

**COMMON LOTTERY BOARD MEETING  
 APRIL 26, 2018  
 1050 First Street NE  
 1st Floor, Eleanor Holmes Norton III Room  
 1:00PM – 3:00PM**

**MINUTES**

**I. Call to Order at 1:06pm & Roll Call**

Member Name	Board Membership Status	Organization	Roll Call	Jan Minutes	Mar Minutes	PCSB Data	Sup as Chair
Ahnna Smith	Chairperson and voting member	DME	X	X	X	X	X
Claudia Lujan	Voting member	DCPS	X	X	X	X	X
Eugene Pinkard	Voting member	DCPS					
Colin Taylor	Voting member	DCPS	X	X	X	X	X
Richard Pohlman	Voting member	TMA	X	X	x	X	X
Will Stoetzer	Voting member	Ingenuity Prep	X	X	X	X	X
Susan Schaeffler	Voting member	KIPP DC	X (phone)	X	X	X	X
Lenora Mills	Non-voting member	DC PCSB	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Shana Young (Hanseul Kang)	Non-voting member	OSSE	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Catherine Peretti	Non-voting member	My School DC	X	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**II. January Minutes and March Minutes**

Both meetings' minutes were unanimously approved.

**III. Year 5 Lottery Results**

Board member Peretti gave an overview of the five year trends and 2018 lottery results. 2018 boasted the largest total of school participants to date. The pool also showed the largest Ward 8 applicant number to date, hopefully due to enhanced outreach in that Ward. The grassroots effort this year was robust and citywide, with specific efforts in Wards 7 and 8 and language minority

communities within Wards 1 and 4. The 2018 lottery had 24,996 applicants and 16,083 matched which are the largest raw numbers to date, but the overall match rate was 64% (declined for the third year). 38% of lottery applicants were matched to their top choice. As always, there were long waitlists for some school/grades and unfilled seats in others.

Board Member Stoetzer asked about seats made available keeping pace with the rise in the number of applicants. There were definitely more seats made available this year, but they were not always in the grade where there were more applications or at the schools that families were ranking highly.

The staff shared some of the outreach strategies employed to ensure families know about the lottery and the deadlines. Board Member Pohlman asked about the 1x1 consultations being effective. They are not that much of a value added to what the hotline already does, but it also isn't too much extra effort for the team to make outgoing calls if someone makes an appointment.

Board member Stoetzer wants to add the number of open houses to the narrative of school's enrollment efforts to make sure we are properly displaying the outreach work that My School DC triggers at the school level.

Alex Simbana from the Board's Parent Advisory Council suggested that we make the common enrollment date recurring (i.e. the 3<sup>rd</sup> Saturday in April.) Board Member Kang asked what we did in terms of outreach to homeless families. The My School DC staff explained the events and partnerships with Virginia Williams, the Playtime Project, hotels that often serve as shelter and others.

#### **IV. Year 4 Audit Results**

Board Member Peretti explained that each year, My School DC follows procurement procedure to hire a third party vendor. The vendor has varied, but AIR conducted the audit this year. AIR created and populated slides and representatives are present for Board member questions. The auditor performs data comparison to identify students enrolled in a school without the proper application and waitlist offer process in the Centralized Waitlist Management System (CWMS).

#### **Enrollments Outside Process and CWMS Mistakes**

Schools reduced enrollments outside process and CWMS mistakes significantly from last year. The reductions were from 330 to 273 enrollments outside process and 490 CWMS mistakes to 212 CWMS mistakes. It is important to note that most of the students enrolled improperly were not displacing students on a waitlist. The decrease has been steady from prior years, and we still need to work toward zero. CWMS mistakes are user errors, considered minor by My School DC,

creating discrepancy in the status of an applicant in the CWMS and that same student's enrollment status.

Board member Lujan explained that her team had been looking into some school level practices in order to correct them and will include those actions in a return letter.

Board member Stoetzer suggested sending audit letters to LEAs prior to April 1<sup>st</sup> so that it's fresh in LEA's minds at the start of the enrollment season.

