GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + + MONDAY, JULY 29, 2013

+ + + + +

The public meeting was held in the offices of the DC Public Charter School Board, 3333 14th Street, N.W., Washington, DC, at 7:00 p.m., John "Skip" McKoy, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT

John "Skip" McKoy, Chair

Scott Pearson, Executive Director
Emily Bloomfield
Barbara Nophlin
Don Soifer
Herbert Tillery
Darren Woodruff

ALSO PRESENT
Naomi Rubin DeVeaux
Rashida Kennedy
Erin Kupferberg
Sarah Medway
Monique Miller

Rashida Tyler

	I	Page 2
AGENDA		
ITEM		PAGE
Approval of the Agenda	•	7
Public Comments	•	
Administrative Contracts over \$25,000	•	8
Evaluation Report of PCSB by NACSA	•	7 52
Policy/Guideline Approval Decisions		
2013 PMF Floors	•	. 53
2013-2014 Application Guidelines		
for New Public Charter Schools	•	. 70
2013-2014 Charter Renewal		. 82
Guidelines		
Board of Trustee Compliance	•	. 73
2014 Mystery Shopper Guidelines	•	. 78
Open for 30-day Public Comment Period	•	. 84
Early Childhood PMF	•	. 85
Adult Education PMF	•	. 99
Elementary and Middle School PMF	•	.112
High School PMF	•	.126
Extend Full Charter Approval of		
Previously "Approved with Conditions" .	•	.134
Paul Public Charter School	•	.135
Cedar Tree Public Charter School	•	.140
Charter Amendment Notification	_	.143

	Page 3
Briya Public Charter School	143
Charter Renewal Decisions	.146
SEED School of Washington, DC,	
Public Charter School	146
Maya Angelou Public Charter School.	
Charter Continuances Decisions	.180
for 5- and 10-year Charter Reviews	
Center City Public Charter School	.180
Eagle Academy Public Charter	200
School	
Community Academy	.211
Elsie & Carlos	212
Perry Street	217
BASIS	.220
Adjourned	

	Page 4
1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(7:10 p.m.)
3	CHAIR MCKOY: Good evening.
4	Welcome to DC Public Charter School Board.
5	Usually we have, the last couple of months
6	we've had public hearings and public meetings.
7	And know tonight you'll be
8	disappointed to know there's no public
9	hearing. Is this on? Good evening, can you
10	hear me now?
11	FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Yes.
12	CHAIR MCKOY: Usually we have a,
13	it feels like usually, but the last couple of
14	meetings we've had public hearings and public
15	meetings. Tonight we only have the public
16	meeting and before we get into the meeting I'd
17	like to introduce the members of the Board,
18	particularly because there are two new ones.
19	To my extreme right, Herb Tillery,
20	welcome Herb.
21	MEMBER TILLERY: Thank you.
22	CHAIR MCKOY: New member. Emily

1 movement.

2 CHAIR MCKOY: All in favor?

3 (Multiple Ayes)

CHAIR MCKOY: Opposed? Never had anybody oppose the Agenda. Members if you turn to the Administrative Contracts of contracts over 25,000, as usual if there is no objection we'll just admit these into the record.

And so our first large item, we have guests from the National Association of Charter School Authorizers, to those in this space, as they say, NACSA.

So if you two would come up and, yes, come up and introduce yourselves and we're going to have a presentation and we may have some questions.

NACSA is here because in their role of reviewing authorizers around the Country they occasionally do basically evaluations. Some of you in the audience may have been interviewed by them when they were

1 out here.

So what they're going to present is the result of their assessment, their analysis, or their evaluation of us which they recently completed.

MS. PIEHL: Thank you. My name is Katie Piehl. I'm a Director of Authorizer Development for the National Association of Charter School Authorizers and I am here joined with Carly Bolger who helped us out with this evaluation of the DC Public Charter School Board.

We are looking forward to talking with you tonight and having a very robust conversation about the findings and recommendations and we look forward to talking with you and engaging in a solid conversation and answering any questions you have.

So what we're first going to discuss is, I'll give you a little bit of background on NACSA. I'm sure many of you are familiar with our organization, but I do want

to be able to provide a little bit of
background especially for our newest Board
members.

working?

And I'll also talk a little bit about the process of the evaluation, what we went through to gather the information, interview stakeholders, interview staff members, conduct observations, and come up with our findings and recommendations for you.

And then Carly will discuss the results of the evaluation and then we'll also talk about some next steps and that's when we want to be able to get into a good, robust conversation about the findings and next steps for you all.

So, Carly, do you want to introduce yourself here real quick?

MS. BOLGER: Hi, good evening. My name is Carly Bolger and I, is this not on?

MALE PARTICIPANT: Is that

MS. BOLGER: I don't think so.

MALE PARTICIPANT: It's working,

you have to just hold it closer. It's one of

those --

MS. PIEHL: Is it working if I -MALE PARTICIPANT: Okay.

MS. PIEHL: Very good, okay.

We'll do that.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. BOLGER: All right. Holler if you can't hear me. Good evening, thank you so much for hosting us. We're really excited to share our findings with you.

I was here as a consultant with NACSA helping to conduct this evaluation and my experience in authorizing goes back about seven years. I was the Executive Director of the Office of New Schools for Chicago Public Schools, and before that was the Statewide Authorizer for the State of New Jersey.

And got my start in authorizing at the School District of Philadelphia. So it was great to come here and look at all of the, and really strong practices that you have here 1 and we'll get into more detail about that in a little bit.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. PIEHL: Great. So one of the, I'm not sure if there's a little tag on there, I'm not sure if you have trouble seeing it, there you go.

So we have some goals today that we like to share and then we'll come back and we'll revisit these goals at the end of the presentation. We would like to be able to provide you with again a detailed review of the findings and recommendations.

Also identify some specific actionable steps to improve authorizing practice and talk about some strategic steps that you can take to help meet your mission and vision, which is a very clear mission and vision for quality authorizing and leadership, as well as leadership in the field of authorizing.

And we want to also be able to address any questions that you have regarding

the evaluation in particular as well as any authorizing and practice questions.

So NACSA, just to give you a little bit of background about NACSA, we are an organization that is specifically focused on quality authorizing practices.

We're not for profit, nonpartisan, and we're a membership organization. So the Board is a member of our Association, and our goal or our mission is to improve student achievement through responsible Charter School oversight in the public interest.

So we're really very pointedly focused on quality authorizing and we see that as the lever for quality and improvement in student achievement especially in the Charter School realm.

The Division of Authorizer

Development is a part of NACSA and the work

that our team does is the work that's the most

on the ground with Authorizers, so we work in

partnership with Authorizers across the

Country in certain areas, including board and staff training.

We also help with direct consulting work, maybe we directly manage certain projects like application decision making for some authorizers, or we also share models and tools and templates and spread and share best practices across the field.

Evaluation is one of the elements that one of the pieces of our work and you are one of ten Authorizers this year that has gone through this process.

And then we provide as needed for a membership additional support. If you need someone to take a look at or share best practices in an area, like if you have a question in a particular issue we can provide you with some recommendations or some examples that we've seen across the field, just given our expansive interaction with authorizers across the Country.

NACSA is focused on its central

authorizing principles and we have a document that's Principles and Standards for Quality Authorizing, and our three main principles are to maintain high standards, protect students in the public's interest, and to hold autonomy.

The evaluation is really centered on these tenets and as well as on the standards that align with these main tenets. So you'll see in the evaluation that we focus in four main areas and those all kind of build up into authorizing principles that we have and with the idea that ultimately, as mentioned in our mission, that the work is to improve student outcomes.

So jumping into the evaluation itself, just to give you a little bit of some grounding in the work and what the evaluation looks at, we reviewed your authorizing practices from how it's established as well as how it's applied.

So in looking at how it's

established, that means the documented and that the items, the work that's documented or formalized in some way, but as applied is the work that the authorizer actually does.

So in some cases these might be, they might agree and be the same and in some cases they might be a little bit different in terms of our ratings of how authorizers are doing.

And sometimes if the established is higher then that means that the authorizer has well established policies, for instance, on closure and renewal, but in practice that policy might not be implemented to its fullest degree.

Vice versa if the applied is higher, then the authorizer has maybe some bare bones charter application process, it's not fully developed, but in practice they do a very rigorous job of reviewing and approving high quality applications.

The ratings that we then give,

there's five different levels and it's fairly self-explanatory it goes from undeveloped or absent to well developed. So there's kind of a ratings scale that we provide, and again, we provide a rating for established as well as applied.

We looked at a series of sources when conducting the evaluation and those sources really range from looking at tools that generally tell you a little bit more of how things are established amongst the authorizers, so policies and protocols, tools, contracts, but then we also, as we look at as this slide darkens a little bit you look at elements that end up telling you a little bit more information about how the authorizer's work has been applied.

So records of decision making, clearly that shows you what the authorizer has done in that record of their work. So with that I'm going to hand it over to Carly and she's going to talk about some specifics to

1 your Authorizer Evaluation, so thank you very
2 much.

MS. BOLGER: So on this slide we have an overview of how the DC Public Charter School Board was rated in each of the four key categories. You've all received the report at this point and hopefully have had some time with it.

But even at a quick glance you can tell just from this slide that overall the DC Public Charter School Board is doing a very good job of authorizing charter schools based on access, principles and standards.

So in getting to review the documents and talk to staff it was, I would say, an enjoyable experience to see a high level of work and a commitment to the key principles of authorizing that was evident at every level of the Organization.

So I'm going to spend some time in the next few slides giving an overview of each category that we rated, but given that you

have the report, I think we'll spend the bulk of our time today talking about what some next steps might look like. So with that, I'll go on.

So here we have some of the things that you guys are doing really quite well and that we'd like to see you continue to devote some effort and resources to, and I'm just going to talk through the list here.

The policies and processes that
you have in place and the systems that you use
for evaluating your schools are best in class,
and that goes from the new framework that you
have to measure and monitor academic
performance, the financial framework that you
had for existing and the charm framework which
sort of takes it to the next level.

And then the equity reports that you're starting to implement now that look at some of the other smaller factors that aren't always captured by test scores and audit reporting. So we would encourage you to

1 continue to further develop these systems.

As the Board, I'm sure you are all well versed in the organizational changes that have taken place here at the DC Public Charter School Board.

There's been a shift not just in the individual staff members, but in the way that the Organization is structured in order to do its job, and I know, or I should say that I heard both in staff interviews and stakeholder interviews, that that, as one would expect, was not without some learning, right?

But overall, that seems to be a really solid structure that is positioning you to do your work even better in the future and so we applaud you for sticking with it through maybe some bumps in the road, but overall it seemed to be a very strong structure that aligns to your mission.

I'm going to spend a moment on this third bullet because I will say that in

the time that I've been involved in

authorizing, I would say this group of people,

both at the Board and staff level, spoke

proactively about maintaining charter school

autonomy as part of their core mission in a

way that I hadn't heard before.

Talking about charter school
autonomy usually comes as a response when
you're being told that you aren't doing it,
and here we heard in the course of
conversation about academic frameworks,
financial frameworks, the word autonomy for
charter schools and the recognition that
that's something to be respected by the Board
came up again and again, but without
sacrificing any of the accountability.

And then this was another I would say unique, quite honestly, to the way this Board is structured, it's independence from interference in high stakes decision making, and it's freedom from conflict of interest at both the staff and, more importantly, at the

1 Board level is commendable.

And we, you know, we heard of freedom in discussion that, again, is not found elsewhere sometimes. So that was terrific.

So this next set of recommendations it talks about things that you are starting to do or already doing, but could be doing more. So we talked a bit about the performance measurement tools that you have.

I think, so what you've done already is good and it is of very high quality, so these are sort of next step things.

And one of those recommendations would be to start to compile all of that into a single document that gives both the schools and stakeholders an all-in-one spot glance of how a school's performances is, both academic, financial, and then the equity reports as well to really give a whole, a complete picture.

Another is, and this is something

again you're already working on, but

developing a PMF for those schools that don't

fit the traditional confines that are all

ready addressed in your current Performance

Management Framework.

We heard both from staff that that's a focus and we heard from schools who I know you've been engaging with extensively that it's in the works and we encourage you to continue to develop that so that you have an accurate measure for all types of schools in your portfolio.

And lastly, again, we heard some start of this in our conversations, but to I'd say focus your energy and resources on preparing for upcoming renewals, given that that is somewhat new work for this Board.

To continue to meet with schools proactively to discuss what the criteria for renewal or non-renewal are going to be and to clarify any questions that might exist around which goals will be evaluated, which metrics

1 | will be applied.

This next set of recommendations are actionable things that reveal themselves to us through our evaluation that the Board should address quickly or as soon as you can, and you'll see form these that they are important, but they are somewhat small things.

In reviewing the application processes, you all have a very robust and well rounded process for reviewing applications, what it lacks is standardization. And we'll talk more about that in the next section, actually.

Going along with that point is conduction some additional and some revised training of the evaluators that are reviewing your application and that, again, goes to the standardization piece to sort of eliminate some intra or inter-rater reliability issues.

The intervention policies that you have in place for schools that fail to meet certain criteria based on compliance or

academic performance could be better

documented and again, I'll talk more about

that in a bit just to talk about why that's

important.

The next bullet speaks to that as well, how the PMF will factor into intervention, revocation, and renewal decisions, and I know that that's work that's already under way to clarify where that meaningful framework fits into your authorizing practice, but to continue to work on that.

And then although much of this is largely in place, to just continue the work of going further in coming up with policies that grant increasing autonomy to high-performing charter schools.

So application decision making, if it's okay with the Board, the key competencies, I think we've all ready established a fairly high base line for performance, so if it's all right with you

we'll focus on the areas for development. Is that okay?

CHAIR MCKOY: Sure.

MS. BOLGER: Just to keep the presentation moving. So when we were looking at the application decision making and I came here for the defense day that your staff holds, what we found were evaluators who were quite well qualified to be doing the evaluations.

We found a very high level engagement. It was evident that the staff who were doing the evaluations had been very thorough, but in reviewing the documents what we found was that there were substantive comments, but they weren't aligned to any particular rubric, which the end result is probably going to be okay.

You've got very intelligent, well qualified people doing these evaluations, but why it's important for authorizing is that it clouds the transparency to the applicants a

bit, and particularly as a Board if you were to face challenges, it's much easier when you've got an outcome that you can clearly tie back to a rubric.

So while it might seem
administrative sounding, there is much more
substance to having reviewer comments that are
aligned to standards that have been set forth
and communicated to the evaluators and to the
schools.

There had been a move to push evaluations inside and you've certainly developed a staff that's capable of doing so. We would just encourage you to ensure that all types of schools receive an expert review to bring in consultants when necessary if the school type warrants it.

Moving on now to the performance management systems. So I mentioned it a bit in the overview, which is you have very robust policies in place for evaluating your schools on a number of levels.

What the next step would be, what the next level is, is combining all of that into a single place so that it's predicable.

And, again, this speaks to the transparency and the relationship that you have with the schools whom you authorize, so that it is predictable when if I do "X" then "Y" is likely to happen from the Board.

And you can certainly never address all of those things. There is a bit of an art to this and some circumstances cannot be foreseen, but to the degree that you can that's probably a worthwhile endeavor for staff at this point is to consolidate those policies and make them more predicable for schools.

Continue to proactively meet with schools in advance of their renewal year. So starting this work early, given the length of terms of the charter term here, it is quite understandable that goals that were set 15 years ago when you all were authorizing like

the fourth charter school, have either fallen by the wayside or have become irrelevant.

And that's to be expected, but it's important given that to meet with schools proactively so that there is agreement upon which goals they will be evaluated by and that there's a clear understanding of the criteria that will be used for renewal, particularly with the conversation that's ongoing about how the PMF is going to be used in high stakes decisions, to just use that as a way to continue to engage the schools as you're all ready doing, particularly heading into a renewal process which can seem a little unknown from the outside.

And like I said, that work, I know, is all ready underway. The performance based accountability, this ties in with the last points a bit.

As I mentioned a little, the PMF we heard, I'd say this generated a good amount of discussion in the stakeholder groups and

1 amongst staff.

I know it's been a real focus for the Board to continue to define how the PMF is going to be used in a way that is compliant with the law that you have an it's compliant with the charters and in a way that you can get schools to understand and accept.

It, you know, certainly is not irrelevant just because it is not currently in the charters, but it's thinking about how you as a Board can continue to use this really meaningful framework to inform you in a way that you know that it should, but that will take some work with your schools I think as you all probably know at this point.

The next point here gets to taking these frameworks that you have and putting them together so that anyone who asks can get a full picture of what the school looks like, the school included.

So that they have at a snapshot where they stand according to things that

you've said matter.

The last point is streamline data collection processes. So the epicenter compliance tool that you all use was well received and well regarded by the schools that we interviewed.

I think there's a system called Proactiv, which is less popular, and why this matters is not just because of the hiccups that come from uploading data from school administrators who don't have time to be doing it.

It's that it can serve, if people don't trust it, it can serve to undermine the decisions that you're making based off of it. So it's important to streamline those processes so that the users believe in them.

And then this one, as I said, the autonomy, you guys have a very clear appreciation and respect for your charge as a Board to both hold schools accountable, but also preserve their autonomy.

If there were an area to focus on in this it would be just continually seek to grant additional autonomies to schools who warrant it.

on the documents we reviewed, the staff we interviewed, the stakeholder engagement that we did, some actionable next steps that the Board can take to address some of the gaps, and some of these I've all ready addressed, so if you don't mind I'll just kind of go over them fairly quickly.

Systematizing elements of the application process, so you've got the quality there, this is just making sure that it gets tight so that your application decisions are aligned to standards that have been communicated to the schools in advance and that they are predictable.

I think we've talked a good amount about the comprehensive performance document.

I put the streamlining data question in the

category of longer term because you'll have to decide as a Board if that is a system that you want to continue with or if there are fixes or training or something along those lines that can, I wanted to say pacify, but that's not the right word, that can help the users have trust that the data being collected is of high quality.

The next category of recommendations are more strategic, so less, sort of, one off action items. And I come back again to the PMF, which really is a solid measure of academic performance and it's one I think worthy of your efforts to ensure that it gets used in meaningful ways.

And I know that you, in fact, did
a great amount of engagement on the front end
and in fact I think at one point scrapped the
first version because the feedback from the
schools was not positive, and continue that
level of engagement to ensure that you can
fully use that tool that is really quite

1 worthwhile.

The longer term goals, this is something that I would say came up somewhat tangentially and is really the next level of authorizing, so we've spent the last 15 years getting authorizers to only approve high quality schools, so that gets you half the way there.

But now particularly for you in D.C. when you're looking at a market share that is at 50 percent or over 50 percent you take on additional responsibilities beyond quality, so not instead of.

The quality bar is still the first hurdle, but it's now I think looking at ways that you can expand the way you think about demand for schools in a particular area when you're making school closures, thinking about the impact, not just of the kids in that school, but of the kids in that neighborhood even if they don't go to a charter school.

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

And that is the next level of sort

of strategic authorizing. Now that your market share is at that level, your impact is much greater just by virtue of how many schools you oversee.

And we would recommend that some of that start to be reflected in the application and in the renewal process.

And then as part of your State
admission to become a leader in authorizing
nationally to continue to engage with and
share some of the great work that you're doing
here and being proactive about that, you know,
I know that I certainly learned some stuff
while I was here that I was happy to be able
to dig deeper into.

And, you know, there are certainly ways through NACSA to do that and other ways as well to engage with other authorizers so that they can learn from the best practices that you already have in place here.

So that's the overview of our presentation. This is just a reminder of the

goals that we had for today so we can take a look back through and see if there's anything that we didn't cover and Katie and I would just open it up at this point to any questions you have either from reading the report or anything that you've heard here today and we'd be happy to have a conversation.

CHAIR MCKOY: Thank you both very much. I have some questions, but I'll hold. Emily, go ahead.

MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: I think I have one for the staff and then one for both of you. I think it's an excellent report. I really enjoyed reading it and I felt like the recommendations were really on target.

I'm disturbed to hear that we're, it sounds like there are a lot of boards that have conflicts of interest and other issues, so, glad that we don't but I'm disturbed about the issues of charters if that's a --

MS. BOLGER: It's more about the structure. This structure is unique that it's

a completely independent Board, sort of by definition.

MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: The question for you is, one of the things we grapple with is about the one that you would like us to take on too about the strategic question about the responsibility and looking more broadly in areas or concerns that we need to be addressing as charters, neighborhoods, groups of students, et cetera.

How would this fit in with this question of a rubric, which I think is spot on? Where do you fit that in, because if you're an applicant, you know, I think you follow what I'm saying --

MS. BOLGER: I do.

MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: -- and then I just want to ask the staff, Scott, kind of what your, a lot of the recommendations like the rubric, et cetera, which I think are right.

It sounds like there may be some

work on that and I was wondering if you could kind of let us know if you've all ready taken on some of these recommendations and where you are on that.

MEMBER PEARSON: We agree with all of these recommendations. We think the report is excellent. They did a tremendous amount of digging in a very short amount of time and there's almost perfect alignment between what they lay out as priorities and what we have thought of as priorities.

I would not say we've started the work on the rubric. We have? Oh, okay, we've have. There's been a process underway, so there's, thank you, so we're working on that.

We are working on strategic authorizing. You all saw a presentation last week about the work underway there. We are working on aligning all of our policies.

We currently, that we inherited a policies and procedures manual, we put in place a number of policies and they sort of

exist in lots of different places and we recognize that that's not fair to the schools or the public that they have to look in lots of different sources so we have work underway that Nicole is leading to consolidate all of our policies.

I think in the course of that work there is I think a need for us to be more clear as they say about, you know, what is the difference between a notice of concern and a charter warning? What, you know, how do you get a charter warning? How do you get a notice of concern?

In the process of the renewals, we clarified for schools how the PMF interacts with the renewal process, but I don't think we've ever created a document that sits on our website that states that as clearly as it should.

So we agree with all of the recommendations in, I think, every area. In every area there we are working toward them.

Page 38

I think the one that is the most challenging is the data.

so we have a great data team that is more than twice the size that it was a year ago that is working on these issues. We've had a data quality initiative that has worked to reduce data errors, that has worked to identify the core causes of data errors, and the challenges that schools have uploading the data into Proactiv.

But I think we, in the process of doing that and getting very familiar with Proactiv, I think we've concluded that it's a flawed platform and that we can put lots of band aids on it and patch it and fix it, but ultimately it's not going to be what we hope it to be.

And the question we have is, you know, do we essentially invest in a whole new platform at the same time that there is a long term plan that is agreed to throughout the City to move to a single data collection

through OSSE that we would then rely upon
instead?

And that process is taking way
longer than it should and it continues to take
a long time, but it gives us more pause than
we normally would to put a lot of time and
money into a whole new system.

Naomi, do you have anything to add to --

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: No.

MEMBER PEARSON: Okay.

MS. BOLGER: I can speak to your question about strategic authorizing. What comes to mind is that unlike the principles and standards that NACSA has clearly written out, there is not a comparable document for strategic authorizing because the individual City context is so important.

I can tell you, and Scott and I spoke about this a bit when I was here before, that there are some cities that are dealing with this on a pretty big scale, Chicago,

notably, but Philadelphia as well. Those two come to mind.

And there are, you need to be, I would recommend that the Board be clear on what their strategy is and then you think about how you incorporate it into things like a rubric or an application process.

But to give an example to illustrate, if there were a particular neighborhood where, that was being targeted for school closures by the District and say there's still kids there and they still need a high quality school.

There are ways to differentiate the application to prioritize applicants who wish to serve that community and then you align your rubric that it's stated clearly at the front end of the process.

But there's a lot of demographic analysis and research that has to go in, or that has to be conducted prior to that so that you know that you're setting your priorities

1 correctly.

I'd say that there's going to have to be continued collaboration with the District to have an understanding of what their strategic priorities are and the recommendation would be as a Board to devote your energy and focus to figuring out what that strategy is then looking to the principles and standards for how you incorporate it into your application renewal closure decisions.

I hope that isn't too general, and
I'm happy to answer follow up questions if
they exist. But the context of the City
matters in that answer.

MEMBER SOIFER: Well first of all thanks. I appreciate both that the diligence of the report sort of hinges on the principles that you see here, but also that the recommendations themselves really seem steeped in sort of values of good governance like transparency and consistency and to that end

I think that the recommendations make a whole lot of sense.

A lot of the questions that we deal with are questions that, I mean just on the agenda tonight, 15-year renewals and Performance Frameworks for early childhood and adult education areas that the movement nationally has very little experience working with.

I also appreciate that, I guess we've spoken on the phone, we've done that before, but the work that you've done in Chicago, and certainly I've referred to Volunteers of America policies and documents before, they're excellent and that's the sort of leadership that I think we as an independent authorizer and the movement really can benefit from.

I think that particularly it's those areas. The focus on the Performance Management Framework and I appreciate the thoughtful approach that you took to analyzing

it because it certainly was some of the better years of our lives working it through and particular emphasis on longitudinal student growth is I think something I'm really proud of.

And as we apply that approach, you know, that approach generally to Early
Childhood PMF which we have on the Agenda
tonight and to adult education and
alternative.

We definitely continue to look to NACSA to find examples that we could benefit from and bring to our charter schools and our movement here and look forward to working with you in those areas.

And if there are, and as we go, we look forward to reaching out and if there is specific things that we can learn from I think this a great, you know, relationship both ways and look forward to continuing to share best practices and thoughts.

MS. PIEHL: Thank you. One note

on the one particular element that you talked about that I know you're working on, is an adapted PMF for alternative education and early childhood.

Alternative education is an area that we're currently focusing on. It's certainly one where we don't have all the answers, it's an evolving issue, accountability for alternative education programs.

And we do have a working group
that we have been, that has been meeting over
the last six months or so, and at the NACSA
conference we're hoping to have some of kind
of that first big thinking around that working
group.

So that might be an area to dive into as well. Nelson Smith is heading up that work and, Scott, you might actually be familiar with it. I'm not sure if you're on it --

MEMBER PEARSON: We're very

education focus programming. So it really does actually, and that's part of the discussion and conversation is how do you set accountability systems for one type of population versus another and those in and of themselves are quite unique and different.

So you can get down a rabbit hole real fast which is why we're emerging in talking and thinking about this is because this is something that has been difficult for our field to grapple with, so taking it on, yes.

CHAIR MCKOY: Do either of you have examples, several times you've mentioned considering a policy or policies that allow us to grant more autonomy to high performers?

Do you have examples, the things you had in mind either for around the Country or that you were just thinking about?

MS. PIEHL: Well in terms of granting autonomy to high performers you could engage in certain strategies that some

authorizers do. One most notably is a more streamlined renewal process.

So you might have, depending on what your renewal process looks like for all charter schools if you have one that has scores at a certain level on your accountability framework, then they could be streamlined in that they don't have to go through, maybe they don't have to go through an interview process or they have, if that's part of your process, or they don't have, maybe they have a shortened application that they have to submit.

Those are some examples of some ways that you can increase autonomy. Do you have any other that you wanted to add?

MS. BOLGER: Yes. So there are sort of two ways of looking at it. First is being clearer to everyone what high quality means, so who's going to cross that bar to be granted the autonomy.

And then the other part is

Page 48

thinking about what are some freedoms that you can offer and some that I've had experience with is a streamline process to grow.

I mean it's not free, where you don't just pay, you're good, you get more, I mean you still have to ask some questions, but it's streamlined. A renewal process when I was in Chicago we did not conduct site visits for schools who were rated level one, our highest rating.

My thinking was they're going to have to see some pretty crazy stuff in there for me to have a renewal decision that's going to be different than what it is based on what I've reviewed from their data, which makes it easier for the school to go about being a school as opposed to, you know, being renewed.

And so just those are examples.

Your schools will give you more than I have if
you ask them I'm sure. But being clear about
what the high quality means first is
important.

CHAIR MCKOY: Well I want to thank

Katie and Carly both. I read the report and

it even comes more alive listening to you guys

and I think there's a lot of stuff we can use

to keep us moving in the right direction, so

thank you very much and thanks for coming

tonight.

MS. PIEHL: Thank you. Thanks for having us.

MS. BOLGER: Thank you to everyone and to your staff for being so helpful in gathering all of the documents and devoting a lot of their time to talking with us and answering our questions and our follow up questions.

Everyone was terrific and very, very helpful. So, thank you.

CHAIR MCKOY: Thank you.

MS. PIEHL: Thank you.

CHAIR MCKOY: Okay. So next we have our first real voting item, extend full charter approval of previously approved

is there, are we going to have a staff report or a staff summary? Hello?

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: Do you have the more recent Agenda?

CHAIR MCKOY: I don't have the more recent Agenda. Okay, I have a more recent Agenda, thank you. So we've reorganized the Agenda and we're now going to go to policy guideline approval decisions which was way down on my Agenda and we've now moved it up this position.

And so are you going to do all of them?

MS. TYLER: No, just the first one.

CHAIR MCKOY: Rashida's doing the first one?

MS. TYLER: Yes.

CHAIR MCKOY: Okay. Ms. Tyler, go

22 ahead.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

MS. TYLER: All right. Good evening. All right, so the PCSB staff recommends that the Board vote to approve the proposal to increase the floors for some of the Performance Management Framework indicators in the elementary, middle school and high school PMFs for the 2012-2013 school year.

As per the technical guide, floors are annually set at the 3-year weighted average of the bottom tenth percentile of charter school results. And if this weighted average rises, the floors are recalculated.

During our 30-day public comment period, PCSB received written comments and a representative from Latin American Montessori Bilingual Public Charter School, who offered public testimony on June 24, at PCSBs public hearing.

All of this feedback is appended to the policy along with our responses. The comments fell into three categories. Number

one, release the school year floors and targets earlier in the school year so that schools can better benchmark their performance throughout the year.

Number two, keep the floors the same for five years to allow for continuity.

And number three, keep the floors the same to capture the full impact of schools year over year growth.

Based on the comments that we received, PCSB agrees that it should release the floors as soon as possible and requests that the Board vote to amend the policy to require PCSB to release PMF floors and targets for a new school year within two weeks of the completion and release of the previous year's PMF scores starting in school year 2013 and 2014.

We do suggest that the Board continue to evaluate the floors each year.

The floor increases are small and there's no evidence that the increases result in schools

1 that are improving overall to lose points.

In the 2011-2012 school year despite some floor increases, 21 elementary and middle schools and five high schools increased their overall PMF scores.

Additionally our impact analysis of the proposed 2013 floor increases takes into consideration the impact that raising floors will have on schools.

And if all schools scored exactly the same, no high school would change their tier based on the floor increases and only eight elementary or middle schools would change their tier.

As for the initial proposal open for public comment, PCSB has always been concerned about dramatic year to year changes in PMF floors and therefore we used a 3-year weighted average to calculate these floors.

However, despite using this rolling average method, this year some of the weighted averages rose substantially resulting

in one proposed floor nearly doubling.

So PCSB staff therefore proposes a modification to the policy that in no case will a PMF floor rise by more than 33.3 percent in any given year.

CHAIR MCKOY: Comments?

MEMBER WOODRUFF: More of question than a comment. I have heard from various sources from various schools a concern over the fact that each year the floors can potentially rise so there's a perception even if it's not statistically accurate that the bar is rising, you know, each year almost in spite of whatever it is you're doing to improve your outcome.

So I guess my question is given that that perception's out there in the charter community, what would be the negative rationale for not raising, say you went to a every other year raising the floors, or something like that, maybe not the five years that was recommended in commentary, but say

you didn't raise the floors annually, what are the potential, the negative impact of doing something like that?

MS. TYLER: So that wouldn't allow us to be reactive to things like the State assessment changing, for example. So there's a little uncertainty about when the PARCC may role out.

When things like that happen, we want to make sure that we can annually make updates to our floors as needed. Last year we made an update based on OSSEs calculation of the graduation rate.

So they transferred from the Lever Rate calculation to the Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate. If we would've waited, you know, every two years we wouldn't have been able to make a quick, actually in that instance, a reduction to our floors to reflect our school's performance.

So we just want to make sure that we can react as, you know, things in our

1 educational landscape change.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Right. I guess

I'm not necessarily ready to take a position

one way or the other, but I'm thinking where

it says "in no case will a PMF floor rise by

more than 33 percent in a given year," so that

means it could potentially, that that floor

could go up by a third from what it was the

previous year.

And again, thinking in terms of perception, if the school feels that it's in good faith putting in school improvement efforts, trying to improve their outcomes, only to the see floor rise by a third, is that, that's not problematic?

MS. TYLER: That we only raise it a third, so --

MEMBER WOODRUFF: That still seems like a big raise potentially.

MS. TYLER: So the only instance where the raise was that dramatic was our eighth grade DC CAS math proficiency. And

keep in mind that is the bottom tenth percentile performance using the 3-year weighted average.

thing.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Right.

MS. TYLER: Yes. So that was the only metric where we saw, where we put that measure in place, that was the only one that really influenced our decision to do that.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Right.

MEMBER TILLERY: So it doesn't --

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Go ahead.

MEMBER TILLERY: It doesn't really have an impact, I mean other schools, you know, I'm kind of, was thinking the same

If they see that they're making progress, it's almost like playing football and you're running down the field and then they move the goal post when you get there.

You're still making progress, but you still got further to go to get to the goal post.

MEMBER NOPHLIN:

And if raising it

22

	Page 60
1	will impact the next year's tier status?
2	MS. TYLER: Yes.
3	MEMBER NOPHLIN: And so do you,
4	can you talk about how that looks? I mean
5	have you looked at that to see what that might
6	do for schools, especially those that are in
7	two and maybe go to three, or one that go to
8	two, so that we could kind of understand that
9	a little bit.
10	MS. TYLER: So we did do the
11	impact analysis. We used last year's data and
12	we ran it again with the floors as updated and
13	that's how we got the schools that made the
14	change.
15	So that's the impact. We've ran
16	an impact analysis on 11-12 data. Are you
17	suggesting that we run it
18	MEMBER NOPHLIN: And that's the
19	eight schools you were talking about?
20	MS. TYLER: Yes.
21	MEMBER NOPHLIN: Okay.
22	MS. TYLER: That's how we got that

1 information, yes.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: And so I think it's important to know the range of that change is very small. We're talking about one point, so there were schools that, for example, that would have fallen a tier, that were just barely in the other tier.

