Cross-Sector Collaboration Task Force
Off-Cycle Call
Thursday, June 7, 2:00 pm – 3:00 pm

Task Force Members:

- Faith Hubbard
- Kevin Clinton
- Claudia Luján
- Kemba Hendrix
- Hanseul Kang
- Emily Lawson
- Mary Levy
- Scott Pearson
- Amanda Alexander

Call Summary:

Facilitator: At the last meeting, we went through the community engagement process and summarized what we heard. We spent the bulk of the meeting going through draft recommendations, incorporating feedback from community, trying to make changes and edits. We need to start putting the report together. We've put together some of the sections as a starting point and wanted to discuss a proposed outline.

Task Force Member: The outline is straightforward. My questions are more within the buckets.

Facilitator: We took a first stab at summarizing the safety transfer pilot, which grew out of recommendations around mid-year mobility. Will fit into section 4a. Within that section, we have to discuss the two pilots. But if there's more we should say or want to signal more work to do, that's the section.

TF Member: For next steps, is there a general next steps section? This goes to the Mayor right?

Facilitator: It starts with letter from Task Force to Mayor, but also want it to be public-facing. Next steps are in section 4d, additional areas of need. If there are areas needing attention from a cross-sector perspective, we can put in there and recommend how some entity would continue. Everyone feels strongly some body should continue to coordinate this work.

TF Member: Would we specify players for each recommendation?

Facilitator: We need implementation considerations for each recommendation, and if we need to establish working groups for these recommendations, we can account for that in the report.

TF Member: The five objectives would fall within the outline, all within B and C under recommendations?

Factiliator: The At-Risk recommendations are under B, and the OCS recommendations under C.

TF member: For objectives 1 and 2, I think given all we've talked about with objective 2, there's good data on economic diversity and how that's useful, I still think there are 3 recommendations under that objective. We should move the first to under objective 1 and broaden Objective 2, make it more straightforward. It could be "Provide greater access to quality education for at-risk students by identifying programs, expanding and sharing information, and providing greater access." The recommendation on the lottery and information are one, then another is diversity because it's a separate thing. We could then move it toward the back.

Facilitator: Objective 2 was objective 1, then we heard we should lead with objective 2, so we swapped them and changed the language based on feedback. Some direct suggestions were "increase socioeconomic diversity." The first two objectives are to complement each other.

TF member: I hear that, but I was still thinking about community input. This is better but could lead to the same reactions. I still think recommendations 1 and 2 under objective 2 are about moving kids around, but on the other hand, we might not increase socioeconomic diversity. Providing information to at-risk kids might mean they go to schools that already have at-risk kids and might not increase diversity. First recommendation would probably increase diversity, but that's not the point in doing it, we'd be doing it because it's a strong program kids need access to. They are complementary, but the one about benefits of diversity is just the third bullet under objective 2. We should try to make it even smaller because we don't want the lottery to get lost.

Facilitator: Other thoughts? Will objective 2 fall away or be smaller?

TF Member: It's good to keep Objective 2, but the lottery is a big one and might get traction. We should make it part of objective 1 or make it separate.

TF Member: I'm supportive of moving the lottery from 2 to 1 because it puts it within the lens of increasing access to quality and better serving at risk students vs. socioeconomic diversity aspect. This relates to at-risk populations.

Facilitator: What would objective 2 include then?

TF Member: 1.2 could be moved also. Better information to at-risk families to navigate their way in the lottery.

TF Member: 1 and 2 are connected.

TF Member: Yes, they should go together

TF Member: There's a subset of recommendations focused on improving program quality in terms of what we're doing and best practices, then subset on access and education for families. Two different populations and focuses. One way we could look at it.

TF Member: Where would you put socioeconomic diversity?

TF Member: Could do it either way.

TF Member: I'm not that attached but if it's not in #2, we should retitle #2. Not just focusing on socioeconomic diversity as a title.

TF Member: If we choose to differentiate between program quality and program access, we could change the title.

TF Member: Also, on the first paragraph of the letter, I wouldn't say "while not perfect."

Facilitator: This brings us to how to divide up the rest. We don't have enough time to convene everyone to go through multiple iterations of the report. We envision splitting up the sections and have 1-2 people own the sections, make changes and do writing, then incorporate all and review as a group. DME staff is happy to take the lead but my hope was more active participation from Task Force members.

TF Member: I'm good contributing to editing. I feel putting together the research is daunting. I like what you've already done that's a fair amount of work.

Facilitators: Do others agree?

TF Member: Yes

TF member: On OCS, I'm not sure if it's as much research and history, but happy to work with a small group on exact words.

Facilitator: I am hearing the bulk of the writing duties should be left to DME staff, with OCS it's a little different because explaining context. For version control, we could have everyone edit but make changes in comment bubbles so everyone can keep track. Do people feel comfortable with that?

TF Member: If I work with 1-2 people, I can do track changes in objective 1-2 for the ones that are written out. It's more efficient to ingest track changes, comments could be more difficult.

Facilitator: That should work

TF Member: I'm happy to work together on that and get you something we agree on.

Facilitator: If you look at Objective 1, there is nothing there expect the recommendations so far. If you want to make any changes to that first, then DME needs to insert research/narrative, leave that to us but you can make a note of it.

TF Member: Sure I can do that

Facilitator: We have a meeting on the 18th, and I would love to make some changes and discuss then. I can send email with all the parts, with people agreeing to work on specific parts, DME will work on certain pieces. On the 18th I would hope we all are ready for finishing touches.

TF Member: Is the meeting on June 18th the last meeting?

Facilitator: That is the only meeting scheduled, but we may decide we need something additional. We are making enough progress to get to a finish line. I will reach out to others directly. Will send out an email of what we've agreed to: DME doing initial drafting, some Task Force members putting specific thoughts on pieces, but not responsible for the final product. People are comfortable with the general outline knowing it's high level. When we get together on the 18th, we hope we made significant progress. We will pull it up and go through pieces that deserves the group's attention. Hopefully we will identify a date by which we'll have this complete.

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 pm.