

## **Cross-Sector Collaboration Task Force**

Policy Expert Focus Group

February 14, 2018, 9:30 am – 11:30 am

Shaw Library

### **Facilitators:**

-Ramin Taheri | Director of Cross-Sector Collaboration Initiatives, Office of the Deputy Mayor of Education (DME)

-Bethany Little| Murch ES, BASIS PCS parent; Education policy expert

-Mary Levy | Independent education analyst, Former DC Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Former Washington Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs

### **Staff:**

-Katrina Ballard | Leadership for Educational Equity Public Policy Fellow, Office of the Deputy Mayor of Education (DME)

-Rebecca Lee | Policy Advisor, Office of the Deputy Mayor of Education (DME)

### **At-Risk Working Group, Objective 5**

- There are a lot of questions, so it's hard to have detailed thoughts without knowing the current data and detailed policies. How are things currently allocated for students at risk? I agree with statements as they are written.
- In the DCPS profiles, free and reduced lunch is available, but at-risk is not. How many of the students are actually at-risk? Funding needs to be reaching them, particularly for homeless students, especially if the school doesn't have after care. It's not where the at-risk funding is going to go, but it needs to bolster whole school population. Individual student focus is important, but schools with concentrated poverty often need wider support. Yes on this, but it also seemed there was a gap.
- I completely agree. My immediate thought is this is good in theory, but when we're talking about what the school needs are, we're missing a piece of children's lives. We need to be realistic about working across other government entities and community providers. When you look at the school in isolation of the community, it's limiting. For this one in particular, it would behoove the city to think more broadly not just about schools but a continuum.
- There is a need for a baseline understanding of needs and how to serve them well. If funding is filling in gaps, we're already behind. I don't see any attempt to connect at risk and special education here. That's a whole underlying problem, and we need data on the overlap, which is extraordinarily high. The question is whether we're adequately funding special needs, because 95% of kids with special needs already not successful. It's a conceptual thing going across the recommendations. We can't think about at risk funding without it.
- We should be making sure spending at-risk funds is for kids. We have looked at some of the spending, and 50% is spent for at risk programs, and the rest is spent on gap fillers, which affected some students at-risk but others as well.
- ELL too.
- Is that still happening?

- The language has been there from the beginning and Councilmember Grosso said he was going to correct that.
- Facilitator: Part of this is about at-risk funds not being used to serve at-risk students, but part of it is also about eligibility. We could examine all resources and needs of students and determine whether there's anything we can do in the current funding structure or if there are other ways to make improvements.
- We could come up with a budget and allocate full-time employees and slots. That's like in other big districts that translates into spending more money in schools with senior teachers because they are paid more. Could we change that pattern through this system?
- Facilitator: Everything you're saying is right in one sector, DCPS. The formula directs LEAs how to allocate at-risk funds, not how to spend them. DCPS has issues with at-risk spending, but for the charter sector, it's a little different. We are trying to stay away from issues relevant to mostly one side.
- That's fair. At the state level, we talked about creating a process that ensures at-risk funds are used at schools serving kids who are at risk. From an OSSE standpoint, there's possibility to create funds for that. Don't know if charters could do that, but it could be possible at a network level.

#### **At-Risk Working Group, Objective 4**

- The first bullet, sharing data across schools and sectors is tricky because when a school closes, there are different timeframes for things to happen. No one is allowed to ask whether a child has an IEP. A parent can volunteer, but that is happening in May, and some families don't volunteer. Schools don't get the IEP until the end of summer, and they are not getting information in a timely fashion to serve students. How we protect children's rights to be enrolled in a school irrespective of their needs, but also make the school set up for success to know about needs early enough to get right people and programming in place?
- Regarding the first bullet, the speed at which records can be shared hinges on whether the student is enrolled, because information is protected under FERPA. Is there a way to flag enrollment faster, so there is protection for students' privacy and data and a sound understanding on where student is enrolling, faster. My organization works on the transition from 8<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> grade. OSSE is getting SLED data as early as June, then the non-SLED data in July and August. No earlier because of the enrollment issue. Also on the bottom point, I wrote a note about coaching for using the data, and a second note for how we smartly understand data year over year to avoid unsavory use of data? Information on students with a lot of challenges, make sure schools use that information to develop support but not to have an earlier pushout. I don't have a good answer, but it depends whether schools are willing to share data.
- Facilitator: This came out from presentation about Bridge to HS data exchange, thinking about other transition points and safeguards we need to build in.
- Does that include pre-k and CBO to system transitions?
- Facilitator: We definitely have some issues moving from CBO to schools, and that conversation was really about what other transition points would be helpful and feasible.
- That's not how I read the objective. When student transfers midyear or from 6<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> grade, that's great, but do the notes from the counselor follow them?