So it was like they had a score of a 65.3, which would now be a 63.8, which because the cutoff was 65, they fell in, so the range is actually more important to, now this is a pretty small range, we're falling about two points at most.

And no high schools fell which, you know, I thought was quite interesting so it was just impacting, and the more elementary and middle schools and all of them were at 65.6, well now they're at 64.3.

CHAIR MCKOY: So I think that

Darren mentioned the PARCC. I mean everything

I read in here is that nationwide scores,

particularly State scores, are likely to dip

for a year or two just because of the new assessments that the kids are going to have face.

So if that's the case then how would that affect your floor structure?

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: Well it wouldn't affect it all for this vote, for tonight, because there's not --

CHAIR MCKOY: No, tonight, no, no.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: -- but, at that point, and I don't think this is working. So at that point in time, so we're going to be relying a lot on national, I mean the PARCC and Smarter Balanced, which is the other option.

They are providing scales, and we're talking now a national test that's going to be piloting this year in States, including D.C. potentially, and that they should be able to provide us with a scale and we would have to adjust our floors and our targets to match what the nation is doing.

	But it is an unknown territory
	that we're working on. We're not even sure
	that it's going to happen this next school
	year, so we're all waiting.
ı	

CHAIR MCKOY: Okay.

MEMBER SOIFER: If I could just clarify to that, what you're saying though is that the basic structure with the, you know, the tenth percentile, wouldn't necessarily need to change?

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: That's what we're thinking --

MEMBER SOIFER: It would just be -

14 | -

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: -- the weighted piece might --

17 MEMBER SOIFER: Okay.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: -- although we might be able to just insert it in to the DC CAS when the DC CASs are ready, aligned to the common core.

We're working on it. We're

Page 65

towards more and more performance quality.

I'm still not confident or clear on what would be lost if we changed the floors every other year as opposed to every year.

I'm still a little troubled that that seems like a very quick potential escalation of the performance bar.

MEMBER PEARSON: I think if we changed it every other year and we used the same, we change the scores every other year, but we use the same process which is that we set the floor at the lowest tenth percentile of the last three years giving extra weight to the most recent years.

The effect would be to potentially have more radical jumps, because rather than having a steady climb each year, or a flattening out and, you know, you'd have more of a step function every two years, so I'm not sure you would achieve the goal of moderating it.

Page 66

I think what this policy actually does, this policy attempts to moderate it by setting a ceiling on how quickly the floors can rise and that seemed to us the best way to keep that process relatively stable so that schools are operating in a stable environment.

MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: I guess for me
the thing that makes me feel comfortable is
it's just really, I mean as I understand it,
okay, it's really about the cutoff of where
you don't award points, right?

So students, and this is really low, so we're just not, and it's in one indicator and it's a really important one, it's eighth grade math, which is the basis for being successful in high school math.

So you have to score still pretty low, you can still get points actually, you can start accruing points at a pretty low level, yes. So, right but I think it's a complicated thing, yes.

So that's why it would feel

Last question.

comfortable, it is a moving average which
smooths it out. And I think, like I said, I
think it is better than this sort of, I think
it lends more predictability, but I do think
sort of, I think
it lends more predictability, but I do think
like whatever the moving average is.

MEMBER WOODRUFF:

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Was there anymore context to that proposal that, the floors stay the same for five years, that was mentioned in some of the comments we got? Was there anything else that went along with that?

MS. TYLER: I don't think so.

That comment originated at the task force
meeting. I think the school leaders
originally proposed, they first said, you
know, let's not increase it every year and
someone proposed every three years --

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Okay.

MS. TYLER: -- someone proposed every five.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Right, right.

MS. TYLER: And if I'm remembering
correctly I don't think it was related to
anything specific.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Okay.

CHAIR MCKOY: All right. Let's call the question. All in favor of the motion which is to accept the proposal as put forth by staff, those in favor say aye.

(Multiple Ayes)

CHAIR MCKOY: All opposed?

MEMBER WOODRUFF: I would like to

say no.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIR MCKOY: One opposed. Any abstentions? Okay, you're abstaining? So we've got one, two, three, four yeses, one abstention, and one negative, so I guess no matter what the floor or the man pays, I guess that carries.

Let's go on to the next one, and

Naomi are you doing this one? This is the 13
14 application guidelines for new public

charter schools.

22 charter schools

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: Yes. I'll just do this one. I guess Monique is coming up, Monique Miller.

This policy was voted on to open for public comment, and we had 30 days of public comment. PCSB received comment from FOCUS and no other public comment came in.

We addressed the comments. A lot of it was very helpful edits and found redundancies where we were asking the same question in two different places and so we could delete one or the other.

You can see a full list of all of the comments and our responses attached to the policy, but the guidelines are the earliest ever to release the guidelines for a new school to apply for a charter.

So we are releasing it now, the applications aren't due until March 3, but we think this is actually as much time as it takes to write a really good application.

And so we're really excited to be

1 CHAIR MCKOY: Opposed?

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Abstentions? Thank you. Okay, Rashida?

MS. KENNEDY: Yes. PCSB staff

4 requested the Board would vote on the Board of

5 Trustees Compliance Policy. This policy was

6 originally opened for public comment and has

7 been opened since the June 24 Board meeting.

There were not any comments that were submitted. This policy would require that Boards remain compliant and must maintain a compliant Board of Trustees as outlined by the School Reform Act, or be subject to a notice of concern.

Schools must have two voting parent members on the Board within the first 60 days of the start of a new school year and if a parent member resigns or is removed from the Board mid-year, the LDA has 60 days to replace that parent member.

When the Board is out of compliance for any of the requirements of the School Reform Act, the school has 60 days to

1 become compliant.

MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: Do we have the same requirement for adult education?

MS. KENNEDY: So for adult education as it is right now, we have conversations with the school to see if they can at least have an alumni and if they can't have an alumni then a student member.

So it's been more lenient on adult schools.

MEMBER PEARSON: In fact, the

Carlos Rosario renewed charter they will be

voting on later tonight specifically states

that the parent member slot may be filled by

an alum or a student or a parent if that's

appropriate.

MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: I just wonder if we should look at that more systematically for what's the best practice for adult education in this regard to come up with.

MEMBER SOIFER: I see in this case, this is really simply taking something

that's specifically delineated in the School Reform Act and not in any way adding any interpretive element or higher bar.

This is just us going about enforcing what we're required to enforce by law, but there's no additional bar to this.

MS. KENNEDY: Right.

MEMBER SOIFER: Great.

CHAIR MCKOY: Where did the 60 days come from for a parent replacement?

MS. KENNEDY: We were just, you know, over the past couple years, you know, since I've been reviewing compliance documents, when schools have a parent to resign that seems to be a legitimate amount of time that the schools might be able to replace that parent.

And as of now it's been kind of a case by case working with the school, do they have an action plan? Are they working with an outside agency to assist them? And 60 days just seems to be really a realistic amount of

1 time to replace a parent.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: Where some other Board members take a longer, the 60 days can really work for a parent replacement.

CHAIR MCKOY: Explain that to me.

I don't see, I don't get that. I don't see
why it would be different.

MS. KENNEDY: So are you asking a different bar for the other requirements such as like D.C. majority, odd number --

CHAIR MCKOY: No, other than if it's an institution that has a representative on the Board, why would the parent and other Board members be different in terms of amount of time it takes to replace them, that's all I'm just asking?

I hear what you're saying about 60 days, that seemed to work, but I don't understand why.

MS. KENNEDY: I would just say that just from working with our schools the past couple years, that seems like the bar

that is found to be providing illegal or noncompliant responses to callers posing as

parents through PCSBs Mystery Caller

initiative would be issued Board action to a

charter warning and this is something that

we've done for the past two years and it's

been very transparent to schools.

We've let them know that we're going to be calling and basically asking, you know, what does it take to enroll a child and we've given feedback.

There hasn't been a consequence these past couple years other than PCSB leadership sending an email or calling the school and letting them know that there were some noncompliant answers and then the school has often responded back saying thank you for alerting this to us and indicating what they might do differently to train their staff.

So the main thing this policy does is adds a consequence.

CHAIR MCKOY: Any discussion?

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Question. So do
we as far as picking which schools to have a
mystery caller call is there any system to
that or is it --

MS. KENNEDY: There is not. We call all the schools and if the answer is sufficient then we don't call again, if the answer is not sufficient then we'll call them again a second time to see if it was just random.

And if there are two inappropriate answers that's when they would receive the notice of concern.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: So the only way to avoid getting a mystery call is to have appropriate responses when you get the first mystery call?

MS. KENNEDY: Yes.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Okay.

MEMBER SOIFER: And the only

consequence is the notice of concern?

MS. KENNEDY: Yes.

1 application guidelines for new --

2 MALE PARTICIPANT: Charter

3 Renewal.

CHAIR MCKOY: -- public charter schools, and then we skipped the third bullet, renewals, on both of these Agendas.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: Charter
Renewal Guidelines. Sorry.

CHAIR MCKOY: No problem.

MS. MILLER: On Friday, June 21,
PCSB made available for public comment a draft
of its revised Charter Renewal Guidelines. In
addition to a 30-day period the Board held a
public hearing on June 24, we didn't receive
any written comments.

The purpose of the revision is to detail the entire renewal process, including how to prepare the renewal application, assess the school's performance and the process after the PCSB votes, which includes signing a Charter Renewal Agreement for the next 15-year term.

So based on our experience over the past six months we tried to outline everything that takes place during the renewal process from preparing all the way through the end to negotiating a contract.

CHAIR MCKOY: Discussion?

Comments? Yes, Emily.

MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: I think that there was a discussion about a rubric, you know, presented NACSA, so as you've done this have you looked at a rubric that would accompany this?

MS. MILLER: Not to the Charter
Renewal process, but what we've done is in the
renewal guidelines outline how we would assess
the charter goals.

One of the steps in that process was meeting with schools who are undergoing charter review and renewal, to make sure that we're all in agreement on the goals that have been established, you know, what we've learned through this process is that schools may have

departed from goals originally established in their charter.

motion.

on the same page with what's being assessed and how we're assessing it. Now as far as a rubric for the charter application, we are working on revising the rubric that was used during the 2012-2013 cycle and that will be made available this month, in August.

CHAIR MCKOY: Comments? No more comments? Could I have a motion then?

MEMBER SOIFER: I'll make a

MEMBER TILLERY: Second.

CHAIR MCKOY: Moved and seconded, and I assume it's in favor of the staff recommendation? Okay, didn't want to -- all in favor?

(Multiple Ayes)

CHAIR MCKOY: Opposed? Good, thank you. And now, okay, I think that completes the policy guidelines. Now we're

moving to the 30-day public comment period, so these are to be released for public comment.

All right, Erin, you want to do the first one, early childhood?

MS. KUPFERBERG: Thank you. For the last six months I have been working with DC's Early Childhood School Leaders to develop the Early Childhood Performance Management Framework Policy that PCSB staff is recommending the Board vote to open for public comment.

I want to take a moment to clarify the intentions of the Early Childhood PMF.

Since DC has a wide variety of charter options for 3-year-olds through second grade students, the Early Childhood Performance Management Framework, or PMF for short, is intended to show parents how schools are performing.

Prior to this proposal, parents could not compare any of the early childhood charter schools with another. I also want to explain how this works.

Schools may choose from over 30 assessments for ones that best fit its program goals. All of these assessments are already in use at the schools, so there will be no noticeable change in instruction or assessment for the students.

For pre-kindergarten students, the Early Childhood PMF asks schools to assess basic literacy skills, which are the foundation of future success in school.

These assessments are given orally and individually and privately. For example, a teacher may sit with a student and have the student identify different shapes or different upper and lower case letters.

Some schools may also choose to use a social/emotional assessment. For many of these assessments students are observed over a week or two by a teacher to see if they are playing well with others and talking through their frustration instead of acting out behaviorally.

Again, these are basic skills research has shown correlate with future success in school. In addition, pre-kindergarten classrooms will be observed on emotional support, classroom organization, and instructional support.

For kindergarten through second grade students, students are assessed in reading, math, and the optional social/emotional growth.

The goal of the kindergarten through second grade PMF is to measure a school's progress towards student proficiency in reading and math by third grade when they will take, for the first time, the State assessment.

Again, all of these assessments are currently being used in schools and no additional tests are being required.

CHAIR MCKOY: So I understand that there's some concern that these are in some way high stakes tests for little toddlers and

so just to make sure that people in the audience and so forth are very clear what we're talking about, would you just sum up in a way what you just said and compare it to what happens at third grade when they get the DC CAS the first time?

MS. KUPFERBERG: Yes. So our charter schools with early childhood grades have been using these assessments to measure, like I said, basic literacy and math.

Since the accountability plan started a number of years ago, these same assessments are being used still through the Early Childhood PMF just with the common unit of measurement instead of individual school created goals.

So the high stakes State assessment still begins in third grade and that's the assessment, the DC CAS.

CHAIR MCKOY: All right. Thank you. Any more, yes, Darren?

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Just curious,

what was the context of making the social/emotional learning part of the assessments or assessment options optional?

It seems like it would be great to have a sense of how well all of the young children are doing socially and emotionally, so why wouldn't a school want to utilize that?

MS. KUPFERBERG: I think there's two reasons that, from working with the task force members, one is many schools, though they track social/emotional, it is not the, and they make sure all their students are on level where they need to be social/emotional, their focus, their program focus is not particular in that area.

But some of our schools it is a huge focus of their pre-k to second grade and even all the way through twelfth grade program.

So it really did lend to what the school's focus and their intentions are with those early grades.

And then the second point is while schools have measured social/emotional, they haven't always done it for all of their students on assessment that they are used to or comfortable with, so they weren't willing to possibly be held accountable to an assessment they had no information on.

But for RTI purposes they had used one to target needed intervention for students, just not on an all student population.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Okay. And it's your sense that the research on early childhood supports that approach?

MS. KUPFERBERG: Yes. And with everything that we've, that our task force researched and I researched, was social/emotional is a huge part of these early grades and part of what we worked through with the task force is we're not saying that schools aren't measuring social/emotional, but it's whether they wanted to count it in

framework or not was the option, depending on
what type of program their focus is.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Okay. Thank
4 you.

MEMBER NOPHLIN: So I'm happy that that's happening. I'm happy that we're going to be looking at the children younger and younger.

Is there a score that's going to come in this first year of the Early Childhood PMF or is it nothing going to happen until third grade DC CAS?

MS. KUPFERBERG: And by score you mean tier?

15 MEMBER NOPHLIN: A tier.

MS. KUPFERBERG: Yes. So we are running the Early Childhood PMF pilot. We just finished up this last year.

All of the data is being submitted through this week and we are going to analyze that data, student level results, that was for assessments given last year.

And then when the task force meets again in September we're going to discuss through looking at the data, how to tier this PMF, and we'll back before you in October with the results of those task force meetings to let you know how we're proposing to tier this PMF for the 13-14 year.

CHAIR MCKOY: Herb, is that a question? No.

MEMBER SOIFER: I just had one, I guess two quick questions. These are, and this applies I guess to each of the four PMF measures that we're putting out for public comment, and it's really just one about procedure.

I can tell by the out of office auto replies that I'm getting that a lot of crucial people at schools to these questions are out of town now and then an awful lot happens between now and our next meeting.

And I'm just wondering if, I mean
I think the feedback that we get from schools

is going to be crucial on these, and I'm really looking forward to the specific conversation and dialogue about that, and I wonder if opening up the 30-day public comment now, or maybe if we could leave open the possibility of extending that if that proves to be inadequate.

Because the minute people are,
there's an awful lot happening 30 days from
now as well that requires the pressing
attention of school leaders and the people who
are in schools who are maybe most qualified to
provide the substantive feedback.

So I wonder if it proves to not be an adequate window of time, if we might consider extending that or what the implications might be.

MS. KUPFERBERG: I have one comment to that and I know, Naomi, I think has a follow up. One is that with the early childhood school leaders is particularly the ones who have been active in the task force.

Not only active, who just wanted to be on the lister for the task force, so it includes almost all of the early childhood schools.

I have been I guess transparent with them to let them know when the public comment was opening, how long it would lasting, so that they had a chance even if they weren't in town for these 30 days to definitely be able to write in a public comment.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: So we're working on two time lines. One is, is you're absolutely right, we want to get as much input as we can in public comment and it can't stress enough that all of the decisions to get to this point were done through consensus through task force.

So if you look on Page 9, for example, is a list of all the schools that were part of the early childhood task force, and it is all of the schools practically that

1 serve early childhood grades.

So they are well aware of this document and are, you know, and have already voted to bring this to you at this point.

MEMBER SOIFER: I think that's the one of the four of them. I'm least concerned about being aware of the --

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: Right. So

I'll just talk on the adult ed --

MEMBER SOIFER: Yes.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: -- is the same thing. If you look on their list all of the adult ed schools currently in operation and even those that aren't yet in operation, we're part of those task forces and also came to consensus.

And the same with the elementary, middle, and high school, I would say we didn't have a full task force at every meeting, but again, they've been meeting since January to go over all of this and we've been sending out to them the information and we will have

another meeting this fall, in August, to make sure that we're still all in agreement on that one.

The deadline that we're running up against is if we don't make a decision prior to the beginning of the school year, it feels very disingenuous then to say, oh, by the way in December, this is how you're going to be held accountable, and this is what the task force said to us because, you know, we were running up against time lines.

It's better to come to a decision and have the Board approve prior to the school year so that they can start benchmarking towards that, than to wait until December or January when they may not have been thinking about all of those goals. So that's our --

MEMBER SOIFER: I certainly
appreciate that and the parents point is a
good one, I just, anyone that has something
substantive that they want the Board to
consider, I hope that we can hear from them

1 and look forward to --

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: And having the August Board meeting is great because we do have then a moment for a couple comments to come in. This doesn't get up for vote until September.

MEMBER SOIFER: Right. Right.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: So you have --

MEMBER SOIFER: The September

meeting.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: -- it's not until September that you're voting, so they have, school will have started by the time you'll vote.

MEMBER NOPHLIN: So I just have one more comment about that. One, the first part of the comment is that this is a really bad time for schools that, you know, everything in the world is happening to them right now.

The principal's on vacation, everybody's on vacation, it's a really bad

time for them. And the other thing is that all of the people, if everybody on the task force wasn't the principal, it's very possible that they don't have a full understanding of it.

And so, you know, as those other people vote they may not be voting as the person in charge so consideration for something like that I think would help.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: So every, and we totally agree, so always on the, Agenda's go out beforehand as well as the PowerPoint's and at times we've had to say bring this back to your leadership and we'll vote on it next time, because we realize sometimes a delegate is bent, that can't speak for the entire school.

And that, you know, this is a process.

CHAIR MCKOY: Also there's really no sense if we get up to that point we can't extend for one of them or another one for more

1 public comment.

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2 MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: Absolutely.

3 CHAIR MCKOY: Any more comments?

4 Can I get a motion then?

5 MEMBER SOIFER: Motion to open for 6 public comment.

7 MEMBER WOODRUFF: Second.

CHAIR MCKOY: And that is for all four, right? All four pretty much for overview.

MEMBER SOIFER: I think she should just run through the other three. I'm happy to make a motion for all four.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Yes, if we could

hear the --

CHAIR MCKOY: Okay. So we can vote on them all at once, why don't we hear the others then.

MS. TYLER: All right. So I'm now going to speak about the adult education framework. So PCSB staff recommends that the Board vote to open for public comment a

proposal to create an Adult Education

Performance Management Framework.

PCSB has developed the Adult Ed

PMF in collaboration with the charter schools

with adult education programs, Local Charter

Advocacy Organizations, American Institutes

for Research, and Timbo Consulting in order to

fairly assess the quality of programs serving

adults in D.C., including young adults who are

disconnected from the K-12 system.

In particular I just wanted to highlight I work Dahlia Shaewitz from AIR, who's provided a tremendous amount of research and development into creating all elements of the framework.

These performance indicators in the PMF reflect the importance of student progress and achievement and are currently being piloted with the schools during the 2012-2013 school year.

While the task force recommends that the Board vote to open for public comment

the adult ed at this Board meeting, some employment and outcome data from the pilot year is still being collected and analyzed and the results may cause changes to the floors and targets.

These data will be presented to you all prior to the vote to adopt the Adult Ed PMF on September 16, 2013. This framework will be used as a common accountability measure for adult education charter schools.

During 2013 the task force of PCSB staff, schools, and consultants met to discuss the details of the framework, particularly data collection strategies, floors and targets for each indicator, weights for each metric, survey methodology and the alignment of each indicator to unique school programs.

So if this is approved the Adult Ed PMF would replace the current accountability plan system which describes progress on accountability targets set by individual charter schools.

I just want to highlight the major indicators now of the Adult Ed PMF. So again, it's designed to measure the effectiveness of our adult education programs using five indicators.

Number one, student progress which was defined as learning gains as measured by tests that are valid and reliable for adults and disengaged youth.

Number two, student achievement which is measured by whether or not the students have attained the skills needed to get a job, a better job, or attend college without needing remedial classes.

Number three, we also want to look at college and career readiness. Number four, leading indicators of attendance and student retention, and number five, mission specific measures which assess the aspects of the school program otherwise not captured.

Since each school is vastly different in its program, not all schools will

be measured using the same assessments or on the same indicators.

There's a lot in this framework,
but the last thing I would like to highlight
for you is on Page 9 of the proposal, which is
a task force generated system for weighting
each indicator in the PMF.

So just to describe our process, schools propose, I would say six to seven options for weighting which we presented to the task force to vote on and get consensus on how we will weight each indicator.

At that meeting the schools decided to scrap all of those proposals and designed a new proposal which we have 100 percent consensus on to weight each indicator in the PMF framework.

So the student progress,
career/college readiness, and mission specific
indicators would all be weighted based on the
number of students that a school serves
according to each indicator, worth no more

1 than 70 percent of the total score.

Our mission specific indicators would also be weighted based on the number of students, but that would be capped at a maximum weight of 20 percent of a school's score.

Finally, student achievement would be worth 10 percent of a school's score and the leading indicators of attendance and retention would each be worth 10 percent of a school's score.

So this is just an example of how we have gotten, you know, feedback from our school leaders about this framework. Any questions?

CHAIR MCKOY: Yes. I'm looking at your Page 9, I'm not sure I understand how the math works --

MS. TYLER: Okay.

CHAIR MCKOY: -- on student progress and career/college readiness, not more than 70 percent for either one, yet the

1 total is 70 percent.

MS. TYLER: Right. So the total when we capture all of those weights combined

CHAIR MCKOY: Right.

MS. TYLER: -- so if a school serves 20 students, you know, using the student progress metric, so students who are going through the educational program show gains in their educational functioning levels

CHAIR MCKOY: Right.

MS. TYLER: -- but has more students in the career and college readiness metric, that weight would be more, but it would be based on a scale of 70 percent.

So if we broke it out based on the numbers, and this isn't accurate math, but the student progress metric may be worth 20 percent of a school's score, career and college readiness may be worth 30 percent, and mission specific indicators would be worth 20

CHAIR MCKOY: Okay. I have one other question. I'm not sure where it was in your, when you were describing your five measures --

MS. TYLER: Yes.

17

18

19

20

21 CHAIR MCKOY: -- you said
22 something about, it led me to believe that you

remedial courses so that the students when
they get to college aren't spending their Pell
Grant money on remedial classes that don't
give them credit.

CHAIR MCKOY: Right.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: So a big part of what our adult ed schools are doing is actually helping students to know that they can get to college and then use the grant money to take classes towards a degree not to get the education they were supposed to have gotten in high school.

So we have schools currently whose mission is to provide those type of classes.

So, while it's not in there directly, I do think that is part of the adult, and this is not a K-12 high school, this is an adult ed school.

Darren's shaking his head.

MS. TYLER: One other thing that might help clarify the definition, if you look on Page 3, the third line item looks at career

and college readiness measure --

CHAIR MCKOY: Right.

MS. TYLER: -- so this focuses on students who have entered employment. That's the first thing. So once a student exits the program, have you obtained a job? So schools follow up to see if students have obtained a job.

The second is, have you kept the job? So the third program after exit, you've got a job, we want to make sure that you have retained it. So again, a school will follow up to see if that measure has been met.

And the third is entering postsecondary, so we want to see students transitioning to either occupational courses or other post-secondary education.

And one thing we're also excited about is potentially being able to help schools match their students when they are either in employment or post-secondary options.

So we hope to be able to help them do that match and help to relieve some of the burden on surveying every student that's exited their program.

turn it over to my colleagues, but nationally recently there's been a lot written about persistence in charter high schools graduating, you know, 100 percent of my students go to college, 100 percent graduate, 100 percent go to college, and then you check up, you know, two years into college and the big dip.

So where I'm going with this is, this is analogous to persistence after a GED or some sort of an alternative high school education.

So my question is though, are we being equally persistent on this issue of persistence with regular high schools or are we just, I understand the concern here, and I understand the statistics, it just occurred to

me we got to care across the board that students get placed, they graduate, they get accepted in whatever their post-secondary is, and they are successful there?

MS. TYLER: I agree. So currently it's not a measure that we're exploring, but we certainly can open it up to explore during the 2013-14 school year with our task forces very easily. I think we all agree with that.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: I think we're waiting for the data to catch up and once we are at a place where OSSE can provide us with persistency data, we would be interested in looking at it.

But right now that data is, as to the best of my knowledge, not fully reliable at the aggregate levels.

CHAIR MCKOY: Okay. Fair enough.

Just want it on the record that at some point
we'll look at this. Colleagues, any other
comments? Thank you, Rashida, we're going to
come back and vote on these all at once.

The task force reviewed all of the current measures and we're recommending modifications to the attendance rate, the reenrollment rate, and gateway metrics. The school leaders also recommended changing the weights of each category.

17

18

19

20

21

22

So I'm going to begin with the

attendance rate, so the task force explored changing the attendance rate for elementary and middle schools from average daily attendance to in-seat attendance.

According to our technical guide the average daily attendance is calculated as the number of days present plus the number of excused absences divided by the number of days enrolled.

Under our recommendation, the inseat attendance rate will be calculated as the number of days present divided by the number of days enrolled. So we would be modifying the floors and targets for attendance with this shift.

We would propose lowering the floor from 85 to 82 and lowering the target from 95 to 92. The second indicator is the re-enrollment rate, so task force members propose two additions to the criteria to calculate a school's re-enrollment rate.

Removing the calculation of

students that meet the following criteria. So number one if a student is expelled for a federally recognized reason for expulsion, such as bringing a firearm to school.

Number two, students placed into private placement from a DCPS dependent LEA, as a student is removed from the school's roster at that point and placed into DCPS.

The next area where the task force proposed updating was related to the gateway metric. So currently schools are measured on proficiency rates of all third grade students in reading and/or all eighth grade students in math.

So task force members and PCSB staff recommend that the framework be adjusted to measure a schools math and reading performance at the schools actual exit grade and of only the students who had attended the school for at least the previous three years.

The consensus was that this would be a more accurate measure of the school's

actual gateway performance. This adjustment would highlight how effectively schools are preparing students who are enrolled in their campus after their schools are able to work with a student for several years.

It will also allow schools to accept new students to any grade without feeling the pressure to move them to proficiency in an unreasonable amount of time.

Due to the huge impact that this type of change could potentially have on the PMF and quality concerns with our cohort data, and the time it will take to conduct a thorough analysis and thoughtful discussion, we're actually suggesting that the task force continue to meet on this topic.

We pilot this metric next year and still make the results public.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Question.

CHAIR MCKOY: Go ahead.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: So would this still be best described as a gateway metric if

MS. TYLER: Well we look at eighth grade math performance as well, which, I mean, I think of gateway as, you know, the point before a student exits or when they are entering like a different part of the framework. I'm open to --

MEMBER WOODRUFF: I'm just throwing that out there. It seems like, I like the idea of giving the schools more time with the student to do whatever it is they're doing with their academic program, but, yes, it sounds like a different adjective might be in order.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: Well we have some schools that start with third grade, so it felt really weird to do their gateway --

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Absolutely.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: -- in the year that the kids were coming in, and so this is sort of looking at that saying a gateway is the point when the school is saying I have done what I can, you know, we should do it

1 that point.

2 MEMBER WOODRUFF: Well, it's an 3 issue.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: It's piloting, and so there's a lot of different, if you look there is a whole bunch of different ways we need to think about whether gateway is only at the exit year or whether there's a fifth grade gateway as well or a sixth grade --

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Exit metric.

MS. TYLER: An exit metric may be the new name.

MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: Yes, I thought that it was intended that it be something different when we were talking about third grade and eighth grade math that what they're moving to is some way of calculating the impact of longevity in the school, which I thought was really the MGP in a more abbreviated fashion.

The gateway is really, was based,

I thought on a belief that Third grade reading

was critical and eighth grade math wasn't just about exiting middle school, but I thought the theory was that students would've completed Algebra I by eighth grade so we would see, well are they on a path to be successful, a college ready curriculum in high school.

I thought that was the basis on which we selected those. This says it's something else.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: Well I think there's been more research around that third grade, so that was the third grade's, if you can't read by third grade, you're never going to read and there was all this research about five years ago, four years ago, well that's sort of not true anymore.

We've done more research, they do their, there are kids who guess what, learn to read and are very successful or are, you know, successful, at fifth Grade, so I think there's been a little bit of a shift in whether this critical reading by third grade.

So some of it is responding to that, but I hear you, it is an exit measure and that's what the schools interpreted this measure as, at least within the task force.

So if we want to, you know, you don't have to.

MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: I didn't think it was the belief though that developmentally kids couldn't learn to read by third grade, it's that actually most schools stop teaching, the teachers aren't trained to teach students how to read.

Now we know that a lot of schools are doing that because they're putting in place in for mediation and they recognize that that's the case.

But I thought what we were saying is, let's assume that many of these students because of mobility, their parents could move someplace where those teachers in fourth grade aren't going to be teaching students how to read, so one of the obligations of the school

	Page 120
1	MEMBER NOPHLIN: Yes.
2	MS. TYLER: we'll publish with
3	the average daily attendance rate. If this is
4	approved then the 2014 framework which is
5	released next November will have the in-seat
6	rate.
7	MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: So, but let me
8	very clear, the attendance rate and the new
9	re-enrollment indicators are going into effect
10	for the 13-14 school year for now.
11	The gateway is not, the gateway
12	was, hey, they, you know, we aren't changing
13	the gateway at all for this upcoming school
14	year except to say they are interested in
15	piloting some different measures there.
16	MEMBER NOPHLIN: Okay. So for the
17	upcoming school year
18	Ms. RUBIN DEVEAUX: For 13-14.
19	MEMBER NOPHLIN: it's going to
20	bo in-goat

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: Yes, in-seat.

MEMBER NOPHLIN: -- then new seat

21

22

1	time	and	
_	Стще	and	

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: Yes.

3 MEMBER NOPHLIN: Okay.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: And a couple ways that students would not count in the reenrollment rate.

MEMBER NOPHLIN: Okay.

CHAIR MCKOY: Any other questions on this? Yes.

MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: Just to clarify on the special education for private placement, this just affects those tools that are relying on DCPS as their LEA and that, anyway --

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: And it's completely data driven --

17 MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: Right.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: -- because they have to remove this student from their student information system when they go to private placement and so they can't count for re-enrollment because they're no longer even

1 in their system so it's unfair.

2 MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: Right, Right,

3 okay. Just I wanted to be clear.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: Yes.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: One of the proposed changes with this new potential policy is that the only students that would be counted for this gateway exit, whatever we call it, metric, would be those students that had been at that specific school for three years.

Do we have any idea of what proportion of our students are at the same school for three years straight? Would that remove half the kids from this measure, a quarter, a tenth?

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: Depends on the school. I mean you can look at re-enrollment rates and get the idea of how many students are staying at the school, but it depends on the school.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Okay, I'm just

thinking if there's any potential unattended consequences of that. And was there any consideration of just keeping since we, your point is well taken about third grade being an important time to a kid's reading skill sets.

Was there any discussion of leaving it at third grade, but keeping that 3-year requirement so the school is getting credit for kids they've had since first grade or since kindergarten as opposed to changing the grade?

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: That's how it started. Yes, that's how the conversation began and then it evolved to the task force to get to this place.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Okay.

MS. RUBIN DEVEAUX: But it started there and we may go back to there as the pilot, you know, unfolds and if that's the direction the Board would like to go, then that would make sense.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Yes, I'm

agreeing with Emily that losing those
particular grade years as a measure of a
gateway time could be a problem.

CHAIR MCKOY: Any further comments? Okay, do we have one more?

MS. TYLER: Yes. I'm not leaving here.

CHAIR MCKOY: Okay.

MS. TYLER: All right, so the last one I'll summarize is the High School

Performance Management Framework so we again recommend that the Board vote to open for public comment a proposal to modify the High School PMF beginning in the 2013-2014 school year.

Again, we met with the High School
PMF task force comprising of charter leaders,
PCSB staff, and advocates several times
throughout the school year to discuss
modifications in the High School PMF.

The task force suggests making modifications to the attendance and re-

enrollment rates, the gateway metric, and weighting of the student progress indicators.

So to highlight the changes to the student progress indicator, there were no changes proposed for the median growth percentile, or MGP, used to measure student progress.

However, task force members requested a change in the weights. The current framework allows 15 points for student progress measured by growth scores in reading and math.

From eighth grade to tenth grade on the State assessment the task force would like to have more points awarded for student progress and recommended changing this to 20 points.

For the student achievement indicator, task force members recommended adding dual enrollment so that advanced placement and IB, International Baccalaureate indicator, and moving it from student

1 achievement to the gateway indicator.

By adding dual enrollment more schools will be able to earn points in getting students college recognized course credits that are proven to lead to stronger college persistency rates.

The current framework also allows 30 points for student achievement up to 25 points for student achievement in reading in math on the tenth grade assessment and an additional five points for advanced placement and/or IB credit attainment.

The gateway metric, for high schools gateway is an extremely important indicator in that it shows attainment of college and career ready skills.

