DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMON LOTTERY BOARD
MAY 4, 2017
2:30 - 4:30 PM
1350 Pennsylvania Avenue NW #G9

MINUTES

Board Member (Designee)	Organization	Voting Status	Roll Call	1/27 Min	CSCTF Recs	Research PCSB	Research Mathematica
Jennifer C. Niles	DME	Voting Member	✓	X	X	X	X
Susan Schaeffler	KIPP DC	Voting Member	✓	X	X	X	X
Emerald Becker	DCPS	Voting Member	✓	X	X	X	X
Colin Taylor	DCPS	Voting Member	✓	NP	X	X	X
Will Stoetzer	Ingenuity Prep	Voting Member	✓	X	X	X	X
Eugene Pinkard (Teresa Biagioni)	DCPS	Voting Member	✓	X	X	X	X
Richard Pohlman	TMA PCHS	Voting Member	✓	X	X	X	X
Darren Woodruff	DC PCSB	Non-Voting Member	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Shana Young	OSSE	Non-Voting Member	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Catherine Peretti	MSDC	Non-Voting Member	✓	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

I. Review January 2017 meeting minutes

Board approved unanimously.

II. 2017 Lottery Results

The Common Lottery Board reviewed the results of the 2017 lottery which had a lower match rate than previous years and a lower rating of being "satisfied with their results" by those surveyed by the MSDC field team. The field team only called families matched in the lottery,

prioritizing applicants that did not have an e-mail address, language minority applicants, and residents of Wards 7 and 8. They discussed how the school grade combinations people choose in the lottery affects the match rate and went over the MSDC outreach efforts this year. The Board considered what trends there might be and the conclusion was that we need more data to fully understand the information. The key conclusions were that there are long waitlists for some school/grade combinations, and others go unfilled. Even high quality seats (Tier 1 and Reward schools) went unfilled this year. However, we know that schools continue to see applicants over the spring and summer and some of these unfilled seats will fill up by the start of school and the enrollment count.

Emerald Becker of DCPS asked how we can improve the match rate and MSDC discussed the factors that parents have said they look for when talking to us in focus groups and answering surveys. The median number of school selections this year was three), to keep an eye on the match rate for planning, and to consider how transportation affects choices and capture rates. Rich Pohlman suggested the Board not be myopic about the match rate as a metric, and Will Stoetzer noted that many schools over offer seats, expecting attrition of their matched students. Emerald Becker does want to use the match rate as a benchmark and to work to increase the number of schools families select on their applications, and possibly exploring consequences for entering the lottery. One suggestion by Rich Pohlman was to have data on seats available and the chances of matching to a school included in school profiles. He has warmed to the idea of such a metric after several conversations as a full Board, and with Colin Taylor on the data subcommittee.

Cat Peretti noted that total number of applications and match rate are not actually annual goals or metrics of success for MSDC, but can be key indicators of a healthy system of choice. MSDC will continue to consider the proportion of applications from different wards that signals MSDC outreach is reaching all families. MSDC also hopes schools will continue their recruitment and outreach themselves which both increases a family's opportunity to find a school that is a good fit and could boost the number of schools to which families apply.

III. 2016 Lottery Audit Results

The board discussed findings of the audit from Year 3 of the lottery. MSDC targeted a 20% reduction in students enrolled outside the process and achieved a 44% reduction. The team made this improvement in partnership with schools through general training plus one-on-one training. The next step is sending letters to LEA leaders on the audit results (Board Chairs, Executive Directors/Heads of School, the Chancellor and the PCSB).

Many of these erroneous enrollments were due to the misconception that homeless families do not need applications, confusion over the transfer preference at multi-campus LEAs, and under-

enrolled schools not seeing the value in making a family apply in the post-lottery period when they know they have an open seat. Cat Peretti said that these post-lottery applications were still important in preventing dual enrollments.

MSDC also tracked errors made in the management of waitlists which included forgetting to reverse declines after an initial mistake but where the student is enrolled, not keeping updated records when a student later enrolls at another school, and students enrolled without a proper waitlist offer (which is still considered an enrollment error).

MSDC sees the issue as one of training and information not of bad actors. Rich Pohlman wants to look closely at errors made around October 5th, Membership (Count) Day when schools are rushing to enroll students. Rich Pohlman suggested we work with OSSE data on entry and exits dates to see if there are more errors closer to Oct. 5th.

