

SHAPPE Meeting of October 25, 2016

Attending: McKinley, SWW, Cardozo, Luke Moore, Wilson, Roosevelt, Washington Lawyers Committee, DCPS Pathways, DCPS Community Engagement, State Board of Education

We had a cross section of principals, parents and teachers as well as central office administrators and community members.

Introduction of Issues:

The Cross Sector Task force is considering a number of options that have been proposed to respond to mid-year mobility or churn. A group of advocates from the Ward Education Councils have also talked about the issue and put forward some suggestions.

8% of students are mobile mid-year. The students entering the public schools mid-year are entering DCPS schools. The majority of these students are moving in or out of state (75%). Other students come back to their neighborhood schools after the October 5th student count. These are largely students going from charter to DCPS. There are also students who move between DCPS schools. Charter schools do not have to accept students after the start of school like DCPS specialty schools and private schools.

Taken from Cross Sector Task Force slide deck:

Sector differences ♣ DCPS enrolls the majority of all entries including across LEA exits from PCS ♣ Nearly all across LEA exits are from PCS √ High churn schools ♣ High churn rate ranges from 10% to 37% ♣ 32% of all public schools students in DC attend high churn schools ♣ High churn schools experience more mid-year entries than exits ♣ High churn schools have larger shares of at risk students √ Disproportionate impact on wards ♣ High churn schools are mostly located in Wards 7 and 8 ♣ Nearly all DCPS schools east of the river are high churn ♣ Two thirds of public charter schools east of the river are low entry/high exit √ Disproportionate impact on high schools ♣ DCPS comprehensive high schools are disproportionately affected by across LEA mobility and have higher mobility than any other type of school

Given these statistics our neighborhood high schools are definitely affected and will be impacted by any proposal to address this issue.

Proposals:

If DCPS as the by right system were to welcome students regardless of where they came from and what their issues were what would they need to do this well?

- DCPS High schools have full student loads at the beginning of the year as it is. Even if all students are not attending every day, they are the responsibility of that teacher. The

initiative to add 20 electives as well as the increase in class ratios instituted about 4 years ago has meant that the core classes at many schools are full or over enrolled from day 1. The single largest thing that would give teachers a chance with the students enrolled in August as well as those that come later is **reducing the class size** in non-elective classes.

- The transition counselor could make a difference if they were able to track down things like the students transcript and community service hours. This has been very labor intensive and difficult to obtain from the different schools students have left. The suggestion is to make this a requirement or obligation of the Charter System – a student’s records have to be transferred to the neighborhood school upon request.
- Special Education Student transfers may need extra care to ensure that their IEP is followed. This requires a reduction in the case load of some of our Special Ed Counselors.
- The items listed in the attached proposal are all great. Actually all students would benefit from this kind of a welcome as they started the year. It could be in place for them and then carried over to the transfer students.
- Schools also need to address the needs of students wanting to leave or drop out with some of these same strategies and a more personal approach
- There may not be the need for a full transition academy; it is more a transition counselor to make sure the school has the transcript so they are enrolling them in the appropriate classes. This person (it may need two people at larger schools) would also be a point of contact for teachers receiving these students.
- There is support for the index of churn, three years of rolling data and additional funds to make sure the schools is appropriately staffed for transfers from the beginning.

Response to Current Proposals before the Cross Sector Task Force:

- No support for by right charters with boundaries. This group agreed that DCPS should claim the students and the responsibility as the municipal system. They absolutely do not accept the assumption in the proposal that quality charter schools are inherently better schools.
- Centralized City wide process for students who enter, transfer and exit mid-year: the group did not feel this should be about counseling, vetting or negotiating the transfer. They did not trust that this would be done in a neutral way that was in the best interest of the student, family and city. They felt it would be gamed. They did feel that unless a neutral agency held the data on the transfers, it would not be believed. They would like to understand more why students leave or arrive. The details on this may not be right yet but the need to understand the reasons is correct.
- Extra resources should be required and DCPS should take the hardship transfers.