Currently our gateway measures do not include career ready indicators. The task force members recommended that PCSBs Board approve the following updates.

Number one, increase the points allocated to the gateway from 30 to 35

beginning in 2013-2014. Again, shifting the APIB metric from the student achievement section to the gateway section.

Number three, include a measure of students dually enrolled in college credit bearing courses with a C or better with the APIB metric, increasing the weight of the entire metric from 5 to 7.5 points, but keeping the floors and targets constant as currently only high schools with college prep missions are attaining the target for this indicator.

We also had only three schools who provided the PCSB with dual enrollment data, so it would be impossible to conduct a fair analysis of the impact of this measure.

So this is another measure where we'd like to establish, have a baseline year during our pilot year to establish our floors and targets and this metric would be incorporated in the 2014-2015 school year.

We'd like to create a new

indicator called career readiness that will include career and technical education certification and IB career related certificate, also known as IBCC metric.

We'd also like to pilot this
metric next year and publish the results next
year, but not count it towards the school's
overall score.

We'd like to create an allowance for the ACT plan assessment as an alternative to measuring PSAT performance for eleventh graders. Again, we'd like to have a year to collect this data.

The task force proposed reducing the number of points from 7.5 to 5.0 beginning next year for PSAT and ACT plan data and also adding a 5-year adjusted cohort graduation rate to the current graduation rate metric beginning next year.

And for the last PMF I described the attendance rate and re-enrollment rate which would be the same formulas for both

1 frameworks.

2 CHAIR MCKOY: Okay.

MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: I think this
is all a move in a really good direction and
I know that you're teeing up the career ready
portion of it, that it's to be developed, but
I'm really looking forward to that part of the
work being done and with the hope of
certification being obviously high quality
which I know this staff is very attentive to.

Because I think it's hard to encourage providers of high quality career and college readiness programs that aren't sort of your standard issue college prep.

If we don't have some basis for rewarding them for that, and they only kind of, because you have to make choices in your schedule, and so I think we need to do that if we're going to really see some innovation here and options for kids.

CHAIR MCKOY: Colleagues, any

22 more?

MEMBER WOODRUFF: I would just very quickly add just the fact that we have from early childhood all the way through to adult ed these new PMF frameworks that we'll continue to work on and tweak.

I think it's a fantastic recognition of the different populations, age ranges, and the need for us to be more sensitive to all the different populations.

So congratulations to staff on preparing what I think is going to be some improvements in how we hold our schools accountable. I think this is fantastic.

MEMBER SOIFER: If I could add, as the action here is opening for public comment if I could just draw attention to two points that I hope that the community would be mindful of in preparing those comments.

One is the mission specific goals that are part of the Adult PMF which I think we all agree have an important role in that process.

And second related to that is when you get into methodology of some of those mission specific measures, for instance, evaluating, you know, employment status period of time after graduation, that methodology is crucial that we want to ensure that the methodology used is as full validity, but also that we don't in any way penalize schools that may use a more rigorous methodology.

So I would call, I would first of all very much appreciate the inclusion of that consideration in what we're putting out for public comment and we just ask that the community pay particular attention to those areas and look forward to engaging on any thoughts that we receive about them.

CHAIR MCKOY: Okay. So I've made the assumption that with these four PMF frameworks we want to put out for public comment that we can vote on them as a package.

And so let's try that and if any member wants to pull one out just, you know,

Asian society and their teachers have received training and so when they come back they're going to complete that process.

The other is the condition that they had to develop curriculum that's for their technology program. And so what they've discovered through implementing the plan and addressing the conditions that technology is going to be used more as a tool for instruction versus a separate program.

So they've revised that. And in addition, finally, they've met all of the other, if you have questions about the facility and the lease and financing those renovations and things like that.

But I think that they are in a good position to start off the school year successfully, and they have assured us that they will have the remaining pieces of the curriculum finished by the first day of school.

CHAIR MCKOY: Do you want to add

existing building, it's not going to be

22

1 substantial renovation.

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And we're also going to be building an addition to accommodate a high school regulation sized gym, some additional office space, an art room, a resource center.

6 MEMBER WOODRUFF: Is this like 7 going out into open to the --

PARTICIPANT: Right. Fortunately we have a great deal of space on our campus.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Right.

PARTICIPANT: So we're going to be doing that and that addition should be finished sometime in October of next year.

The renovation of the existing building will be done in a summer blitz next summer.

So with those two changes we'll be ready for the eleventh grade in the following school year.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: What are the numbers that apply for the ninth and tenth grades?

22 PARTICIPANT: In terms of

1 quality school in the mix.

CHAIR MCKOY: Then call the question, all in favor?

(Multiple Ayes)

CHAIR MCKOY: Opposed? Abstained?

Great. If you just sit there for a second

while we do Cedar Tree. I think this will be

expeditious as well.

MS. MILLER: Okay. So at our February 25, 2013, Board meeting the Board approved the conditions, Cedar Tree's request to amend its mission, terminate its contract with Mosaica Education, Inc. and serve only pre-k3 through Kindergarten starting in school year 2013-2014.

The school has, and they'll again, substantially met all of the conditions.

There was one condition that we recommended be omitted as a condition and that was because right now they had only identified three returning students with identified special needs and so they're still going through the

enrollment process and don't have all of the,
the full curriculum, I'm sorry, cumulative
records from the students who are enrolling in
this school.

In addition to that they were required to complete the qualitative, the special education qualitative assurance review. That needs to be, it wasn't completed properly, so given that the review was done for its existing grades at the time.

We're going to require that the school undergoes the training to complete the special ed quality review next year, but also ensure that it's more tailored to the population that they're serving which applies to early childhood instead of focusing on the full LEA spectrum.

They have agreed to, they
participated in the Early Childhood
Performance Management Framework as required
and they adopted their Early Childhood PMF as
their goals.

	Page 140
1	CHAIR MCKOY: Would you like to
2	add anything?
3	PARTICIPANT: No.
4	MEMBER WOODRUFF: How is the
5	enrollment coming?
6	PARTICIPANT: Today we have 316
7	lovely young people enrolled, fully enrolled.
8	We're very excited.
9	CHAIR MCKOY: More discussion, any
10	questions? Can I get a motion then?
11	MEMBER TILLERY: I'll make the
12	motion that we fully approve.
13	CHAIR MCKOY: A second?
14	MEMBER SOIFER: Second.
15	CHAIR MCKOY: Been moved and
16	seconded. Anymore discussion? Everybody
17	liked Cedar Tree over Howard Road. All in
18	favor?
19	(Multiple Ayes)
20	CHAIR MCKOY: All opposed?
21	Abstentions? So moved. Congratulations.
22	PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

they provide is equipped for the future

22

framework and the assessment that's used to
determine if the students have mastered that
curriculum is CASAS.

And CASAS, passing the CASAS determines whether or not students will receive or can receive a National External Diploma.

And Christie can tell you more about this, but they were asked by OSSE to offer this, and so that's why they presented this request, or this notification to us.

CHAIR MCKOY: Is this replacing a different assessment?

MS. MCKAY: No. This will be used for our Advanced II, a cohort in our Advance II course so that those students who want to go on and get their high school diploma will be able to do that.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: And it's portfolio based, right?

MS. MCKAY: Yes, it is portfolio based.

1 MS. MILLER: So this doesn't 2 require a vote, it's just a notification. 3 CHAIR MCKOY: Any other questions, 4 anybody? 5 MEMBER TILLERY: I'm stuck on something. I'm stuck on this CASAS, the 6 7 Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System. 8 You can master the curriculum but you still 9 don't earn a credential, a recognized 10 credential? 11 MS. MCKAY: So CASAS, private 12 CASAS that we do for our DSL classes is to measure the amount of English. NEDP allows us 13 14 to be able to look at really their ability to 15 gain their high school diploma through OSSE. 16 So it's more comprehensive. 17 MS. MILLER: Did that answer your 18 question? 19 MEMBER TILLERY: Yes, somewhat. 20 CHAIR MCKOY: Okay. If we don't 21 have any other questions or comments, thank 22 you very much.

1 MS. MCKAY: Thank you.

CHAIR MCKOY: We're going to get back in the voting mode and I think SEED is the next up.

Okay, welcome. This is going to be a vote for a renewal of their charter,

SEED's charter, I guess we can everyone sign in and introduce.

MS. MEDWAY: Hello.

CHAIR MCKOY: Hello.

MS. MEDWAY: My name is Sarah

Medway. I am a Charter Agreement Specialist

with PCSB and I have with me here

representatives from SEED Public Charter

School, Vasco Fernandes, the Chairman of the

Board, Rajiv Vinnakota, the founder of the

school, Charles Adams, Head of School, Kara

Locke, Principal, and Erika Asikoye, the

Director of Student Support Services.

And I'm here to summarize PCSBs staff's finding of the school's performance for its charter renewal as well as to give a

recommendation for its renewal.

To quickly summarize the standards for charter renewal, every school signs a contract to charter for a 15-year term and at the end of those 15 years if it was just to continue operating it must submit a petition for charter renewal.

SEED PCS is in its 15th year of operation and has submitted such a petition.

PCSB staff reviewed that petition as well as the school's performance over the course of the 15 years.

The School Reform Act requires the Board to approve a school's petition for renewal unless it finds that the school has not met its goals and expectations as detailed in its charter, or has committed a material violation of applicable laws.

And the School Reform Act also requires us to review the school's fiscal management and economic viability and for those three standards, PCSB staff found that

This, it isn't part of the Agenda,

22

but this is a significant milestone and an important point so I'd love to ask sort of a couple specific areas and just really get your thoughts on.

First of all, most notably in looking at the Performance Management Framework report card from last year, I would draw particular attention to the fact that you are above average in longitudinal student growth in reading and math, and particularly about the highest in the City in math and I would congratulate you on that.

And by all means for the benefit of the City, I hope that that can continue.

I just sort of give you the opportunity just to speak to that, particularly the topic of growth and your experience with it and what your expectation would be moving forward?

MR. ADAMS: Thank you. We appreciate your honoring the moment in the significance of the renewal process.

In terms of mathematics, I was, I

remember I might of been in this room awhile back when PMF was introduced and talking about what it was going to look it I guess in the BETA version and knowing the eighth grade math scores are going to be instrumental in terms of that evaluation and I'll presume you're talking about middle school.

MEMBER SOIFER: Particularly.

MR. ADAMS: Right, particularly middle school. Thanks. And so what we recognized early on was that every child deserves to be exposed to the same mathematical content.

In general, all curricular contents, but specifically mathematics, and what we decided to do was offer all of that content and double the instructional time in mathematics in two separate instructional blocks for middle school.

We did the same thing in reading, but that's a continuous 90 minutes, and then we separated students in temporary homogenous

groups for the benefit of learning the skills so that they could return to their classroom with their peers and not be separated and essentially not tracked.

And so everyone would have the opportunity to take specific mathematics, higher mathematics classes in high school, but in the middle school we pushed everybody through, pushed and pulled folks through and provided time everyday, every instructional day throughout the year to get support.

So a classic example would be a young person, they're all studying

Pythagorean's Theorem, a squared plus b squared equals c squared, and someone, I may not know my multiplication tables and you may, you still experience that same content with the teacher, but then we are separated at some time about developing that skill.

So we can continue to participate and hopefully, and it looks like it's working, that no one is left behind. I think Kara can

add some color to what that looks like when they get to high school, which is our hope, and I appreciate your question, because we're watching that hopefully happen right now with the current upper school classes.

MS. LOCKE: Good evening. So I too appreciate the comment about our growth particularly with our high schoolers and I would just add to what Charles said, you know, I think staff attention has a lot to do with the progress that we've made.

We've had the opportunity to have a staff, particularly in the area of math, that we've been able to develop because they're sticking with us and we're building momentum with that team.

The gift of time is obviously a huge asset that we have to work with and Charles mentioned some of the interventions that we've developed that kind of wraparound in terms of time of day.

I think moving forward we're

interested in continuing to learn about new ways to warehouse our data, track growth over time, extend what we're looking at from DC CAS in the middle grades to then high school PSAT and then college, you know, what math courses are a freshman in college taking? What is the success rate there?

And kind of delve deeper into the work we've started to do with ACCUPLACER, and using that as a tool in the junior year of high school to really figure out what we can still work on in those last few years of high school.

So I think those are some of the next steps that we have in terms of continuing to refine our practice with the math curriculum.

CHAIR MCKOY: Okay.

MR. VINNAKOTA: I want to throw one thing in as to one person who's been here the whole time with SEED is that the framework for charter schools in the District of

Columbia allows you both to experiment and learn and change.

And in this case this is a perfect example of where my colleagues who have been working so hard were able to look at the data and where we had what was a minimally a tracking type approach in the middle school, when they came in and looked at the data in the first six months of their leadership basically just wiped that clean and said we've got to do this differently based upon what we're learning.

And then implemented what they are just talking thorough about six years ago, and so one of the things that's great about this is we learned from what we were doing, we learned both the good and the bad.

We changed our program and now you're starting to see the fruits of those labors and some of those hard decisions over the last couple years.

MEMBER SOIFER: I think that's a

great segue to where I wanted to sort of point this question next, which is, Sarah's introductory comments drew to attention quite out there I think to the strong progress towards the goals in the charter.

And I guess it predated my being on the Board, but I understand the evolution in those goals as you develop them.

And I wonder with the vantage point that you now have and the success that you've achieved, if you've considered adding more academic content, or looking at those goals through a prism of academic content and if moving forward now for the next 15 years, if you're content sticking with those goals or, well particularly, and let me just sort of, you know, because the residential component is a major aspect of your school in daily life, programmatically funding wise, and every other way.

If you're content with those goals as you met them in the past or if that's

1 something that you'd give to consideration?

and there was some turbulence.

MR. ADAMS: Yes. I think that's timely. I guess it's maybe a, not a counterpoint to what Raj mentioned, but there was, I got there in the tenth year, the ninth, tenth year of the school as the head of school and there was a lot of building while flying

And I think that the novelty of the model, in all honesty, caused us to focus on what made us different as opposed to what we're really hoping to do is to do what all good schools do and move the kids from where they are when we meet them academically and also create some pretty aggressive expectations, aspirations, benchmarks for our students before they leave us so they're set up for the next stage, which is college and life beyond.

And so we are quite excited about the opportunity to change some of these goals.

I remember, I guess it was tenth year review

there was one or two goals that we didn't
necessarily understand how we got to where
they were and I think that the good thing
about the District of Columbia and the charter
environment is that a lot of folks are doing
the same thing at the same time.

And so I know that we have colleagues in this work who are upgrading their goals and expectations for their students and really focusing on academics and there are some things that I know that over the last five to six years that we feel we've gotten right, or gotten, you know, much better at, and we know where the value added is.

And I think what we want to do now and what we're strategically, proactively, and purposely doing is really emerging the benefits of the boarding program with the academic rigor and the wraparound is not just about social skills development, it's also about academic skills development.

So we've looked at the boarding

program at SEED and the value of it to families as well as to the District of Columbia in terms of cost to ensure that what we're doing is buttressing the academics via study sessions, study hall, one-on-one tutoring, small group tutoring, peer tutoring, and making sure that what we're providing in the evening is not just the social skills, and I think that's how the goals are written.

And then there was some lens in terms of academics, but it was really about the boarding aspect and just that we don't want to be known as the boarding school East of the river, or the only one.

We actually want to be known as a really good school that happens to be a boarding school that's East of the river serving a certain population.

MR. FERNANDES: I would add just one thing because, you know, we see ourselves as having it pretty well and see ourselves as a very good school, but we want to be viewed

1 as a great school.

And no matter what the standard, we don't want to be just, you know, a very good school relevant to this or that, so constantly in our deliberations and when, I'm on Board, so I don't get involved in the detail problematic aspects of what these two folks do day to day.

But our focus is really to keep improving year on year really learning from what we've done. So we want to viewed essentially as a great school no matter where you go in the Country, no matter who you're comparing us to that we be this great school.

I don't think we're quite there yet. I think we're a very good school and we've done quite a bit with what we have in terms of support we get of this community.

But we all think we can do probably better with time.

MEMBER SOIFER: I just had one other aspect of that I wanted just to ask, to

follow up sort of similarly, and that is your policy for accepting students at the sixth grade level, if you could speak to the history of that and, again, with the benefit of the opportunity in front of us, terms of the goals and targets and what you've learned from that.

Actually, maybe for my own benefit, I could use some history on that myself.

MR. VINNAKOTA: The history around seventh grade entry was based upon a years worth of research that was done by Eric Adler and myself, the other co-founder, when we traveled around the Country as we were starting SEED to talk to boarding schools of all stripes.

And one of the things that we gathered from that information is that you want to try to have children come to your school as early as possible so that they can get all the benefits of attending our school.

But there was also a lot of

research that had been done and also anecdotal evidence from looking at schools like Milton Hershey School, Girard College in Philadelphia, that started in the kindergarten, that said that from an a child development perspective that having children come earlier than fifth grade was very difficult from a sense of ownership than a sense of personal I.

And so we did not want to go any earlier than that. We decided to start with seventh grade because it was a transition point for a majority of the schools in the District of Columbia when we opened in 1998.

So most students were switching schools anyways between the sixth and the seventh Grade, and so having SEED as an option at that point in time seemed to us to be the best method to be able to attract families and children to attend the school.

We then moved to sixth grade partly because of our lessons from what we

were learning as to wanting to start earlier with students, but also because under the previous superintendent, she moved most of, the transition point's between the fifth and the sixth Grade.

We're learning a lot more over the last few years and I'll hand it off to you in some of our thinking now.

MR. ADAMS: Yes, and I have a middle school background so I was quite excited about backing into sixth grade. I was very happy knowing that, speaking of research, that sixth graders tend to still listen to adult and seventh graders start listening mostly to their peers, and any of us who are parents know that that's true.

And so I was quite excited about that. Many of our staff and colleagues had some concerns about sixth graders being in the same space with twelfth graders, literally at some time in the year we could have 10-1/2 year-old and we could have a 19-year-old,

depending on their personal academic trajectory.

But the one thing that we learned, and it's actually a scary fact, is that the first couple years when we brought in sixth graders, that our sixth graders were joining us with the same academic deficits as our seventh graders, right?

So the gaps that they were bringing in really meant that somewhere else a year wasn't making a difference and if you look at our current DC CAS data and just, and you know, recently embargoed DC CAS data and last years, couple years.

I guess I just said that on the record. But all jokes aside, if you look at the data, sixth grade is really still the challenge.

And so while it's a challenge and while mathematically, quantitatively, it may not be attractive in terms of what it does to our scores.

opportunity to create with those students and those families the culture and the aspirations and meet them where they are already in terms of what they expect and want and believe their children can do, and get going on closing those gaps, that hopefully we get to your first question, that those same students who come into sixth grade are really doing quite well in eighth grade and beyond into our high school.

And the challenge, we've been able to get traction quicker for whatever reason,

I don't know if anyone else on the panel here wants to speak about it with mathematics, but if you look at the sixth grade challenges some of it still shows up in terms of reading in middle school.

MEMBER SOIFER: So I guess I just, as the authorizer, I feel obligated to at lest raise the question as to whether or not shifting the policies so that you're taking

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

one of the challenges for us is I think the

phenomenon of the small pond. I mean we have

a charter that's 325 students and so we end up

20

21

22

with a small high school which I think constrains us at times in terms of the offerings, the academic offerings, social offerings, for anyone who has gone to a small school as a student or has worked in one, that's one of the challenges.

I think that also there is a, so looking at the possibility of having students enter our school later than sixth grade, and I don't know if that's the six, seven, eight, and at the Board level we actually are talking about it, but haven't decided yet, or is it sixth grade and ninth grade?

It gives a couple of benefits that seemingly right now without really diving deeply in terms of a year, we don't have the year that Raj and Eric had to do the research while we're running the school.

But in having the opportunity to add students who are entering high school simultaneously, some from within SEED and some from without, I think that could socially

benefit our students in terms of interacting with other students, I mean they literally are with each other for 120 hours a week for seven years.

So that's that small pond idea. I think it also would allow us to modulate our high school enrollment numbers so we could have a pretty predictable class by class which I now the principal to my far left would really appreciate in terms of staffing and building capacity within teachers.

So there's a number of benefits.

I think that we are interested in the next steps of this process after the renewal is to look at what would be the benefits of various points or just an additional point and hopefully being able to put some language in our agreement that allows us to do that.

Because, for instance, when we went from seventh grade back to sixth grade, we were able to just indicate that based on the way the original agreement was written as

1 opposed to having to amend it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

So if we could do something like that in terms of language then that's gives us the flexibility to figure out what really works best for our school community and culture and then decide when to bring those students in.

I don't know if you wanted to, or if we're good? That's helpful?

MEMBER SOIFER: Yes.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you. Appreciate it.

13 MEMBER SOIFER: Sure.

MEMBER TILLERY: So with such a specialized population in terms of having residential, you have kind of a captive audience.

Have you been able to track your college acceptance rates and compare those to the general population? So what has been your college acceptance rates?

MR. ADAMS: So I'll say yes we've

been able to track our college acceptance
rates and I think Raj is probably the best
person to answer that question in terms of we
transitioned recently from college acceptance
to a college persistence and college
graduation --

MEMBER TILLERY: That's where I'm going. Are you just going to take me there.

MR. ADAMS: Right. No, I mentioned before.

MEMBER TILLERY: I understand.

MR. VINNAKOTA: So just to kind of provide the philosophical underpinning here, one of the things that from its founding we wanted to hold ourselves accountable for was the number of college graduates.

That students that came with us at its final goal was to be able to get them to go to college, be they're, or a community college, did they bring 4-year colleges and to not only get accepted but to matriculate, to persist, and then to graduate.

And so one of the things that
we've been able to do is we actually have a
full program called College Transition and
Success program, CTS, that not only tracks all
of our students, but also has a number of
people who provide supports for potential
hurdles that any of our students may face
during the transition while they're at
different schools.

It also allows us to track on a very specific basis both the challenges that they're facing in general to be able to create a feedback loop into the school.

What are we learning about the needs of our students once the transition into community colleges, 4-year colleges, elsewhere, so that it helps us improve our program?

To your question, we graduate about 90 percent plus of our graduates get accepted to 4-year colleges. Eighty-five percent plus enroll within 18 months and about

two-thirds of them graduate or are on track to graduate within six years.

And what we're able to also do, and one of the things that's been very exciting this year is now that we have nine years of graduates before this year, so this was our tenth graduating class, is we've been able to also create a rubric that identifies those schools that we believe are the best schools to support our students.

And we literally created a rubric and a guide of green, yellow, and red schools where we will talk with our families and students and our college counseling program, our academic, our student life support, and student program programs.

All of them work and coach our students to be able to understand the distinctions, the reason why we believe that they should be going to green or yellow schools, their chances of success through such a process.

And so that's one of the things
that we're using not only for our students,
but actually we're now starting to share with
colleges to tell them here's where you are
from what we're learning and here's how you
can get better.

MEMBER TILLERY: And I also recommend sharing that of course in the upcoming budget, but you'll have to be sharing that among other college access providers in the City.

MR. VINNAKOTA: Absolutely. We believe, exactly.

MEMBER TILLERY: So that we're making good on the joint investment.

MR. VINNAKOTA: Right.

MEMBER TILLERY: You know, I've figured this City invests somewhere between \$35-\$40 million a year on college scholarships, and we need to have some coordinated return on that investment to make sure that they're getting through school.

And a certain number of those young people need to be coming back and populating D.C. to take these jobs so that we don't have to keep going outside the City to bring in town, we brought our own town, so we'll talk later.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Just to go back to Don's earlier questions and comments about the admissions policy. It sounds like you're considering potentially going beyond just the sixth grade, which I would strongly support.

What has been the community or parent level of interest in having access to see that at different grade levels?

MR. ADAMS: I think the reason I started in terms of answering this question with ninth grade is I think that we often hear of new families who have younger children who are in our middle school asking about their older siblings who are about to enter high school, so I think that's probably where we hear it the most, where they express some

1 interest.

And/or folks who happen to come to SEED for an athletic event or a partnership or come from another, you know, something else going on in the school, then they'll ask what are our entry points.

I mean so I think that, we serve primarily Wards 7, 8, and 5 in that order, probably around 75-80 percent of our students, some of them, many of them, even though we're a boarding school come from walking distance.

So I think that we also hear it, I mean not all, but me, you know, we also hear that it would be nice if we had another entry point.

I think there's a positive flip side to that as well, is that parents actually when they enter SEED as the parents of a sixth grade student, also recognize that they have their high school option locked in.

That that child stays there, we do right by them, they do right by the school,

all works well. I think that's, so that's the flip side that we often don't talk about and I recognize that the most points of entry is really important for a number of reasons.

You mentioned investment and the financial side and you also mentioned just access. I know that, just talking to the District of Columbia about having the ability to attend schools that are in your neighborhood and so forth, so we're well aware of that.

I think we just really want to figure out the details and make sure that what we do makes the most sense. But that's often what we hear, you know, we have a science fair and maybe some other students or some other folks are there or other teachers are involved in that other school.

That's the question. It's usually about high school. I mean on the ground at the school we discuss should it be six, seven, eight, right?

So then we can build that culture in the middle school and then they all go into high school together, or is it sixth and ninth grade, and so there's some things that we want to work out.

But I'm open to it. I don't see a reason not, I inherited it, and I don't think it's, without any editorial, right, it was what it was and we move back into sixth grade and later on --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. FERNANDES: I just want to say something very quickly, a lot of parents when we talk to them about those challenges that they face and sort of things that they're looking to do, they'll say, I know, I want to take him out because he has this interest in this or that aspect of the arts, or this or that sport.

And so when you have a relatively small high school, because at best every class is going to be as large as the previous class,

kid moves out of the area or something that happened to make the class go down.

So that's the challenge I see the parents complaining a lot about is that they don't have, in some cases, the richness experience that they may have if the high school was even just 15-20 percent larger.

Small numbers can certainly make a difference because instead of having 25 a class may have 30-35, all of a sudden you have some art programs that weren't available before become available, some sports options become available.

And that's where you hear the parents complaining a lot is that, you know, depending on the class and who's interested in what and what teachers are providing what, sometimes there isn't a critical mass where we can say --

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Let me say I asked this question in the context to support the various leads to where the performance of

MS. MEDWAY: I would like to now present your consideration, a proposal for charter continuance for Center City PCS.

CHAIR MCKOY: Okay.

MS. MEDWAY: I have

representatives from the school with me. I
have Ralph Boyd, Jr., the Chair of the Board
of Trustees, Russ Williams, President and CEO,
Toni Barton, Director of Student Support
Services, Christine Duran, Director of
Facilities, and Jacqueline Lawlah, Director of
Operations.

CHAIR MCKOY: Welcome.

MS. MEDWAY: To summarize the standard for charter reviews, it's quite similar to that of renewal. We're looking at the same three areas, whether the school has met its goals and expectations, its legal compliance, and its fiscal management.

The difference from the renewal is that the standard for continuance is not as strict. The school need not have met every

one of its goals and expectations for the Board to vote on charter continuance.

Center City PCS is in its fifth
year of operation and as such PCSB is required
to conduct a charter review. The staff has
conducted this review and it found the
following.

The finding for Center City's goals and expectations is that the school fully met five of its goals and expectations, that it partially met two of these goals, that it did not meet three goals related to academics, reading, math, and science, and that there insufficient evidence to assess the remaining two goals.

And as I said, we found that it had remained in substantial legal compliance and managed its finances properly. I should note though, that of Center City's six campuses they performed quite strongly on the PMF and two are tier one schools.

I should also note that even

though we assessed the school to not have met its goal in math and science because it's below the State average of proficiency in those areas, that the school has been steadily increasing its proficiency among its students.

And so the staff's recommendation is that the school focuses on continuing to improve those areas and also really focuses on reading proficiency and finally that it ensures that its sixth campus, there's one campus that's an outlier on the PMF and that's the Congress Heights campus, that it really focus on raising its PMF performance in the coming years.

CHAIR MCKOY: Okay. Before I go to colleagues on the Board, would any of you like to say anything?

MR. WILLIAMS: Sure.

CHAIR MCKOY: Welcome, Russ.

MR. WILLIAMS: Welcome, good

evening, thank you Chairman of the Board,

members of the Board. So is anyone in front

of you tonight on this team sort of pleased with these outcomes? No, we're not pleased with these.

And earlier someone said they
wanted to get from good to great, I think I've
only been at the school for a few months and
I was approved by the Chairman of the Board
Boyd and the Board of Directors to sort of
lift the school from sort of okay, to good, to
great.

And we certainly, we know we have some work ahead of us, but we also have sort of put in place a lot of things over the past few months, including getting a lot of the right people in the right seats, getting a lot of talent infused into the organization, and we have really strong alignment between the Board of Trustees and sort of leadership and six strong principals at our six campuses as we enter the 13-14 school year.

And we know the research is very clear that the strong outcome that's driven at

our schools are primarily, you know, driven by the strong leadership in the building.

And we're looking to, you know, move this organization in terms of focusing this year on what we teach and how we teach and those are two of three key drivers of schools and without focusing on those things, we're really here to just talk about window dressing.

And so with the renewed emphasis on that and sort of improving the quality of what we do. We know that task predicts performance by challenging our kids more, we expect to drive stronger outcomes as we go forward.

MR. BOYD: Good evening. I'll be as brief as I can be, but I do want to echo what Mr. Williams has said and approach my comments this way.

When I and my colleagues on the Board of Directors answered the question, why would anyone or why should anyone have, not

just confidence in us, marginal confidence in us going forward, but really a strong degree of confidence that we will continue that improvement trajectory.

There are really three things that
I think about. Leadership, what's the
improvement trajectory, and do these people
get it? Have they cracked the nut? Do they
know where they're strong and why and how to
sustain it?

Do they know where they need improvement and why, and do they know how to do it in a sustained way? And I think the answer with respect to each of those questions in our case is, yes.

It hasn't always been yes, but it is a firm yes now. In terms of leadership, and I always view leadership is the best predictor of how any organization will do whether it's a public company, whether it's a non-profit that has a \$50,000 annual budget.

The strength of leadership is

really the key question and we understood a year ago that we needed to get better in every element of our leadership from our Board of Directors, it needed to be bigger, broader, and deeper in its expertise.

We understood that we really had to upgrade our scene and leadership team in our Central Office and we also understood that we had to have more uniform strength in our school leadership across our six school platform.

And we really have spent, with the help of some very strong partners, charter board partners, in school venture fund, in teacher project, new leaders have really worked steadfastly with us over the last 18 months to improve us in all of those areas.

We have heard them. We have applied the resources and we think the expertise to get better in each one of those areas, and I think if you look at our roster of board members today you'll see it's much

1 deeper and stronger than it was.

It's something well beyond Ralph
Boyd, Jack Griffen, Joe Bruno, and George
Brown. We've added really length depth and
strength to that Board. Our executive
leadership team is measurably and materially
stronger as is the leadership in our schools
across each of the six schools.

Now I think you see that improvement that has come from that across our PMF scores and I think you will continue to see it in our student achievement and performance data.

And then finally I would just say
having jumped in as the interim CEO for six
months during this school year, I got a very
careful look under the hood and it's funny,
I've been on the Board since the beginning and
you think you know, but until you're there
rolling up your sleeves, on the ground in each
of the schools, which I was pretty
persistently.

You get a much better appreciation for what's working and why and what isn't.

And I will tell you I bring confidence that we've cracked the nut. We are much more data driven. We are much more persistent in our push through on instruction in each of the schools.

So I think the schools that would suggest data wise that you should have some concerns on, continue to look at them, we are, but I feel pretty confident that you're going to have confidence in us as you see those schools moving forward.

CHAIR MCKOY: Any questions?

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Yes. As one of our charter operators with the multiple campuses, and we have several of those, but I think that brings with it a particular responsibility because of, you know, six campuses.

And I'm opening this to all of you, not just the gentleman here, can you

speak to some of the action steps I guess you're taking with given your partnering and your rolling up your sleeves, that you're doing across the six campuses to raise their outcomes and their performance.

I'm just curious to hear a couple of examples.

MS. BARTON: So I've actually had several roles at Center City. I've actually been a principal at one of our campuses and now I am at the Central Office as the Director of Student Support Services.

And I was actually interim

principal at the Congress Heights Campus,

which is the campus that was mentioned, and I

think one key thing that is going to be

instrumental in Congress Heights's scores

continuing to rise is the fact that the leader

who is now in place as the principal of

Congress Heights is one of our longest

standing staff members at Center City.

And what you typically find in

some of your schools in Ward 8 is very high turnover for principals, and she has demonstrated that she has a firm commitment to Center City and that particular campus has grown leaps and bounds since she has been in leadership there, just in that one year of leadership.

so like Mr. Boyd said, having the right people in the right spots is a huge change that we have for this coming up school year and we have spent a lot time this summer completely reworking our curriculum so that it matches what the standards are now asking of our students to make sure that they are on the continued trajectory to improve and to do well across all central areas.

CHAIR MCKOY: Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think it's worth noting the curriculum work that's taking place is a huge lift, but we all looked at what we were doing and we agreed that it wasn't good enough.

1 And so we're investing a

significant amount of resources and we have a lot of our Center City people are doing the work of improving Center City, it's our teachers, it's our school leaders, and it's our staff that are looking at and doing the deep dive in terms of curriculum base, resource reviews, picking out what is it that's really going to drive stronger options for our kids.

Toni and her team have been involved in curriculum work from the beginning, so we have a support scale, all supports and supports for advanced students being thought about from the get go so that those children and those supports aren't left out of the work that we're doing.

And we're not starting from scratch here on curriculum, we're building, we, you know, we're evaluating, assessing the different programs out there and we're taking foundational programs and then we're building

1 everything around them.

But we're providing our teachers with better tools, better maps, better lesson plans, and just better information as we go forward, as we understand and the research is very clear, and when we challenge these kids, and they want to be challenged, and they will rise to the occasion and they will do the work and the task predicts performance.

And the outcomes will strengthen along with the strengthening and the challenging nature of the work that we're asking them to do. And so that's what our team is focused on, committed to, in terms of improving things.

