Attendees:

- Mayor Anthony Williams
- Irene Holtzman
- Melissa Kim
- Mary Levy
- Bethany Little
- Claudia Luján
- Jennifer Niles
- Scott Pearson
- Antwan Wilson
- Shantelle Wright

- Jennifer Comey, Facilitator, reviewed the agenda and community engagement suggestions from the off-cycle call (slide 9).
- Task Force Member: For convening a workgroup, would this mean the people who work there?
  - o Facilitator: It means the community. There are examples of DCPS doing this. For instance, some groups are concerned with facility overcrowding and DCPS established a working group with the community to brainstorm solutions.
- Task Force Member: In two community meetings I've been in, there were members concerned about those running the meeting didn't understand who was making suggestions and participating. For example, on a Google survey, it wasn't clear if the respondents were from the neighborhood or Ward in question. We need a commitment to figure that out and collect the right information. Especially for remote comments, we need to know who they're representing.
  - o Facilitator: Are you saying we should weight comments by where they are from? Or those community members who are more directly affected than others?
  - o Task Force: No. There is an interesting tension between citywide schools and the neighborhood, and we're not solving that today, but we need to understand the support and where it comes from. We need a critical analysis of that. It's contextual, whether we're talking to the school community vs. the parent community.
- Task Force Member: Calendaring a year in advance is interesting. We need recognition that we don't know what will come up, and we will need to add additional meetings. If we add more things and it's seen as not done in advance, this could cause more problems

than it solves. Is there a period in which things need to be added? What do you know a year in advance, and how real is that?

- Facilitator: If we get to a shared schedule – what we're trying to work on here, some things will be regular, and we'll know the agenda loosely.
- Task Force Member: Community engagement can't always be calendared a year in advance, and that may lead to backlash and failure. Calendar some things, but not all.
- Task Force Member: We should back map with something, like a budget decision that happens annually. Something logical.
- Task Force Member: I don't understand what it means, what are you saying in advance?
- Facilitator: The suggestion is for holding a meeting open to the public at a specific place and time, and the agenda is posted with some advance notice. There are no surprises, avoiding the problem that people didn't know the meeting was happening.
- Task Force Member: Like the first Tuesday of every month, there's some kind of education conversation happening?
- Task Force Member: That's easier to do for things you know about in advance. For all the engagements you need about a particular school, you won't know in advance.
- Facilitator: Where we can anticipate touchpoints, we will.
- Task Force Member: It will help people scheduling meetings so there aren't conflicts.
- Facilitator: In January, we will talk about our upcoming community engagement process. There was a request from one member to discuss this cycle we're trying to make our own – what do these things mean? We will begin with slide 11, the first step.
- Task Force Member: We should clarify about what you mean by students apply to all schools. In-boundary is listed, but they don't go through the lottery. What does that mean? This year we're piloting mid-year to see what that will tell us…
- Facilitator: How do we make an active choice for families that want to go to in-boundary? There has not been a discussion for how to do that yet.
- Task Force Member: I think it would help to understand what the goal is for this cycle. Many schools have enrollment throughout the year. It's not just here.
- Facilitator: There is a season where students re-enroll.
- Task Force Member: There are different seasons in the charter world (Feb. - May and then Dec.-Feb.). The choice to apply is not the same as the choice to re-enroll.
- Facilitator: This circle in the graphic acts as though there is one timeframe. The application opens December 9 or 10, then we get lottery results in early April, then reenrollment by April 1.
- Task Force Member: Part of the question is what are we trying to capture in this? What's the goal?
- Facilitator: We're trying to coordinate a process so everyone understands where kids want to go to school. This is the process to get that started. There are also questions for understanding what students and families want throughout the application process.

- Task Force Member: Shared data comes from the strategic analysis. There's data that comes from enrollment that's important, which can be shared before CSAPE. But are we trying to change the current application process?
- Task Force Member: It looks like this is mandatory, which I have objections to. But if it's opt-in, how does that interact with mid-year transfer piece? If you're trying to find best fits for kids, that's highly specialized. How are they tied together?
- Task Force Member: Did you say we're trying to get a coordinated process for opening and closing?
- Facilitator: I believe I said common enrollment. I believe that's what I said.
- Task Force Member: What about intersection with residency verification?
- Facilitator: Enrollment and residency is combined. Residency still happens regardless.
- Task Force Member: I'm not sure I see the policy reason suggesting everyone should have to apply for every school.
- Task Force Member: My School DC is voluntary for charters, so when you write that students apply to all schools, does that mean we're making MSDC mandatory?
- Facilitator: We can correct this to read students apply to participating schools in the lottery.
- Task Force Member: We would get a bunch of annoyed parents who are re-enrolling at the school they're already in about repeating the process, and could this mean not getting let in?
- Facilitator: In this graphic, we separate enrollment from application. We are keeping those separate intentionally.
    - Because we're almost out of time, I'm flagging quickly that slides 13-15 flesh out the chapters for CSAPE. Slide 15 is more specific about what metrics would be under each chapter. Filters refer to how they would be cut different ways. I would love feedback. Does this help?
- Task Force Member: Definitely. There are factors other people put on the table that were important to have represented that aren't here. I can send you those.
- Facilitator: I do want to include transportation under #6.
- Task Force Member: There's also funding representation.
- Facilitator: I also want to make sure this CSAPE is distinct from OSSE or other LEA attempts to describe the school for the parent. We are not replacing Learn DC or the OSSE Report Card. We are looking at patterns and trends for opening and siting, with closing set to the side. I'm not clear how funding fits. I can send follow up notes to get more feedback.