- There was the suggestion that if a student wants to transfer to their DCPS neighborhood school they should be allowed to. If they want to stay in the charter sector, the charter schools should find a place for them.
- Round Robin Lottery. The feeling by past charter folks and DCPS folks present was that this could easily lead to folks feeling they may get a second chance to get their first choice school by leaving and transferring mid- year. The general feeling was that this would probably increase mid- year mobility. With regard to maintaining wait lists, the fear is that if they are abolished a principal will pick and choose who they want to enter. Overall the round robin lottery was rejected.

Areas that could be attended to that would ease cross sector transfers:

- An exit folder that each student in either sector automatically has and the receiving school automatically gets
- Extend the 4 year graduation requirement so the school can better serve the ELL , special education and at risk youth without being punished
- More common practice on discipline
- A better understanding of the effect housing changes have on this issue and ways to make that more stable in the city for low income families
- Instate the position of resource teacher for hardship transfers
- Look at some common definitions of courses to ease the credit issue across LEA's
- Don't leave community service to the end for students
- Make sure that students and families Know Their Rights and have access to advocacy like the student advocate or the ombudsman.
- Put in place the mechanisms to get the data on why students transfer
- The codes and DCMR should be updated to be more accurate and to allow a student to finish out the year at the school they are attending
- Indexes should be developed for mid-year mobility and schools with a high average should be given extra funds at the start of the year to staff for the needs of these students.

Every Student Succeeds Act – Measures of Accountability

Ruth Wattenberg: State Board of Education

Under this new law which replaces No Child Left Behind, each school will propose new accountability measures. They will be submitted for approval in either March or July. OSSE is developing these proposals but the State Board must approve them. A robust public engagement process is required.

The current draft which OSSE is working on for high schools looks at additional measures. The accountability measures fall into

Academic Achievement – 35% this would measure the number of students scoring 4 or 5 on the PARCC as well as the percent of reduction in those scoring 1 or 2.

Issues: Not the same students

Academic Progress – 35% growth as measured by the Median Growth Percentile

Graduation Rate – 10% adjusted cohort rate as compared to the previous year. You can use a 5 year rate but it has to be weighted less than the 4 year rate.

Progress in Achieving English Language proficiency- 10% - percent of students reaching growth targets -ACCESS

School Quality and Student Success- 10% other high school measures could include SAT, AP, IB and dual enrollment participation; Attendance; Re-enrollment; on track to graduate

Ruth noted other possible measures including School Climate and or Satisfaction surveys, career preparation, staff turnover, indications of a broad curriculum

Those present talked about the need to disaggregate for students with high needs potentially like homeless and TANF students. The school report card should note allow folks to see the good work that is being done with many students with different challenges.

Challenges for the schools include the student who transfers to their neighborhood school as an 18 year old with 9 credits. They do not like to come to school, may be homeless but belong to this neighborhood school now. We need to be able to portray a far truer picture of the school's task and then how it is being addressed.

We discussed the difficulty of forcing students to graduate in 4 years when that did not serve them well at all. This is especially true of ELL students who may have arrived to this country with little formal education. The accountability measures have forced decisions that are not in the best educational interest of the students. The 4 year measure has to be reconsidered. There should be no penalty if it takes longer for students to graduate especially those who have special challenges.

There is a strong correlation between school climate and student achievement. Are there appropriate measures we could use to capture this?

Could class size be a measure? Could a school get credit for implementing a strong program of restorative justice?

There should absolutely be longitudinal measures in place instead of measuring progress using different student from year to year.

We only have to have one testing year in high school, what should it be? We would like to reduce the strong focus on the test and instead focus on education. What are the necessary incentives and measures to achieve this?

The report cards and the ways schools are portrayed has felt particularly unjust. It will be very important for the work of different schools to be accurately described and fairly measured.

We invited Ruth back to our January meeting for a chance to continue this discussion.

The meeting ended at 8pm. Thank you Luke Moore for hosting us

DRAFT