Cross-Sector Collaboration Task Force
Opening, Closing, and Siting Off-Cycle Call
January 25, 2018, 11:00 am – 12:00 pm

Attendees:
- Mary Levy | Independent education analyst, Former DC Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Former Washington Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs
- Claudia Luján | Deputy Chief, Strategic School Planning, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Shanita Burney | Deputy Chief, Community Engagement, District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS)
- Irene Holtzman | Executive Director, Friends of Choice in Urban Schools (FOCUS)

Call Summary:
- Facilitator Ramin Taheri began with describing the purpose of the call and provided an overview of the graphic on slide 3, which outlines responsibilities for each entity within a coordinated cycle. The section with DCPS and PCSB shows both sectors have their own processes, and both sectors will hopefully commit to using the strategic analysis, which is noted here. We want to see coordination between both sectors in their planning and improvement process.
- Task Force Member: What is the RFO process?
- Facilitator: That stands for Request for Offers, DME's process for managing the reuse of surplus school buildings.
- Task Force Member: For the public, that has to be explained. They also won't know what the MFP is.
- Facilitator: The original intent behind the graphic was just so we could refer to it; it wasn't necessarily intended to be brought to the public. To the extent it's not helpful, I want to improve it. That's a great flag, and I'll make sure we make some changes.
- Task Force Member: This says it's a proposed model for coordinated planning, but it doesn't look like it has to do with coordinating. You're saying it's just describing what the responsibilities are, so you may want to indicate that. People might not understand.
- Facilitator: Sure, we can talk about that more. Some of is it explained by what the OCS group talked about in terms of coordination, but if you don't know what you're looking at, that may be confusing. Slides 4, 5, and 6 explain what's in the shapes. On Slide 6, one of the big things is both sectors are making decisions based on the same information, on similar timelines, and incorporating community feedback in regular and transparent ways. At the start of the Task Force before my time, there was discussion around the Task Force's goals, and the specific areas of focus under the goal of developing a framework for coordinating planning processes included sharing data, timelines and community engagement, so that is reflected here.
- Facilitator: Starting on Slide 7, similar to the At-Risk recommendations, we went back through all the notes and feedback and tried to put recommendations into words. Objective 1 is about establishing a coordinated cycle. Objective 2 is about ensuring there's common data and information. Objective 3 is about common timelines and letting the public know what happens, where and when.

- Facilitator went over Objective 1 recommendations and implementation considerations for Objective 1.
- Task Force Member: On 1.1.2, you go back to using the call from quality schools language, and we've moved away from that. Was that an oversight?
- Facilitator: Yes, we can update that.
- Task Force Member: On 1.1.6, there's only one LEA this applies to, so I would like to know more about the thinking behind this.
- Facilitator: It's a consideration the Chancellor has mentioned. It may not be a recommendation to move on immediately, but given it was raised a few times, we thought it would be good to discuss and get feedback from community. The Task Force will decide whether to include it in final report after we collect the public feedback. Certainly if DCPS doesn't support it, we should have that conversation.
- Task Force Member: Objective is coordinated cycle, trying to understand it, there are pros and cons and it would mean a change in culture. Trying to understand the connection this is trying to solve for and what goal this is moving toward under coordination.
- Facilitator: The overarching goal would be to coordinate the way families choose schools across sectors, and having to make an affirmative choice for school. We could also gather information about why families are choosing schools and use that information for policymaking. We should consider it if there is serious opposition.
- Task Force Member: We should figure out how to talk through that and lay out the pros and cons. I want to think through it and have that be part of the discussion at our next meeting.
- Facilitator: You should raise this at the next meeting on Tuesday.
- Task Force Member: Will it be open discussion?
- Facilitator: Yes, it will be open discussion. We took everything from the notes and put them here. This had been mentioned a few times, so we put it down.
- Task Force Member: I agree with the point about 1.1.6. My immediate reaction as a parent was that I didn't like that at all.
- Facilitator: You should both raise this on Tuesday when we talk with the whole Task Force.
- Task Force Member: We talk about a cycle in these slides, but we have moved away from that in the framing. I think there are some cyclical pieces for timelines and decisions, but at some point, we should think about that.
- Facilitator: The potential to have something cyclical is relevant under Objective 3, so let's bring that up again when we get to Objective 3.
- Facilitator moved on to Objective 2 and reviewed material on slide 8. There were no questions on Objective 2.
- Facilitator: Objective 3 [slide 9] is aiming to become more coordinated and transparent across the board. On the potential cyclical aspect, this is where we think of it as a recurring cycle. Each year, sectors will consider the same decisions, and we want to think of it as recurring and predictable. Is there anything we didn't put on paper that's been discussed in the meetings?
- Task Force Member: What are you envisioning for a citywide guide (3.3.1)?
- Facilitator: We've had some conversations about the difficulty in finding information, when meetings are held, and what would be considered in terms of feedback. We thought about putting out some guidelines about noticing meetings, having the public aware of the opportunity for

feedback, etc. It's in the implementation consideration bucket because we discussed it a little, but it's not fully formed.

- Task Force Member: On 3.1.1, I would recommend you not limit the working group to DCPS, PCSB, and DME. You might want some community representation. Groups like 21st Century School Fund and FOCUS have a lot of experience with facilities and people starting charter schools. FOCUS runs workshops, and having that perspective on timelines and the planning process could be very useful.
- Task Force Member: On the PCSB, DCPS, DME triangle [slide 3], PCSB and DCPS aren't the same type of entity, so there should also be some kind of charter LEA representation. PCSB and charter LEA interests may not be perfectly aligned.
- Facilitator: Both excellent points, thank you.
  o The plan going forward is to have a conversation with the entire Task Force. The At-Risk group presented their recommendations at the last meeting, and we can do the same for the OCS group. We can further refine the recommendations from the Task Force feedback, then again after the focus groups, and then again after the citywide meetings. On Tuesday, you should highlight the pieces that trouble you or you don't think are worthwhile or wise.
- Task Force Member: I'm happy to present a section.
- Task Force Member: Is the OCS group meeting before presenting to the whole group?
- Facilitator: We can probably fit that in; we'll think about the agenda.

Meeting adjourned at 1:35 pm.