there is good legislation but no power?
 - Yes. The city is required to produce a master plan every five years but there is no authority to respect that planning in the six-year Capital Improvement Plan that is updated annually.
- It is one thing for the Committee to discuss student assignment policy but has this morphed into a technical fix for facilities planning?
 - This is a major school governance issue for the city.
- We would need an amendment to the code to have these changes. How far down the road in terms of policy and supporting information are we going? But if people buy in, they will do it.
- I think these changes should be on the table to be included, they should not be added as an appendix.
- Number 23 (coordinating DCPS and charter planning) is very important.

- This would be a major change if this is part of the charter approval process. The charter board is meeting tonight to approve eight more charters. Consideration for charter board approval of new charters is very limited.
- Why do we need another charter high school?
- Maybe we can incorporate these concerns rather than cite the specific code. We can distinguish between resource allocations that are city-wide and the ability of charters to still be independent with respect to curriculum and hiring. It is important for the city to plan city-wide but still provide for charters without impinging in their independence.
- That's helpful. We need a really solid case because this goes to the heart of the charter movement and who they are and what they do.
 - We would be ignoring everything we have heard at every community meeting if we do not address this. It is a concern in all eight wards.
- There is a distinction between giving autonomy to charter operators who are managing pilot programs that feels different than having an authorizer provide for locating charters anywhere. Twenty years ago when charters were introduced providing autonomy at the school level for pilot programs was the goal. But where and how many charters require a public system between the two sectors that have to work together. We need a statement here that is more specific than "we ought to do coordinated planning".
- We need specificity of time-lines that indicate when policy should be instituted. It serves us well if we know that in code what we should do to get to an outcome.
- We need a column for each of these bullets that states which authority covers which aspect of planning and policy - -the DME, DCPS, etc.
- Numbers 27 and 28 (review of DCPS schools if capacity is over 90% or under 60%) provides for a regular process because we will not have gotten all the boundaries and feeders right. This is a way to trigger needed adjustments in advance. The trigger would be a review and adjustment rather than disruptive school closings. It essentially puts schools on a watch list associated with planning with respect to capacity and enrollment.
- About numbers 27 and 28 (regular process to review DCPS schools over 90% or under 60% of capacity) we need guidelines and goals rather than specifics - - 90% or 60%; I have no idea.
 - We have a good idea; the percentages should be footnoted.
- We are missing an incentive structure around student mobility which is a very important dynamic for educational success. This goes to the questions from the Community Working Groups about alignment of the grade configurations between the sectors. Charters often start middle schools at 5th grade whereas DCPS starts middle school at 6th

grade; the Working Groups were clear that this needs to be coordinated. Do we put a pin in this and return to it?

- Yes.
- At the beginning of this discussion this evening we were getting a “yea” or “nay” on discussion items but we seem to have stopped doing that. I disapprove of everything on page 11; numbers 23 to 28.
 - We really ran out of time.
- Is there a counter-proposal?
 - If you mean that nothing should apply to charters? If so, that is helpful.
 - We need to keep moving, but to the point about the objections to page 11, obviously some things may be too new and people need time to digest them. If the Committee does not come to “yes” we are not assuming there is agreement.
 - There is no consensus needed; this is collaborative and the goal is not “yes” - - we’ve got a long discussion in front of us.
- At the next meeting it would be helpful to incorporate the edits and circulate before the meeting.
 - Our goal was to get all of the comments back to you.
- There are incentives for student mobility as most of it is from the charters back to DCPS. How does any of this address that? Charters get paid quarterly but DCPS gets paid once a year.
- The incentive structure needs to change because the funds don’t get down to the students.
 - The master planning process is guidelines, not specifics. Recommendations try to deliver on growth and the degree to which at-risk students are supported. Some new schools would need to be created. There is concern about access to selective and specialized schools and how to increase their supply throughout the city.

Recommendations for Feeder Pathways

The updated revisions to the feeders the Committee are at the end of the recommendations.

1. Anacostia has little change except that Sousa is fed by now by CW Harris and Nalle (which had gone to Kelly Miller) because DCPS leadership wanted to see East Capitol Street as the divider. Note that formerly Savoy going to Johnson was simply an error that has been corrected; Savoy now feeds to Kramer.
2. Woodson is fed by Kelly Miller and the new application middle school.

3. Ballou's feeders remain unchanged.
4. Eastern has essentially the same feeders as before but adds Van Ness as a new school to open in 2015 which feeds with Brent, Tyler, and Amidon-Bowen into Jefferson Middle School.
5. Dunbar includes students from the new Brookland Middle School - - Bunker Hill, Burroughs, Noyes and Langdon – as well as Wheatley and Langley which feed into the new McKinley Tech. Middle School. All these schools will revert to PS-5th grade schools.
6. Cardozo feeders include a re-opened Shaw Middle School; Francis-Stevens PS-8 and the 6th-8 at CHEC.
7. Coolidge is fed by the proposed new north middle school which takes in Brightwood, Takoma, Whittier and LaSalle-Backus, all of which would convert to PS-5th grade schools from PS-8th grade schools.
8. Roosevelt is fed from a re-opened MacFarland Middle School (Barnard, Truesdell, Powell, Bruce-Monroe @ Park View and Raymond (with the PS-8th reverting to PS-5th grade schools) as well as West PS-8 and Oyster-Adams PS-8.
9. Wilson feeders would remain unchanged except for West which now feeds into Roosevelt.

