

## Summary: Task Force Retreat ratings (11/7)

4 members absent from meeting

	Number of responses	Average rating	Rating %	Summary of the comments
Underlying Assumptions	15	1.6	#1: 35% #2: 41% #3: 18% #4: 6%	<p><u>All of the comments (7 members) identified concerns w/ making this voluntary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Voluntary LEA participation feels risky to 7 members; it leaves the policy feeling uncertain.</li> <li>• The requests include a clearer definition of “voluntary” and what the process would be for getting charters to opt-in</li> </ul>
Component 1: Should there be a centralized process?	15	1.5	#1: 63% #2: 31% #3: 6% #4: 0%	<p>Concerns that this will cause more hardship - distribution will cause transportation problems for some students (2 comments)</p> <p>Concerns that this will slow down in-boundary enrollment process, particularly for students who are transient (4 comments)</p>
Component 2: Should there be hardship set-asides and/or out-of-state set-asides?	20	1.8	#1: 30% #2: 55% #3: 15% #4: 0%	<p><u>Reservations are mainly around what the definition of the set-asides would be</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hard to determine how many favored one or both types of set asides</li> <li>• Unsure if homeschooled students should be included in out-of-state definition; worried about people with “social capital” could game the system; this could just be a way to get around the waitlist</li> <li>• What would the effect on DCPS overall enrollment be?</li> <li>• Concern a Task Force member: if a school was ready to accept beyond a certain class size the school should have already planned for a larger class</li> <li>• One “3” rating: expelled students should be included as hardship transfers</li> </ul>
Component 3: Rate how the waitlists should be implemented	16	1.9 (5 people did not write a rating)	#1: 17% #2: 44% #3: 6% #4: 6%  No rating – only comments: 27%	<p><u>Vast majority want to eliminate waitlist</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nobody wanted status quo: 0</li> <li>• Updated waitlist: 3 members</li> <li>• No waitlists: 11</li> <li>• Unsure: 2</li> <li>• Most people were in favor of eliminating the waitlists; some wanted them eliminated in mid-December, some wanted them eliminated earlier (e.g. after 10/5)</li> <li>• One person rated eliminating waitlists as a 4</li> <li>• One person questioned if there would be an incentive for schools to have set-asides if waitlists were allowed to exist</li> </ul>

	Number of responses	Average rating	Rating %	Summary of the comments
Component 4: Should participating LEAs use a uniform method for identifying open seats?	15	2.2	#1: 14% #2: 53% #3: 33% #4: 0%  No rating – only comments: 0%	<p><u>Most were in favor of the open seat policy (1 in 1 out).</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted that there are already issues with waitlists and the number of students</li> <li>• Could impact schools differently; the policy also seems more relevant for schools that can control their enrollment and that the policy needs to be clarified for schools of right</li> <li>• One person noted they would only support this if there were the option to opt-out of this</li> <li>• One person noted the need for more information on how schools are currently impacted by post 10/5 entries.</li> <li>• One person liked the idea of the minimum but wants to set an actual minimum and a target</li> </ul>
Component 5: Information and counseling	15	1.6 (1 did not rate)	#1: 53% #2: 27% #3: 13% #4: 0%  No rating – only comments: 7%	<p><u>Of the 10 who commented, most want either counseling or wrap around services provided</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Division over MSDC’s role: MSDC should not provide the counseling OR MSDC should only provide informational counseling but should be equipped to connect families with other resources and counselors</li> <li>• Counseling: from OSA, more wraparound services, 3<sup>rd</sup> party (e.g. DCSRN)</li> <li>• Concerns that the counseling process would slow down in-boundary entries</li> </ul>