The audit also examines applicants that enroll in a different grade from the grade they applied to through MSDC. The most common errors were those who applied for 10th grade enrolled in 9th because they were retained and PK3 students enrolled in PK4 because the family applied to the wrong grade.

The Board then discussed the match rate, the waitlist offer rate and, the capture rate (that is, the percentage of students that enroll in a school where they were offered a seat). The capture rate is 61%. Again, the Board wants to look for more information that can help MSDC and schools improve the capture rate. We see that 14% of lottery applicants end up outside of the DC public system entirely (private school, dropping out, moving to another state), even when most of them get an offer. Will Stoetzer wants to know how this compares to years past. Cat Peretti will follow up on that question.

IV. Cross Sector Collaboration Task Force Recommendations

The Cross Sector Collaboration Task Force made recommendations to the Mayor which MSDC will implement and if the Board approves will develop the business rules for implementation.

Cross Sector Collaboration Task Force Recommendation 1: The Task Force recommends that My School DC manage a <u>common mid-year entry and transfer process</u> for public school students starting in SY17-18.

> MSDC will keep the application open and centrally manage the waitlists until the end of March when the following year's lottery results are posted. MSDC will collect applications for mid-year in-boundary applicants (even in K-12) and collect data about why students are moving mid-year.

The Board unanimously approves.

Cross Sector Task Force Recommendation 2: The Cross-Sector Task Force recommends that Local Education Agencies (DCPS and public charters) voluntarily set aside hardship seats that are separate from school waitlists in order to serve students who meet the hardship criteria starting in SY17-18.

The board discussed concerns about implementation and how this could affect the core mission of MSDC. Will Stoetzer said that hardship transfers touched upon issues of trust in the system of which MSDC is only one part. Rich Pohlman was concerned with the capacity of the small MSDC staff to implement the recommendation. More specific to the business rules, Darren Woodruff was concerned about who chooses the possible schools for a family experiencing hardship. Susan Schaeffler also noted the importance of clearly defining the hardship criteria to prevent gaming.

> Deputy Mayor Niles moves that the Board approve that a working group move forward to further define the hardship, and that MSDC reports back on the working group's findings so the Board can know that the mission of MSDC will not be put at risk. The Board unanimously approves.

The Board will get an update on the hardship criteria with specifics on the process at the August meeting.

IV. PCSB Research Request

Darren Woodruff started the discussion by saying the data in this request is not used to limit growth but to help illuminate where growth makes sense. Will Stoetzer would like PCSB to make this data available to existing LEAs, and not just charter applicants, and they agreed.

The Board unanimously approved the request.

V. Mathematica Research Request

The request is for data that will help build a tool to predict enrollment, using lottery data, enrollment data, student-level data, and public data around population growth and neighborhood characteristics. The Board discussed how to handle the FERPA protected data and Rich Pohlman wanted to confirm that the data is only for the deliberative process. Cat Peretti confirmed that was the understanding from Mathematica's proposal – that it would be a predictive tool that is informational and deliberative for planning purposes. Data are needed to develop the model and there will be individual authorized users from My School DC, charter LEAs, DCPS, PCSB and DME. It is not for external use and the authorized user accounts will

not be transferable. The data will only be used to build and test the model, the tool itself will have no protected data, and the researchers will build security into it.

The Board also discussed who would have user authorization to use the tool, specifically Shana Young wanted to know if Mathematica owns the tool or if the funders of the study owned the tool. Mathematica would create the tool and would write a paper as a part of the research request, but after developing it and writing the paper Mathematica nor Walton will not have access to use it. Duty to authorize users will be given by the Executive Director of MSDC and the permissions of the user account will determine which schools the user can see. For example, a DCPS user will be able to see all DCPS schools and the PCSB user will be able to see all charters. Otherwise a charter LEA will only be able to see its schools.

Susan Schaeffler was concerned that the tool would be used to limit charter school growth and the growth of DCPS programming, and when everyone came to the table to build My School DC there was tacit agreement that doing so would not harm either sector.

The Board unanimously approved the request with the understanding that the ownership question around the tool is addressed. The next step for this request is to create the data sharing agreement and submit it for legal counsel approval.