Longer term than what goes with that is improving the quality of the teaching that's taking place in our classrooms and we've, and he is not here tonight, but we recently reached an agreement with Shawn Hartnett who is pretty well known in the District circles.

And he'll be leading the principal and the assistant principal in the development of our staff as we go forward and he'll be working in terms of improving the quality of teacher leaders, in terms of improving the quality of instructions taking place in our school.

And a lot schools use, what typically is referred to as like an observation feedback model, but we're sort of flipping that we're moving into more an observation and coaching model.

There certainly will be feedback, but we're going to be actively involved in and engaged in coaching teachers in the classrooms and making sure that we're picking up on a couple of the key things that will move the lever in terms of improving the quality and instruction and not focusing too broadly.

But focusing on one of two key things each time we're sort of coaching to which way that we can approve, you know, that

will have ancillary effects of improving instruction along the way as well.

MR. BOYD: I just wanted to say a couple things very quickly, number one, we really as a Board of Directors threw mind, body, and soul into this selection of our new school leader.

And one of the reasons we retained Russ and we're happy that he said yes to our invitation to join us was our sense that among his many other skills that he knew what first grade talent looked like, could attract it, could inspire it, could support it, and could sustain it, and I think if you look at our organizational chart today both in the Central Office and as it's emerging in our schools, you see pretty hard evidence, concrete evidence of that.

The second thing I would add is we paid a lot of attention to Congress Heights as a Board because it became clear to us that that school a year and a half ago to two years

ago had issues that in our minds said this is an at-risk situation from our prospective, whatever our regulators view is that's our view.

And we made a concentrated effort to really engage and support and improve the leadership and the culture there. My view, our view as a Board is, I don't care what you have, if you don't have a strong culture, children cannot learn.

Teachers can't teach and children can't learn. Really focused on getting a strong leader in that building who understood the community, who understood the school's challenges, understood the difficult decisions that would have to be made and we felt was prepared to make them and push them through while reinforcing the community's commitment to the school and where it operates.

I thing rather than me talking about and what we think has happened there, I think I'd just invite you to watch that school

very carefully and see what the data tells you about that.

And to visit the school and to experience the culture yourselves because we can see a material of difference in it.

CHAIR MCKOY: Comments anybody?

other question. I appreciate all of that.

The one aspect of that that you came pretty close to answering, but that I didn't want to ask about is professional development strategies, so if you could address that a little bit more directly that would be great?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. I mean we have a pretty strong investment in professional development and leaning on Mr. Hartnett who is going to be focusing on developing leadership throughout the organization.

We have a Director of Professional

Development, we have on the 5th and 6th of

August we have a new teacher induction

program, because the research is very clear about how many people you retain when you sort of induct them into them versus you just bring them and don't support them.

So we're inducting our new teachers. We're providing all of them with mentors and sort of ongoing touches throughout the course of the year. We have a 2-week PD like most schools do later this summer/fall of our returning staff.

That's an institute that's got a lot of partners and of our own teachers and our team weaving through doing a variety of differentiated sections and then our school provides regular ongoing PD.

We have a whole calendar that's already been mapped out for the school year with a lot of touch points throughout the year in terms of a handful of full days then a few afternoons each month where we're doing sort or regular professional development in response to what is the data telling us, what

are our teachers telling us in terms of, you know, making sure that we're providing PD that is sort of targeted, relevant, and useful for our staff.

So we're very much shifting from,

I mean, for better or worse Center City for a

long time had the sit and spin model, you

know, where the teachers who are sort of, you

know, their body language was they were dying

because somebody was lecturing at them for

three or four hours.

So we're moving very much towards a PLC model where the, whoever's presenting has five to 15 minutes and then teachers need to be working in teams, but it's evaluating student work, evaluating data, or just, you know, collaborating in terms of like reviewing lesson plans or fixing whatever it is that they think is not working.

There will be a lot more sort of whether they're in grade bands or in progressions, just working in teams at our PD

1 even in our summer institute.

It's just, you know, the research on PLCs is very compelling and the PLCs impact on teacher satisfaction, teacher improvement, teacher retention, is very compelling.

And so we're moving towards being much more of a teacher driven organization where the CEO is more supportive and the teachers are allowed to have a lot more time to collaborate and work together in teams in order to help drive stronger outcomes.

MR. BOYD: So that's our cultural shift at the Central Office.

CHAIR MCKOY: Okay. I feel like we're ready for a vote. I feel a vote coming on here. Can I get a, because my colleague across the table of me said one, two more brief points. Can I have a motion?

MEMBER WOODRUFF: I move to approve for it's not renewal --

MS. MEDWAY: It's a vote for charter continuance.

	Page 198
1	MEMBER WOODRUFF: Yes. I vote for
2	approval.
3	MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: Second.
4	CHAIR MCKOY: Moved and seconded.
5	Any more discussion? All right. All in
6	favor?
7	(Multiple Ayes)
8	CHAIR MCKOY: All opposed?
9	Congratulations.
10	MR. BOYD: Thanks very much.
11	MS. MEDWAY: I have one more
12	charter to present
13	CHAIR MCKOY: All right.
14	MS. MEDWAY: for Eagle Academy
15	PCS.
16	CHAIR MCKOY: Welcome.
17	MS. MEDWAY: So I apologize, this
18	is actually the first time that I've met you
19	in person. I worked with you often.
20	MALE PARTICIPANT: On the phone.
21	MS. MEDWAY: Yes, and so would you
22	please introduce yourself to the Board.

1 MS. PINKNEY: Good evening, I'm 2 Cassandra Pinkney, founder and executive 3 director of Eagle Academy. 4

DR. SMITH: Joe Smith, COO-CFO.

MS. MCKEON: Good evening,

Kathleen McKeon, director of research innovation and accountability.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. WHITE: And I'm Davene White, I'm Chairman of the Board and Trustee.

CHAIR MCKOY: Dr. Medway.

MS. MEDWAY: I'm here to present a Board proposal for charter continuance of Eagle Academy PCS. This is Eagle Academy's 10th year in operation and, as required by the SRA, PCSB staff conducted a charter review of the school's performance in meeting its goal and expectations, its legal compliance and its fiscal management to ensure economic viability.

For those last two points, staff found that the school had remanded substantial legal compliance and managed its finances

effectively to ensure economic viability.

For our assessment of the school's goals and expectations it should be noted that in the school's charter application it actual detailed a 104 really specific goals.

And in later PCSB approved accountability plans, it detailed those goals more generally. In six subject areas, literacy, numeracy, among some others.

And PCSB staff evaluated those six subject areas and found that the school had fully met four of those goals related to social and emotional development, student attendance, parent participation and school climate. And that the school had partially met two goals related to literacy and mathematics.

And I should note that this was, this was a different review in that this was the first year that Eagle Academy had a third grade class. And there were 40 students in the class and of those, 18 of them were

1 special education students.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

The assessment was partially met because the school performed lower then the DC third grade reading and proficiency, reading and math proficiency average.

However, staff finds and recommends that the school has met the standards for charter continuance and recommends that the Board vote to continue the schools charter. And also asks that Eagle Academy focus on that. We've discussed how you focused on that we look forward to tomorrow when the DC CAS results are issued.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIR MCKOY: I have nothing to say. Would any of you like to say anything other then referring to tomorrow?

MS. PINKNEY: Kathy, would you

19 | like to --

DR. SMITH: You want to, no we'll

21 start.

MS. PINKNEY: Yes.

DR. SMITH: I do want to say that Eagle Academy takes very seriously the success of the students. It's never our students who fail it's always the adults who fail the students. And we absolutely believe that.

And there can be lots of excuses thrown around for it, but you know what, it comes back to, did you do your job? I think Cassandra and I would both agree that we focused a lot better this year --

MS. PINKNEY: Yes.

DR. SMITH: -- on this then we did last year. Maybe we can give you a gazillion excuses like a new school and new construction and for our first time and all the excitement around that. So there was distractions for us.

But we very purposely focused on what we were going to do with our children and how we were going to do it. And we have done that previously, we've done well with our accountability plans in the past.

But we were distracted that one
year. And we think that this year that we've,
this past year, that we've focused very
heavily on what we need to do and how we do
it.

I think a lot of it has to do with how Ms. McKeon has focused us on the research. That's what she does and she does it very well. And kept us very abreast of who was translating the research into operational programs for us.

So for example, we started, Kathy had a study with class, three years ago or four years ago, I don't remember?

MS. MCKEON: Three.

DR. SMITH: Three. So we started with class three years ago which is a good way of telling us how well our teachers are performing in the classroom.

We added ANet, which was a tremendous help to us. What's the other one we added, Kathy?

MS. MCKEON: So we've added Lexia

IXL Math and we are using GOLD as an

assessment tool as internal documentation so

that we're monitoring children's developmental

growth.

DR. SMITH: And you already know what the tremendous feedback we got from the math program was in terms of improving our students ready for math, without saying anything more then that and also improving our students in reading from --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

DR. SMITH: So we're very committed to continuing that and we hope that we come before you in five years that whatever we didn't get to include this year will be our low marks. We hope that those end up being, we hope to get better every year and we believe we can.

We had our 2nd graders participate in the DC CAS, voluntarily. And we also had them take ANet.

And we're very confident about what we're saying in terms of where we're going to be next year. It will be even better then we are this year.

MS. PINKNEY: Well I just wanted to say that everything that we do at Eagle Academy is for the child. We call ourselves a full community service school.

DR. SMITH: That's right.

MS. PINKNEY: And that is what we definitely do is get out there, pound the pavement, we go to home visits. We do everything we can to bring those families in.

That is not an easy area in Ward 8 to get people to trust you. Not only with their children but just trust you period because a lot of things are very secretive to them.

But we do have great parent participation. We do a lot of silly things like a mothers day tea and a fathers day griller.

But people need that in order to feel that they are part of. Our doors are open, we ask them to come in.

Our ANCs actually have meetings in our building. In fact, the ones that are having the meeting now are not even our ANC.

We invite them in because we want them to know that we are transparent and that everything we do at Eagle Academy is with intention. Nothing that we do is just bluff or for just because.

Our whole intention is that those children learn, learn well and retain all of that information.

DR. SMITH: I'm sorry, one other, she wants me to talk about technology.

MS. PINKNEY: Oh, yes.

DR. SMITH: As you guys know we're a high tech school. Every kid has an iPad from the time their 3 years old. There's computers in every classroom.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Really?

1 MS. PINKNEY: Yes.

DR. SMITH: They're smart, oh, absolutely.

MS. PINKNEY: You should come.

DR. SMITH: There's SmartBoards in every classroom. Every classroom has cameras to record the lessons all day. Our teachers then can go back home, hook into the internet, put in their code number and watch whatever part of the lesson during, they don't watch the whole day, but whatever part of the lesson they want to watch that they feel they needed to improve upon or they were curious about, they can do that.

That's one of the ways we improved construction. That's all in the new school and we also put it in our other school and I think it's going to have the same effect over there.

The one thing that we did forget though is, you guys are going to be getting an invitation. We are having the grand opening

1 for our school October 29th at 10:00 a.m.

So we hope that all of you will put that on your calendars. And there will be a formal invitation in the mail to you and some other folks to come out and enjoy the celebration for our new school. We are very excited about it.

MS. PINKNEY: Yes, we are.

CHAIR MCKOY: Don't you want to say something?

MS. WHITE: Well Joe kind of stole my thunder about the October 29th. But I definitely want to say that from the standpoint of the Board, we are extremely proud of Eagle Academy, its teachers, its facility, its staff and the students and parents, and we are 100 percent supportive of all of the programs and policies of the academy.

CHAIR MCKOY: Okay, thank you.

21 Colleagues?

22 MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: I just want to

say, I would move to approve this and I had the pleasure of visiting that day that Mayor Greg came and did his walk around and was very impressed with what I saw.

And I appreciate the fact that you've embraced a lot of the technical assistance that you've been given and it looks like you're really taken it aboard. And I also appreciate the fact that you don't really use the fact that you may students with IPs as any excuse at all for anytime that you've had a struggle in terms of moving students where you wanted to go.

Because I think you've been one of the most responsible primary school educators, early school educators in terms of really embracing children with IPs and doing what you can with them. And I think that somehow we'd like to see all schools take on.

And so I really want to commend you for that. And that's it.

CHAIR MCKOY: All right, can I get

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

1 you going to use this one?

Thank you, sorry. So we are asking the Board to extend Community Academy Public Charter School charter for an additional 30 days so that we can finalize the negotiation of a new charter term.

At the June 24th meeting we had already requested an extension for those schools charters that were set to expire June 30th. So we're just asking for another extension that would go, that would last until August 20th.

We expect that we would be able to have a finalized agreement by August 14th.

And then the Board would vote on this agreement at its August 19th meeting.

CHAIR MCKOY: Okay, is there any discussion, that's pretty straightforward I think. Can I get a motion?

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Move to approve.

MEMBER TILLERY: Second.

CHAIR MCKOY: Moved and second.

T ATT IN LAVOI:	1	All	in	favor
-------------------	---	-----	----	-------

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

2 (Chorus of ayes)

CHAIR MCKOY: All opposed? All right. Now we have charter agreements to be renewed, Elsie Whitlow Stokes and Carlos

Rosario. Maybe reps --

MS. MILLER: You want them both?

CHAIR MCKOY: Yes, because I think

9 it's going to be --

MS. MILLER: All right, then. So Allison, Sonia, Linda, can you come up? And if you can sign right here.

(Off record comments)

CHAIR MCKOY: Welcome. Monique?

MS. MILLER: Yes, sir. So we have before us Stokes Public Charter School, Carlos Rosario Public Charter School. And the Board has already voted to renew its charter, we are

19 just voting on an negotiated agreement.

Our general Counsel has been working with each of the schools legal counsel to iron out details, review attachments. We

to tell you that I know that you have been very proud of our school for the last 15 years and we're getting ready to make you even more proud for the next 15. Come and visit our school and see what a real adult education school that is exemplary, looks like.

Because we're exemplary in every area. As rated by you, yourselves. And I want to say, I was so pleased to have you at our graduation. Really, very pleased.

MALE PARTICIPANT: Thank you.

MS. GUTIERREZ: I hope next year everybody comes because if you come to our graduation, their kind of emotional, aren't they?

MALE PARTICIPANT: Wonderful.

MS. GUTIERREZ: They are

wonderful.

CHAIR MCKOY: I'm not sure, maybe you shouldn't go there next time.

MS. GUTIERREZ: No, we have shared our graduations with over 300 immigrants

1	graduating and it's really special.
2	CHAIR MCKOY: Ms. Moore?
3	MS. MOORE: Good evening.
4	CHAIR MCKOY: Good evening.
5	MS. MOORE: I think that each of
6	you know that I believe our first 15 years

I can say about the experience and we look
forward to the next 15 years. Thank you.

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

MR. MOORE: As a board member, I'm the Security Board of Rosario, thank you to the Board for this recognition. Since I didn't come prepared to say anything I'll say, let's do this.

have been absolutely delightful. That is what

CHAIR MCKOY: All right, well thank you all for coming and can I get one motion? I think, okay, Member Tillery.

MEMBER TILLERY: Yes, I'll make the motion.

20 CHAIR MCKOY: What is it, what to 21 support both?

MEMBER TILLERY: Yes.

	Page 216
1	CHAIR MCKOY: All right, can I get
2	a second?
3	MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: Second.
4	CHAIR MCKOY: Moved and seconded.
5	Any more discussion? All right, all in favor?
6	(Chorus of ayes)
7	CHAIR MCKOY: All opposed?
8	Applicant's congratulations.
9	MS. MILLER: Thank you.
10	(Off record comments)
11	CHAIR MCKOY: Okay
12	MEMBER WOODRUFF: Eric speaks.
13	CHAIR MCKOY: we've got Charter
14	Amendment Decision 1 and that's Perry Street
15	Prep. Do you want to come on down? Monique,
16	you doing this too?
17	MS. MILLER: Yes, sir.
18	CHAIR MCKOY: Okay. How is
19	everybody?
20	MR. JENKINS: I'm fine, I'm great.
21	MS. FORD: Good evening, I'm
22	Chante Ford, special education director.

MS. NOLAN: Good evening, I'm

Janice Nolan, ELO director.

MR. JENKINS: Good evening, Shadwick Jenkins, head of school.

MS. MILLER: So Perry Street Prep has submitted a charter amendment to amend its goal. The school will be undergoing term renewal in the 2013, 2014 school year.

As such, its goals will be assessed based on the grandfather clause and the elected PMF as charter goals policy.

Which states, a school undergoing a ten year review board, 15 year charter renewal within the first five years, that is respective PMF implemented, will need to demonstrate annual, be consistent, improvement in performance with no score below 40 percent in the past two years and earn at least 45 percent of possible PMF points for at least two years prior to the review.

In addition, the school had included goals by which it would like to be

held accountable. All students with disability will meet these factors and grow in the areas of reading and math on the district approved state wide effectively annually.

And 80 percent of non-partitioned English language learners will make improvements within their English language proficiency level as demonstrated on the annual access exam.

CHAIR MCKOY: Would you like to make any statements?

MR. JENKINS: Yes, I just want to point out that under the issue, submission of the original or initial goals we have a new leadership team intact. The reason for the submission is because now we have an issued team that is directly focused on using data to inform our instruction.

In doing so and looking at the PMF goals, wanted to make certain that we involve all the, engage all of our community members, all stakeholders, parents as well as students.

1 With that in mind, we would want 2 to make certain in choosing PMF goals that 3 they become part of this process. Not only 4 just the board members but also the community 5 members as well. And that actually informed us in 6 7 helping to make the decision to adopt the PMF 8 goals along with our special education 9 targets, as well as our other targets. 10 CHAIR MCKOY: Colleagues? 11 MEMBER BLOOMFIELD: I move that 12 they, I mean I accept we give us their goals 13 for their charter. We accept them. 14 MEMBER WOODRUFF: Can I add a 15 comment un between --16 CHAIR MCKOY: Let's get a second 17 first. 18 MEMBER WOODRUFF: I'll second it.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: And I'll quickly

Okay.

say, I'm looking forward to having a bunch

CHAIR MCKOY:

more opportunity to have an in depth

19

20

21

22

and presented to the Board on BASIS Public

Charter School Board. The BASIS Public

21

22

1 Charter School.

So we, Avni and Amanda who are sitting here with me are, comprised our special education department here at the PCSB. And they visited BASIS and were looking at the special education program.

And in their visit to the school they identified a few actions that BASIS should take, along with actions that were in action at the time that BASIS did on their own without coming to us at all by hiring an outside consultant called End to End Solutions.

What we have recommended is that the finalized draft action plan that they submitted to us be made final by August 12th. And that they communicate to the parents of students with disabilities its plan to implement the actions during this upcoming school year.

In addition, the staff recommended that we conduct four check ins with BASIS over

the course of the year and that will be done by Avni and Amanda. And the first check in will be an on sight review and will occur on a mutually agreed upon date during the week of August 19th.

And then the remaining three checks ins will be, BASIS will submit to PCSB a written summary of its current status of its compliance with their own action plan. And the dates are listed are below and they may go throughout the year. That's pretty much --

CHAIR MCKOY: Does either one of you two or staff want to just summarize what the action plan is? For the Castle, summary.

MR. LEWIS: So in addition to, excuse me, sorry. Cameron Lewis, I'll be school director with BASIS DC this upcoming school year.

In addition to reworking the leadership team at the school, we have new additions to the leadership team including coordinator of special education services and

a full compliment of support staff. And we have incoming new head of school, myself additional, and Doctor Nicole Johnson, remaining with the staff.

We have identified areas through our audit. Identifying communication with parents, professional and development training that needs to take place in order to familiarize all staff, support or instructional, with special education, federal guidelines, everything as necessary.

So in addition to that we've also,
I mentioned it but I mean we have a full
staffing that we've really identified.
Records additionally, keeping, making sure
that our record keeping system is completely
organized, up to date, updating online
tracking systems and streamlining our goals
for special education students, IB staff of
course.

CHAIR MCKOY: Colleagues?

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Very pleased to

see some of the action steps that are outlined here in the report that we have. I just want to put it into context because you're new to, in your positions?

MR. LEWIS: I'm new to this position in D.C., yes.

MEMBER WOODRUFF: Okay. One of, I mean as excited and we continue to be excited about the performance and the potential performance of BASIS here in Washington, D.C. and what it can do for our students.

One of the concerns we have when we authorize BASIS as a Charter School here was that we be sure that your organization will take seriously the responsibility for the complete, continual and diversity of students.

And we were confident that in the areas where you have proven to be strong you would be strong. But we were concerned that the resources in the school would be adequately applied to all sorts of student with special ed and otherwise.

So, all this to say I want to make sure you appreciate the seriousness with which, we're particularly watching what goes on at BASIS with students with disabilities, with students who may come in below grade level and that whole continuum because we would be very, we miss to have that be an ongoing challenge with problem that doesn't give us any potential as that given to students who are coming in inside with performance.

So I just want to underline, reinforce and state very strongly that that's a huge area that we're watching. For this school in particular.

MR. LEWIS: Absolutely. May I make a brief comment?

CHAIR MCKOY: Sure.

MR. LEWIS: Coming from outside of the BASIS organization, I've taught one year with BASIS and I've taught a number of years in Urban Chicago with population of special needs students up to 20 percent of the case load.

Being into the organization it appears that I'm new to these action steps as well, but it appears to be the type of, as an outside opinion, as a type of approach that is going to produce adequate accommodations, modifications for our kids.

I mean this is the staff that is onboard at this date, not two months ago, but now --

CHAIR MCKOY: Sure.

MR. LEWIS: -- appears to really have what it takes to properly meet the needs of these kids. And I feel, as an outside opinion and also a member of BASIS, very confident in saying that.

CHAIR MCKOY: Any other comments?

MEMBER SOIFER: Pardon me.

CHAIR MCKOY: Yes.

MEMBER SOIFER: Just to clarify the comment made earlier, so there's a full

	Page 227
1	time special ed coordinator?
2	MR. LEWIS: Yes.
3	MEMBER SOIFER: Whose now, whose
4	added to the staff or whose
5	MR. LEWIS: We had recently
6	brought onboard Jennifer Demalik. She's an
7	experienced in the D.C. public school system,
8	she is a special education coordinator.
9	We have a fully complement of
10	special education teachers, which we have
11	hired. We also have speech pathology and
12	social working, which we've added to the team
13	to best support the students.
14	MEMBER SOIFER: And her role will
15	then be special coordinator?
16	MR. LEWIS: She is coordinator,
17	yes. That is her sole responsibility. A lot
18	of the action steps, which we have identified
19	and you've assisted us with, have already been
20	taken care of.
21	The finals have already been, Ms.

Demalik has completely streamlined the files

22

there in accordance as we speak. So we're
working to really get a lot of these done

ahead of the specified date on the schedule.

Because it's just best practice. Not to give

off the buzz word, but --

6 MEMBER SOIFER: Okay.

CHAIR MCKOY: Anything else, Don?

8 MEMBER SOIFER: No.

CHAIR MCKOY: Yes, I just like to say I share my colleagues concerns because that was a concern of mine when we approved you. So I'm glad to see, it looks like you're really facing this full on and taking seriously the responsibilities, so we're pleased that that's happening and look forward to great things from you guys.

MR. LEWIS: Thank you.

18 CHAIR MCKOY: This is not a

19 voting, it says vote.

MS. MILLER: Wrong agenda, old

21 one.

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

22 CHAIR MCKOY: Wrong agenda.

	Page 230
1	(Chorus of ayes)
2	CHAIR MCKOY: Thank you everybody
3	for coming down tonight. 10:39.
4	(Whereupon, the meeting in the
5	above-mentioned matter was adjourned at 10:40
6	a.m.)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

	199:3,13 200:20	145:19	223:15	20.19 142.15
A	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			30:18 142:15
abbreviated 116:20	201:11 202:2	acting 84:21	additions 111:20	advanced 125:20
ability 143:14	205:7 206:9	action 31:11 73:20	222:21	126:11 141:16
174:8	208:15,19 210:18	77:4 130:15 187:1	address 10:22 22:5	142:15 189:14
able 8:1,13 10:10	211:3	221:10,15 222:9	26:10 30:9 194:12	Advocacy 98:6
10:21 33:14 55:18	Academy's 199:13	222:14 224:1	229:14,17	advocates 110:14
62:19 63:19 70:1	accept 28:7 64:12	226:4 227:18	addressed 21:4	124:18
73:16 92:10	68:7 113:7 219:12	229:10	30:10 69:8	affect 62:5,7 64:5
107:19 108:1	219:13	actionable 10:14	addressing 35:9	afternoons 195:20
113:4 126:3	acceptance 167:19	22:3 30:8	134:8	age 45:9 130:7
142:18 143:14	167:21 168:1,4	actions 221:8,9,19	adds 77:21	agency 73:21
150:14 152:5	accepted 109:3	active 91:22 92:1	adequate 91:15	agenda 2:3 5:17,19
159:19 162:12	168:21 169:21	actively 191:14	226:7	5:21 6:5 42:5
166:17,21 167:18	accepting 158:2	actual 112:18	adequately 224:21	43:8 50:6,8,9,10
168:1,18 169:2,12	access 16:13	113:1 200:4	adjective 115:12	50:12 79:21
170:3,8,18 211:13	171:10 172:13	Adams 144:17	adjourn 229:18,19	146:22 177:11
aboard 209:8	174:7 218:9	146:14 147:19	adjourned 3:22	220:20 228:20,22
above-mentioned	accommodate	148:9 154:2 160:9	230:5	Agendas 80:6
230:5	136:3	163:5,9,20 164:2	adjudicated 45:21	Agenda's 96:11
abreast 203:9	accommodations	164:6,11,15,19	adjust 62:21	aggregate 109:17
absences 111:8	226:7	167:11,22 168:9	adjusted 55:15	aggressive 154:15
absent 5:14 15:3	accompany 81:12	172:15	58:15 112:16	ago 26:22 38:5
absolutely 92:14	accountability	adapted 44:3	128:17	86:12 117:15,15
97:2 115:17	19:16 27:18 44:9	add 39:8 47:16	adjustment 113:1	132:17 152:14
135:10 171:12	46:4 47:7 86:11	130:2,14 134:22	Adler 158:12	184:2 192:22
202:5 207:3 215:7	99:9,20,21 199:7	140:2 146:13	administrative 2:5	193:1 203:13,14
225:16	200:7 202:22	150:1,9 156:19	6:6 25:6	203:17 226:10
Abstained 138:5	accountable 29:21	165:20 192:19	administrators	agree 14:6 36:5
abstaining 68:14	88:6 94:9 130:13	219:14	29:11	37:20 96:11 109:5
abstention 68:16	168:15 218:1	added 70:5 155:14	admission 33:9	109:9 130:21
abstentions 68:14	accruing 66:19	185:4 203:20,22	admissions 172:9	202:9
71:2 76:16 79:16	ACCUPLACER	204:1 227:4,12	admit 6:8	agreed 38:21
140:21	151:9	adding 73:2 125:20	admitting 163:15	139:18 188:21
academic 17:14	accurate 21:11	126:2 128:17	adopt 99:7 219:7	222:4
19:11 20:19 23:1	54:12 103:18	153:11	adopted 139:21	agreeing 124:1
31:13 70:10	112:22	addition 80:13 85:3	adult 2:18 42:7	agreement 27:5
114:10 115:11	achieve 65:21	134:12 136:3,12	43:9 72:3,4,9,19	80:21 81:20 94:2
153:12,13 155:19	achieved 153:11	139:5 164:2	93:9,13 97:20	144:12 166:18,22
155:21 161:1,7	achievement 11:11	217:21 221:21	98:1,3,5 99:1,7,10	190:20 211:14,16
163:12 165:3	11:16 98:18	222:15,19 223:12	99:18 100:2,4	212:19 213:1,14
170:15 213:21	100:10 102:7	additional 12:14	105:21 106:7,16	agreements 212:4
academically	105:10 125:18	22:15 30:3 32:12	106:17 130:4,20	agrees 52:11
154:14	126:1,8,9 127:2	73:6 85:19 126:11	141:15 143:7	ahead 34:10 50:22
academics 155:10	185:12	136:4 141:20	160:14 214:5	57:11 75:8 113:20
156:4,11 179:13	Act 71:12,22 73:2	166:16 211:5	adults 98:9,9 100:8	177:11 181:12
academy 3:10,13	75:19,21 76:2	223:3	104:14 202:4	213:8 228:3
135:17 198:14	128:10,16 145:13	additionally 53:6	advance 26:18	aids 38:15
133.1/ 170.14		, 22.0		
	ı ————————————————————————————————————	I .	I .	I .

AIR 98:12	113:9 143:13	applicable 145:18	126:20 132:4	agnivations 154.16
alerting 77:18	189:2	146:2	137:21 140:12	aspirations 154:16 162:3
C	analogous 108:15	applicant 35:14	145:14 146:10	assess 80:18 81:15
Algebra 117:4 align 13:9 40:17	\mathbf{c}		191:22 197:20	84:8 98:8 100:19
70:8	analogy 58:5	applicants 24:22 40:15	209:1 211:20	
	analysis 7:4 40:20			114:15 179:14
aligned 24:16 25:8	53:6 60:11,16	Applicant's 216:8	approved 2:22	assessed 82:4 85:8
30:17 63:20	113:14 127:16	application 2:10	49:22 99:18 120:4	180:1 217:10
aligning 36:19	analyze 89:20	12:5 14:18 22:8	132:18 133:12	assessing 82:5
alignment 36:9	analyzed 99:3	22:17 23:18 24:6	138:11 181:7	189:20
99:16 181:17	analyzing 42:22	30:14,16 33:7	200:6 218:4	assessment 7:3
aligns 18:20	ANC 206:6	40:7,15 41:10	228:11	55:6 84:5,17
Alison 213:20	ancillary 192:1	47:12 68:21 69:21	approving 14:20	85:16 86:18,19
alive 49:3	ANCs 206:4	80:1,18 82:6	April 141:12	87:3 88:4,7
Allison 212:11	and/or 112:13	200:4	architectural	125:14 126:10
allocated 126:22	126:12 173:2	applications 14:21	135:21	128:10 142:1,13
allow 46:15 52:6	anecdotal 159:1	22:10 69:19	area 12:16 30:1	143:7 200:2 201:2
55:4 113:6 166:6	ANet 203:20	applied 13:21 14:3	32:17 37:21,22	204:3
allowance 128:9	204:22	14:16 15:6,17	44:5,17 87:15	assessments 62:2
allowed 197:9	Angelou 3:5	22:1 184:19	112:9 150:13	84:2,3,11,18
allows 125:10	annual 183:21	224:21	176:1 205:14	85:17 86:9,13
126:7 143:13	217:15 218:9	applies 90:12	214:8 225:14	87:3 89:22 101:1
152:1 166:18	annually 51:10	139:15	areas 12:1 13:11	asset 150:18
169:10	55:1,10 218:4	apply 43:6 69:17	24:1 35:8 42:7,20	assist 73:21
all-in-one 20:18	answer 41:13,15	136:20	43:15 131:15	assistance 209:7
alternative 43:10	78:6,8 114:20	appreciate 41:17	147:3 178:17	assistant 191:2
44:3,5,9 45:8,13	143:17 164:9	42:10,21 94:19	180:4,8 184:17,21	assisted 227:19
45:17 108:16	168:3 183:14	131:11 146:14	188:16 200:8,11	Association 6:11
128:10	answered 182:21	147:20 150:3,7	218:3 223:5	7:8 11:9
alum 72:15	answering 7:18	166:10 167:11	224:18	assume 59:5 82:16
alumni 72:7,8	49:14 172:16	194:8 209:5,9	art 26:11 136:5	118:18
Amanda 70:6	194:10	225:2 229:3	176:11	assumption 131:18
221:2 222:2	answers 44:8 77:16	appreciated 229:13	arts 175:18	assurance 139:7
amend 52:13	78:12	appreciation 29:20	Asian 134:1	assured 134:18
138:12 167:1	anybody 6:5 132:8	186:1	aside 161:16	athletic 173:3
217:6	137:17 143:4	approach 42:22	Asikoye 144:18	attach 119:5
amendment 2:25	194:6 229:13	43:6,7 88:14	asked 142:9 176:21	attached 69:14
133:8,13 137:21	anymore 67:8	152:7 182:18	asking 69:10 74:8	attachments
216:14 217:6	76:12 79:13	226:6	74:16 77:9 172:19	212:22
amendments	117:16 140:16	appropriate 72:16	188:13 190:13	attained 100:12
132:18	anytime 209:11	78:16 163:2	210:22 211:3,10	attaining 127:11
America 42:14	anyway 5:2 121:14	approval 2:3,8,21	asks 28:18 84:8	attainment 105:11
American 51:16	anyways 159:16	49:22 50:11	201:10	126:12,15
98:6	APIB 127:2,7	132:17 198:2	aspect 153:18	attempts 66:2
amount 27:21	apologize 198:17	approve 5:16,18,21	156:12 157:22	attend 100:13
30:20 31:17 36:7	appears 226:4,5,13	32:6 51:3 64:9	175:18 194:9	159:20 174:9
36:8 67:5 73:15	appended 51:20	70:17 76:7,9	aspects 100:19	attendance 100:17
73:22 74:14 98:13	applaud 18:17	79:10 94:13	157:7	102:9 110:18
	•	•	•	•

