

Notes – Cross-Sector Collaboration Task Force – Meeting 28 – June 18, 2018

- TF Member: several of us have complained about iterations of the vision. Not telling us much about where we're going. We put together something similar to what Facilitator just said.

---high quality neighborhood schools with robust choice system

---I myself reacted positively to the list you gave

---In my experience working with parents, those things are important

---Lately, they don't want to take their kid across the city; want predictability; its driving them crazy.

TF Member: pressure testing, nothing in writing yet.

the hard thing for me is not having a destination.

so high level that it is hard to justify. Hard to articulate why we're doing something

TF Member: part of what is hard is the predictability and strong by right

Wants city to put stake in the ground. What network of schools/options is going to move us forward? Is it improving neighborhood or is it we want to give folks an option to travel all around the city; not necessarily contradictory but hard to walk away without feeling like they are moving away from each other. How do we invest in both?

TF Member: that's what we're hearing other places. I don't have a definitive answer. Sliding scale. In an ideal world we have both. As a city which one takes precedence? People see it as an either or.

TF Member: 3 disconnected things:

1) systems that being developed getting closer to balance (Denver moving in direction). Haven't given up on idea that they can be healthy

2) Vision is less hard than articulating how we get there. You don't have to resolve that to have a vision statement. But acknowledging that the answers aren't in the vision. No place has done this yet. As a country.

3) Good to start off with a vision but it was really early; not a ton of robust engagement by task members. Now could be a good time to revisit as long as we don't pretend the how is agreed on.

TF Member: channeling SP: strong by right neighborhood school is also a choice. I appreciate that we are in a different place. We'll start, share, and keep pushing. Get closer to something that helps us. Where do we go next? More specific. Help guide decisions.

TF Member: I appreciate comments; capture the dynamics well. I appreciate what you've said capture and make explicit the tensions and by putting language to it we can have the conversations about those tensions. Some value in making parental values explicit.

TF Member: Amen to that.

TF Member: Predictable and proximate - important that vision is balanced. Wouldn't feel comfortable if we came out and said we need to scale back this whole charter. Proximity and predicatbly=neighborhood; vs more charter like values.

TF Member: thinking about charters in terms of predictability PK3-12; proximity offerings; people can take advantage of any of those and end up with what works for them

TF Member: in general more affluent families feel better about our education system. Lower income/at risk are less likely. Feel passionately about the cross cutting lense of at risk work.

TF Member: Is your statement something personal or something that the task force is making, confusion if released at the same time?

TF Member: I am being asked to think about this right now. I feel unable to articulate priorities because we don't have a frame/end goal. Examples of hypothetical policies and how not clear they fit in to the "to what end?" Not set on anything. How to we plug the cross sector work into this larger/more specific vision? Going back to TF Member's point, we should make that front and center in whatever we do.

TF Member: acknowledge the difference in governance. Charter schools have a brand. A model. If you don't like that model, you don't go. You go elsewhere because they don't change their model. DCPS responds to politicians, etc. Different form of accountability. The two are not interchangeable in the way they relate to parents.

TF Member: To clarify, where to see it?

TF Member: what are we acknowledging?

TF Member: Choose for particular model.

TF Member: maybe.

TF Member: the point is that a large population that don't have a choice. For a variety of reasons the neighborhood school is your school. At the end of the day there is no option to not have that be what a family can access. When talking about choice, it is a point to be articulated somewhere. Level set what it is and who has it and what it means for education in our city.

TF Member: can't articulate choice across sectors.

TF Member: there's a point that isn't being reflected because we're so constrained. Begin to lose the idea that it isn't a reality for everyone.

Facilitator: We can acknowledge it but we aren't putting recs in support of it.

TF Member: focus on quality; spectrum of choice that looks different across the city; don't focus on that spectrum; focus on the vision and access to quality

TF Member: It is true that not everyone has choice and not everyone has high quality neighborhood. It is the quality and choice that are driving. Right now we're substituting choice for quality. Really what I'm doing is being pushed into choice because I don't have quality neighborhood option.

Elevate quality over anything else.

TF Member: to not acknowledge or articulate some of these pieces would sound tone deaf. Not a caveat but acknowledging this is one piece of bigger issue.

TF Member: if we acknowledge, we need to articulate this type of discussion. The average person is not going to benefit from this type of discussion and will come to their own conclusion. Make sure it is framed in the way we are discussing it and recommending it.

TF Member: appreciate input - we will share for feedback. Google drive folder for people to look at.

Facilitator: level of candor in the report; acknowledging TF Member's sentiments. Governance not directly tied to student outcomes/quality but it has been raised by several so we acknowledge. The mid-year transfer has been a failure - acknowledge

Facilitator: I want task force to weigh in on future of cross sector work after wind down. Thoughts?

Opinions?

TF Member: I would love to acknowledge in that section the many types of practitioner examples that don't require another body.

TF Member: At the last Savoy meeting, TF Member OCS group had some thoughts.

TF Member: I was thinking about this in terms of accountability/too heavy wc. there are aspects of a Board of Ed; monthly meetings; public input and feedback. I've never worked for DCPS while there has

been a BofEd so could be things I'm not thinking about. Monthly public education meetings. Not equating it to BofE. What is ongoing engagement on public education? Not a board of ed role? What is the policy agenda and who are the stakeholders to weigh in?

TF Member: DME we have talked about this. Lots of narrow engagement. Low lift in time of hunger for greater accountability. Value to dialog as a whole; not just DCPS and PCSB which do this in some regard.

TF Member: Not too broad or too specific it will be cross sector.

TF Member: Bring everything together. How it all integrates and entities. I could see that being really valuable. Objectives around community engagement. Predictable and coordinated engagement.

TF Member: What was of value and what wasn't of value of cross sector conversation? But the things that seemed important - expectation that OSSE, DCPS, PCSB, DME at table together where people can access. Catalysts for valuable things that wouldn't have otherwise occurred. Need to have a structure for that ongoing conversations/engagement. Not easy but worthwhile.

TF Member: add to that another effective thing: common base of data and information. Share common information.

TF Member: should have ongoing involvement by relatively small group of parents, educators, etc. not just dc gov't. But nothing gigantic. But do you want representation from community.

Facilitator recap: acknowledge work going on. Some value of task force; adding momentum. Value of this task force being public facing. Shining light on work. Move forward with education agencies working together with public engagement.

Facilitator: think carefully about what it looks like going forward. Want it to be right.

Facilitator: last item. This is the last meeting on the calendar. I propose the week after the 4th. 1 hour long call every week; process to refine the report. Go as long as last week of august. Ramp up the cadence. Not mandatory but highly encouraged.

Thoughts?

TF Member: 1) google drive - use the comment feature not for editing.

2) When you update can you put a date on them.

TF Member: grand culmination of document.

Facilitator: yes. If need be will be in person.

TF Member: articulation of that wind down. these will eb the opps for input where/when/how.

Facilitator: thanks to Ed Counsel.