


# OPENING, CLOSING, SITING WORKING GROUP: MEETING 5

Task Force  
Meeting  
May 30, 2017

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Goals for today's meeting
- Where we left off – recap of last meeting
- Continue discussion of SRA
- Group exercise – Defining the problem, articulating theory of action
  - Review working group process and template
- Discussion of timing
- Next Steps
- Appendices

# GOALS FOR TODAY'S MEETING



Review the  
working group  
process so far and  
the information  
about the SRAs

Discuss a theory of  
action/policy  
solution around a  
strategic citywide  
analysis

Begin discussing  
the common issue  
around the timing  
of opening, closing,  
and siting schools

Determine next  
steps

# WHERE WE LEFT OFF

# RECAP OF LAST MEETING

- Agreement that DC could benefit from both sectors making planning decisions based on a common understanding of the “lay of the land”
- Began discussing the use of a centrally-generated Strategic Regional Analysis to serve this purpose
- Examined the types of information and data presented in Denver and Oakland’s SRAs and discussed potentially creating a strategic citywide analysis for DC

# CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF STRATEGIC REGIONAL ANALYSIS

# WHAT IS A STRATEGIC REGIONAL ANALYSIS?

- A Strategic Regional Analysis (SRA) is an analysis of public education data that looks to identify regional and citywide needs to inform decisions about existing or future schools.
  - It examines the data and information on existing gaps and needs with an eye toward the overall goals for students and for public education in the city.
- The following slides categorize the types of data analysis conducted in the Denver and Oakland Strategic Regional Analyses.

# SRA STRUCTURE

## Denver

- Analysis based on 6 regional areas
- Included in the SRA:
  - Enrollment Forecasts
  - Student Demographics
  - Choice Participation & Access
  - School Performance
  - Programmatic Choice
  - Facility Utilization
- SRA “supports the Denver 2020 goal of having at least 80% of students attending School Performance Framework (SPF) green or blue schools in every region in the district”
- Examines gaps in: 1) Capacity; 2) Performance; 3) Match rates; 4) Pathways

## Oakland

- Analysis based on 5 regions
- Included in the SRA:
  - Regions & Schools
  - Community Schools
  - Demographics & Enrollment
  - Attrition Transition
  - School Quality
  - School Choice
  - Feeder Patterns
  - Live/Go
  - Teacher Retention
  - Programs
- SRA supports Oakland’s “goal to ensure [they] are good stewards of our schools and are expanding our portfolio of quality schools.”
  - Equity and Access



# TYPES OF DATA ANALYSIS

## **Current Demand Analysis:**

*Demand for public education today, irrespective of sector*

## **Future Demand Analysis:**

*Change in enrollment over time*

## **Transition Analysis:**

*Where students go when moving from elementary to middle to high school*

## **Student Demographic Analysis:**

*The makeup of current student population and how they are being served*

## **Performance Analysis:**

*Student access to quality schools based on common accountability measures*

## **Environmental Analysis:**

*Other factors affecting schools and student access*

## **Current & Future Supply Analysis:**

*The current number, location, and quality of seats (and the future need for seats)*

## **Facility Analysis:**

*The current state of school facilities*

## **Live/Go Analysis:**

*Where students live vs. where they attend school*

**GROUP EXERCISE:  
AGREEING ON  
DEFINITION OF  
PROBLEM AND THEORY  
OF ACTION**

# WORKING GROUP: PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING RECOMMENDATIONS

Discuss the Principles and Goals related to the Working Group's subject area

**Formulate recommendations**

Develop and discuss possible policy solutions

Define (and refine) the problem we want to solve

Ask probing questions about what we know now; brainstorm theories of action; determine what further information we need

# WORKING GROUP TEMPLATE

*Chapter [x]—Opening, Closing, Siting Schools*  
*Section [x]—Strategic Regional Analysis*

**Section [x]. Using Strategic Regional Analysis for DC to coordinate processes on school openings, closings, and facilities planning.**

**Related Task Force Goal(s):**

**Goal 2—** Develop methods for information sharing with the public and across public school sectors.

**Goal 3--** Develop a framework for coordinating processes on school openings, closings, and facilities planning.

**Theory of Action:** *[insert: connection to guiding principles and why the goal(s) matter for students] {*

**Working Group Subject Area:** *[insert: this could be broad subject area or a narrower statement of subject area]*

**Working Group Charge:** *To examine the obstacles to achieving [insert language related to larger Task Force goal and/or assigned subject area] and develop recommendations for effective policy solutions.*

**Brief Overview of the Issue and Key Data:** *[insert: what we know about the issue and supporting data]*

**Possible Policy Solutions:** *[insert: broad policy solutions discussed and considered]*

**PCS perspective of the  
problem**

**DCPS perspective of  
the problem**

• Lack of shared information presented at a neighborhood level about our current and potentially future public education system, population and demographics, and neighborhood characteristics.