111.1 2 4 4 6 11		h 1 20.15	215.6	104.12
111:1,2,4,4,6,11	available 80:11	band 38:15	215:6	194:13
111:14 119:18	82:9 176:11,12,13	bands 196:21	benchmark 52:3	blitz 136:15
120:3,8 124:22	average 51:11,13	bar 32:14 47:20	benchmarking	blocks 148:19
128:21 200:14	53:19,21 57:3	54:13 65:7 73:3,6	94:14	Bloomfield 1:17
attended 112:19	67:1,6 111:3,6	74:9,22	benchmarks	5:1,20 34:11 35:3
attending 158:21	120:3 147:9 180:3	Barbara 1:17 5:7	154:16	35:17 45:7 64:11
attention 91:11	201:5	119:12	benefit 42:18 43:12	66:7 72:2,17
130:16 131:14	averages 53:22	bare 14:18	147:13 149:1	76:11 81:8 116:13
147:8 150:10	Avni 70:5 221:2	barely 61:7	158:4,8 166:1	118:7 121:10,17
153:3 192:20	222:2	Barton 178:9 187:8	177:7	122:2 129:3 132:6
attentive 129:10	avoid 78:15	base 23:21 189:7	benefits 155:18	135:6 137:20
attract 159:19	award 66:11	based 16:12 22:22	158:21 165:14	177:16 198:3
192:12	awarded 125:15	27:18 29:15 30:5	166:12,15	208:22 210:2
attractive 161:21	aware 93:2,7	48:14 52:10 53:12	bent 96:16	216:3 219:11
at-risk 193:2	174:10	55:12 81:1 101:20	best 12:8,15 17:12	bluff 206:10
audience 6:21 86:2	awful 90:19 91:9	102:3 103:16,17	33:19 43:20 66:4	board 1:4,12 2:13
114:20 167:17	awhile 148:1	104:3,14 116:21	72:19 84:2 109:16	4:4,17 5:9,13 7:12
audit 17:21 223:6	aye 68:8	142:20,22 152:11	113:22 159:19	8:2 11:9 12:1
August 82:9 94:1	ayes 6:3 68:9 70:22	158:11 166:21	167:5 168:2 170:9	16:5,11 18:2,5
95:3 194:22	76:14 79:14 82:19	217:10	175:21 183:18	19:3,14,19 20:1
211:12,14,16	132:11 138:4	baseline 127:18	227:13 228:4	21:17 22:4 23:19
221:16 222:5	140:19 177:20	basic 63:8 84:9	BETA 148:4	25:1 26:8 28:3,11
authorize 26:6	198:7 210:12	85:1 86:10	better 18:16 23:1	29:21 30:9 31:2
177:2 224:13	212:2 216:6 220:7	basically 6:20 77:9	43:1 52:3 67:3	35:1 40:4 41:6
authorizer 7:7 9:18	230:1	152:10	70:9,13 94:12	51:3 52:13,19
11:18 14:4,11,17	a.m 208:1 230:6	basis 3:20 66:15	100:13 127:6	71:4,4,7,11,15,18
15:19 16:1 42:17		117:7 129:15	155:13 157:20	71:20 74:3,13,14
162:20	B	169:11 220:13,14	171:6 184:2,20	75:6,11,12,12
authorizers 6:12,19	b 149:14	220:21,22 221:5,8	186:1 190:3,3,3,4	76:20 77:4 80:13
7:9 11:21,22 12:6	Baccalaureate	221:10,22 222:7	196:6 202:10	83:10 94:13,21
12:11,20 14:8	125:21	222:17 224:10,13	204:18 205:3	95:3 97:22 98:22
15:12 32:6 33:18	back 9:14 10:8 25:4	225:4,20,21	beyond 32:12 76:1	99:1 109:1 110:8
47:1	31:12 34:2 77:17	226:16	154:19 162:10	123:20 124:12
authorizer's 15:16	90:4 96:13 109:22	bearing 127:6	163:21 172:10	126:19 133:12
authorizing 9:14	123:18 132:16	began 123:14	185:2	138:10,10 144:16
9:19 10:14,18,20	133:19 134:2	beginning 76:22	big 39:22 44:15	145:14 146:10
11:2,6,14 13:1,3	144:3 148:2	94:6 110:10	56:19 106:6	153:7 157:6
13:12,19 16:12,18	166:20 172:2,7	124:14 127:1	108:13 177:11	165:11 178:7
19:2 23:11 24:21	175:9 177:1 202:8	128:15,19 185:18	bigger 184:4	179:2 180:16,21
26:22 32:5 33:1,9	207:8	189:13 210:7	Bilingual 51:17	180:22 181:7,8,18
36:17 39:13,17	background 7:21	begins 86:18	bit 7:20 8:1,4 10:2	182:21 184:3,14
auto 90:17	8:2 11:4 70:7	behaviorally 84:22	11:4 13:17 14:7	184:22 185:5,18
autonomies 30:3	160:10	belief 116:22 118:8	15:10,14,15 20:9	192:5,21 193:8
autonomy 13:6	backing 160:11	believe 29:17	23:3 25:1,19	198:22 199:9,12
19:5,8,12 23:16	bad 95:18,22	104:22 162:5	26:10 27:19 39:20	201:9 208:14
29:19,22 46:16,21	152:17	170:9,19 171:13	60:9 105:14	211:3,15 212:17
47:15,21	Balanced 62:14	202:5 204:19	117:21 157:17	215:10,11,12
	I	I	I .	ı

217.12.210.4	192.2 190.10 22	conturned 17.21	asiling 66.2	100.19 110.2
217:13 219:4 220:21,22	182:2 189:19,22	captured 17:21 100:20	ceiling 66:3 celebration 208:6	109:18 110:3 113:20 119:12
boarding 155:18	193:13 206:5 bulk 17:1	Cara 141:10	center 3:8 136:5	121:8 124:4,8
155:22 156:12,13	bullet 18:22 23:5	card 147:7		121.8 124.4,8 129:2,21 131:17
156:17 158:15	80:5	care 109:1 193:8	178:3 179:3,8,19 187:9,21 188:4	132:7,12,15 133:2
173:11		227:20	· /	, ,
boards 34:17 71:10	bumps 18:18 bunch 116:6	career 100:16	189:3,4 196:6 centered 13:7	134:22 135:3,10
body 192:6 196:9	219:21		central 12:22 184:8	137:17 138:2,5
	burden 108:3	103:14,20 106:22 114:11 126:16,18		140:1,9,13,15,20
229:14,17 Bolger 7:10 8:18,19	buttressing 156:4	,	187:11 188:16 192:15 197:13	141:2,6,9,11 142:12 143:3,20
8:22 9:8 16:3	buzz 228:5	128:1,2,3 129:5 129:12	CEO 178:8 185:15	142.12 143.3,20
24:4 34:21 35:16	DUZZ 228.3	career/college	197:8	144.2,10 140.12
39:12 47:17 49:10	<u>C</u>	101:19 102:21	certain 12:1,5	164:4,10 177:8,14
bones 14:18	c 127:6 149:15	careful 185:17	22:22 46:22 47:6	177:17,21 178:4,7
bottom 51:11 57:1	calculate 53:19	carefully 194:1	156:18 172:1	177.17,21 178.4,7
bounds 188:5	111:21	Carlos 3:16 72:12	218:20 219:2	186:14 188:17
Boyd 178:7 181:8	calculated 111:6,11	212:5,16	certainly 25:12	194:6 197:14
182:16 185:3	calculating 116:17	Carly 7:10 8:10,16	26:9 28:8 33:13	194.0 197.14
188:8 192:3	calculation 55:12	8:19 15:21 49:2	33:16 42:13 43:1	198.4,8,13,10
197:12 198:10	55:15 111:22	carries 68:18	44:7 94:18 109:7	208:9,20 209:22
brevity 229:13	calendar 195:16	CAS 56:22 63:20	176:8 177:5	210:6,10,13,16
brief 177:10 182:17	calendars 208:3	86:6,19 89:12	181:11 191:13	211:17,22 212:3,8
197:18 225:17	call 68:6 70:20 78:3	151:3 161:12,13	certificate 128:4	212:14 213:3,7
bring 25:16 43:13	78:6,7,8,15,17	201:13 204:21	certification 128:3	212.14 213.3,7
93:4 96:13 167:6	114:21 122:9	CASAS 142:3,4,4	129:9 141:20	215:20 216:1,4,7
168:20 172:5	131:10 138:2	143:6,11,12	cetera 35:10,20	215.20 210.1,4,7
186:3 195:3	205:7 220:6	case 54:3 56:5 62:4	Chair 1:13,15 4:3	218:10 219:10,16
205:13	called 29:7 128:1	72:22 73:19,19	4:12,22 5:3,6 6:2	219:19 220:4,8,11
bringing 112:4	169:3 221:12	84:15 118:16	6:4 24:3 34:8	222:12 223:21
161:10	caller 76:18 77:3	152:3 183:15	46:13 49:1,18,20	225:18 226:12,18
brings 186:18	78:3	226:1	50:7,18,21 54:6	226:20 228:7,9,18
Briya 3:1 141:3,5	callers 77:2	cases 14:5,7 176:5	61:19 62:9 63:5	228:22 229:3,7,11
Briya's 141:13	calling 77:9,14	CASs 63:20	64:7,13,15,19	229:20,22 230:2
broader 184:4	cameras 207:6	Cassandra 199:2	68:5,10,13 70:14	Chairman 144:15
broadly 35:7	Cameron 222:16	202:9	70:19 71:1 73:9	180:21 181:7
191:19	campus 113:4	Castle 222:14	74:5,11 75:4,7	199:9
broke 103:17	136:9 180:10,11	catch 109:11	76:5,9,12,15	challenge 161:18
brought 161:5	180:12 187:14,15	categories 16:6	77:22 79:1,8,12	161:19 162:12
172:5 227:6	188:4	51:22	79:15,22 80:4,9	176:3 190:6 225:8
Brown 185:4	campuses 179:20	category 16:22	81:6 82:10,15,20	challenged 190:7
Bruno 185:3	181:19 186:17,20	31:1,9 110:21	85:20 86:20 90:8	challenges 25:2
budget 171:9	187:4,10	cause 99:4	96:20 97:3,8,16	38:9 162:16
183:21	capable 25:13	caused 154:10	102:16,20 103:5	164:20 165:6
build 13:11 175:1	capacity 166:11	causes 38:8	103:12 104:5,12	169:11 175:14
building 135:15,22	capped 102:4	Cedar 2:24 50:2	104:16,21 105:5,8	193:15
136:3,14 150:15	captive 167:16	132:20 138:7,11	105:12,15 106:5	challenging 38:1
154:7 166:11	capture 52:8 103:3	140:17	107:2 108:5	182:13 190:12
	I .	I .	I .	<u>I</u>

chance 92:8	146:11 151:22	230:1	climate 200:15	171:4
chances 170:21	153:5 155:4	Christie 141:8	climb 65:18	color 150:1
change 53:11,14	164:22 178:3,15	142:8	close 194:10	Columbia 1:2
56:1 59:5 60:14	179:2,5 184:13	Christine 178:10	closer 9:2	75:13 152:1 155:4
61:4 63:10 65:11	186:16 197:22	circles 190:22	closer 9.2 closing 162:6	156:3 159:14
84:5 113:11 125:9	198:12 199:12,15	circumstances	closing 102.0 closure 14:13 41:11	174:8
132:9 141:19	200:4 201:8,10	26:11	closures 32:18	combined 103:3
152:9 141:19	211:4,4,6 212:4	cities 39:21	40:11	combining 26:2
163:8 188:10	211.4,4,6 212.4 212:16,17,18	City 3:8 38:22	clouds 24:22	come 5:10 6:14,15
	212.10,17,18	39:18 41:14 45:18	coach 170:17	8:8 9:21 10:8
changed 65:3,10 152:18	217:13 217:0,11	147:11,14 171:11	coaching 191:12,15	29:10 31:11 40:2
changes 18:3 53:17		171:18 172:4	191:21	72:20 73:10 89:10
99:4 122:6 125:3	220:14,22 221:1 224:13	177:4 178:3 179:3	code 207:9	94:12 95:5 109:22
125:5 136:16	chartered 105:22		cohort 55:15	
	133:10	187:9,21 188:4 189:3,4 196:6	113:12 128:17	133:1,19 134:2 158:19 159:7
changing 55:6		,	142:15	
110:20 111:2 120:12 123:10	charters 28:6,10 34:20 35:9 50:1	City's 179:8,19 clarified 37:15	collaborate 197:10	162:9 173:2,4,11 185:10 204:15
120:12 123:10	211:9	clarify 21:21 23:9	collaborating	206:3 207:4 208:5
Chante 216:22		63:7 83:12 106:21	196:17	
	check 108:11 221:22 222:2	121:11 226:21	collaboration 41:3	212:11 213:1,13
charge 29:20 96:8 Charles 144:17			98:4	214:4,13 215:13 216:15 225:5
	checks 222:7	clarifying 45:8		
150:9,19	Chicago 9:16 39:22	class 17:12 166:8,8	colleague 197:16	comes 19:8 39:14
charm 17:16	42:13 48:8 225:22	170:7 175:21,22	colleagues 108:6	49:3 202:8 214:13
chart 192:15	chief 213:21	176:2,10,16	109:20 129:21	comfortable 66:8
charter 1:4,12 2:10	child 77:10 148:11	200:21,22 203:13	146:17 152:4	67:1 88:5
2:12,21,23,24,25	159:5 173:21	203:17	155:8 160:18	coming 23:15 49:6
3:1,2,4,5,6,6,8,10	205:7	classes 100:14	180:16 182:20	69:2 115:19
4:4 6:12 7:9,11	childhood 2:17	106:3,10,14	208:21 219:10	135:14 140:5
11:11,16 14:18	42:6 43:8 44:4	141:16 143:12	223:21 228:10	172:2 180:14
16:4,11,12 18:4	83:4,7,8,13,16,20	149:7 150:5	collect 128:13	188:10 197:15
19:4,7,13 23:17	84:8 86:8,14	classic 149:12	collected 31:7 99:3	215:16 221:11
26:20 27:1 32:21 37:11,12 43:13	88:14 89:10,17	classroom 85:5	collection 29:3 38:22 99:14	225:10,19 229:4
<i>'</i>	91:21 92:3,21	149:2 203:19		230:3
47:5 49:22 51:12	93:1 130:3 139:16	206:21 207:6,6	college 100:13,16	commend 209:20
51:17 54:18 68:22	139:19,21	classrooms 85:4	103:14,21 104:8	commendable 20:1
69:17 72:12 77:5 79:18,20 80:2,4,7	children 87:6 89:7	190:18 191:15	105:3,18 106:2,9	comment 2:15 51:14 53:16 54:8
, , ,	158:19 159:6,20	clause 217:10	107:1 108:10,11	
80:12,21 81:13,16	162:6 172:18	clean 152:10	108:12 117:6	67:14 69:5,6,6,7
81:19 82:2,6	189:16 193:10,11	clear 10:17 27:7	126:4,5,16 127:5	71:6 76:19 80:11
83:14,21 86:8	202:19 205:16	29:19 37:9 40:4	127:10 129:13,14	83:1,2,11 90:14
98:4,5 99:10,22	206:13 209:17	48:20 58:22 65:2	151:5,6 154:18	91:4,19 92:7,11
108:8 110:13	children's 204:4	86:2 120:8 122:3	159:3 167:19,21	92:15 95:16,17
124:17 132:17,18	choices 129:17	181:22 190:6	168:1,4,5,5,16,19	97:1,6,22 98:22
132:20,21 133:8	choose 84:1,16	192:21 195:1	168:20 169:3	110:9 124:13
133:13 137:21	choosing 219:2	clearer 47:19	170:14 171:10,19	130:15 131:13,20
144:6,7,12,14,22	Chorus 210:12	clearly 15:19 25:3	colleges 168:20	132:5 150:7
145:3,4,7,17	212:2 216:6 220:7	37:18 39:15 40:17	169:16,16,21	219:15 225:17
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

226:22	asmulaining 176.4	aanditionally	aonaidarina 16.15	151:1,15 180:7
	complaining 176:4 176:15	conditionally 133:12	considering 46:15 172:10	187:18 204:14
commentary 54:22 comments 2:4		conditions 2:22		
24:16 25:7 51:15	complement 227:9		consistency 41:22	continuity 52:6 continuous 148:21
	complete 20:21	50:1 132:18	consistent 217:16	
51:22 52:10 54:6	134:3 139:6,12 224:16	133:14 134:8	consolidate 26:14	continuously 146:6 continuum 225:6
67:10 69:8,14	· -	138:11,17	37:5	
70:14 71:8 80:15 81:7 82:10,11	completed 7:5 117:3 139:8	conduct 8:8 9:13 48:8 113:13	constant 127:9	contract 81:5 138:12 145:4
95:4 97:3 109:21		127:15 179:5	constantly 157:5 constrains 165:2	
124:5 130:18	completely 35:1 121:16 188:12	221:22	construction	contracts 2:5 6:6,7 15:13
143:21 146:13,17	223:16 227:22	conducted 40:21	202:14 207:16	conversation 7:15
153:3 172:8	completes 82:22	179:6 199:15	consultant 9:12	7:17 8:14 19:11
182:19 194:6	completing 133:18	conducting 15:8	221:12	27:9 34:7 46:3
210:21 212:13	completing 133.18	conducting 13.8	consultants 25:16	91:3 123:13
216:10 226:18	completion 32.10 compliance 2:13	conference 44:14	99:12	177:10
commitment 16:17	22:22 29:4 70:11	confidence 183:1,1		conversations
188:3 193:18	71:5,21 73:13	183:3 186:3,12	consulting 12:4 98:7	21:14 45:12 72:6
committed 145:17	146:2 178:19	confident 65:2	content 148:13,17	coordinated 171:21
190:14 204:14	179:17 199:17,22	186:11 205:1	149:17 153:12,13	coordinated 171.21 coordinator 222:22
common 63:21	222:9	224:17 226:17	153:15,21	227:1,8,15,16
86:14 99:9	compliant 28:4,5	confines 21:3	contents 148:15	COO-CFO 199:4
communicate	71:10,11 72:1	conflict 19:21	contents 148.13	core 19:5 38:8
221:17	77:10,11 72.1	conflicts 34:18	41:14 45:16 67:8	63:21
communicated	complicated 66:21	congratulate	87:1 176:21 224:3	correct 164:5
25:9 30:18	compliment 223:1	147:12	continual 224:16	correctly 41:1 68:2
communication	component 153:18	congratulations	continually 30:2	correlate 85:2
223:6	component 133.18	130:10 140:21	58:11	cost 156:3
community 3:13	30:21 143:7,16	146:20 177:22	continuance 178:3	could've 105:13
40:16 54:18	comprised 221:3	198:9 210:14	178:21 179:2	counsel 212:20,21
130:17 131:14	comprised 221.3	216:8 220:9	197:22 199:12	counseling 170:14
157:18 167:5	124:17	Congress 180:12	201:8	count 88:22 121:5
168:19 169:16	computers 206:21	187:14,17,20	Continuances 3:6	121:21 128:7
172:12 193:14	concentrated 193:5	192:20	continue 17:7 18:1	counted 122:8
205:8 210:18	concern 37:10,13	consensus 92:17	21:10,18 23:11,14	counterpoint 154:4
211:3 218:21	54:9 71:13 78:13	93:16 101:11,16	26:17 27:12 28:3	Country 6:20 12:1
219:4	78:21 79:5 85:21	112:21	28:11 31:3,20	12:21 46:18
community's	108:21 228:11	consequence 77:12	33:10 43:11 52:20	157:13 158:14
193:18	concerned 53:17	77:21 78:21	113:16 130:5	counts 104:11
company 183:20	93:6 224:19	consequences	133:11 145:6	couple 4:5,13 73:12
comparable 39:16	concerns 35:8	123:2	147:14 149:20	74:22 77:13 95:4
compare 83:20	113:12 160:19	consider 91:16	183:3 185:11	121:4 147:3
86:4 167:19	186:10 224:12	94:22 164:17	186:10 201:9	152:21 161:5,14
comparing 157:14	228:10	consideration 53:8	224:8	165:14 187:6
compelling 197:3,5	concluded 38:13	96:8 123:3 131:12	continued 41:3	191:17 192:4
competencies	concrete 192:17	154:1 178:2	188:15	course 19:10 37:7
23:20	condition 134:4	considered 153:11	continues 39:4	126:4 142:16
compile 20:16	138:18,19	163:1,11	continuing 43:20	145:11 171:8
	-, -	7		2
	l .	Į	ı	ı

195:8 222:1		dow 24.7 124.20	defined 45:18	174.12 212.22
	currently 28:9	day 24:7 134:20		174:13 212:22
223:20	36:20 44:6 59:11	149:11 150:21	100:7	determine 142:2
courses 105:3	85:18 93:13 98:18	157:8,8 205:21,21	definitely 43:11	determines 142:5
106:1 107:16	106:13 109:5	207:7,11 209:2	64:21 92:10	DeVeaux 1:21
127:6 151:5	112:11 126:17	days 69:5 71:16,18	205:11 208:13	39:10 50:5 61:2
cover 34:3	127:10 133:9	71:22 73:10,21	definition 35:2	62:6,10 63:11,15
co-chairing 45:3	135:20 137:5	74:3,18 91:9 92:9	45:16 106:21	63:18 64:6 69:1
co-founder 158:13	141:17	111:7,8,12,13	degree 14:15 26:12	74:2 80:7 92:12
cracked 183:8	curricular 148:14	195:19 211:5	106:10 183:2	93:8,11 95:2,8,11
186:4	curriculum 117:6	DC 1:12,13 3:3 4:4	delegate 96:15	96:10 97:2 104:6
crazy 48:12	133:18,21 134:5	7:11 16:4,10 18:4	delete 69:12	104:13 105:20
create 98:1 127:22	134:20 139:2	56:22 63:19,20	deliberations 157:5	106:6 109:10
128:9 154:15	141:18,21 142:3	83:14 86:6,19	delightful 215:7	110:1 115:14,18
162:2 169:12	143:8 151:17	89:12 151:3	delineated 73:1	116:4 117:10
170:8	188:12,19 189:7	161:12,13 201:3	delve 151:8	120:7,18,21 121:2
created 37:17	189:12,19	201:13 204:21	Demalik 227:6,22	121:4,15,18 122:4
86:16 170:11	cut 75:10	222:17	demand 32:17	122:17 123:12,17
creating 98:14	cutoff 61:10 66:10	DCPS 112:6,8	demographic 40:19	220:16,19
credential 143:9,10	cycle 82:8	121:13	demonstrate	develop 18:1 21:10
credit 45:20 106:4		DC's 83:7	217:15	83:7 134:5 150:14
123:9 126:12	$\overline{\mathbf{D}}$ 2:1	deadline 94:4	demonstrated	153:8
127:5		deal 42:4 133:17	188:3 218:8	developed 14:19
credits 126:4	Dahlia 98:12	136:9	demountables	15:3 25:13 30:5
criteria 21:19	daily 111:3,6 120:3	dealing 39:21	135:16,18	98:3 129:6 150:20
22:22 27:7 111:20	153:19	December 94:8,15	departed 82:1	developing 21:2
112:1	darkens 15:14	decide 31:2 167:6	department 221:4	149:19 194:18
critical 114:8 117:1	Darren 1:19 5:2,3	decided 101:14	dependent 112:6	development 7:8
117:22 176:18	61:20 86:21	148:16 159:11	depending 47:3	11:19 24:1 98:14
critique 177:5	Darren's 106:19	165:12	89:1 161:1 176:16	155:20,21 159:6
cross 47:20	data 29:2,10 30:22	decision 12:5 15:18	depends 45:15	191:2 194:11,16
crucial 90:18 91:1	31:7 38:2,3,6,7,8	19:20 23:18 24:6	122:17,20	194:21 195:21
131:6	38:10,22 48:15	48:13 57:8 94:5	depth 185:4 219:22	200:13 223:7
CTS 169:4	60:11,16 64:1	94:12 216:14	describe 101:8	developmental
cultural 197:12	89:19,21 90:3	219:7	described 58:5	204:4
culture 162:3 167:6	99:2,6,14 109:11	decisions 2:8 3:2,6	113:22 128:20	developmentally
175:1 193:7,9	109:13,15 113:12	23:8 27:11 29:15	describes 99:20	118:8
194:4	121:16 127:14	30:16 41:11 50:11	describing 104:18	devote 17:7 41:6
cumulative 139:2	128:13,16 151:2	92:16 152:20	deserves 148:12	devoting 49:12
curious 86:22	152:5,8 161:12,13	193:15	designed 100:3	dialogue 91:3
135:11 187:6	161:17 185:13	deep 177:9,11	101:15	diced 105:14
207:13	186:4,9 194:1	189:7	desire 177:6 213:15	difference 37:10
current 21:4 59:15	195:22 196:16	deeper 33:15 151:8	despite 53:3,20	45:19 161:11
59:18,19,21 99:19	218:17	184:5 185:1	detail 10:1 80:17	176:9 178:20
110:17 125:10	date 222:4 223:17	deeply 165:16	157:7	194:5
126:7 128:18	226:10 228:3	defense 24:7	detailed 10:11	different 14:7 15:1
150:5 161:12	dates 222:10	deficits 161:7	145:16 200:5,7	37:1,4 46:6 48:14
164:4 222:8	Davene 199:8	define 28:3	details 99:13	69:11 74:7,9,14

04 14 14 100 22	1201.11	55.0.60.00	200 20 201 10	220 12 221 4 6
84:14,14 100:22	discussed 201:11	55:2 62:22 68:20	200:20 201:10	220:13 221:4,6
114:3 115:5,12	discussion 20:3	87:6 106:7 115:11	202:2 205:6 206:9	222:22 223:10,19
116:5,6,15 119:11	27:22 46:3 64:16	118:14 136:12	208:15	227:8,10
120:15 130:7,9	70:20 76:13 77:22	152:16 155:5,17	earlier 52:2 159:7	educational 56:1
142:13 154:11	79:13 81:6,9	156:4 162:9 177:6	159:11 160:1	103:9,10
169:9 172:14	113:14 123:6	187:4 188:21	172:8 181:4	educators 163:4
189:21 200:19	132:8 137:18	189:3,6,17 195:13	226:22	209:15,16
differentiate 40:14	140:9,16 177:18	195:20 209:17	earliest 69:15	effect 65:16 120:9
70:13	177:18 198:5	210:19 216:16	early 2:17 26:19	207:18
differentiated	211:18 216:5	218:19	42:6 43:7 44:4	effectively 113:2
195:14	220:1,5	Don 1:18 5:11	70:1 83:4,7,8,13	200:1 218:4
differently 77:19	disengaged 100:9	228:7	83:16,20 84:8	effectiveness 100:3
152:11	disgusted 64:19,21	Don's 172:8	86:8,14 87:22	effects 192:1
difficult 46:10	64:21	doors 206:2	88:13,18 89:10,17	effort 17:8 193:5
159:8 193:15	disingenuous 94:7	double 148:17	91:20 92:3,21	efforts 31:14 56:13
dig 33:15	distance 173:11	doubling 54:1	93:1 130:3 139:16	eight 53:13 59:4
digging 36:8	distinctions 170:19	Dr 199:4,10 201:20	139:19,21 148:11	60:19 165:10
diligence 41:17	distracted 203:1	202:1,12 203:16	158:20 209:16	174:22
dip 61:22 108:13	distractions 202:16	204:6,13 205:9	earn 58:7 126:3	eighth 56:22 66:15
diploma 141:14	district 1:2 9:20	206:15,18 207:2,5	143:9 217:18	112:13 115:1
142:7,17 143:15	40:11 41:4 75:13	draft 80:11 221:15	easier 25:2 48:16	116:16 117:1,4
direct 12:3	75:17 151:22	dramatic 53:17	easily 109:9	119:2 125:13
direction 49:5	155:4 156:2	56:21	East 156:13,17	148:4 162:10
123:20 129:4	159:14 174:8	draw 130:16 147:8	easy 205:14 220:14	Eighty-five 169:21
directly 12:4	190:22 218:3	dressing 182:9	echo 182:17	either 27:1 34:5
106:15 194:13	disturbed 34:16,19	drew 153:3	economic 145:21	46:13,18 64:9
218:17	dive 44:17 189:7	drive 182:14 189:9	146:4 199:18	102:22 107:16,21
director 1:16 5:8	diversity 224:16	197:11	200:1	222:12
7:7 9:15 144:19	divided 111:8,12	driven 121:16	ed 93:9,13 98:3	elected 217:11
178:9,10,11	diving 165:15	181:22 182:1	99:1,8,19 100:2	229:16
187:11 194:20	Division 11:18	186:5 197:7	105:21 106:7,17	element 44:1 73:3
199:3,6 216:22	Doctor 223:3	drivers 182:6	130:4 139:13	184:3
217:2 222:17	document 13:1	DSL 143:12	224:22 227:1	elementary 2:19
Directors 181:8	20:17 30:21 37:17	dual 125:20 126:2	editorial 175:8	51:6 53:3,13 59:4
182:21 184:4	39:16 93:3	127:14	edits 69:9	61:16 93:17 110:6
192:5	documentation	dually 127:5	education 2:18	110:10 111:2
disabilities 221:18	204:3	due 69:19 113:10	42:7 43:9 44:3,5,9	elements 12:9
225:4	documented 14:1,2	Duran 178:10	45:13,17 46:1	15:15 30:13 98:14
	23:2		70:7,11 72:3,5,20	
disability 218:2	documents 16:15	dying 196:9	, , ,	eleventh 128:11
disappointed 4:8		D.C 32:10 62:19	97:20 98:1,5	136:17 eliminate 22:18
disapprove 64:10	24:14 30:6 42:14	74:10 98:9 172:3	99:10 100:4	
disconnected 98:10	49:12 73:14	224:6,10 227:7	106:11 107:17	ELO 217:2
discovered 134:7	doing 14:9 16:11		108:17 121:11	Elsie 3:16 212:5
discuss 7:20 8:10	17:6 19:9 20:8,9	E 2:1	128:2 138:13	email 77:14
21:19 64:17 90:2	24:9,13,20 25:13		139:7 141:15	embargoed 161:13
99:12 110:6	27:13 29:11 33:11	Eagle 3:10 198:14	201:1 214:5	embraced 209:6
124:19 174:21	38:12 50:18 54:14	199:3,13,13	216:22 219:8	embracing 209:17

emerging 46:8	173:18 181:20	24:8 25:9	executive 1:16 5:7	96:22 132:17
155:17 192:16	entered 107:4	evening 4:3,9 5:5	9:15 185:5 199:2	151:3 211:3
Emily 1:17 4:22 5:2	entering 107:14	8:18 9:9 51:2	exemplary 214:6,7	extending 91:6,16
34:10 81:7 124:1	115:5 165:20	150:6 156:8	exist 21:21 37:1	extension 211:8,11
emotional 85:5	entertain 135:4	180:21 182:16	41:14	extensively 21:8
200:13 214:14	entire 80:17 96:16	199:1,5 215:3,4	existing 17:16	External 141:14
emotionally 87:6	127:8	216:21 217:1,3	135:15,22 136:14	142:6
emphasis 43:3	entry 158:11 173:6	220:17	139:10	extra 65:14
182:10	173:14 174:3	evenings 220:18	exit 107:10 112:18	extreme 4:19
employment 99:2	environment 66:6	event 173:3	116:8,10,11 118:2	extremely 126:14
107:4,21 131:4	155:5	everybody 96:2	122:8	208:14
encourage 17:22	epicenter 29:3	140:16 149:8	exited 108:4	
21:9 25:14 129:12	equally 108:19	210:11 214:13	exiting 117:2	F
endeavor 26:13	equals 149:15	216:19 230:2	exits 107:5 115:4	face 25:2 62:3
energy 21:15 41:7	equipped 141:22	everybody's 95:22	expand 32:16	169:7 175:15
enforce 73:5	equity 17:18 20:20	everyday 149:10	133:9	facilities 135:9
enforcing 73:5	Eric 158:12 165:17	evidence 52:22	expansive 12:20	178:11
engage 27:12 33:10	216:12	159:2 179:14	expect 18:12 162:5	facility 134:14
33:18 46:22 193:6	Erika 144:18	192:17,18	182:14 211:13	208:16
218:21	Erin 1:22 83:3	evident 16:18	expectation 147:18	facing 169:12
engaged 191:15	errors 38:7,8	24:12	expectations	228:13
engagement 24:12	escalation 65:6	evolution 153:7	145:16 146:5	fact 31:16,18 45:1
30:7 31:17,21	ESL 104:10	evolved 123:14	154:16 155:9	54:10 72:11 130:2
engaging 7:17 21:8	especially 8:2	evolving 44:8	163:4 178:18	147:8 161:4
131:15	11:16 60:6	exactly 53:10	179:1,9,10 199:17	187:18 206:5
English 143:13	essentially 38:19	171:13	200:3	209:5,9,10
218:6,7	149:4 157:12	exam 218:9	expected 27:3	factor 23:6
enjoy 208:5	establish 127:18,19	example 40:8 55:6	expeditious 138:8	factors 17:20 218:2
enjoyable 16:16	established 13:20	61:6 84:12 92:20	expelled 112:2	fail 22:21 202:4,4
enjoyed 34:14	14:1,10,12 15:5	102:12 149:12	experience 9:14	fails 79:5
enroll 77:10 169:22	15:11 23:21 81:21	152:4 203:12	16:16 42:8 48:2	fair 37:2 109:18
enrolled 111:9,13	82:1	examples 12:18	81:1 147:17	127:15 174:15
113:3 127:5 140:7	et 35:10,20	43:12 46:14,17	149:17 176:6	fairly 15:1 23:21
140:7	evaluate 52:20	47:14 48:18 187:7	194:4 215:8	30:12 98:8
enrolling 139:3	evaluated 21:22	exceeding 220:2	experienced 227:7	faith 56:12
enrollment 110:19	27:6 200:10	excellent 34:13	experiment 152:1	fall 94:1 135:19
121:6 125:1,20	evaluating 17:12	36:7 42:15 45:2	expert 25:15	fallen 27:1 61:6
126:2 127:14	25:21 131:4	excited 9:10 69:22	expertise 184:5,20	falling 61:12
137:1 139:1 140:5	189:20 196:15,16	107:18 140:8	expire 211:9	familiar 7:22 38:12
166:7	evaluation 2:6 7:4	154:20 160:11,17	explain 74:5 83:22	44:20 45:1
ensure 25:14 31:14	7:11 8:5,11 9:13	208:7 224:8,8	explore 109:7	familiarize 223:9
31:21 131:6	11:1 12:9 13:7,10	excitement 202:15	explored 111:1	families 156:2
139:14 146:3	13:16,18 15:8	exciting 170:5	exploring 109:6	159:19 162:3
156:3 199:18	16:1 22:4 148:6	excuse 209:11	exposed 148:12	170:13 172:18
200:1	evaluations 6:21	222:16	express 172:22	205:13
ensures 180:10	24:10,13,20 25:12	excused 111:8	expulsion 112:3	fantastic 130:6,13
enter 165:9 172:20	evaluators 22:16	excuses 202:6,14	extend 2:21 49:21	far 78:2 82:5 166:9
		- 7		
enter 105:9 1/2:20	evaluators 22:16	excuses 202:6,14	extena 2:21 49:21	141 / 0.2 02.3 10