With the programmatic feeders:

- Dual language schools - - Powell, Bruce-Monroe, Bancroft, Cleveland (strand), Marie Reed (strand) and Tyler (strand) have rights to MacFarland and from there to Roosevelt.
- DCPS did not feel that STEM was specialized enough at the elementary level that a continuation to a STEM middle school made sense - - but the STEM middle school at McKinley feeds to Woodson as a STEM high school.
- International Baccalaureate programs at Thomson and Turner go to Jefferson; Shepherd would go to Deal.

Members Questions and Comments about Feeder Pathways

- We need to ask Committee members about the specifics of their areas. Who with expertise met to consider the boundaries and feeders?
 - The technical team met with Carrie Thornhill, Eboni-Rose Thompson and d'Andre Anderson about the boundaries and feeder patterns. They had real concerns with cutting off access to Eastern from east of the Anacostia. We also met with Marion Barry about Ward 8 but did not get to the feeder issues. The southern section of Ward 8 is not much changed with respect to feeders.
- Are the feeders to Woodson adequate to support it?
 - It is a challenge.
 - With Cardozo we filled a place-holder with the new Shaw middle school which has been in the CIP so it is not that new.

- Shaw got pushed back in the CIP.
 - We took Oyster-Adams to feed to Roosevelt. DCPS unveiled a plan for Roosevelt with a strand that has a strong language component.
- What are the implications for Marie Reed and Cleveland?
 - Marie-Reed as a dual language school would have programmatic rights to MacFarland.
- What about Cardozo? That would have some enrollment impact. I'm concerned about feeder patterns and don't see it working for the Cardozo area. This needs a more thoughtful look because the elementary to middle to high school sequence is riddled with problems from the beginning to the end.
 - What about performance and capacity?
- All of the above; the middle school is not even built. Cardozo's language emphasis is on immigrants; for parents without that need, nothing speaks to them.
 - There was lots of push-back on the Cardozo 6th-12th configuration. This is what came up in response to those problems.
- I'm hopeful for some planning for a middle school. We need a BIG plan.
 - Impact analysis on feeders to Eastern is on-going as there are too many schools feeding in for it to accommodate them all. We need to look at the advisability of having the city-wide schools feed to Eastern; School-Within-School and Capitol Hill Montessori could become a real problem.
- What about programmatic feeders? We are not planning a Montessori high school strand.
 - We've trying to work with the programmatic feeders as one way to increase integration, especially as we now have Eastern's boundaries now all on the west side of the Anacostia.
 - That will be a big issue with the public.
- We really need two more meetings; this is the most important issue we were supposed to be working on. Oyster is one issue; Eliot-Hine and the pipeline into Eastern and Wilson are challenging but could be very successful. There are real capacity constraints at Wilson.
- Did the idea of a new Ward 3 high school fall off the list?
 - You are correct; right now we are not sure if the projections for growth are accurate. In the policy we have provided for schools that are over 90% of capacity going automatically into a review and analysis.

Proposed Elementary School Boundaries, Round 2

The technical team had lots of feed-back on boundaries; what you see in the spread-sheet are the rationale and key data points in the revisions to the April boundaries.

Advisory Committee members are being issues your own user-name and password to the Boundary Planner software so you can test out your own revisions to the April proposal. There is an instruction sheet with your meeting packet. You will only be changing your own version, not the master version.

We have had very detailed feedback for some areas; we will put the collected public correspondence in the drop box for the Committee. The spiral printed book of thumbnail boundaries is the April version; you will be able to see that version and the May update in Boundary Planner. We are seeking feedback on the second version now.

Members Questions and Comments to Proposed Elementary Boundaries, Round 2

- May we show Round 2 boundaries to the public?
 - You should be able to show them to everyone.
 - Note that the impact analysis you are seeing has been done on the April boundary version.
- Does it go to the public before it gets changed again?
- We are still taking feed-back on the boundary issues. The feeders are the bigger question.
- Can we get clarification that is OK to show the new proposed boundaries?
 - We are not showing this second round of proposed boundaries as yet.

Upcoming Community Meetings

Three Community Meetings will be set within the next two weeks, probably starting the week of June first. The current thinking about the format includes a presentation and then facilitated table conversation. There will be no informational fairs. The discussion tables will break out by high school feeder patterns.