- Facilitator: That needs to be part of it too. Principals have personal relationships with each other and can call one another when students move, but is there a systematic way to identify that in a way that's not detrimental to student success?
- Is there a possibility of a centralized student information for a unique student file that could be accessed from OSSE?
- That's what OSSE is actually doing, and they have been doing it for years. It's not publically available, but I would hope schools themselves could access it.
- It's a statewide longitudinal data system. There are over 30 student information systems in the district, and OSSE transfers student information systems data into SLED, which OSSE controls, but it's bare bones information. Notes from a counselor won't be in there, for example. There's SEDs data for special education, and we have worked to get stage 4 early enrollment data to trigger special education data to the receiving school. This is now happening months earlier, which is new this year. There is no one data systems all schools input information into. Data is fed into SLED for all the schools, but inputs at the school level are in their individual student information systems.
- OSSE itself has LASIS, which is the adult and alternative schools data, also used for nonprofits for GED and adult literacy. OSSE also have an early childhood data system on front end for 0-3 year olds. Around the bare bones nature of SLED, that is a political situation where OSSE has only been able to collect what's federally mandated to collect. It is not federally mandated that state education agency collect grades or credits, just test scores. There are big limitations around national research about predictive factors for on time graduation.
- There's also a statewide student information available for LEAs to use for free but student information systems are now much more than central data entry, they do a lot, and not many LEAs have signed on to use that.
- Facilitator: There are 67 LEAs, and not everyone is interested in using one information system.
- But the part about early childhood is important but picks up other challenges. The information OSSE has is mostly information about kids who are at-risk, but not all at-risk kids are on subsidy, and not all infants and toddlers are on subsidy, so that's a barrier. A lot of CBOs need the technology upgrades to maintain that data. It's an important issue and something the district should invest in, get technological capacity into CBOs. As we increasingly recognize the importance of early childhood for the success of kids, that should be marked early on. The transition from CBO to public system, when and why it happens is hugely important.
- Does ELL classification trigger the same classification in system?
- They will do that this year, SPED one was so successful in planning early going to do the same for ELL.

### **At-Risk Working Group, Objective 3**

- Facilitator: Attendance has been in the news, there's the EDC! Task Force, but the Task Force needed something related to attendance. Where are the recommendations not redundant? There's a lot of pink around the awareness recommendation.
- I put pink. Focusing on promoting attendance in the early grades makes good sense because not all families understand that pre-k attendance is really important. I don't actually think no one believes going to school every day matters. The barrier piece is

what matters. Why aren't you coming to school? Maybe the classroom isn't compelling, there are structural barriers, transportation, community support. The first one misreads the problem, with the exception of early childhood.

- There is a caveat, the Attendance Works research shows that simple awareness helps. If I send my kid 4 times a week to school, and that's a lower than average rate in the school, awareness pulls it up. The bigger problem is the reality of the barriers.
- Facilitator: We are working with Attendance Works, and that's a big piece of it. I am also hearing that focus on early grades is especially important. The teacher, educator, and school level is a topic of conversation, so we moving already, we launched a community of practice around attendance.
- The awareness campaign is fine, but as I'm the resident and I see kids hanging out during the school day, I think of maybe not a community training but some kind of infrastructure. I feel ill-equipped to show them what to do without a personal relationship, could there be a hotline for positive youth development-minded people? Could we call the reengagement center? It could be targeted toward how can you help with this even if you're not a parent, and what can you do that's not punitive? It's a low-lift way of adding something to the campaign.
- How do we make schools places where kids want to go and be? Barriers can be inside the school too. Kids get to certain age where it's about them and not their families for getting to school. Attendance and truancy, there are language choices. A lot of parents drop their kid off and don't know where they're going for the day.
- I like these ideas in concept, but I feel we can get into profiling issues, there's a lot that could deteriorate in bringing a community response for that specific instance. I like the idea of understanding the barriers, but a huge concern is student safety in certain communities. I have heard from young women they don't feel safe walking to school or at school. There's more of the problem than what we're putting on the objective list. To host events or do the campaign without understanding what's going on first could actually set us back to effectively addressing issue.
- Facilitator: I hear that we're compartmentalizing the problem, we're hearing that. The devil is in the details, and implementation will require consideration of all these other factors.
- To me, it comes down to where the resources will be allocated. We should focus resources on understanding barriers, then come up with solutions. I have sat in meetings with Mayor talking about signing the pledge. If we're spending resources on that, that's why you see pink at the top.
- Attendance feels like one of those foundational things for improving educational outcomes. There are external barriers we can think of and will come out with the summit, but there are also internal barriers in the classroom. Instruction is not engaging but driven by a system that puts PARCC above everything else. For people with the voice, that's an important message. We are making instruction so painful that kids don't want to come to school. Until we get to this, we need to start redirecting the accountability focus. I can see why kids don't want to come to school.
- It's important to explore the messaging that attendance is related to discipline. It would be interesting to keep that in mind for how our messaging and how to go to class, because we're kicking kids out.