	Ī	1	I	Ī
fashion 116:20	final 168:18 220:19	54:21 67:9,21	folks 149:9 155:5	foundational
fast 46:8	221:16	100:4,18 104:10	157:8 173:2	189:22
fathers 205:21	finalize 211:5	104:18 117:15	174:17 208:5	founder 144:16
favor 6:2 68:6,8	finalized 211:14	126:11 155:12	follow 35:15 41:13	199:2
70:21 76:13 79:13	221:15	179:10 196:14	49:14 91:20 107:7	founding 168:14
82:16,18 119:4,6	finally 102:7	204:15 217:14	107:12 158:1	four 13:11 16:5
132:10 138:3	134:12 180:9	fix 38:15	following 112:1	68:15 90:12 93:6
140:18 177:19	185:14	fixes 31:3	126:20 136:17	97:9,9,13 100:16
198:6 210:11	finals 227:21	fixing 196:18	179:7	117:15 131:18
212:1 216:5 220:6	finances 146:3	flattening 65:19	football 57:17	132:2,4 196:11
229:22	179:18 199:22	flawed 38:14	force 67:14 87:10	200:12 203:14
February 138:10	financial 17:15	flexibility 167:4	88:16,20 90:1,5	221:22
federal 223:10	19:12 20:20 174:6	flip 173:16 174:2	91:22 92:2,18,21	fourth 27:1 118:20
federally 112:3	financing 134:14	flipping 191:11	93:19 94:10 96:3	framework 17:13
feedback 31:19	find 43:12 177:2	floor 52:21 53:3,7	98:21 99:11 101:6	17:15,16 21:5
51:20 77:11 90:22	187:22 213:2	53:12 54:1,4 56:5	101:11 110:12,16	23:10 28:12 42:21
91:13 102:13	finding 144:21	56:7,14 58:6	111:1,19 112:9,15	47:7 51:5 83:9,17
169:13 191:10,13	179:8	59:12 62:5 65:13	113:15 118:4	89:1 97:21 98:2
204:7	findings 7:15 8:9	68:17 111:17	123:14 124:17,21	98:15 99:8,13
feel 66:8,22 155:12	8:14 9:11 10:12	137:19	125:8,14,19	101:3,17 102:14
162:20 186:11	finds 145:15 201:6	floors 2:9 51:4,9,13	126:19 128:14	110:6,7 112:16
197:14,15 206:2	fine 216:20	52:1,5,7,12,14,20	forces 93:15 109:8	115:6 120:4
207:12 226:15	finished 89:18	53:9,18,19 54:10	Ford 216:21,22	124:11 125:10
229:12	134:20 136:13	54:20 55:1,11,19	foreseen 26:12	126:7 139:20
feeling 113:8	firearm 112:4	59:3 60:12 62:21	forget 207:20 213:7	142:1 147:7
feels 4:13 56:11	firm 183:17 188:3	65:3 66:3 67:9	form 22:6	151:21
94:6	first 6:10 7:19	99:4,14 111:14	formal 208:4	frameworks 19:11
fell 51:22 61:10,14	31:19 32:14 41:16	127:9,19	formalized 14:3	19:12 28:17 42:6
felt 34:14 115:16	44:15 47:18 48:21	flying 154:7	formulas 128:22	129:1 130:4
193:16	49:21 50:16,19	focus 13:10 21:7,15	forth 25:8 68:7	131:19
FEMALE 4:11	67:16 71:15 78:16	24:1 28:2 30:1	86:2 174:10	free 48:4 229:12
45:2 79:18 141:4	83:4 85:15 86:6	41:7 42:20 46:1	Fortunately 136:8	freedom 19:21 20:3
142:19 163:21	89:10 95:16 107:5	69:7 87:14,14,17	forward 7:13,16	freedoms 48:1
206:22	123:9 131:10	87:21 89:2 154:10	43:14,17,20 91:2	freshman 151:6
Fernandes 144:15	133:5 134:20	157:9 180:13	95:1 129:7 131:15	Friday 80:10
156:19 175:12	147:5 152:9 161:5	201:11	147:18 150:22	front 31:17 40:18
field 10:19 12:8,19	162:8 192:11	focused 11:5,14	153:14 182:15	158:5 180:22
46:11 57:18	198:18 200:20	12:22 190:14	183:2 186:13	fruits 152:19
fifth 114:11,13	202:15 215:6	193:12 201:12	190:5 191:3	frustration 84:21
116:8 117:20	217:14 219:17	202:10,18 203:3,7	201:12 210:16	full 2:21 28:19
159:7 160:4 179:3	222:2	218:17	215:9 219:21	49:21 52:8 69:13
figure 151:11 167:4	fiscal 145:20	focuses 107:3 180:7	228:15	93:19 96:4 131:7
174:13	178:19 199:18	180:8	found 20:4 24:8,11	132:17 139:2,17
figured 171:18	fit 21:3 35:11,13	focusing 44:6	24:15 69:9 77:1	169:3 195:19
figuring 41:7	84:2	139:16 155:10	145:22 179:6,16	205:8 223:1,13
files 227:22	fits 23:10	182:4,7 191:19,20	199:21 200:11	226:22 228:13
filled 72:14	five 15:1 52:6 53:4	194:17	foundation 84:10	fullest 14:14

	l	1	l	l
fully 14:19 31:22	38:12 78:15 90:17	214:20 222:10	144:2,5 148:3,5	148:4 158:3,11
109:16 137:21	123:8 126:3	goal 11:10 57:19,21	162:6 168:8,8	159:7,12,17,21
140:7,12 179:10	171:22 181:14,15	65:21 85:11 146:8	170:20 172:4,10	160:5,11 161:17
200:12 227:9	193:12 207:21	168:18 180:2	173:5 175:22	162:9,10,16 163:1
function 65:20	214:3	199:16 217:7	183:2 186:11	163:22 164:3,5
functioning 103:10	gift 150:17	goals 10:7,9 21:22	187:16 189:9	165:9,13,13
fund 184:14	Girard 159:3	26:21 27:6 32:2	191:14 194:17	166:20,20 172:11
funding 153:19	give 7:20 11:3	34:1 81:16,20	202:19,20 205:3	172:14,17 173:19
funny 185:17	13:17 14:22 20:21	82:1 84:3 86:16	207:18,21 211:1	175:4,9 192:12
further 18:1 23:15	40:8 48:19 106:4	94:17 130:19	212:9 226:7	196:21 200:21
57:21 79:6 124:4	144:22 147:15	139:22 145:16	GOLD 204:2	201:4 225:5
future 18:16 84:10	154:1 202:13	146:5,7 153:5,8	good 4:3,9 5:4 8:13	graders 128:12
85:2 141:22	219:12 225:9	153:13,15,21	8:18 9:6,9 16:12	137:6,6 160:13,14
	228:4	154:21 155:1,9	20:12 27:21 30:20	160:19,20 161:6,6
G	given 12:19 16:22	156:9 158:5 163:3	41:21 48:5 51:1	161:8 204:20
G 2:1	21:16 26:19 27:4	163:12 178:18	56:12 69:21 82:20	grades 86:8 87:22
gain 143:15	54:5,16 56:6	179:1,9,10,11,12	94:20 129:4	88:19 93:1 136:21
gaining 177:7	77:11 84:11 89:22	179:15 200:3,5,7	134:17 146:19	139:10 151:4
gains 100:7 103:10	139:9 187:2 209:7	200:12,16 217:9	150:6 152:17	163:15,18 164:17
gamut 45:11	225:9	217:11,22 218:14	154:13 155:3	grade's 117:12
gaps 30:9 161:9	gives 20:17 39:5	218:20 219:2,8,12	156:16,22 157:4	graduate 108:10
162:7	162:1 165:14	223:18	157:16 167:9	109:2 168:22
gateway 110:19	167:3	goes 9:14 15:2	171:15 180:20	169:19 170:1,2
112:10 113:1,22	giving 16:21 65:14	17:13 22:17	181:5,9 182:16	graduated 105:2
114:22 115:3,16	115:9	114:11 190:16	188:21 199:1,5	graduates 168:16
115:20 116:7,9,21	glad 34:19 228:12	225:3	203:17 215:3,4	169:20 170:6
120:11,11,13	glance 16:9 20:18	going 6:16 7:2,19	216:21 217:1,3	graduating 108:9
122:8 124:3 125:1	go 10:6 17:3 30:11	15:21,22 16:20	220:16,18 229:4	170:7 215:1
126:1,13,14,17,22	32:21 34:10 40:20	17:9 18:21 21:20	gotten 102:13	graduation 55:13
127:3	43:16 47:8,9	22:14 23:15 24:18	106:12 155:13,13	55:16 128:17,18
gather 8:6	48:16 50:11,21	27:10 28:4 38:16	governance 41:21	131:5 168:6
gathered 158:18	56:8 57:11,21	41:2 47:20 48:11	GOVERNMENT	214:10,14
gathering 49:12	59:6 60:7,7 68:19	48:13 50:3,10,14	1:1	graduations 214:22
gavel 141:3	75:8 76:1 79:6	59:10,12 62:2,12	grade 56:22 66:15	grand 207:22
gazillion 202:13	93:21 96:12	62:17 63:3 73:4	83:15 85:8,12,14	grandfather
GED 104:8,9	108:10,11 113:20	77:9 89:6,9,11,20	86:5,18 87:17,18	217:10
105:11 108:15	119:18 121:20	90:2 91:1 94:8	89:12 112:12,13	grant 23:16 30:3
general 41:12	123:18,20 132:16	97:20 103:9 105:1	112:18 113:7	46:16 106:3,9
148:14 167:20	142:17 157:13	105:16 108:14	114:8,12,13 115:2	granted 47:21
169:12 212:20	159:10 164:16	109:21 110:22	115:15 116:8,9,16	granting 46:21
generally 15:10	168:19 172:7	114:7 117:13	116:16,22 117:1,4	grapple 35:4 46:11
43:7 163:13 200:8	175:2 176:2	118:21 119:18	117:12,13,20,22	great 9:21 10:3
generated 27:21	180:15 182:14	120:9,19 129:19	118:9,20 119:1,2	31:17 33:11 38:3
101:6	189:15 190:4	130:11 134:3,9	123:4,7,9,11	43:19 73:8 76:17
gentleman 186:22	191:3 205:12	135:6,14,22 136:2	124:2 125:13,13	87:4 95:3 114:8
George 185:3	207:8 209:13	136:7,11 138:22	126:10 133:9,10	136:9 138:6
getting 16:14 32:6	211:11 213:7	139:11 141:3,4	135:17,18 136:17	146:21 152:15
		,	,,,	
	I	I		I

152.1 157.1 12 14	arm 126.4	Hojahtala 197.17	higher 14:11,17	hurdle 32:15
153:1 157:1,12,14 181:5,10 194:13	gym 136:4	Heights's 187:17 held 1:12 80:13	73:3 149:7	hurdles 169:7
205:19 216:20	H	88:6 94:9 218:1	highest 48:10	nurules 109.7
228:16	half 32:7 122:15	Hello 5:4 50:4	147:11	I
greater 33:3	192:22	144:9,10	highlight 98:12	IB 125:21 126:12
green 170:12,20	hall 156:5	help 10:16 12:3	100:1 101:4 113:2	128:3 223:19
Greg 209:3	hand 15:21 160:7	31:6 96:9 105:18	125:3	IBCC 128:4
Griffen 185:3	handful 195:19	106:21 107:19	high-performing	idea 13:13 115:9
griller 205:22	happen 26:8 55:9	108:1,2 184:13	23:16	122:12,19 166:5
ground 11:21	63:3 89:11 150:4	197:11 203:21	hinges 41:18	identified 138:20
174:20 185:20	173:2	helped 7:10	hired 227:11	138:21 221:8
grounding 13:18	happened 176:2	helpful 49:11,17	hiring 221:11	223:5,14 227:18
group 19:2 44:11	193:21	69:9 167:9 213:17	history 158:3,8,10	identifies 170:8
44:16 156:6	happening 89:6	213:18	hit 137:13	identify 10:13 38:8
groups 27:22 35:9	91:9 95:19 228:15	helping 9:13 106:8	hold 9:2 13:5 29:21	84:14
149:1	happens 86:5 90:20	219:7	34:9 130:12	Identifying 223:6
grow 48:3 133:11	156:16	helps 169:17	168:15	II 141:16 142:15,16
218:2	happy 33:14 34:7	Herb 4:19,20 90:8	holds 24:8	illegal 77:1
grown 188:5	41:13 89:5,6	Herbert 1:18	hole 46:7	illustrate 40:9
growth 43:4 52:9	97:12 160:12	Hershey 159:3	Holler 9:8	immigrants 214:22
85:10 125:5,11	192:9	hey 120:12	home 205:12 207:8	impact 32:19 33:2
147:10,17 150:7	hard 129:11 152:5	he'll 191:1,3	homogenous	52:8 53:6,8 55:2
151:2 204:5	152:20 192:17	Hi 8:18	148:22	57:13 59:9,11,15
guess 42:10 54:16	Hartnett 190:21	hiccups 29:9	honestly 19:18	59:18,20 60:1,11
56:2 66:7 68:16	194:17	high 2:20 13:4	honesty 154:10	60:15,16 113:10
68:17 69:2 90:11	head 106:19 144:17	14:21 16:16 19:20	honoring 147:20	116:18 119:9
90:12 92:5 117:18	154:6 217:4 223:2	20:12 23:21 24:11	hood 185:17	127:16 163:11
144:7 148:3 153:6	heading 27:13	27:10 31:7 32:6	hook 207:8	197:3
154:3,22 161:15	44:18	40:13 46:16,21	hope 38:16 41:12	impacting 61:16
162:19 187:1	hear 4:10 9:9 34:16	47:19 48:21 51:7	70:2 94:22 108:1	implement 17:19
194:7	64:13 74:17 94:22	53:4,11 61:14	129:8 130:17	221:19
guests 6:11	97:15,17 118:2	66:16 85:22 86:17	147:14 150:2	implemented 14:14
guide 51:9 111:5	135:8,12 172:17	93:18 105:17	204:14,17,18	152:13 217:15
170:12	172:22 173:12,13	106:12,17 108:8	208:2 214:12	implementing
guideline 50:11	174:15 176:14	108:16,20 117:6	hopefully 16:7	134:7
guidelines 2:10,12	187:6	124:10,13,16,20	149:21 150:4	implications 91:17
2:14 68:21 69:15	heard 18:10 19:6	126:13 127:10	162:7 166:17	importance 98:17
69:16 70:3,17	19:10 20:2 21:6,7	129:9,12 136:3	hoping 44:14	important 22:7
79:21 80:1,8,12	21:13 27:21 34:6	137:22 142:17	154:12	23:4 24:21 27:4
81:15 82:22	54:8 105:16	143:15 149:7	hosting 9:10	29:16 39:18 48:22
223:11	184:18	150:2,8 151:4,11	hour 132:16 229:12	61:3,11 66:14
GUTIERREZ	hearing 4:9 51:19	151:12 162:10	hours 166:3 196:11	123:5 126:14
213:5,9,13 214:12	80:14 177:18	165:1,20 166:7	213:19	130:21 147:2
214:17,21	hearings 4:6,14	172:20 173:20	Howard 140:17	174:4
guys 17:6 29:19	heavily 203:4	174:20 175:3,21	huge 87:17 88:18	importantly 19:22
49:3 206:18	Heights 180:12	176:6 188:1	113:10 150:18	impossible 127:15
207:21 228:16	187:14,20 192:20	206:19	188:9,20 225:14	impressed 209:4
			-	

improve 10:14	indicate 166:21	Institutes 98:6	47:10	Jacqueline 178:11
11:10 13:15 54:15	indicating 77:18	institution 74:12	interviewed 6:22	Jane 137:3
56:13 169:17	indicator 66:14	instruction 84:5	29:6 30:7	Janice 217:2
180:8 184:17	99:15,17 101:7,12	134:10 186:6	interviews 18:10	January 93:20
188:15 193:6	101:16,22 111:18	191:19 192:2	18:11	94:16
207:13	125:4,19,22 126:1	218:18	inter-rater 22:19	Jenkins 216:20
improved 207:15	126:15 127:12	instructional 85:6	intra 22:19	217:3,4 218:12
improvement	128:1	148:17,18 149:10	introduce 4:17	220:10
11:15 56:12 183:4	indicators 51:6	223:10	6:15 8:17 144:8	Jennifer 227:6
183:7,12 185:10	98:16 100:2,5,17	instructions 191:6	198:22	Jersey 9:18
197:4 217:16	101:2,20 102:2,9	instrumental 148:5	introduced 148:2	job 14:20 16:12
improvements	103:22 120:9	187:17	introductory 153:3	18:9 100:13,13
130:12 218:7	125:2 126:18	insufficient 179:14	invest 38:19	107:6,8,10,11
improving 53:1	220:3	intact 218:15	investing 189:1	132:13 202:8
157:10 182:11	individual 18:7	integrating 133:20	investment 171:15	jobs 172:3
189:4 190:15,17	39:17 86:15 99:22	intelligent 24:19	171:21 174:5	Joe 185:3 199:4
191:4,5,18 192:1	individually 84:12	intended 83:17	194:15	208:11
204:8,10	induct 195:3	116:14	invests 171:18	John 1:13,15
inadequate 91:7	inducting 195:5	intent 141:13	invitation 192:10	Johnson 223:3
inappropriate	induction 194:22	intention 206:10,12	207:22 208:4	join 192:10
78:11	influenced 57:8	intentions 83:13	invite 193:22 206:7	joined 7:10
include 45:20,22	inform 28:12	87:21	involve 218:20	joining 161:6
126:18 127:4	218:18	interacting 166:1	involved 19:1	joint 171:15
128:2 204:16	information 8:6	interaction 12:20	157:6 174:17	jokes 161:16
included 28:20	15:16 61:1 88:7	interacts 37:15	189:12 191:14	Jr 178:7
217:22	93:22 121:20	interest 11:12 13:5	in-seat 111:4 120:5	JULY 1:9
includes 80:20 92:3	158:18 190:4	19:21 34:18	120:20,21	jumped 185:15
including 12:1	206:14	172:13 173:1	iPad 206:19	jumping 13:16
62:18 80:17 98:9	informed 219:6	175:17	IPs 209:10,17	jumps 65:17
181:14 222:21	infused 181:16	interested 109:13	iron 212:22	June 51:18 71:7
inclusion 131:11	inherited 36:20	120:14 151:1	irrelevant 27:2	76:20 80:10,14
incoming 223:2	175:7	166:13 176:16	28:9	133:7 211:7,9
incorporate 40:6	initial 53:15 218:14	interesting 61:15	issue 12:17 44:8	junior 151:10
41:10	initiative 38:6 77:4	interference 19:20	108:19 116:3	
incorporated	innovation 129:19	interim 185:15	129:14 218:13	K
127:21	199:7	187:13	issued 77:4 201:13	Kara 144:17
increase 47:15 51:4	input 92:14	internal 204:3	218:16	149:22
67:17 126:21	ins 221:22 222:7	international	issues 22:19 34:18	Kathleen 199:6
increased 53:5	insert 63:19	125:21 133:20	34:20 38:5 193:1	Kathy 201:18
increases 52:21,22	inside 25:12 225:10	internet 207:8	item 2:2 6:10 49:21	203:12,22
53:3,7,12	insights 104:3	interpreted 118:3	106:22 210:17	Katie 7:7 34:3 49:2
increasing 23:16	inspire 192:13	interpretive 73:3	220:20 229:8	keep 24:4 49:5 52:5
64:22 127:7 180:5	instance 14:12	intervention 22:20	items 14:2 31:11	52:7 57:1 66:5
independence	55:19 56:20 131:3	23:7 88:9	IXL 204:2	157:9 172:4
19:19	166:19	interventions		keeping 123:3,7
independent 35:1	institute 195:11	150:19	<u>J</u>	127:9 223:15,16
42:17	197:1	interview 8:7,7	Jack 185:3	Kennedy 1:22 71:3

70.4 72.7 11 74.9	106.9 109.0 12	lata 220.12	171.5	L arria 204.1
72:4 73:7,11 74:8	106:8 108:9,12	late 229:13	171:5	Lexia 204:1
74:20 75:5,14,18	115:3,22 117:19	Latin 51:16	lease 134:14	life 153:19 154:19
75:22 76:17 78:5	118:5,13 120:12	launching 114:10	leave 91:5 114:2	170:15
78:18,22 110:2	123:19 129:5,10	law 28:5 73:6	154:17	lift 181:9 188:20
kept 107:9 203:9	131:4,22 132:1	Lawlah 178:11	leaving 123:7 124:6	liked 140:17
key 16:5,17 23:19	137:22 149:16	laws 145:18 146:2	lecturing 196:10	Linda 212:11
182:6 184:1	150:9 151:5	lawyer 213:16	led 104:22	line 23:21 106:22
187:16 191:17,20	153:17 155:7,11	lay 36:10	left 149:22 166:9	lines 31:4 92:13
kid 176:1 206:19	155:13,14 156:20	LDA 71:18	189:16	94:11
kids 32:19,20 40:12	157:3 160:16	LEA 112:6 121:13	legal 178:18 179:17	list 17:9 69:13
62:2 105:17	161:13 162:14	139:17	199:17,22 212:21	92:20 93:12
115:19 117:18	163:4 165:10	lead 126:5 163:2	legitimate 73:15	listed 222:10
118:9 119:1	167:8 171:17	leader 33:9 187:18	lend 87:20	listen 160:13
122:15 123:9	173:4,13 174:7,15	192:7 193:13	lends 67:4	listening 49:3
129:20 154:13	175:16 176:15	leaders 67:15 83:7	length 26:19 185:4	160:14
182:13 189:10	177:8 181:11,21	91:11,21 102:14	lenient 72:9	lister 92:2
190:6 226:8,15	182:1,3,12 183:9	110:13,20 124:17	lens 156:10	literacy 84:9 86:10
kid's 123:5	183:11,12 185:19	184:15 189:5	lesson 190:3 196:18	200:9,16
kind 13:11 15:3	186:19 189:20	191:5	207:10,11	literally 160:20
30:11 35:18 36:2	191:22 196:2,8,9	leadership 10:18	lessons 159:22	166:2 170:11
44:14 57:14 60:8	196:17 197:2	10:19 42:16 77:14	207:7	little 7:20 8:1,4
73:18 129:16	202:7 204:6 206:8	96:14 152:9	lest 162:20	10:2,4 11:4 13:17
150:20 151:8	206:18 214:1	181:18 182:2	letters 84:15	14:7 15:10,14,15
167:16 168:12	215:6	183:6,17,18,22	letting 77:15	27:14,20 42:8
208:11 214:14	knowing 148:4	184:3,7,10 185:6	let's 67:17 68:5,19	55:7 60:9 65:5
kindergarten 85:4	160:12	185:7 188:6,7	118:18 119:10	85:22 117:21
85:7,11 123:10	knowledge 109:16	193:7 194:18	131:21 132:15	135:9 194:13
138:14 159:5	known 128:4	218:15 222:20,21	135:3 215:14	live 213:2
knew 114:6 192:11	156:13,15 190:21	leading 37:5	219:16	lives 43:2
know 4:7,8 18:9	Kupferberg 1:22	100:17 102:9	level 16:17,19	load 226:2
20:2 21:8 23:8	83:5 86:7 87:8	114:10 191:1	17:17 19:3 20:1	Local 98:5
27:17 28:2,8,13	88:15 89:13,16	leads 176:22	24:11 26:2 31:21	Locke 144:18
28:15 31:16 33:12	91:18	leaning 194:16	32:4,22 33:2 47:6	150:6
33:13,16 35:14	K-12 98:10 106:17	leaps 188:5	48:9 66:20 87:13	locked 173:20
36:2 37:9,11		learn 33:19 43:18	89:21 141:16	long 38:20 39:5
38:19 40:22 43:7		117:18 118:9	158:3 165:11	76:2 92:7 196:7
43:19 44:2 45:21	labors 152:20	151:1 152:2	172:13 218:8	longer 31:1 32:2
48:17 54:13 55:17	lacks 22:11	193:10,12 206:13	225:6	39:4 74:3 121:22
55:22 57:14 58:5	landscape 56:1	206:13	levels 15:1 25:22	190:16
59:15 61:3,15	language 166:17	learned 33:13	103:10 109:17	longest 187:20
63:8 65:19 67:17	167:3 196:9 218:6	81:21 152:16,17	172:14	longevity 116:18
73:12,12 77:8,10	218:7	158:6 161:3	lever 11:15 55:14	119:10
77:15 81:10,21	large 6:10 175:22	learners 218:6	191:18	longitudinal 43:3
90:6 91:19 92:6	largely 23:14	learning 18:12 87:2	Lewis 222:15,16	147:9
93:3 94:10 95:18	larger 176:7	100:7 149:1	224:5 225:16,19	look 7:16 9:21
96:6,18 102:13	lasting 92:8	152:12 157:10	226:13 227:2,5,16	12:15 15:13,14
103:7 105:17	lastly 21:13	160:1,6 169:14	228:17 229:5	17:3,19 34:2 37:3

42.11.14.17.20	154.7 155.5		102.5	100.10.201.15
43:11,14,17,20	154:7 155:5	managed 146:3	maximum 102:5	199:10 201:15
72:18 92:19 93:12	158:22 160:6	179:18 199:22	Maya 3:5	208:9,20 209:22
95:1 100:15	175:13 176:4,15	management 21:5	Mayor 209:2	210:6,10,13,16
106:21 109:20	177:9 181:13,14	25:19 42:21 51:5	McKay 141:8,8	211:17,22 212:3,8
115:1 116:5	181:15 188:11	83:8,16 98:2	142:14,21 143:11	212:14 213:3,7
122:18 131:15	189:3 191:8	124:11 139:20	144:1	214:19 215:2,4,15
143:14 148:3	192:20 195:12,18	145:21 147:6	McKeon 199:5,6	215:20 216:1,4,7
152:5 161:12,16	196:20 197:9	178:19 199:18	203:7,15 204:1	216:11,13,18
162:16 166:15	202:10 203:6	manual 36:21	McKoy 1:13,15 4:3	218:10 219:10,16
184:21 185:17	205:17,20 209:6	mapped 195:17	4:12,22 5:6 6:2,4	219:19 220:4,8,11
186:10 192:14	227:17 228:2	maps 190:3	24:3 34:8 46:13	222:12 223:21
201:12 210:16	lots 37:1,3 38:14	March 69:19	49:1,18,20 50:7	225:18 226:12,18
215:8 228:15	202:6	marginal 183:1	50:18,21 54:6	226:20 228:7,9,18
looked 15:7 60:5	love 147:2	market 32:10 33:2	61:19 62:9 63:5	228:22 229:3,7,11
81:11 152:8	lovely 140:7	marks 204:17	64:7,13,15,19	229:20,22 230:2
155:22 188:20	low 66:13,18,19	mass 176:18	68:5,10,13 70:14	Mead 5:15
192:12	204:17	master 143:8	70:19 71:1 73:9	mean 42:4 48:4,6
looking 7:13 13:22	lower 84:15 201:3	mastered 142:2	74:5,11 75:4,7	57:13 60:4 61:20
15:9 24:5 32:10	lowering 111:16,17	match 62:21	76:5,9,12,15	62:13 66:9 89:14
32:15 35:7 41:8	lowest 65:13	107:20 108:2	77:22 79:1,8,12	90:21 114:7 115:2
47:18 59:1 89:7	luck 229:4	matches 188:13	79:15,22 80:4,9	122:18 163:5,14
90:3 91:2 102:16	3.5	material 145:17	81:6 82:10,15,20	164:19,21 166:2
109:14 114:1	M	194:5	85:20 86:20 90:8	173:7,13 174:20
115:20 129:7	mail 208:4	materially 185:6	96:20 97:3,8,16	194:14 196:6
147:6 151:3	main 13:3,9,11	math 56:22 66:15	102:16,20 103:5	219:12 220:1
153:12 159:2	77:20	66:16 85:9,14	103:12 104:5,12	223:13 224:8
165:8 175:16	maintain 13:4	86:10 102:18	104:16,21 105:5,8	226:9
178:16 182:3	71:10	103:18 112:14,17	105:12,15 106:5	meaningful 23:10
189:6 218:19	maintaining 19:4	115:2 116:16	107:2 108:5	28:12 31:15
219:21 221:5	major 100:1	117:1 125:12	109:18 110:3	means 14:1,11
looks 13:19 28:19	153:18	126:10 147:10,11	113:20 119:12	47:20 48:21 56:7
47:4 60:4 105:10	majority 74:10	148:4 150:13	121:8 124:4,8	59:5 147:13
106:22 149:21	75:11,12 76:3	151:5,16 179:13	129:2,21 131:17	meant 161:10
150:1 209:7 214:6	159:13	180:2 201:5 204:2	132:7,12,15 133:2	measurably 185:6
228:12	making 12:6 15:18	204:8,9 218:3	134:22 135:3,10	measure 17:14
loop 169:13	19:20 23:18 24:6	mathematical	137:17 138:2,5	21:11 31:13 57:7
lose 53:1	29:15 30:15 32:18	148:13	140:1,9,13,15,20	85:12 86:9 99:10
losing 124:1	57:16,20 87:1	mathematically	141:2,6,9,11	100:3 105:10
lost 65:3	124:21 156:7	161:20	142:12 143:3,20	107:1,13 109:6
lot 34:17 35:19	161:11 171:15	mathematics	144:2,10 146:12	112:17,22 118:2,4
39:6 40:19 42:2,3	191:16 196:2	147:22 148:15,18	146:16 151:18	119:11 122:15
49:4,13 62:13	223:15	149:6,7 162:15	164:4,10 177:8,14	124:2 125:6 127:4
69:8 70:8 90:17	MALE 8:20 9:1,5	200:17	177:17,21 178:4	127:16,17 143:13
90:19 91:9 101:3	79:20 80:2 132:14	matriculate 168:21	178:13 180:15,19	measured 88:2
104:9 108:7	198:20 214:11,16	matter 29:1 68:17	186:14 188:17	100:7,11 101:1
114:17 116:5	man 68:17	157:2,12,13 230:5	194:6 197:14	112:11 125:11
118:13 150:10	manage 12:4	matters 29:9 41:15	198:4,8,13,16	measurement
110.15 150.10			1,0,1,0,10,10	
	l	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