- No transparency of information from each sector on how they decide to open, close, or locate schools
- Little to no advance notice so other sector can plan when other sector opens, closes, or locates.
- Lack of meaningful community engagement and input into the planning process

**Public/community  
perspective of the problem**

# DEFINING THE PROBLEM AND ARTICULATING THEORY OF ACTION

Lack of shared information presented at a neighborhood level about our current and potentially future public education system, population and demographics, and neighborhood characteristics.

**Problem:**

**Theory of Action:**

# NEXT STEPS

# APPENDIX: FOLLOW-UP DATA AND INFORMATION



# MEASURING QUALITY IN DENVER

## ■ School Performance Framework:

Level	School Name	Enrollment	% FRL	% Minority	% ELL	% SPED	% Earned Points	SPF Rating	Growth	Status (Proficiency)	Student Engagement	Re-enrollment	Parent Satisfaction
E	Ashley Elementary School	334	94.6%	88.3%	48.8%	9.3%	47.52%	Accredited On Watch	Meets	Does Not Meet	Approaching	Approaching	Approaching
E	Denver Language School	555	12.1%	27.0%	16.8%	0.9%	64.49%	Meets Expectations	Meets	Meets	Approaching	Meets	Approaching
E	Hallett Fundamental Academy	377	90.7%	92.0%	13.0%	12.7%	58.57%	Meets Expectations	Meets	Meets	Does Not Meet	Approaching	Meets
E	Lowry Elementary School	470	36.2%	37.0%	12.6%	8.1%	62.42%	Meets Expectations	Meets	Meets	Meets	Meets	Meets
E	Montclair Elementary School	479	67.0%	59.1%	28.2%	7.5%	62.42%	Meets Expectations	Meets	Meets	Approaching	Approaching	Meets
E	Palmer Elementary School	337	49.0%	54.3%	12.5%	14.8%	49.30%	Accredited On Watch	Meets	Approaching	Approaching	Does Not Meet	Does Not Meet
E	Park Hill Elementary School	567	24.3%	27.7%	6.3%	13.9%	69.86%	Meets Expectations	Meets	Meets	Meets	Meets	Meets
E	Polaris at Ebert Elementary School	333	3.0%	9.0%	2.7%	3.9%	84.82%	Distinguished	Meets	Exceeds	Exceeds	Exceeds	Meets
E	Smith Renaissance School	425	98.4%	92.9%	35.3%	11.5%	73.79%	Meets Expectations	Exceeds	Meets	Approaching	Does Not Meet	Meets
E	Stedman Elementary School	355	85.6%	88.2%	20.0%	12.1%	50.34%	Accredited On Watch	Meets	Meets	Does Not Meet	Approaching	Approaching
E	Swigert International School	599	6.8%	13.5%	4.8%	6.5%	90.52%	Distinguished	Exceeds	Exceeds	Exceeds	Meets	Meets
E	Westerly Creek Elementary	706	15.9%	21.7%	6.1%	8.5%	63.40%	Meets Expectations	Meets	Exceeds	Meets	Meets	Meets
K-8	Denver Green School	510	59.0%	49.8%	24.3%	13.5%	55.32%	Meets Expectations	Meets	Meets	Approaching	Does Not Meet	Meets
K-8	The Odyssey School	233	34.8%	29.2%	5.2%	3.9%	61.23%	Meets Expectations	Meets	Meets	Meets	Exceeds	Meets
K-8	William (Bill) Roberts K-8 School	821	16.1%	22.4%	4.4%	7.6%	75.55%	Meets Expectations	Exceeds	Meets	Meets	Meets	Meets
M	Denver School of Science and Technology: Stapleton Middle School	460	52.2%	54.8%	15.4%	4.3%	95.10%	Distinguished	Exceeds	Exceeds	Meets	Exceeds	Meets
M	Hill Campus of Arts and Sciences	786	58.5%	56.6%	18.6%	15.1%	51.02%	Meets Expectations	Meets	Approaching	Approaching	Approaching	Does Not Meet
M	McAuliffe International School	400	21.3%	25.5%	4.3%	6.0%	81.60%	Distinguished	Meets	Exceeds	Meets	Exceeds	Meets
M	Morey Middle School	594	45.1%	44.4%	7.1%	9.6%	33.57%	Accredited On Priority Watch	Does Not Meet	Meets	Approaching	Approaching	Does Not Meet
M/H	Denver School of the Arts	1,076	14.2%	21.7%	2.9%	2.3%	86.07%	Distinguished	Meets	Exceeds	Exceeds	Exceeds	Exceeds
H	Denver School of Science and Technology: Stapleton High School	499	48.1%	60.3%	9.6%	4.2%	88.60%	Distinguished	Exceeds	Exceeds	Exceeds	Meets	Exceeds
H	East High School	2,435	35.6%	45.1%	6.4%	7.7%	80.34%	Distinguished	Meets	Exceeds	Meets	Exceeds	Exceeds
H	George Washington High School	1,424	55.6%	62.9%	8.6%	10.3%	51.25%	Meets Expectations	Meets	Meets	Approaching	Meets	Does Not Meet
H	Venture Prep HS	249	85.9%	86.7%	23.7%	14.9%	45.37%	Accredited On Watch	Meets	Approaching	Approaching	Does Not Meet	Exceeds