## **At-Risk Working Group, Objective 2**

- Facilitator: Opportunity academies is an alternative education approach, and there is lot of talk between sectors for the best way to get it done. Sectors can work together to serve that student population, and the sectors have already been talking about this.
- Like the STAY schools.
- Opportunity academies are the phrase of the year.
- No mention of overlap with at-risk and disabilities.
- The group getting left out is programs that do adult literacy. At some point, we don't have a citywide policy about who owns adult literacy. Public schools, community colleges, DC has whoever picks up the ball and runs with it. Opportunity youth or disengaged youth, but it's a bigger conversation, outside charters.
- Facilitator: It's meant to be inclusive, and not just adult-serving programs. For schools with workforce development, it's a really hard thing to do, but it's the spirit of that approach. Like the credit recovery idea. Is there a temporary space for concentrated support and re-enroll in their school? We need more options for young people coming to high school not prepared at the level they need to be so they're not just sitting for four years and age out. Make sure that is included.
- IDEA rights carry into those programs, alternative students are also entitled to them.
- Only up to age 22.
- But still, between age 18 and 22. Only severely disabled students get that now, there doesn't seem to be an obligation in other programs to own an IEP.
- I think that's a big question mark.
- There's a minority subgroup of students often overlooked- parenting teens. We should consider how school policies do or don't penalize parenting teens because of the nature of being a parent and trying to get to school on time, for example. I don't think the population is big enough for an objective in itself, but we should think about how we demonize them in these policies, if we want to be inclusive.
- One of the issues you see with opportunity academies, the international ones, we group students together and look at a population. For example, older students who are ELLs, we are misidentifying their needs by not being able to re-test them. This creates perception issues adding onto the real issues they already have.
- When they're little, the assumption is because they're not native English speakers they have a disability.
- Opportunity academy is an interesting idea, but implementation needs to consider at what point we are deciding to send someone off track to this category. We should be careful of tracking and demographics. At the first instance of not being on track, what interventions are happening before opportunity academies? I am concerned this could turn into many alternative schools overwhelmingly serve low-income black and brown students.
- Going back to objective 4, I am wrestling with how we're setting up so we're not tracking students like in the 90s. Studies show that when teachers look at data before students arrive, it affects how they approach the data. The tracking conversation needs to be mindful and up front.

## **At-Risk Working Group, Objective 1**

- First bullet point is on track for intention, but would it be more impactful for schools with concentrations of poverty to set aside a certain number of seats? There are preferences