### **Grade Mismatches**

Board member Schaeffler asked if there are any patterns with regards to the grade errors in 9<sup>th</sup>/10<sup>th</sup>. It seems to be pretty well distributed due to the variety of 9<sup>th</sup> grade promotion requirements across schools. Board member Taylor asked if students are aware at the time of enrollment whether they will be held back. They should have completed a semester by the time of application, but probably do not yet know grades or on track status. Board member Pohlman mentioned at his school that it was relative common for students who had been told they were at risk for retention to utilize the lottery.

Board member Stoetzer asked what the protocol was for students who applied to the wrong grade - are the schools required to honor the match in the correct grade? No – students are placed on the waitlist of the correct grade where they would have been had they applied to the correct grade initially.

Board member Schaeffler thinks that it's very important that researchers and decision makers understand that only 64% of students matched/received an offer with their first choice end up enrolling at the school. Several Board members acknowledged that would be a surprising percentage to most people.

The auditor also identifies students enrolled in a different grade than the grade for which they applied. There were 287 students that applied for one grade and enrolled in another, down from 330 last year and 521 the year before. The most common reasons are that the student applied to 10<sup>th</sup> grade but enrolled in 9<sup>th</sup> due to retention and lack of credits – this number increased slightly from last year. The other common reason is that the student applied to PK3, but was age eligible for PK4 and the parent made a decision with the school to be placed in PK4. This number decreased from last year from 114 to 37 with a technical enhancement embedded in the application advising the applicant of age eligibility for PK4 based on birth date.

The auditor analyzes enrollment trends to determine who enrolled from a match or offer in the lottery. Overall, 60% of applicants that made the lottery deadline and received an offer are

enrolling at a school from that match or waitlist offer. Post-lottery applicants are more likely to receive an offer and slightly less likely to accept it.

For the students that are not accepting their match or offer by enrolling, where are they going? Some re-enroll at their current school, some at their in-boundary school, and some leave the public system entirely (move out of DC, private school, dropping out, etc.).

## **V. Process Change Recommendations**

### **Code of Ethics:**

Board Member Peretti recommends that the Common Lottery Board adopt a code of ethics addressing the topics of accountability, collaboration and communication on the Board. Each new member will be expected to sign one upon onboarding starting in July. Board Member Lujan noted that the definition of a personal interest is having a “close personal relationship” with a lottery applicant which could encapsulate every Board member. Having an interest doesn’t mean having a conflict, only a disclosure, but there is a suggestion to more clearly define “close personal relationship” so every member doesn’t get conflicted out of voting. Board Member Pohlman suggested adding an “e.g.” because close personal relationship is necessarily defined by the person. DCPS wants to run it by their General Counsel before the July adoption vote.

### **Audit Letter Response:**

The staff proposes adding a provision to the audit process requiring a return letter from LEAs with audit findings is also recommended.

Board Member Pohlman suggested taking out specific years to make the policy guide more evergreen. Board Member Taylor suggested just including Chancellor and “senior leaders” at DCPS since titles change year to year. Board Member Kang suggested posting non-respondent LEAs publically or otherwise leaving space for the Board to take additional steps. Board members are not sure public posting would have an impact on reducing errors. Board Members Pohlman and Kang suggested language to reserves the right to take further actions, but should specify what that action could be. Board Member Peretti relayed that kicking schools out of the lottery is counter to the goals of the program – and it would have to be very severe and recurring issues for the staff to want that result. Further discussion is warranted on what the appropriate response would be for non-responding LEAs. Board Member Pohlman has suggested language the following language edits in anticipation of a July vote:

“LEAs with audit findings will be required to respond to the letter on or before June 30<sup>th</sup> with the corrective actions taken or to be taken. Failure to respond or present satisfactory action to correct the specific type of finding may result in a public report to the Common

Lottery Board which may take appropriate steps (e.g. referral to the Office of the Inspector General or other authority, limiting future participation, censure, report to chartering authority or other oversight body).”

Board Member Lujan asked whether the corrective actions had to be complete by the time of the letter? Not necessarily – the letter should specify what the actions are and when they were taken or will be taken. Hopefully some corrective actions will happen on an ongoing basis.