20:10 86:15	71:17,19 72:2,8	71:15 74:3,14	mid-year 71:18	124:13
measures 90:13	72:11,14,17,21	87:10 110:13	milestone 147:1	modifying 111:13
100:19 104:19	73:8 75:6,9,15,20	111:19 112:15	Miller 1:23 69:3	modulate 166:6
110:17 120:15	76:4,7,11 78:1,14	125:8,19 126:19	70:4 80:10 81:13	moment 18:21
126:17 131:3	78:19,20 79:2,10	180:22 184:22	133:1,2,4,7 138:9	83:12 95:4 147:20
measuring 88:21	79:11 81:8 82:12	187:21 218:21	141:12 143:1,17	momentum 150:16
128:11	82:14 86:22 88:12	219:4,5	210:20,22 212:7	MONDAY 1:9
median 125:5	89:3,5,15 90:10	membership 11:8	212:10,15 216:9	money 39:7 106:3
mediation 118:15	93:5,10 94:18	12:14	216:17 217:5	106:10
Medway 1:23	95:7,9,15 97:5,7	mentioned 13:14	228:20	Monique 1:23 69:2
144:9,11,12 178:1	97:11,14 113:19	25:19 27:20 46:14	million 171:19	69:3 210:19
178:5,14 197:21	113:21 114:6,15	61:20 67:10	Milton 171.17	212:14 213:10
198:11,14,17,21	114:19 115:7,17	150:19 154:4	mind 30:11 39:14	216:15
199:10,11	116:2,10,13 118:7	168:10 174:5,6	40:2 46:18 57:1	monitor 17:14
meet 10:16 21:18	119:13,17 120:1	187:15 223:13	192:5 219:1	monitoring 204:4
22:21 26:17 27:4	120:16,19,22	mentors 195:7	mindful 130:18	Montessori 51:16
112:1 113:16	120:10,17,22	met 99:12 107:13	minds 193:1	month 82:9 195:20
133:15 154:14	121.3,7,10,17	110:14 124:16	mine 228:11	months 4:5 44:13
162:4 179:12	123:22 129:3	133:16,17 134:12	minimally 152:6	81:2 83:6 152:9
218:2 226:14	130:1,14 131:22	138:17 145:16	minimum 58:7	169:22 181:6,14
meeting 1:6,12	130:1,14 131:22	146:5,7,8 153:22	minute 91:8	184:17 185:16
4:16,16 44:12	135:11 136:6,10	178:18,22 179:10	minute 91.8 minutes 148:21	226:10
67:15 71:7 76:20	136:19 137:2,7,10	178.18,22 179.10	196:14	Moore 215:2,3,5,10
81:18 90:20 93:19	137:13,15,20	198:18 200:12,16	mission 10:16,17	Mosaica 138:13
93:20 94:1 95:3	140:4,11,14 143:5	201:2,7	11:10 13:14 18:20	mothers 205:21
95:10 99:1 101:13	140.4,11,14 143.3	method 53:21	19:5 100:18	motion 64:9 68:6
138:10 199:16	148:8 152:22	159:19	101:19 102:2	70:15 76:6,7,9
206:6 211:7,16	157:21 162:19	methodology 99:16	101:19 102:2	79:9,10 82:11,13
220:2 230:4	163:7,10,14,16,17	131:2,5,7,9	130:19 131:3	97:4,5,13 132:1
meetings 4:6,14,15	163:19 164:1,13	metric 57:6 99:15	138:12	137:18 140:10,12
90:5 206:4	167:10,13,14	103:8,15,19	missions 127:11	177:13,14 197:18
meets 90:1	168:7,11 171:7,14	112:11 113:17,22	misunderstand	210:1,3,5,7
member 4:21,22	171:17 172:7	116:10,11 122:9	105:3,5	210:1,3,3,7
5:1,4,7,8,9,12,13	176:20 177:13,16	125:1 126:13	mix 138:1	220:5 229:18,19
5:14,18,20,22	186:15 194:7	127:2,7,8,20	mobility 118:19	move 5:18,20 25:11
11:9 34:11 35:3	197:19 198:1,3	128:4,6,18	mode 144:3	38:22 57:19 64:11
35:17 36:5 39:11	208:22 210:2,4,9	metrics 21:22	model 119:15	64:22 70:16 113:8
41:16 44:22 45:3	211:20,21 213:12	110:19	154:10 191:10,12	118:19 129:4
45:7 54:7 56:2,18	215:10,17,18,22	MGP 116:19 125:6	196:7,13	132:3,15 135:7
57:4,9,10,11,12	216:3,12 219:11	middle 2:19 51:6	models 12:7	154:13 175:9
58:3,9,13,17,19	219:14,18,20	53:4,13 59:4	moderate 66:2	182:4 191:17
58:21 59:8,17,22	223:22 224:7	61:17 93:18 110:7	moderating 65:21	197:19 209:1
60:3,18,21 63:6	226:16,19,21	110:10 111:3	modification 54:3	211:20 219:11
63:13,17 64:4,11	227:3,14 228:6,8	117:2 148:7,10,19	modifications	moved 50:13 64:15
64:14,18,20 65:9	229:1,9,19,21	149:8 151:4 152:7	110:18 124:20,22	70:19 76:16 79:12
66:7 67:7,19,22	members 4:17 6:5	160:10 162:18	226:8	82:15 132:7
68:4,11 70:16,18	8:3,8 18:7 64:7	172:19 175:2	modify 110:9	140:15,21 159:21
00.7,11 /0.10,10	0.5,0 10.7 07.7	1/2.1/1/3.2	inouny 110.7	170.13,21 137.21
	l		l	l

				l
160:3 198:4	nationwide 61:21	130:4 132:20	141:13 142:11	141:20 142:10
211:22 216:4	nature 190:12	151:1 172:18	143:2	148:16
movement 6:1 42:7	nearly 54:1	184:15 192:6	noting 188:19	offered 51:17
42:17 43:14	necessarily 56:3	194:22 195:5	novelty 154:9	141:17
moves 176:1	63:9 155:2	202:14,14 207:16	November 119:21	offerings 165:3,3,4
moving 24:5 25:18	necessary 25:16	208:6 211:6	120:5	office 9:16 90:16
49:5 58:1,6 67:1,6	223:11	218:14 222:20	number 25:22	136:5 184:8
83:1 116:17	NEDP 143:13	223:2 224:3,5	36:22 51:22 52:5	187:11 192:16
125:22 137:20	need 12:14 35:8	226:4	52:7 74:10 86:12	197:13 229:17
147:18 150:22	37:8 40:3,12 58:7	newest 8:2	100:6,10,15,16,18	officer 213:21
153:14 186:13	63:10 64:9 87:13	nice 132:13 173:14	101:21 102:3	offices 1:12
191:11 196:12	116:7 129:18	Nicole 37:5 213:16	111:7,7,8,12,12	officials 229:15
197:6 209:12	130:8 171:20	223:3	112:2,5 126:21	oh 36:13 45:5 94:7
220:12	172:2 177:2	night 177:9	127:4 128:15	135:13 137:13
multiple 6:3 68:9	178:22 183:11	nine 170:5	166:12 168:16	163:20 206:17
70:22 76:14 79:14	196:14 203:4	ninth 133:10	169:5 172:1 174:4	207:2 213:16
82:19 132:11	206:1 217:15	135:16 136:20	192:4 207:9	okay 9:5,6 23:19
138:4 140:19	needed 12:13 55:11	137:6 154:5	225:21	24:2,18 36:13
163:17 177:20	88:9 100:12 184:2	165:13 172:17	numbers 103:18	39:11 49:20 50:8
186:16 198:7	184:4 207:12	175:3	136:20 166:7	50:21 58:3,9 59:7
220:18	needing 100:14	Nolan 217:1,2	176:8	60:21 63:5,17
multiplication	needs 119:8 138:22	non 5:12 77:1	numeracy 200:9	64:7 66:10 67:19
149:16	139:8 169:15	noncompliant	nut 183:8 186:4	68:4,14 70:20
mutually 222:4	223:8 226:1,14	77:16	N.W 1:13	71:2 75:7 76:4
mystery 2:14 76:18	negative 54:18 55:2	nonpartisan 11:7		78:19 79:8,16
77:3 78:3,15,17	68:16	non-partitioned	0	82:17,21 88:12
79:5	negotiated 212:19	218:5	objection 6:8	89:3 97:16 102:19
	negotiating 81:5	non-profit 183:21	obligated 162:20	104:5,16 105:8,15
<u>N</u>	negotiation 211:6	non-renewal 21:20	obligations 118:22	109:18 120:16
N 2:1	213:11	Nophlin 1:17 5:7	observation 191:10	121:3,7 122:3,22
NACSA 2:6 6:13	neighborhood	5:18 59:8,17,22	191:12	123:16 124:5,8
6:18 7:21 9:13	32:20 40:10	60:3,18,21 79:11	observations 8:8	129:2 131:17
11:3,4,19 12:22	174:10	89:5,15 95:15	observed 84:18	132:9 133:4,6
33:17 39:15 43:12	neighborhoods	119:13,17 120:1	85:4	135:3,13 137:7,15
44:13 81:10	35:9	120:16,19,22	obtained 107:6,7	138:9 141:6,8
name 7:6 8:19	Nelson 44:18	121:3,7	obviously 129:9	143:20 144:5
116:12 141:7	never 6:4 26:9	normally 39:6	150:17	151:18 177:22
144:11	117:13 202:3	notably 40:1 47:1	occasion 190:8	178:4 180:15
Naomi 1:21 39:8	new 2:10 4:18,22	147:5	occasionally 6:20	181:9 197:14
45:1 68:20 91:19	5:1,6,12 9:16,18	note 43:22 179:19	occupational	208:20 210:17
213:10	17:13 21:17 38:19	179:22 200:18	107:16	211:17 215:17
nation 62:22	39:7 52:15 62:1	noted 200:3	occur 222:3	216:11,18 219:19
national 6:11 7:8	68:21 69:16 70:17	notice 37:10,13	occurred 108:22	220:4 224:7 228:6
62:13,17 141:14	71:16 75:5 80:1	71:13 78:13,21	October 90:4	old 206:20 228:20
142:6	101:15 113:7	79:4	136:13 208:1,12	older 172:20
nationally 33:10	116:12 120:8,22	noticeable 84:5	odd 74:10	omitted 138:19
42:8 108:6	122:6 127:22	notification 2:25	offer 48:2 141:14	onboard 226:10
L				

227:6	212:3 216:7 220:8	overlap 164:8	135:2,13 136:8,11	178:3 179:3
once 97:17 107:5	option 62:15 89:1	oversee 33:4	136:22 137:3,5,8	198:15 199:13
109:11,22 132:22	159:17 173:20	oversight 11:12	137:12,14 140:3,6	PCSB 2:6 51:2,15
133:19 169:15	optional 85:9 87:3	overview 16:4,21	140:22 141:1,4	52:11,14 53:16
ones 4:18 84:2	options 83:14 87:3	25:20 33:21 97:10	142:19 163:21	54:2 69:6 71:3
91:22 206:5	101:10 107:22	owls 177:9	198:20 206:22	77:13 80:11,20
one-on-one 156:5	129:20 176:12	ownership 159:8	214:11,16	83:9 97:21 98:3
ongoing 27:9 195:7	189:9	ownersinp 137.0	participate 149:20	99:11 112:15
195:15 225:8	orally 84:11	P	204:20	124:18 127:14
online 223:17	order 18:8 98:7	pacify 31:5	participated	144:13 145:10,22
open 2:15 34:4	115:13 173:8	package 131:20	139:19	146:9 179:4
53:15 69:4 76:19	197:11 206:1	page 2:2 82:4 92:19	participation	199:15 200:6,10
83:10 91:5 97:5	223:8	101:5 102:17	200:14 205:20	220:20 221:4
97:22 98:22 109:7	organization 7:22	106:22	particular 11:1	222:7
110:8 115:6	11:5,8 16:19 18:8	paid 192:20	12:17 24:17 32:17	PCSBs 51:18 77:3
124:12 136:7	85:5 181:16 182:4	panel 162:14	40:9 43:3 44:1	126:19 144:20
175:6 206:3	183:19 194:19	PARCC 55:7 61:20	87:15 98:11 124:2	PD 195:8,15 196:2
opened 71:6,7	197:7 224:14	62:13	131:14 147:8	196:22
159:14	225:20 226:3	Pardon 226:19	186:18 188:4	Pearson 1:16 5:12
opening 91:4 92:7	organizational	parent 71:15,17,19	225:15	36:5 39:11 44:22
130:15 186:21	18:3 192:15	72:14,15 73:10,14	particularly 4:18	45:3 65:9 72:11
207:22	Organizations 98:6	73:17 74:1,4,13	25:1 27:8,13 32:9	79:2 163:14,17
operates 193:19	organized 223:17	172:13 200:14	42:19 61:22 91:21	213:10,12
operating 66:6	original 166:22	205:19	99:13 147:10,16	peer 156:6
145:6	218:14	parents 77:3 83:18	148:8,9 150:8,13	peers 149:3 160:15
operation 93:13,14	originally 67:16	83:19 94:19	153:16 213:20	Pell 106:2
145:9 179:4	71:6 82:1	118:19 160:16	225:3	penalize 105:1,19
199:14	originated 67:14	173:17,18 175:13	parties 213:3	131:8
operational 203:10	OSSE 39:1 109:12	176:4,15 208:17	partly 159:22	people 19:2 24:20
operations 70:12	142:9 143:15	218:22 221:17	partnering 187:2	29:13 86:1 90:18
178:12	OSSEs 55:12	223:7	partners 184:13,14	91:8,11 96:2,7
operators 186:16	outcome 25:3	part 11:19 19:5	195:12	119:8 140:7 169:6
opinion 226:6,16	54:15 99:2 181:22	33:8 46:2 47:11	partnership 11:22	172:2 181:15
opportunity 147:15	outcomes 13:15	47:22 87:2 88:18	173:3	183:7 188:9 189:3
149:6 150:12	56:13 181:2	88:19 92:21 93:15	parts 177:4	195:2 205:15
154:21 158:5	182:14 187:5	95:17 106:6,16	passing 142:4	206:1
162:2 165:19	190:10 197:11	115:5 129:7	patch 38:15	percent 32:11,11
219:22	outlier 180:11	130:20 146:22	path 117:5	54:5 56:6 67:5
oppose 6:5	outline 81:2,15	206:2 207:10,11	pathology 227:11	101:16 102:1,5,8
opposed 6:4 48:17	outlined 71:11	219:3	Paul 2:23 50:2	102:10,22 103:1
65:4 68:10,13	224:1	partially 133:17	132:19 133:5,8,9	103:16,20,21
71:1 76:15 79:15	outside 27:15 73:21	146:7 179:11	135:5	104:1,3 108:9,10
82:20 123:10	172:4 221:12	200:15 201:2	pause 39:5	108:11 169:20,22
132:12 138:5	225:19 226:6,15	PARTICIPANT	pavement 205:12	173:9 176:7
140:20 154:11	overall 16:10 18:14	4:11 8:20 9:1,5	pay 48:5 131:14	208:17 217:17,18
167:1 177:21	18:18 53:1,5	45:2 79:18,20	pays 68:17	218:5 226:1
198:8 210:13	128:8	80:2 132:14 133:6	PCS 145:8 146:11	percentile 51:11

57:2 63:9 65:13	198:19	placement 112:6	26:14 28:15,16	130:9
125:6	personal 159:9	121:12,21 125:21	29:2 31:18 34:4	portfolio 21:12
perception 54:11	161:1	126:11	61:5 62:11,12	142:20,21
56:11	perspective 159:6	places 37:1 69:11	64:2 70:5 88:1	portion 129:6
perception's 54:17	petition 145:6,9,10	plan 38:21 70:11	92:17 93:4 94:19	posing 77:2
perfect 36:9 152:3	145:14	70:12 73:20 86:11	96:21 109:19	position 50:13 56:3
performance 17:15	phenomenon	99:20 128:10,16	112:8 115:3,21	134:17 224:6
20:10 21:4 23:1	164:21	134:7 221:15,18	116:1 123:4 135:1	positioning 18:15
23:22 25:18 27:17	Philadelphia 9:20	222:9,14	147:2 153:1,10	positions 224:4
30:21 31:13 42:6	40:1 159:4	plans 135:21 190:4	159:13,18 166:16	positive 31:20
42:20 51:5 52:3	philosophical	196:18 200:7	173:15 218:13	173:16
55:20 57:2 65:1,7	168:13	202:22	pointedly 11:13	possibility 91:6
80:19 83:8,16	phone 42:11	platform 38:14,20	points 27:19 53:1	165:8
98:2,16 112:18	198:20	184:11	58:8 61:13 66:11	possible 52:12 96:3
113:1 115:2	picking 78:2 189:8	playing 57:17 64:2	66:18,19 125:10	158:20 217:18
124:11 128:11	191:16	84:20	125:15,17 126:3,8	possibly 88:6
139:20 144:21	picture 20:21 28:19	PLC 196:13	126:9,11,21 127:8	post 57:19,22
145:11 147:6	piece 22:18 63:16	PLCs 197:3,3	128:15 130:16	107:14
163:12 176:22	pieces 12:10 134:19	please 5:11 198:22	166:16 173:6	post-secondary
180:13 182:13	Piehl 7:6,7 9:4,6	pleased 181:1,2	174:3 195:18	107:17,21 109:3
185:13 187:5	10:3 43:22 45:5	214:9,10 223:22	197:18 199:20	potential 55:2 65:6
190:9 199:16	45:11 46:20 49:8	228:15	217:19	122:6 123:1 169:6
217:16 224:9,10	49:19	pleasure 209:2	point's 160:4	224:9 225:9
225:11	pilot 89:17 99:2	plus 111:7 149:14	policies 14:12	potentially 54:11
performances	113:17 119:14	169:20,22	15:12 17:10 22:20	56:7,19 62:19
20:19	123:19 127:19	PMF 2:9,17,18,19	23:15 25:21 26:15	65:16 107:19
performed 179:20	128:5	2:20 21:2 23:6	36:19,21,22 37:6	113:11 172:10
201:3	piloted 98:19	27:10,20 28:3	42:14 46:15	pound 205:11
performers 46:16	piloting 62:18	31:12 37:15 43:8	162:22 208:18	PowerPoint's
46:21	116:4 120:15	44:3 52:14,17	policy 14:14 46:15	96:12
performing 83:18	Pinkney 199:1,2	53:5,18 54:4 56:5	50:11 51:21 52:13	practically 92:22
203:19	201:18,22 202:11	83:13,17 84:8	54:3 66:1,2 69:4	practice 10:15 11:2
period 2:15 51:15	205:5,10 206:17	85:12 86:14 89:11	69:15 71:5,5,9	14:13,19 23:11
80:13 83:1 131:4	207:1,4 208:8	89:17 90:4,7,12	76:18,18,21 77:20	72:19 151:16
205:16	210:15	98:4,17 99:8,19	79:4 82:22 83:9	228:4
Perry 3:18 216:14	pinning 59:9	100:2 101:7,17	122:7 158:2 164:4	practices 9:22 11:6
217:5	place 17:11 18:4	110:10 113:12	172:9 217:11	12:8,16 13:20
persist 168:22	22:21 23:14 25:21	119:18 124:14,17	Policy/Guideline	33:19 43:21
persistence 108:8	26:3 33:20 36:22	124:20 128:20	2:8	pre 85:3
108:15,20 168:5	57:7 81:3 109:12	130:4,20 131:18	pond 164:21 166:5	predated 153:6
persistency 109:13	118:15 123:15	139:21 148:2	popular 29:8	predicable 26:3,15
126:6	135:16 181:13	179:21 180:11,13	populating 172:3	predictability 67:4
persistent 108:19	187:19 188:19	185:11 217:11,14	population 46:5	predictable 26:7
186:5	190:18 191:6	217:19 218:19	88:11 139:15	30:19 166:8
persistently 185:22	223:8	219:2,7 220:3	156:18 167:15,20	predictor 183:19
person 96:8 149:13	placed 109:2 112:5	PMFs 51:7	225:22	predicts 182:12
151:20 168:3	112:8	point 16:7 22:14	populations 130:7	190:9
	•	-	-	<u>-</u>

prep 127:10 129:14	187:10,14,19	219:3	proposal 51:4	53:16 68:21 69:5
216:15 217:5	191:1,2	processes 17:10	53:15 67:8 68:7	69:6,7 71:6 76:19
prepare 80:18	principals 181:19	22:9 29:3,17	83:19 98:1 101:5	80:4,11,14 83:1,2
prepared 193:17	188:2	produce 226:7	101:15 110:9	83:10 90:13 91:4
215:13 220:20	principal's 95:21	professional	124:13 178:2	92:6,10,15 97:1,6
preparing 21:16	principal \$ 93.21 principles 13:1,2,3	194:11,16,20	199:12	97:22 98:22 110:9
81:4 113:3 114:2	13:12 16:13,18	194.11,10,20		113:18 124:13
130:11,18	39:14 41:9,18	proficiency 56:22	proposals 101:14	130:15 131:13,19
present 1:15,21 7:2	prior 40:21 83:19	85:13 112:12	propose 101:9 111:16,20	130:13 131:13,19
111:7,12 178:2	94:5,13 99:7	113:9 180:3,5,9	proposed 53:7 54:1	132.4,19,21
198:12 199:11	217:19	201:4,5 218:8	59:2 67:16,18,20	211:4 212:16,17
	priorities 36:10,11	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, ,	· ·
presentation 6:16 10:10 24:5 33:22	40:22 41:5	profit 11:7 program 45:17	76:8,22 112:10 122:6 125:5	220:14,21,22 227:7 229:15,17
36:17	prioritize 40:15	84:2 87:14,19	122.0 123.3	public's 13:5
	-	'		_
presented 81:10 99:6 101:10	prism 153:13	89:2 100:20,22 103:9 104:8,10,15	proposes 54:2 proposing 90:6	publish 119:21 120:2 128:6
142:10 220:21	private 112:6 121:11,21 143:11	, ,	1	pull 131:22 132:9
presenting 196:13	privately 84:12	107:6,10 108:4 115:11 134:6,10	prospective 193:2 protect 13:4	pull 131:22 132:9 pulled 149:9
preserve 29:22	Proactiv 29:8	,	-	-
President 178:8		141:14,16 152:18 155:18 156:1	protocols 15:12 proud 43:4 208:15	purpose 80:16
	38:10,13 proactive 33:12		-	purposely 155:17 202:18
presiding 1:14		169:3,4,18 170:14	214:2,4	
pressing 91:10	proactively 19:4	170:16 195:1	proven 126:5 224:18	purposes 88:8
pressure 113:8	21:19 26:17 27:5	204:8 221:6	· -	pursued 146:6
presume 148:6	155:16	programmatically	proves 91:6,14	push 25:11 58:11 64:22 186:6
pretty 39:22 48:12	probably 24:18	153:19	provide 8:1 10:11	
61:12 66:17,19	26:13 28:15	programming 46:1	12:13,17 15:4,5	193:17
97:9 154:15	157:20 168:2	programs 44:10	62:20 91:13	pushed 149:8,9
156:21 166:8 177:10 185:21	172:21 173:9 177:2	98:5,8 99:17 100:4 129:13	105:22 106:14 109:12 141:22	pushes 75:1
186:11 190:21		170:16 176:11	168:13 169:6	put 30:22 36:21 38:14 39:6 57:6
	problem 80:9 124:3 225:8			
192:17 194:9,15 211:18 222:11		189:21,22 203:11 208:18	provided 98:13 127:14 149:10	68:7 70:10,11 110:4 114:4
previous 52:16	problematic 56:15 157:7		providers 129:12	131:19 166:17
56:9 112:20 160:3		progress 57:17,20 85:13 98:18 99:21	171:10	
175:22	procedure 90:15 procedures 36:21		provides 195:15	181:13 207:9,17 208:3 224:3
previously 2:22	process 8:5 12:12	100:6 101:18 102:21 103:8,19	-	putting 28:17
49:22 132:17	14:18 22:10 27:14	102.21 103.8,19	providing 62:16 77:1 156:7 176:17	56:12 90:13
202:21	30:14 33:7 36:14	125:11,16 150:11	190:2 195:6 196:2	118:14 131:12
		153:4	PSAT 128:11,16	
pre-k 87:17 pre-kindergarten	37:14,16 38:11 39:3 40:7,18 47:2	progressions	151:4	Pythagorean's 149:14
84:7	47:4,10,11 48:3,7	196:22	public 1:4,6,12,12	P-R-O-C-E-E-D
pre-k3 138:14	65:12 66:5 80:17	project 184:15	2:4,10,15,23,24	4:1
primarily 173:8	80:19 81:4,14,17	projects 12:5	3:1,4,5,8,10 4:4,6	p.m 1:13 4:2
182:1	81:22 96:19 101:8	projects 12.3 properly 139:9	4:6,8,14,14,15	p.m 1.13 4.2
primary 209:15	130:22 134:3	146:3 179:18	7:11 9:16 11:12	Q
principal 96:3	130:22 134:3	226:14	16:4,11 18:4 37:3	qualified 24:9,20
144:18 166:9	166:14 170:22	proportion 122:13	51:14,17,18,18	91:12
144.10 100.7	100.14 1/0.22	proportion 122.13	31.14,17,10,10	/ · · · · · ·

	210-20	h: 42.17	142.14 147.2	1.45.1.146.15
qualitative 139:6,7	219:20	reaching 43:17	143:14 147:3	145:1 146:15
quality 10:18 11:6	quite 17:6 19:18	react 55:22	151:11 154:12	180:6 220:13
11:14,15 13:2	24:9 26:20 31:22	reacting 75:10	155:10,17 156:11	recommendations
14:21 20:13 30:14	46:6 61:15 153:3	reactive 55:5	156:16 157:9,10	7:16 8:9 10:12
31:8 32:7,13,14	154:20 157:15,17	read 49:2 61:21	161:10,17 162:9	12:18 20:7,15
38:6 40:13 47:19	160:10,17 162:9	117:13,14,19	164:13 165:15	22:2 31:10 34:15
48:21 65:1 98:8	178:15 179:20	118:9,12,22 119:1	166:10 167:4	35:19 36:3,6
113:12 129:9,12	R	readiness 100:16	174:4,12 180:8,12	37:21 41:20 42:1
138:1 139:13	rabbit 46:7	101:19 102:21	181:17 182:8	recommended
182:11 190:17	radical 65:17	103:14,21 104:8	183:2,5 184:1,6	54:22 110:20
191:4,6,18	raise 55:1 56:16,19	107:1 128:1	184:12,15 185:4	125:16,19 126:19
quantitatively	56:21 162:21	129:13	189:9 192:5 193:6	138:18 221:14,21
161:20	187:4	reading 34:5,14	193:12 200:5	recommending
quarter 122:16	raising 53:8 54:19	75:9 85:9,14	206:22 209:8,9,16	83:10 110:17
question 12:17	54:20 59:2,11,22	112:13,17 114:9	209:20 210:17	recommends 51:3
30:22 35:3,6,12	180:13	116:22 117:22	213:17 214:10	97:21 98:21
38:18 39:13 45:8	Raj 154:4 165:17	123:5 125:11	215:1 223:14	146:10 201:7,9
54:7,16 59:9,14	168:2	126:9 147:10	226:13 228:2,13	reconsidering
67:7 68:6 69:11	Rajiv 144:16	148:20 162:17	realm 11:17	119:4
70:20 78:1 90:9	Ralph 178:7 185:2	179:13 180:9	reason 75:16 112:3	record 6:9 15:20
104:17 108:18	ran 60:12,15	201:4,4 204:11	162:13 170:19	109:19 141:7
113:19 138:3		218:3	172:15 175:7	161:16 207:7
143:18 146:19	random 78:10	ready 21:4 23:20	218:15	210:21 212:13
150:3 153:2 162:8	range 15:9 45:10	27:13,17 30:10	reasons 87:9 174:4	216:10 223:16
162:21 168:3	61:3,11,12	36:2 45:17 56:3	192:8	records 15:18
169:19 172:16	ranges 130:8	63:20 64:8 117:6	recalculated 51:13	139:3 223:15
174:19 176:21	rant 210:8	126:16,18 129:5	receive 25:15 58:8	recovery 45:21
182:21 184:1	Rashida 1:22,24	136:17 197:15	78:12 80:14	red 170:12
194:8 220:6	71:2 109:21	204:9 213:2 214:3	131:16 142:6,6	reduce 38:7
questions 6:17 7:18	Rashida's 50:18	real 8:17 28:2 46:8	received 16:6 29:5	reducing 128:14
10:22 11:2 21:21	rate 55:13,15,16	49:21 214:5	51:15 52:11 69:6	reduction 55:19
34:4,9 41:13 42:3	110:18,19 111:1,2	realistic 73:22 75:1	133:22 134:1	58:16
42:4 48:6 49:14	111:11,19,21	realize 96:15	141:13	redundancies
49:15 70:8,10,11	120:3,6,8 121:6	really 9:10,22	recognition 19:13	69:10
76:6 79:1 90:11	128:18,18,21,21 151:7	11:13 13:7 15:9	130:7 215:12	referred 42:13
90:18 102:15		17:6 18:15 20:21	recognize 37:2	191:9
121:8 134:13	rated 16:5,22 48:9	28:11 31:12,22	118:15 173:19	referring 201:17
140:10 143:3,21	214:8	32:4 34:14,15	174:3	refine 151:16
164:14 172:8	rates 112:12	41:20 42:17 43:4	recognized 112:3	reflect 55:19 98:17
183:14 186:14	122:19 125:1	46:1 57:8,12 66:9	126:4 143:9	reflected 33:6
quick 8:17 16:9	126:6 167:19,21	66:10,12,14 69:21	148:11	Reform 71:12,22
55:18 65:6 90:11	168:2	69:22 70:7 72:22	recommend 33:5	73:2 75:18,21
210:17	rating 15:5 48:10	73:22 74:4 87:20	40:4 110:8 112:16	76:2 145:13,19
quicker 162:13	ratings 14:8,22	90:14 91:2 95:17	124:12 171:8	regard 72:20
quickly 22:5 30:12	15:4	95:22 96:20	recommendation	regarded 29:5
66:3 130:2 145:2	rationale 54:19	115:16 116:19,21	41:6 64:10,12	regarding 10:22
175:13 192:4	reached 190:20	129:4,7,19 141:18	82:17 111:10	regular 105:17

108:20 195:15,21	212:18	requests 52:12	responsibility 35:7	222:19
regulation 136:4	renewal 2:12 3:2	require 52:14 71:9	186:19 224:15	re-enrollment
regulators 193:3	14:13 21:20 23:7	139:11 143:2	227:17	111:19,21 120:9
reinforce 225:13	26:18 27:8,14	required 73:5	responsible 11:11	121:22 122:18
reinforcing 193:18	33:7 37:16 41:10	85:19 139:6,20	209:15	128:21
related 68:2 112:10	47:2,4 48:7,13	179:4 199:14	result 7:3 24:17	richness 176:5
128:3 131:1	79:19,20 80:3,8	requirement 72:3	52:22	right 4:19 9:8
179:12 200:12,16	80:12,17,18,21	123:8	resulting 53:22	18:13 23:22 31:6
relationship 26:5	81:3,14,15,19	requirements	results 8:11 51:12	35:21 49:5 51:1,2
43:19	144:6,22 145:1,3	71:21 74:9	89:21 90:5 99:4	56:2 57:4,9 59:7
relatively 66:5	145:7,15 146:11	requires 91:10	113:18 128:6	64:4,5,6 66:11,20
175:20	147:21 166:14	145:13,20	201:13	67:5,22,22 68:5
release 52:1,11,14	178:16,20 197:20	research 40:20	retain 195:2 206:13	72:5 73:7 75:4,7,8
52:16 69:16 70:1	217:8,13	85:2 88:13 98:7	retained 107:12	76:5 83:3 86:20
70:2	renewals 21:16	98:13 117:11,14	192:8	92:14 93:8 95:7,7
released 83:2 120:5	37:14 42:5 80:6	117:17 158:12	retention 100:18	95:20 97:9,19
releasing 69:18	renewed 48:17	159:1 160:12	102:10 197:5	103:2,5,12 104:12
relevant 157:4	72:12 182:10	165:17 181:21	return 149:2	105:12,20 106:5
196:3	212:5	190:5 195:1 197:2	171:21	107:2 109:15
reliability 22:19	renovation 135:21	199:6 203:7,10	returning 138:21	110:5 114:14
reliable 100:8	136:1,14	researched 88:17	195:10	121:17 122:2,2
109:16	renovations 134:15	88:17	reveal 22:3	124:9 132:12
relieve 108:2	reorganized 50:10	resident 75:16	review 10:11 16:14	136:8,10 138:20
rely 39:1	replace 71:19	residential 153:17	25:15 81:19 139:8	142:20 146:16
relying 62:13	73:16 74:1,15	167:16	139:9,13 145:20	148:9 150:4
121:13	99:19	residents 75:13	154:22 179:5,6	155:13 161:8
remain 71:10	replacement 73:10	resign 73:15	199:15 200:19	163:9,16,19 164:1
remained 146:1	74:4	resigns 71:17	212:22 217:13,20	164:11,11,15
179:17	replacing 142:12	resource 136:5	222:3	165:15 168:9
remaining 134:19	replies 90:17	189:8	reviewed 13:19	171:16 173:22,22
179:15 222:6	report 2:6 16:6	resources 17:8	30:6 48:15 110:16	174:22 175:8
223:4	17:1 34:5,13 36:6	21:15 184:19	145:10	181:15,15 188:9,9
remanded 199:21	41:18 49:2 50:3	189:2 224:20	reviewer 25:7	198:5,13 205:9
remedial 100:14	147:7 220:20	respect 29:20	reviewing 6:19	209:22 212:4,10
105:2,16,18 106:1	224:2	183:14	14:20 22:8,10,16	212:12 213:11
106:3	reporting 17:22	respected 19:14	24:14 73:13	215:15 216:1,5
remember 105:21	reports 17:18	respective 217:14	196:17	220:12,12 229:9
148:1 154:22	20:20	respond 65:8	reviews 3:6 178:15	rigor 155:19
203:14	representative	responded 77:17	189:8	rigorous 14:20
remembering 68:1	51:16 74:12	responding 118:1	revised 22:15 80:12	131:9
reminder 33:22	representatives	response 19:8	134:11	rise 54:4,11 56:5,14
remove 121:19	144:14 178:6	195:22	revising 82:7	66:4 187:18 190:8
122:15	reps 212:6	responses 51:21	revision 80:16	rises 51:13
removed 71:17	request 133:8,13	69:14 77:2 78:16	revisit 10:9	rising 54:13
112:7	138:11 142:11	responsibilities	revocation 23:7	river 156:14,17
Removing 111:22	requested 71:4	32:12 177:1	rewarding 129:16	road 18:18 140:17
renew 177:13,15	125:9 211:8	228:14	reworking 188:12	robust 7:14 8:13