- now, and LEAs can choose the order. High-demands schools don't always have room for siblings, and they might not have the impact you would hope just by giving a preference.
- If you set aside seats, those are seats just not in the lottery, so you are still displacing those siblings.
  - It would need to be a preference that applies uniformly across the district, so at-risk kids get preference everywhere.
  - Facilitator: My School DC did a lot of digging with this, and they came in and presented to the Task Force. The preference would apply to a small number, that's what research showed, but even with a small effect, it could help. Set asides could be on the table.
  - Comparing objectives 1 and 2, objective 1 is about using choice to reduce concentrated poverty, objective 2 is improving where they are and addressing current concentrations. We have to decide, so it's not all LEAs making one decision but as a city, is choice the solution? Do we do that through a choice mechanism or meet schools where they are?
  - Facilitator: The At-Risk working group said there was no reason not to approach the problem from both sides.
  - Then it's an issue of budgets, there are some lower budget implications and some higher. In the conversation, we skipped that. We should be investing our dollars in objectives 2 and 4, or we haven't discussed what that would look like. What's the budget apportionment between 2 and 4 and the citywide campaign on attendance? It's a shame if we discuss the ideas without discussing apportionment of budget. We can prioritize, but what do policies look like from a cost perspective?
  - Between choice and improvement, objective 1 would be good to have a choice to go to effective program for children like you. There are connection threads between these recommendations. Understandable to bucket issues, but we are talking across matters too.
  - In Objective 1, there's no reference to how parents understand their choices. We can give preferences, but if parents have misunderstandings about what a program is or isn't that might not help.
  - Facilitator: Education navigators are something we spent a lot of time discussing. Choice only works if you have access to and understand your choices.
  - Do we know how the choices of non-at risk students in the lottery, where their parents decide they should go, affect where other students get placed? Are education navigators for everyone? Or just at risk kids? I have some real concerns about how our schools demographically play out, not just based on where at-risk parents want them to go but where white, upper-class families want to place their families in the lottery. Ward 3 parents are trying to get into certain schools, and pre-k3 schools in other areas of the city look different. It might be a diverse student population but segregated by grade level. Is there a way to get at not just the perception for what schools are doing but also a way to address perceptions of which schools are good and bad for non-at risk families? Schools get asked by families, "what's the black population?" and if it's too high, they don't want to go there. We need to start talking about this and not focus on just what's happening to the at-risk students.
  - Facilitator: This is trying to address broader issue of diversity in schools. Most of the predominantly white schools are DCPS neighborhood schools, and those families have the right to go to those schools, so the real issue is housing segregation.
  - Pre-k is different

- Not that much, but you hit the nail on the head that it's a perception issue. The lottery isn't going to change some parents' decisions. Some schools will have a wait list for days and others will have empty seats. That doesn't change outreach and how people speak about schools, like this charter is high-performing but the discipline strategy isn't for me. I want language immersion like the rest of the city, and I'm an at-risk student and a, sorted by a random lottery number.
- Some families pay education navigators.
- That says something, if you need an education navigator that you will pay for it.
- We recommended in recent report for special education, for kids with disabilities, it's hard to know which schools are doing a good job. We support simplifying a system, but there is always a need for navigators to lower the playing field.
- Also important to remember external barriers to attendance also apply to choice. Families don't have the range of choice we think they do because it's not realistic for them to go across town.
- Talking about at-risk conversation for addressing concentrated poverty. Most of the kids we're talking about are east of the river. We already have a huge exodus every morning trying to get across river, and students are late to school or leaving at 6 am. Between choice and the lottery, you win or you lose. Education shouldn't be about winning the game because the kids who don't get a choice still stay, and those are the kids who are left behind. The issue is looking at east of the river. There are real issues with the lottery, and choice is a key driver of strategy. Lotteries are designed so only some people win. Neighborhood kids don't know each other, and the schools we do have need deep investments and shouldn't be the leftovers. That has to be part of conversation. Shouldn't just target families to win more. It's a false sense of choice because you have to leave, because the schools available aren't invested in. Students go across the river but still live in my neighborhood.
- Facilitator: The working group thought objective 2 is very important because of what you said. Also talked about magnet schools because we are not putting burden on at-risk students.
- The inherent challenge is using schools to address what's really housing segregation. We are using the schools to address this, but that brings up other issues to account for what the reality is.
- That's true.
- In any system, we need to improve neighborhood schools, and it has to be a good choice. Some people go for convenience or commitment, but concentrated poverty also comes from the pressure we put on schools for test scores, which leads to mobility. These challenging kids won't score well, creates concentrations of poverty. This comes from the pressure we put on all schools to perform. Less pressure would help.
- In the DCPS boundary process, brought people in to help facilitate conversations. Equity was one of several values that group articulated, in conflict with some of the other values. Point about housing played out. Ward 7 and 1 conversations were educational. In Ward 7, they didn't have a uniform voice; some said they want schools to be amazing in their neighborhood. Other families said I don't want my kid only seeing this neighborhood; I want them to go out. Separation of schools from communities that are still struggling isn't going to have a lot of promise and traction over long term. Families make the choice to go because they want to be exposed to different environments, communities, and

people. We can't address that. Are we a city of choice or neighborhood schools? We can't land in one or the other because it's hard. We want good neighborhood schools we can walk to because our neighborhoods are awesome.