# MEASURING QUALITY IN DENVER

## ■ School Performance Framework:

Student Achievement (Status)	How well students perform on state assessments in a given year.
Student Progress Over Time (Growth)	How much progress students show on state assessments from one year to the next.
Parent and Student Engagement and Satisfaction	How effectively a school connects with parents and families.
Equity	How effectively a school is serving students regardless of background, ethnicity or ability.
Post-Secondary Readiness (Status)	How well a high school is preparing its students for college and career.
Post-Secondary Readiness (Growth)	How much a high school improves in its ability to prepare groups of students for college and career over time.

# MEASURING QUALITY IN DENVER

Example measures for each indicator of Denver's School Performance Framework:

<b>Growth</b>	Growth percentile on state tests-Literacy, Math Growth percentile comparison to similar schools Disaggregated group growth Disaggregated group growth comparison Catch up and keep up growth ES, MS, HS-specific measures
<b>Status</b>	Percent who met or exceeded expectations on state tests Disaggregated group proficiency Disaggregated group proficiency comparison ES, MS, HS-specific measures
<b>Parent &amp; Student Engagement &amp; Satisfaction</b>	Enrollment change Survey response rate Positive response rate Attendance rate
<b>Equity Pull-Out Indicator</b>	Disaggregated group growth, status, comparisons, graduation rates: English Language Learners (ELL), students of color, Free/Reduced Lunch (FRL), students with disabilities

	DCPS	PCS	Students, Families, Communities
Shared Problems	• No transparency of information from each sector on how they decide to open, close, or locate schools		
	• Little to no advance notice so other sector can plan when other sector opens, closes, or locates.		
	• Figuring out how to scale up models that are working for students.		
Hopes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to improve underperforming or under-enrolled and continue creating unique programming that appeals to families</li> <li>Provide quality by-right options to students</li> <li>Grow enrollment</li> <li>Responsive to demand (the need for seats in a given area)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High-quality facilities in locations that make sense for the program</li> <li>Charters offer students a variety of high-quality educational models that align with the desires of communities and families</li> <li>Maintain core mission of serving students citywide</li> <li>High-performing schools with waitlists want to be able to grow</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High-quality schools located throughout the city available to all families</li> <li>Available programming that best meets the need of their children</li> <li>An understanding of why schools open or close</li> </ul>
Fears	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of by-right neighborhood schools: cannot be forced to close schools</li> <li>Unchecked proliferation of charters undermines DCPS enrollment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of autonomy: central authority cannot tell charters where to locate or not locate</li> <li>Restrictions on growth: cannot set caps on opening more schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited high-quality school options that are not accessible to all</li> <li>Inefficient use of public resources</li> </ul>
Perspective of Problem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of coordination or forethought from PCSB leads to charters opening in areas that threaten and undermine DCPS neighborhood schools</li> <li>Need to keep vacant DCPS facilities for building modernization efforts (swing space) and in order to serve anticipated in boundary students</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can't access vacant DCPS facilities</li> <li>Forced to secure facilities in the private market, which are sometimes not well-suited for school use</li> <li>DCPS won't or can't close underperforming or under-enrolled schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Closing neighborhood schools devastates communities more so than closing citywide schools</li> <li>Slowly draining schools hurts students in those schools</li> <li>Need authentic community engagement process for opening schools</li> <li>Lack of guaranteed access to new citywide schools when they are in close proximity to students' homes</li> </ul>