Members Questions and Comments about Upcoming Community Meetings

- How is that going to work in a just three two hour meetings? We don't want people to feed disrespected and just handled. It's a matter of time management - - is it realistic?
 - We want to get the proposals out well ahead of time so that people will come ready to discuss and we won't have to hand them a stack of paperwork.
 - In the feed-back for round 1, we heard that the materials were not approachable.
- What if people at the meetings have not had a chance to look at it? It is critical to get the draft recommendations out by the 6th for a meeting on the 9th and I don't see it happening. The Committee needs to be closer to a final recommendation - - although we are not terribly far now.
 - We are getting close to the end of the school year when it is hard to engage people. We are at the limit for formal notification now. We would welcome ideas on how to solve this dilemma.

- People will mostly just be interested in their own boundaries; they don't need to digest all of it so it is relatively quick. We're not asking people to take a city-wide role.
- But still, people need time to digest the information.
- I listened to a lot of the Community Working Groups and after five or six meetings there are not many new ideas coming up.
 - We didn't change 75% of the boundaries so not everything is brand new. The question is really how to allocate neighborhoods around the new consolidations.
 - This is a tremendous amount of content; we covered a lot and need to set another meeting.
 - Committee members have not had a chance to actually read the Proposed Recommendations in detail; we will send around a copy for comments tonight. We will especially need to know about things you feel really strongly about.
- We haven't talked about grandfathering - - or better stated - - phased implementation, which is a better term since grandfathering as a term has some negative connotations. The policies will have different meanings in different places. And we have feeders to schools that don't even exist now.
 - Grandfathering and triggering are to be a focus at the next meeting.
- At what point do we have a discussion about the charters? That would be a sea-change in some places. How does this trickle down to people who are impacted? Two hours of discussion is either a missed opportunity or something of a liability.
 - This is not meant to be a replacement for a large-scale proactive meeting. We've had targeted meetings with smaller community groups such as the Crestwood meeting coming up tomorrow. We can pack in a whole bunch of outreach meetings.
- It is a different subject with feeder communities when they start looking at how their world changes.
 - We had originally hoped to have nine community meetings - - one for the catchment area of each comprehensive high school.
 - We can have targeted conversations in break-outs according to feeder high schools.
- Will each of the three Community Meetings be the same content and format?
 - Only as it pertains to the specific feeder patterns so we have to be explicit in the outreach.
- Can we try not to tackle grandfathering and all the other policies at the next meetings?

- It would be great to have additional editing on the Recommendations. We will get to you a list of what we agreed on and a list of what we pinned and need to discuss further. We can send it out in softcopy and put it in the drop-box. Based on the differed conversations we will map out an agenda. Do we need an in-person meeting as opposed to conference calls?
- It will be difficult to have all of us on one conference call and if we split it into two calls, we won't get a sense of the group.
 - What about meetings the 28th of May? The 29th of May on a Thursday? And can we start at 5:00 p.m.? And Monday June 2nd?
- Sooner - - next week.
 - [Show of hands for the dates determined Thursday, May 29th and Monday June 2.
 - We really need your comments by the close of business this Thursday – verbal comments are fine.

Attending

Chairperson

- Abigail Smith, Deputy Mayor for Education

Community Representatives

- Maryam Ahranjani, Marshall Brennan Constitutional Literacy Project, American U.
- Wilma Bonner, Howard University, Retired DCPS principal and Assistant Superintendent
- Denise Forte, Leadership for Educational Equity, DCPS parent
- Matt Frumin, Commissioner, ANC3E, DCPS parent
- Heather Harding, Education Consortium for Research & Evaluation (EdCORE), PCS parent
- Sharona Robinson, Ward 8 Education Council; Ballou HS PTSA, DCPS parent
- Cathy Reilly, Senior High Alliance of Parents Principals and Educators (SHAPPE)
- Evelyn Boyd Simmons, ANC2F Ed Committee Co-Chair; DCPS parent
- Marta Urquilla, 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
- Emily Bloomfield, Former Public Charter School Board
- Christopher Delfs, Senior Citywide Planner, DC Office of Planning; DCPS parent
- Clara Hess, Director, Human Capital and Strategic Initiatives, PCSB
- Ellen McCarthy, Acting Director, DC Office of Planning
- Ariana Quinones, Chief of Staff, Office Deputy Mayor for HHS

Technical Team

- Michael Akin, Reingold LINK Communications
- Alex Donahue, 21st Century School Fund

- Mary Filardo, 21st Century School Fund
- Nancy Huvendick, 21st Century School Fund
- Cecilia Kaltz, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education
- Claudia Lujan, Office of Deputy Mayor for Education
- Sheena Pegarido, Reingold LINK
- Simone Zhang, Urban Institute
- Scheherazade Salimi, Chief of Staff, Deputy Mayor for Education

Technical Staff Members

- Judi Greenberg, Special Asst., Office of the Deputy Mayor for Education

Not Attending

Community Representatives:

- Ed Davies, Children Youth Investment Trust Corporation
- Rev Donald Isaac, East of the River Clergy/Police, Community Partnership; Chair, Interfaith Council
- Kamili Kiros, Achievement Prep Board of Trustees; PCS parent
- Eboni-Rose Thompson, Save the Children Organization; Ward 7 Education Council; Plummer LSAT

Technical Team

- Austin Nichols, Urban Institute, Senior Research Associate

District Agency Staff Members

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