- These two things need to work hand in hand. Having schools that are poor facilities, consistently under-resourced, and not creating movement to desegregate schools. We talk about desegregation as just an academic intervention where wealthy students help pull up poor students of color. That is an unhealthy, limited way to view conversation. It's important to emphasize school segregation was a tool of white supremacy to tell black and brown poor children they're inferior. Allowing it to persist reinforces that, tells people we don't deal with controversial issues. Have to do both simultaneously. There are democratic reasons to do both. If we're talking about south of the river, this is tethered to housing patterns. All white parents in Columbia Heights and Petworth on the border of a diverse neighborhood said we would love to support neighborhood schools but we can't. It needs to be a campaign, even if it's a communications strategy, around this issue.
- The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Foundation has done work on segregation, and we are looking at how to use market forces to change that. When we talk about magnet schools, we are missing the mark. We need to talk about high-demand or low supply programmatic options. Not everyone can go there to increase diversity but create something everyone wants, translate socioeconomic status to a diverse school. Magnet is not a good term for what we're really trying to do, which is offer high in-demand programs to increase socioeconomic diversity.
- Want to bring up the at-risk preference for pre-k and Kindergarten. Currently, parents have to leave an organization they're thriving in to get a spot in a Kindergarten program. This is undermining CBOs where babies belong, and undermines idea of choice. Don't know if lottery preference is a way to do that, but better to support families so they don't feel forced into public pre-k slots or additional transitions that are not beneficial.
- Identify pre-k students who are underserved, conduct a supply and demand study, how do you know you're at-risk before you come into the system?
- OSSE oversees child care, and we should have conversations about what data is out there not just in school system.
- What is the opposition?
- I have questions about it, it's not clear to me.
- Facilitator: Parents with kids in CBO child care and feel they are compelled to leave at pre-k 3 because that's only time to get into a school. We could do something to take pressure off families feeling they have to leave at a certain time to get into a school.

### **Opening, Closing, and Siting Schools Working Group, Objectives 1-3**

- The goal of equity is missing; all of this is good if it's heading toward that clear vision.
- Facilitator: Goal 3 is about both sectors coordinating with each other because right now, both sectors do what they want.
- If the plan is focused on competing for students, that's one thing, or if it's creating equitable outcomes for students, I could support that.
- Facilitator: I wish I could tell you both sectors aren't interested in competing but they both are, but this is also about serving students.



- Who would be the education leaders? This raises serious flags, especially as someone who's a strong advocate for DCPS but has no problem calling them out when they're made decisions against community wishes. Told the Chancellor that the last two chancellors closed public schools even where there was opposition. Some of them were the most highly desired schools. Who will be at the table in this town, knowing even DCPS leaders not the strongest advocates for neighborhoods? The equity issue vs competing for students.
- I'm struggling with what we mean by education planning cycle. I'm not an expert, but limited understanding is built into how charter law is written in the city, how the process happens. I don't see or understand how creating dataset impacts opening and closing of charter schools. Would they agree to changing it?
- PCSB receives applications, and they could approve them based on planning goals that are coordinated.
- But PCSB doesn't generate applicants, applications might be coming from other cities. They don't dictate the pool of applicants or the siting. That would require a change in law to determine siting. For communities' needs, what community? DC is different than the needs of ward 6. Is it a neighborhood within the ward? How do we define it and how does that affect review of data and decisions?
- This discussion shows we have a lot of dysfunction in the city with opening and closing schools. PCSB just takes whoever comes forward with an application without examining need, there are lots of excess seats, and it's not a good system. Something has to be done.
- In defense of PCSB, they have scrutiny. They don't have certain authority.
- We could change the law.
- PCSB looks at need and demand in a different way. There's a need for high quality seats. Have excess seats but of low quality, the fundamental thread about what is needed through quality lens.
- Only for charter sector now, what DCPS offers?
- Confused how this will address that problem.
- Facilitator: Task Force agreed we are not addressing the needs of governance structure, and we can't tell DCPS how to close low performing schools. Similarly, we are not telling PCSB not to open schools. But can make headway for working together. Do this in a coordinated way, using the same information, always have community provide input that's meaningful.
- Conceptually that sounds good.
- Isn't it also a naïve use of data? Any one of those could be priorities at different times, but it's not sufficient.
- Equity needs to be behind the decisions too.
- Watching this play out for two years, it's part of student planning. In either case, we didn't deal with governance, that's off the table, but it's really hard. Not sure we can get to a combined vision, goals, or any sort of planning for schools without a governance change. Concerned the data won't be available completely through the public
- Facilitator: It will be available to the public and in an interactive format they can use.
- Agreement between education leaders to make decisions - without facilities plan how can that happen without governance change? No citywide view for what we need and it's getting really expensive. Lucky we're a rich city.
- Facilitator: Do you have a suggestion for governance change?