### **Schools Without Secure Locations:**

Adding the following: My School DC staff will not match students to schools that have not acquired title or otherwise secured (e.g. through a signed lease or letter of intent) a facility. A school with an uncertain facility remains invited to participate and to collect applications through My School DC, but a waitlist will be created for the school rather than a match list, if the facility remains unsecured by March 1<sup>st</sup> of the lottery year.

Board Member Mills says PCSB is not supportive and is concerned this will cause a disincentive to new charters from joining the common lottery. Board Member Stoetzer agrees with the potential disincentive – but thinks it’s more important to protect families from losing opportunity. Board Member Pohlman agrees with Board Member Stoetzer and emphasized that My School DC would not prevent the school from participating, just from matching students outright. They will still have a waitlist which essentially mimics what would happen if they did not participate. The Board will vote in July.

### **Chairperson Role**

Finally, the Board discussed switching the chairperson role from DME to Superintendent now that the operations of My School DC sit at OSSE.

The Board voted unanimously to approve the switch and will seek the necessary legislative change.

## **VI. Mid-Year Application Update**

The goals of the mid-year application were to:

- Ensure students entering mid-year have equitable access to **all available options** to find the school that best matches their needs. This will promote more stable learning environments for entering students and students already attending schools.
- Increase our **knowledge about why** students enter and transfer mid-year to inform future policies to reduce mid-year mobility.

The data show 2,908 new enrollments in both sectors between 10.6.17 and 3.26.18 in SLED, and 91% of those enrollments were in DCPS schools. **37%** of those enrollments came through My School DC – remember this was a “hold harmless” year and a big change for schools but it speaks to how effectively we are ensuring equitable access. Seven charter schools did offer automatic offers to students entering during that time frame.

Board Member Schaeffler brought up at the time of mid-year application starting, there was also a push for LEA payment reform which made sense as a dual effort, and pointed out that this payment initiative is not going forward. Board Member Smith responded that LEA payment is not dead or off the table, but is paused for the time being.

Board Member Lujan does not think DCPS should continue requiring in-boundary K-12 applications next year in the mid-year. She thinks that it’s a huge lift for schools and for their families without a clear justification.

Board Member Peretti suggested turning off the in-boundary requirement and survey work streams for the time being, with the understanding that it can be restarted as soon as there is the impetus for schools to engage. Otherwise, it is confusing to families.

Michele from the My School DC staff shared the concerns of the hotline with regards to the survey, and notes that families being asked to share what is sometimes highly sensitive information while typically standing in the front office.

Board Member Pohlman thinks there is a better way to survey (not through the hotline) potentially through the schools.

Board Member Taylor thinks it worth exploring how to survey families based off their SLED enrollment for a better data set.

Board Member Mills asks that My School DC and OSSE explore other survey options.

## **VII. Research Requests**

The Board voted unanimously to approve PCSB’s annual research request.

Board Member Schaeffler wants to reiterate her point from earlier – that these demand data are nuanced and can easily be used to isolate points to push a political agenda. She doesn’t want decisions to be made about opening and closing, or for demand to be inferred based solely on MSDC data. She votes yes with these reservations in the interest of being a good faith participant and Board member.

The Board considers the DME request to be an internal data analysis to inform the Master Facilities Plan, and not a research request and therefore does not require a vote. Board Member Stotzer notes that the categorization as internal is based on this specific use of the lottery data, since DME and OSSE share some functions that are typical of an SEA in another state.

Board Member Peretti asked DCPS and PCSB about the initial waitlist length data. It has been an increasing burden on the staff to distribute the data to each sector without having a centralized source to check against for good quality assurance. Both sectors are in favor of placing the already public waitlist data on the MSDC data page. The staff will execute.

### **VIII. Board Elections**

The PCSB will coordinate charter member elections for the two seats with terms ending, starting with nominations on June 6<sup>th</sup> with the winners announced July 27<sup>th</sup>.

### **IX. Adjourn 3:05pm**