- Don't have a suggestion.
- I think we should not have an autonomous PCSB that doesn't answer to our mayor. That's a governance problem that Congress imposed on DC. If most people understood that, they'd be troubled. Autonomous schools are one thing, but PCSB is autonomous and not accountable to opening schools where city needs them, and that's a huge problem. Every taxpayer in the city should be concerned about that. There is no other agency in this city that's autonomous. That's the problem.
- Facilitator: I had a bit of a meltdown one day on this because I got very frustrated with the idea that the best we could do is to put out recommendations on data on the issue of Opening, Closing, and Siting schools because I have strong feelings on it. But I did come to believe there are governance challenges, though I don't agree about autonomy, PCSB Members are appointed by the Mayor and not Congress, but there are things that should change. Needs of the city. Those of us who care about it can advocate for a legal change, but for the purpose of the Task Force, we are not imposing anything, especially things people don't agree with. We spent the deep dive on this, and this set of advocacy moves and governance changes won't come before data. Until we have the data and understand how decisions are made and don't match up, until that's transparent and accessible, discussed in regular ongoing ways and community informing decisions, we won't get to next set of changes. Don't love that but it's very clear this is a step worth taking and a prerequisite.
- Is there authority that comes with these recommendations? Education leaders are reviewing decisions, and at the table are the agencies, and the Deputy Mayor is the boss of these agencies. It's not like any of these people are easily influenced. Since we're not talking governance change, what authority would come from this? If Task Force recommends data to share for Opening, Closing, and Siting, do these people have authority to say? If so, that's something I disagree with.
- Facilitator: The authority is already there. The Chancellor can decide about Opening, Closing and Siting, and the goal is the group works together so when the coding issue comes up, they are looking at the strategic analysis.
- 2008 listed Powell Elementary on the closure list, and at that school right now, the Principal moved to that school because her child couldn't get into pre-k. Someone said the school should close, and then the neighborhood exploded. We have seen not only the school expand, but the faces also changed. Powers that be decided to close and that neighborhood would have been without school that is serving neighborhood really well because of people at the top.
- Wouldn't you want the data available so you can make a case for not closing?
- That's what I'm trying to figure out, is it just for the people who have authority to make these decisions? Or for people in the city?
- Facilitator: The Chancellor decides now and doesn't talk to PCSB, and vice versa, so we are trying to change that.
- With the people who already have authority?
- Facilitator: Do you have suggestions about additional decision makers?
- More public input
- For me, a threat throughout all objectives regardless of type, are pieces where I think as a city we could stand to have a stronger element are all around transparency to the community and community engagement. We hear a policy was implemented, and the

community doesn't understand why. Regardless of what we're talking about, that's a huge piece. We have the best of intentions to engage the public, with just engagement without example of what strong engagement looks like allows for government entities with limited resources to get by, and we don't want to just get by. Strong examples like My School DC launch, and the outreach to the community is a strong example. We have done that really well, and it is helpful to provide examples.

- Facilitator: We recommend putting together a group to have guidelines for effective community engagement, rather than just doing community engagement. There's a more specific piece in the slide.
- To the governance question, idea of data piece, the Council approves MFP.
- It does but we don't have one now.
- One way is to see if those data elements could be required as part of MFP itself. I am not familiar, but one way for dealing with circumstances. Current decision-making lines, put out the data and people might respond rationally to it, but you have ward 6 parents screaming at them they want more money. Idea of cross sector is narrowly defined between cross sector and charters, and gleaning from housing conversation, there are some cross-sector opportunities between education and business. There is a high need for this type of program here, but it's a place DCPS or PCSB isn't enticed to move into. We could create a suite of options but incentivize a program wanting to meet a need in the city and DCPS can't. It's a way to say we want to encourage this type of location. Often charters don't have that, and they end up in basements. Thought around other than education space, how can we start to think about leveraging outside of the education space to make it more achievable?
- Facilitator: This starts to identify areas we do need. Housing and transportation access is where we want to look, and we need better understanding across sectors
- Would get to it with education plan, MFP across the city. MFP is parallel, one-off decisions on opening, closing and siting. One-off is not going to get this city where it needs to be without an agreement on general education plan, where we're going and what we want. It has to involvd both sectors, and it hasn't gotten there yet.