22:9 25:20	satisfaction 197:4	106:12,17,18	209:15,16 211:4	154:13 158:15
role 6:19 55:8	saw 36:17 57:6	107:12 108:16	212:16,17 214:2,5	159:2,13,16 169:9
105:22 130:21	209:4	109:8 110:7,10,11	212:10,17 214:2,3	170:9,10,12,21
227:14	saying 35:15 63:7	110:13,20 112:4	217:12,21 220:14	174:9 177:3
roles 187:9	74:17 77:17 88:20	112:20 114:2,11	220:22 221:1,7,20	179:21 182:1,7
rolling 53:21	114:20 115:20,21	115:21 116:18	222:17,18,20	185:7,8,21 186:7
185:20 187:3	114.20 113.20,21	117:2,6 118:22	223:2 224:13,20	186:8,13 188:1
room 135:17 136:5	205:2 226:17	119:20 120:10,13	225:15 227:7	191:8 192:16
148:1	says 56:5 58:22	120:17 122:10,14	schoolers 150:8	195:9 201:10
Rosario 72:12	75:11 76:2 117:8	120:17 122:10,14	schools 2:10 9:16	209:19 211:9
212:6,17 215:11	228:19 229:2	123:8 124:10,14	9:17 16:12 17:12	212:21
rose 53:22	scale 15:4 39:22	124:14,16,19,20	19:13 20:17 21:2	school's 20:19
roster 112:8 184:21	62:20 103:16	127:21 132:20,21	21:7,11,18 22:21	55:20 80:19 85:13
rounded 22:10	189:13	133:19 134:17,21	23:17 25:10,15,21	87:21 102:5,8,11
RTI 88:8	scales 62:16	135:14 136:4,18	26:6,16,18 27:4	103:20 111:21
Rubin 1:21 39:10	scary 161:4	138:1,14,16 139:4	27:12 28:7,14	112:7,22 128:7
50:5 61:2 62:6,10	scene 184:7	139:12 141:17	29:5,21 30:3,18	144:21 145:11,14
63:11,15,18 64:6	schedule 129:18	142:17 143:15	31:20 32:7,17	145:20 193:14
69:1 74:2 80:7	228:3	144:15,17,17	33:4 37:2,15 38:9	199:16 200:2,4
92:12 93:8,11	scholarships	145:3,13,15,19	43:13 47:5 48:9	science 174:15
95:2,8,11 96:10	171:20	146:1 148:7,10,19	48:19 52:3,8,22	179:13 180:2
97:2 104:6,13	school 1:4,12 2:19	149:7,8 150:2,5	53:4,4,9,10,13	score 58:7 61:8
105:20 106:6	2:20,23,24 3:1,3,4	151:4,11,13 152:7	54:9 57:13 58:7	66:17 89:9,13
109:10 110:1	3:5,8,11 4:4 6:12	153:18 154:6,6	58:11 59:3,4,10	102:1,6,8,11
115:14,18 116:4	7:9,12 9:20 11:11	156:13,16,17,22	60:6,13,19 61:5	103:20 105:1
117:10 120:7,18	11:17 16:5,11	157:1,4,12,14,16	61:14,17 66:6	128:8 217:17
120:21 121:2,4,15	18:5 19:4,7 25:17	158:20,21 159:3	68:22 71:14 72:10	scored 53:10 59:3
121:18 122:4,17	27:1 28:19,20	159:20 160:10	73:14,16 74:21	scores 17:21 47:6
123:12,17 220:16	29:10 32:18,20,21	162:11,18 165:1,5	75:22 77:7 78:2,6	52:17 53:5 61:21
220:19	40:11,13 48:16,17	165:9,18,20 166:7	80:5 81:18,22	61:22 65:11
rubric 24:17 25:4	51:6,7,7,12,17	167:5 169:13	83:18,21 84:1,4,8	125:11 148:5
35:12,20 36:13	52:1,2,15,17 53:2	171:22 172:19,21	84:16 85:18 86:8	161:22 185:11
40:7,17 81:9,11	53:11 56:11,12	173:5,11,20,22	87:10,16 88:2,21	187:17
82:6,7 170:8,11	59:1 63:3 66:16	174:18,20,21	90:18,22 91:12	Scott 1:16 5:10,12
run 60:17 97:12	67:15 69:17 71:12	175:2,3,21 176:7	92:4,20,22 93:13	35:18 39:19 44:19
running 57:18	71:16,22,22 72:6	178:6,17,22 179:9	95:18 98:4,19	213:10,11
89:17 94:4,11	73:1,19 75:2,2,18	180:1,4,7 181:6,9	99:10,12,22	scrap 101:14
165:18	75:21 76:2,22	181:20 184:10,10	100:22 101:9,13	scrapped 31:18
runs 45:11	77:15,16 79:4	184:14 185:16	104:7,9 105:17,21	scratch 189:19
Russ 178:8 180:19	83:7 84:10 85:3	188:10 189:5	106:7,13 107:6,20	seat 111:11 120:22
192:9	86:15 87:7 91:11	191:7 192:7,22	108:8,20 111:3	seats 181:15
S	91:21 93:18 94:6	193:19,22 194:3	112:11,17,18	second 5:6,11,22
	94:13 95:13 96:17	195:14,17 199:21	113:2,4,6 115:9	64:13,14 70:18
sacrificing 19:16 Sarah 1:23 5:14	98:20 99:17	200:11,14,15	115:15 118:3,10	76:10,11,12 78:9
Saran 1:23 5:14 144:11	100:20,21 101:21	201:3,7 202:14	118:13 126:3,14	79:11 82:14 83:15
Sarah's 153:2	102:14 103:6	205:8 206:19	127:10,13 130:12	85:7,12 87:17
Salan 8 133.2	104:4 105:2	207:16,17 208:1,6	131:8 151:22	88:1 97:7 107:9

	Ì	Ì	l	ĺ
111:18 131:1	segue 153:1	159:12,17 160:14	sir 133:4 212:15	smart 207:2
132:6 137:19	selected 117:8	161:8 164:7,7	216:17	SmartBoards
138:6 140:13,14	selection 192:6	166:20	sit 84:13 138:6	207:5
177:16 192:19	self-explanatory	Shadwick 217:4	196:7	Smarter 62:14
198:3 210:5,5,8	15:2	Shaewitz 98:12	site 48:8	Smith 44:18 199:4
210:10 211:21,22	send 105:17	shaking 106:19	sits 37:17	199:4 201:20
216:2,3 219:16,18	sending 77:14	shapes 84:14	sitting 221:3	202:1,12 203:16
220:5 229:20,21	93:21	share 9:11 10:8	situation 193:2	204:6,13 205:9
secondary 107:15	sense 42:2 45:13	12:6,8,15 32:10	six 44:13 81:2 83:6	206:15,18 207:2,5
seconded 64:15	87:5 88:13 96:21	33:2,11 43:20	101:9 152:9,14	smooths 67:2
70:19 79:12 82:15	123:21 159:8,9	171:3 228:10	155:12 164:16	snapshot 28:21
132:8 140:16	174:14 192:10	shared 214:21	165:10 170:2	social 155:20 156:8
177:17 198:4	sensitive 130:9	sharing 171:8,9	174:21 179:19	165:3 200:13
216:4	separate 134:10	Shawn 190:20	181:19,19 184:10	227:12
secretive 205:17	148:18	shift 18:6 111:15	185:8,15 186:19	socially 87:6
section 22:12 127:3	separated 148:22	117:21 163:3	187:4 200:8,10	165:22
127:3	149:3,18	197:13	sixth 114:12,13	social/emotional
sections 195:14	September 90:2	shifting 127:1	116:9 158:2	84:17 85:10 87:2
Security 215:11	95:6,9,12 99:8	162:22 196:5	159:16,21 160:5	87:11,13 88:2,18
see 11:14 13:10	133:13	shopper 2:14 79:5	160:11,13,19	88:21
16:16 17:7 22:6	series 15:7 133:14	short 36:8 83:17	161:5,6,17 162:9	society 134:1
34:2 41:19 48:12	seriously 202:2	shortened 47:12	162:16 163:1,22	Soifer 1:18 5:11
56:14 57:16 60:5	224:15 228:14	show 83:18 103:9	164:3,5,7,8 165:9	41:16 63:6,13,17
69:13 72:6,21	seriousness 225:2	shown 85:2	165:13 166:20	64:4,14 72:21
74:6,6 78:9 84:19	serve 29:13,14	shows 15:19 126:15	172:11 173:18	73:8 76:7 78:20
107:7,13,15 117:4	40:16 93:1 133:10	162:17	175:3,9 180:10	79:10 82:12 90:10
129:19 135:3	138:13 173:7	siblings 172:20	size 38:4	93:5,10 94:18
146:19 152:19	213:15	side 173:17 174:2,6	sized 136:4	95:7,9 97:5,11
156:20,21 164:10	serves 101:21	sight 222:3	skill 123:5 149:19	130:14 140:14
172:14 175:6	103:7	sign 141:7 144:7	skills 84:9 85:1	146:18 148:8
176:3 177:6,12	service 177:3 205:8	212:12	100:12 126:16	152:22 157:21
184:22 185:9,12	services 144:19	significance 147:21	149:1 155:20,21	162:19 163:7,10
186:12 192:17	178:10 187:12	significant 147:1	156:8 192:11	163:16,19 164:1
194:1,5 209:19	222:22	189:2	Skip 1:13,15	164:13 167:10,13
214:5 224:1	serving 98:8	signing 80:20	skipped 79:16 80:5	177:13 194:7
228:12	139:15 156:18	signs 145:3	Sklar 141:10,10	226:19,21 227:3
SEED 3:3 144:3,14	sessions 156:5	silly 205:20	sleeves 185:20	227:14 228:6,8
145:8 146:10,12	set 20:6 22:2 25:8	similar 178:16	187:3	229:9,19
151:21 156:1	26:21 46:3 51:10	similarly 158:1	slide 15:14 16:3,10	sole 227:17
158:15 159:17	65:13 99:21	simply 72:22	slides 16:21	solid 7:17 18:15
165:21 173:3,18	154:17 211:9	Simultaneous 45:6	slot 72:14	31:12
177:1,3	sets 123:5	164:18 175:11	small 22:7 52:21	Solutions 221:13
SEED's 144:7	setting 40:22 66:3	201:14 204:12	61:4,12 156:6	somebody 196:10
seeing 10:5 210:17	seven 9:15 101:9	simultaneously	164:21 165:1,4	229:16
seek 30:2	164:16 165:10	165:21	166:5 175:21	someplace 118:20
seemingly 165:15	166:3 174:21	single 20:17 26:3	176:8	somewhat 21:17
seen 12:19	seventh 158:11	38:22	smaller 17:20	22:7 32:3 143:19
	1	1		

	1	1	1	1
Sonia 212:11	227:15	130:10 141:13	152:19 158:15	strategically
soon 22:5 52:12	Specialist 144:12	145:10,22 146:9	171:3 189:18	155:16
sorry 59:8 64:18	specialized 167:15	150:10,13 160:18	state 9:18 33:8	strategies 46:22
80:8 114:18 139:2	specific 10:13	179:5 187:21	45:14,18 55:5	99:14 194:12
206:15 210:6	43:18 45:14 68:3	189:6 191:3	61:22 85:15 86:17	strategy 40:5 41:8
211:2 222:16	91:2 100:18	195:10 196:4	125:14 141:7	streamline 29:2,16
sort 17:17 20:13	101:19 102:2	199:15,20 200:10	180:3 218:4	48:3
22:18 31:11 32:22	103:22 122:10	201:6 208:16	225:13	streamlined 47:2,8
35:1 36:22 41:18	130:19 131:3	210:18 213:20	stated 40:17	48:7 227:22
41:21 42:15 45:9	147:3 149:6	221:21 222:13	statements 218:11	streamlining 30:22
47:18 67:3 75:10	169:11 200:5	223:1,4,9,19	states 37:18 62:18	223:18
108:16 114:9	specifically 11:5	226:9 227:4	72:13 75:20	Street 1:13 3:18
115:20 117:16	72:13 73:1 146:6	staffing 166:10	217:12	216:14 217:5
129:13 147:2,15	148:15	223:14	Statewide 9:17	strength 183:22
153:1,16 158:1	specifics 15:22	staff's 144:21 180:6	statistically 54:12	184:9 185:5
175:15 181:1,8,9	specified 228:3	stage 154:18	statistics 108:22	strengthen 190:10
181:12,18 182:11	spectrum 139:17	stakeholder 18:11	status 59:12,15,17	strengthening
191:10,21 195:2,7	speech 227:11	27:22 30:7	59:18,19,21 60:1	190:11
195:20 196:3,8,20	spend 16:20 17:1	stakeholders 8:7	131:4 222:8	stress 92:16
sorts 224:21	18:21	20:18 218:22	stay 67:9 110:4	strict 178:22
soul 192:6	spending 106:2	stakes 19:20 27:10	staying 110:1,2,3	stripes 158:16
sounding 25:6	spent 32:5 184:12	85:22 86:17	122:20	strong 9:22 18:19
sounds 34:17 35:22	188:11	stand 28:22	stays 173:21	153:4 181:17,19
115:12 172:9	spin 196:7	standard 129:14	steadfastly 184:16	181:22 182:2
sources 15:7,9 37:4	spite 54:14	157:2 178:15,21	steadily 180:4	183:2,9 184:13
54:9	spoke 19:3 39:20	standardization	steady 65:18	193:9,13 194:15
space 6:13 136:5,9	spoken 42:11	22:11,18	steeped 41:20	224:18,19
160:20	sport 175:19	standards 13:2,4,9	step 20:13 26:1	stronger 126:5
speak 39:12 96:16	sports 176:12	16:13 25:8 30:17	65:20	182:14 185:1,7
97:20 137:4	spot 20:18 35:12	39:15 41:9 133:21	steps 8:12,14 10:14	189:9 197:11
147:16 158:3	spots 188:9	145:2,22 188:13	10:15 17:3 30:8	strongly 172:11
162:15 187:1	spread 12:7	201:8	81:17 151:15	179:20 225:13
228:1 229:12	squared 149:14,15	standing 187:21	166:14 187:1	structure 18:15,19
speaking 45:6	149:15	standpoint 208:14	224:1 226:4	34:22,22 62:5
160:12 164:18	SRA 199:15	start 9:19 20:16	227:18	63:8
175:11 201:14	stable 66:5,6	21:14 33:6 64:2	sticking 18:17	structured 18:8
204:12	staff 8:7 12:2 16:15	66:19 71:16 94:14	150:15 153:15	19:19
speaks 23:5 26:4	18:7,10 19:3,22	115:15 134:17	Stokes 212:5,16	struggle 209:12
216:12	21:6 24:7,12	159:11 160:1,14	stole 208:11	stuck 143:5,6
special 45:22 70:7	25:13 26:14 28:1	201:21	stop 58:22 118:10	student 11:10,16
121:11 138:21	30:6 34:12 35:18	started 36:12 86:12	straight 122:14	13:15 43:3 72:8
139:7,13 201:1	49:11 50:3,4 51:2	95:13 123:13,17	straightforward	72:15 84:13,14
215:1 216:22	54:2 68:8 70:6	151:9 159:4	211:18	85:13 88:10 89:21
219:8 220:13	71:3 77:19 82:16	172:16 203:12,16	strategic 10:15	98:17 100:6,10,17
221:4,6 222:22	83:9 97:21 99:12	starting 17:19 20:8	31:10 33:1 35:6	101:18 102:7,20
223:10,19 224:22	110:13 112:16	26:19 52:17	36:16 39:13,17	103:8,19 104:11
225:22 227:1,8,10	124:18 129:10	135:19 138:14	41:5	105:10 107:5

108:3 112:2,7	227:13	summor 136:15 15	227:7	152:14 165:11
	student's 114:10	summer 136:15,15 188:11 197:1		
113:5 115:4,10			systematically 72:18	174:7 193:20
121:19,20 125:2,4	study 156:5,5	summer/fall 195:9	· · · ·	talks 20:7 119:9
125:6,10,15,18,22	203:13	superintendent	Systematizing 30:13	tangentially 32:4
126:8,9 127:2	studying 149:13	160:3		target 34:15 88:9
143:7 144:19	stuff 33:13 48:12	support 12:14	systems 17:11 18:1	111:17 127:11
147:9 165:5	49:4	64:22 85:5,6	25:19 46:4 223:18	137:8,11
170:15,16 173:19	subject 71:12 200:8 200:11	144:19 149:11		targeted 40:10
178:9 185:12		157:18 170:10,15	table 197:17	196:3
187:12 196:16	submission 218:13	172:11 176:21	tables 149:16	targets 52:2,14
200:13 224:21	218:16	178:9 187:12	tag 10:4	58:2,12 62:21
students 13:4 35:10	submit 47:13 145:6	189:13 192:13	tailored 139:14	99:5,14,21 111:14
66:12 83:15 84:6	222:7	193:6 195:4	take 10:16 12:15	127:9,20 158:6
84:7,18 85:8,8	submitted 71:9	215:21 223:1,9	28:14 30:9 32:12	163:3,12 219:9,9
87:12 88:4,10	89:19 133:8 145:9	227:13	34:1 35:6 39:4	task 67:14 87:9
100:12 101:21	217:6 221:16	supportive 197:8	56:3 74:3 77:10	88:16,20 90:1,5
102:4 103:7,8,14	substance 25:7	208:17	83:12 85:15	91:22 92:2,18,21
104:9,10 105:2	substantial 136:1	supports 88:14		93:15,19 94:9
106:1,8 107:4,7	146:1 179:17	169:6 189:14,14	106:10 113:13	96:2 98:21 99:11
107:15,20 108:10	199:21	189:16	133:5 149:6 168:8	101:6,11 109:8
109:2 112:1,5,12	substantially 53:22	supposed 106:11	172:3 175:17	110:12,16 111:1
112:13,19 113:3,7	133:16 138:17	sure 7:21 10:4,5	204:22 209:19	111:19 112:9,15
114:1 117:3	146:5	18:2 24:3 30:15	221:9 223:8	113:15 118:4
118:11,18,21	substantive 24:15	44:20 48:20 55:10	224:15	123:14 124:17,21
121:5 122:7,9,13	91:13 94:21	55:21 63:2 65:21	taken 18:4 36:2	125:8,14,19
122:19 126:4	substituting 119:7	81:19 82:3 86:1	123:4 209:8	126:18 128:14
127:5 138:21	success 84:10 85:3	87:12 94:2 102:17	227:20 229:12	182:12 190:9
139:3 141:15,21	146:21 151:7	104:17 107:11	takes 17:17 53:7	taught 225:20,21
142:2,5,16 148:22	153:10 169:4	135:13 156:7	69:21 74:15 81:3	tea 205:21
154:17 155:10	170:21 202:2	163:20 167:13	202:2 226:14	teach 118:11 119:1
158:2 159:15	successful 66:16	171:22 174:13	talent 181:16	182:5,5 193:11
160:2 162:2,8	109:4 117:5,19,20	180:18 188:14	192:12	teacher 84:13,19
163:1,15 164:22	successfully 134:18	191:16 196:2	talk 8:4,12 10:15	149:18 184:15
165:8,20 166:1,2	sudden 176:10	213:15 214:19	15:22 16:15 17:9	191:5 194:22
167:7 168:17	sufficient 78:7,8	223:15 224:14	22:12 23:2,3 60:4	197:4,4,5,7
169:5,7,15 170:10	135:17	225:2,18 226:12	93:9 119:10	teachers 118:11,20
170:14,18 171:2	suggest 52:19	survey 99:16	158:15 170:13	133:19 134:1
173:9 174:16	186:9	surveying 108:3	172:6 174:2	166:11 174:17
177:3,7 180:5	suggesting 60:17	sustain 183:10	175:14 182:8	176:17 189:5
188:14 189:14	113:15	192:14	206:16	190:2 191:15
200:21 201:1	suggests 124:21	sustained 183:13	talked 20:9 30:20	193:11 195:6,12
202:3,3,5 204:9	sum 86:3	switching 159:15	44:1	196:1,8,14 197:9
204:11 208:16	summarize 124:10	system 29:7 31:2	talking 7:13,16	203:18 207:7
209:10,12 213:15	144:20 145:2	39:7 78:3 98:10	17:2 19:7 46:9	208:15 227:10
218:1,22 221:18	178:14 222:13	99:20 101:6	49:13 60:19 61:4	teaching 118:10,21
223:19 224:11,16	summary 50:4	121:20 122:1	62:17 84:20 86:3	190:17
225:4,5,10 226:1	222:8,14	143:7 223:16	116:15 148:2,7	team 11:20 38:3
_				

150:16 181:1	189:7 190:14	26:10 28:22 35:4	174:12 175:7	183:5 196:11
184:7 185:6	191:4,5,18 195:19	40:6 43:18 46:17	177:1 181:5 183:6	203:13,15,16,17
189:11 190:14	196:1,17 204:8	55:5,9,22 70:4	183:13 184:19,21	222:6
195:13 218:15,17	205:2 209:12,16	134:15 152:15	185:9,11,19 186:8	threw 192:5
222:20,21 227:12	220:1	155:11 158:17	186:18 187:16	thrilled 137:22
teams 196:15,22	terrific 20:5 49:16	168:14 169:1	188:18 192:14	throw 151:19
197:10	territory 63:1	170:4 171:1 175:4	193:21,22 196:19	throwing 115:8
tech 206:19	test 17:21 62:17	175:15 181:13	202:8 203:2,6	thrown 202:7
technical 51:9	testimony 51:18	182:7 183:5	207:18 209:14,18	thunder 208:12
111:5 128:2 209:6	tests 85:19,22	190:15 191:17,21	210:18 211:19	tie 25:3
technology 134:6,8	100:8	192:4 205:17,20	212:8 213:1 215:5	tier 53:12,14 59:6
206:16	text 59:2	228:16	215:17 220:12	59:12 60:1 61:6,7
teeing 129:5	thank 4:21 7:6 9:9	think 5:14 8:22	thinking 28:10	89:14,15 90:3,6
tell 15:10 16:10	16:1 34:8 36:15	17:1 20:11 23:20	32:18 44:15 46:9	179:21
39:19 90:16 142:8	43:22 49:1,6,8,10	28:14 29:7 30:20	46:19 48:1,11	tiers 59:5,10
171:4 186:3 214:1	49:17,18,19 50:9	31:14,18 32:15,16	56:4,10 57:14	ties 27:18
telling 15:15	71:2 77:17 82:21	34:11,13 35:12,14	63:12 64:1 94:16	tight 30:16
195:22 196:1	83:5 86:20 89:3	35:20 36:6 37:7,8	105:9 123:1 160:8	till 75:2
203:18	109:21 132:14	37:16,21 38:1,11	third 18:22 56:8,14	Tillery 1:18 4:19
tells 194:1	140:22 141:1	38:13 40:5 42:1	56:17 80:5 85:14	4:21 57:10,12
templates 12:7	143:21 144:1	42:16,19 43:4,18	86:5,18 89:12	58:3,9,13,17,19
temporary 148:22	146:19 147:19	45:4 49:4 58:4	106:22 107:10,14	70:18 82:14
ten 12:11 217:12	167:11 177:12	61:2,19 62:11	112:12 114:8	140:11 143:5,19
tend 160:13	180:21 188:17	65:9 66:1,20 67:2	115:15 116:15,22	167:14 168:7,11
tenets 13:8,9	208:20 210:15	67:3,3,4,13,15	117:11,12,13,22	171:7,14,17
tenth 51:11 57:1	211:2 213:9,22	68:2 69:20 81:8	118:9 119:1 123:4	211:21 215:17,18
63:9 65:13 122:16	214:11 215:9,11	82:21 87:8 90:22	123:7 200:20	215:22
125:13 126:10	215:16 216:9	91:19 93:5 96:9	201:4	Timbo 98:7
135:18 136:20	220:10,11 228:17	97:11 104:7	thorough 24:14	time 16:7,20 17:2
137:6 154:5,6,22	229:5,7 230:2	106:16 109:9,10	113:14 152:14	19:1 29:11 36:8
170:7	thankful 213:19	115:3 116:7	thought 36:11	38:20 39:5,6
term 26:20 31:1	thanks 41:17 49:6	117:10,20 118:7	61:15 79:3 105:15	49:13 58:15 62:12
32:2 38:21 80:22	49:8 104:5 148:10	119:3,6,8 129:3	114:7 116:13,19	69:20 73:16 74:1
145:4 190:16	198:10	129:11,18 130:6	116:22 117:2,7	74:15 78:9 85:15
211:6 217:7	Theorem 149:14	130:11,13,20	118:17 189:15	86:6 91:15 92:13
terminate 138:12	theory 117:3	134:16 135:4	thoughtful 42:22	94:11 95:13,18
terms 14:8 26:20	thing 57:15 66:8,21	137:19 138:7	113:14	96:1,15 113:9,13
46:20 56:10 74:14	77:20 93:12 96:1	144:3 149:22	thoughts 43:21	114:9 115:9 121:1
105:1 136:22	101:4 106:20	150:10,22 151:14	131:16 147:4	123:5 124:3 131:5
147:22 148:5	107:5,18 119:2	152:22 153:4	three 13:3 51:22	132:22 139:10
150:21 151:15	148:20 151:20	154:2,9 155:3,15	52:7 60:7 65:14	148:17 149:10,19
156:3,11 157:18	155:3,6 156:20	156:9 157:15,16	67:18 68:15 97:12	150:17,21 151:3
158:5 161:21	161:3 187:16	157:19 164:19,20	100:15 104:2	151:21 155:6
162:4,17 165:2,16	192:19 193:20	165:1,7,22 166:6	112:20 122:10,14	157:20 159:18
166:1,10 167:3,15	207:20	166:13 168:2	127:4,13 138:20	160:21 188:11
168:3 172:16	things 15:11 17:5	172:15,17,21	145:22 178:17	191:21 196:7
182:4 183:17	20:7,14 22:3,7	173:7,12,16 174:1	179:12 182:6	197:9 198:18

	1	1	1	1
202:15 206:20	trained 118:11	two 4:18 6:14 40:1	undergoes 139:12	38:9
214:20 221:10	training 12:2 22:16	47:18 52:5,15	undergoing 81:18	upper 84:15 150:5
227:1 229:6	31:4 133:22 134:2	55:17 60:7,8	217:7,12	Urban 225:22
timely 154:3	139:12 223:7	61:13 62:1 65:20	underline 225:12	use 17:11 27:11
times 46:14 96:13	trajectory 161:2	68:15 69:11 71:14	undermine 29:14	28:11 29:4 31:22
110:14 124:18	183:4,7 188:15	77:6 78:11 84:19	underpinning	49:4 65:12 84:4
165:2	transferred 55:14	87:9 90:11 92:13	168:13	84:17 106:9 131:9
title 132:20	transition 159:12	100:10 108:12	understand 28:7	158:8 191:8
today 10:7 17:2	160:4 169:3,8,15	111:20 112:5	58:17,20 59:16	209:10 211:1
34:1,6 140:6	transitioned 168:4	130:16 136:16	60:8 66:9 74:19	useful 196:3
184:22 192:15	transitioning	148:18 155:1	85:20 102:17	users 29:17 31:6
toddlers 85:22	107:16	157:7 164:14	108:21,22 153:7	usual 6:7
told 19:9	translating 203:10	179:11,15,21	155:2 168:11	usually 4:5,12,13
tomorrow 201:13	transparency	182:6 191:20	170:18 190:5	19:8 174:19
201:17	24:22 26:5 41:22	192:22 197:17	understandable	utilize 87:7
Toni 178:9 189:11	transparent 77:7	199:20 200:16	26:21	
tonight 4:7,15 5:15	92:5 206:8	217:17,19 222:13	understanding	V
7:14 42:5 43:9	traveled 158:14	226:10	27:7 41:4 59:14	vacation 95:21,22
49:7 62:8,9 72:13	Tree 2:24 50:2	two-thirds 170:1	96:4	valid 100:8
181:1 190:19	132:20 138:7	Tyler 1:24 50:16,20	understood 184:1,6	validity 131:7
230:3	140:17	50:21 51:1 55:4	184:8 193:13,14	value 155:14 156:1
tool 29:4 31:22	Tree's 138:11	56:16,20 57:5	193:15	values 41:21
134:9 151:10	tremendous 36:7	58:1,4,10,14,18	underway 27:17	vantage 153:9
204:3	98:13 203:21	59:13,20 60:2,10	36:14,18 37:4	variety 83:14
tools 12:7 15:9,12	204:7	60:20,22 67:13,20	undeveloped 15:2	195:13
20:10 121:12	tried 70:12 81:2	68:1 97:19 102:19	unfair 122:1	various 54:8,9
190:3	132:16	103:2,6,13 104:20	unfolds 123:19	166:15 176:22
topic 113:16	trouble 10:5	105:4,7,9,13	uniform 184:9	220:3
147:16	troubled 65:5	106:20 107:3	unique 19:18 34:22	Vasco 144:15
total 102:1 103:1,2	true 117:16 160:16	109:5 110:5 114:4	46:6 99:17	vastly 100:21
104:2	trust 29:14 31:7	114:14,17 115:1	unit 86:14	venture 184:14
totally 96:11	205:15,16	116:11 119:15,20	unknown 27:15	versa 14:16
touch 195:18	Trustee 2:13 199:9	120:2 124:6,9	63:1	versed 18:3
touches 195:7	Trustees 71:5,11	type 25:17 46:4	unreasonable	version 31:19
tough 213:11	178:8 181:18	89:2 106:14	113:9	148:4
town 90:19 92:9	try 70:8 76:1	113:11 152:7	upcoming 21:16	versus 46:5 134:10
172:5,5	131:21 158:19	226:5,6	120:13,17 171:9	195:3
track 87:11 151:2	trying 56:13	types 21:11 25:15	221:19 222:17	viability 145:21
167:18 168:1	turbulence 154:8	typically 187:22	update 55:12	146:4 199:19
169:10 170:1	turn 6:6 108:6	191:9	updated 60:12	200:1
tracked 149:4	141:2	U	updates 55:11	Vice 5:2 14:16
tracking 152:7	turnover 188:2		126:20	view 183:18 193:3
223:18	tutoring 156:6,6,6	ultimately 13:13	updating 112:10	193:4,7,8
tracks 169:4	tweak 130:5	38:16	223:17	viewed 156:22
traction 162:13	twelfth 87:18	un 219:15	upgrade 184:7	157:11
traditional 21:3	160:20	unattended 123:1	upgrading 155:8	Vinnakota 144:16
train 77:19	twice 38:4	uncertainty 55:7	uploading 29:10	151:19 158:10

168:12 171:12,16	100:1,15 107:11	watching 150:4	weren't 24:16 88:5	214:3,7 220:12
violation 145:18	107:15 109:19	225:3,14	92:9 176:11	225:3,14 228:1,14
virtue 33:3	118:5 131:6,19	way 14:3 18:7 19:6	we'll 6:8 8:11 9:7	we've 4:6,14 12:19
vision 10:17,18	132:8,22 133:2	19:18 23:9 27:11	10:1,8,9 17:1	23:20 30:5,20
visit 79:3 194:3	134:22 135:4	28:4,6,12 32:7,16	22:11 24:1 78:8	32:5 36:12,13
214:4 221:7	142:16 146:12	39:3 50:12 56:4	90:4 96:14 109:20	37:17 38:5,13
visited 221:5	151:19 155:15	66:4 73:2 78:14	114:12 120:2	42:11,11 50:9,12
visiting 209:2	156:13,15,22	81:4 85:22 86:4	130:4 133:5	58:14 60:15 68:15
visiting 203.2 visits 48:8 205:12	157:3,11 158:19	87:18 94:7 116:17	135:19 136:16	70:5 77:6,8,11
voluntarily 204:21	159:10 162:5	130:3 131:8	172:6 201:20	81:14,21 88:16
Volunteers 42:14	174:12 175:4,12	153:20 166:22	we're 6:16 7:19	93:21 96:13
vote 5:16 51:3	175:16 182:17	182:19 183:13	9:10 11:7,8,13	117:17 150:11,12
52:13 62:7 64:8	190:7 194:10	191:22 192:2	34:16 36:15 44:6	150:14,20 151:9
70:2 71:4 83:10	201:20 202:1	203:17 210:7	44:14,22 46:8	152:10 155:12,22
95:5,14 96:7,14	206:7 207:12	213:12	50:10 58:1,6 61:4	157:11,17 162:12
97:17,22 98:22	208:9,13,22	ways 31:15 32:15	61:12 62:12,17	167:22 169:2
99:7 101:11	209:20 212:7	33:17,17 40:14	63:2,2,4,12,22,22	170:7 177:10
109:22 110:8	213:3,5,9,22,22	43:19 47:15,18	66:13 69:22 73:5	185:4 186:4
124:12 131:20	214:9 216:15	116:6 121:5 151:2	77:8 81:20 82:3,5	190:19 201:11
135:4 143:2 144:6	218:12 219:1	207:15	82:22 86:3 88:20	202:21 203:2,3
177:12 179:2	222:13 224:2	wayside 27:2	89:6 90:2,6,13	204:1 216:13
197:15,15,21	225:1,12 229:13	weaving 195:13	92:12 93:14 94:2	220:4 223:12,14
198:1 201:9	wanted 31:5 47:16	website 37:18	94:4 107:18 109:6	227:12
210:11 211:15	88:22 92:1 98:11	week 36:18 84:19	109:10,21 110:17	White 199:8,8
228:19 229:2,2,11	104:13 122:3	89:20 166:3 222:4	113:15 114:1	208:11
voted 69:4 93:4	133:11 153:1	weeks 52:15	129:19 131:12	Whitlow 212:5
212:18	157:22 167:8	weight 65:14	135:14 136:2,11	whoever's 196:13
votes 80:20	168:15 181:5	101:12,16 102:5	137:5 139:11	wide 83:14 218:4
voting 5:8,11,13	192:3 205:5	103:15 104:14	140:8 141:4 144:2	Williams 178:8
49:21 71:14 72:13	209:13 218:20	119:5 127:7	150:3,15,22 151:3	180:18,20 182:18
95:12 96:7 144:3	wanting 160:1	weighted 51:10,12	152:12 154:12	188:18 194:14
212:19 228:19	wants 131:22	53:19,22 57:3	155:16 156:4,7	willing 88:5
	162:15 206:16	63:16 101:20	157:15,16 160:6	window 91:15
W	Ward 188:1 205:14	102:3	165:18 167:9	182:8
wait 75:2 94:15	Wards 173:8	weighting 101:6,10	170:3 171:2,3,5	wiped 152:10
114:12	warehouse 151:2	125:2	171:14 173:10	wise 153:19 186:9
waited 55:16	warning 37:11,12	weights 99:15	174:10 178:16	wish 40:16
waiting 63:4	77:5	103:3 110:21	181:2 182:3,8	wonder 72:17 91:4
109:11	warrant 30:4	125:9	189:1,17,18,19,20	91:14 153:9
walk 209:3	warrants 25:17	weird 115:16	189:21,22 190:2	wonderful 214:16
walking 173:11	Washington 1:13	welcome 4:4,20 5:1	190:12 191:10,11	214:18
want 7:22 8:13,16	3:3 224:10	141:6,9,11 144:5	191:14,16,21	wondering 36:1
10:21 31:3 35:18	wasn't 96:3 117:1	178:13 180:19,20	192:9 195:5,6,20	90:21
49:1 55:10,21	139:8 161:11	198:16 212:14	196:2,5,12 197:6	Woodruff 1:19 5:2
58:11 79:6 82:3	188:21	220:15	197:15 204:4,13	5:4,22 54:7 56:2
82:17 83:3,12,21	watch 193:22 207:9	went 8:6 54:19	205:1,2,2 206:18	56:18 57:4,9,11
87:7 92:14 94:21	207:10,12	67:11 166:20	211:10 213:2	58:21 64:18,20
	,			,
		ı	ı	

			l	1
67:7,19,22 68:4	63:22 73:19,20	71:16 75:2 79:3	204:15 206:20	140 2:24
68:11 70:16 75:9	74:21 82:7 83:6	89:10,18,22 90:7	214:2 215:6,9	143 2:25 3:1
75:15,20 76:4	87:9 92:13 135:20	94:6,14 98:20	217:14,18,19	146 3:2,4
78:1,14,19 86:22	149:21 152:5	99:3 109:8 110:11	225:21	15 26:21 32:5
88:12 89:3 97:7	186:2 191:4	110:15 113:17	year's 52:16 60:1	125:10 145:5,12
97:14 113:19,21	196:15,19,22	115:18 116:8	60:11	153:14 196:14
114:6,15,19 115:7	212:21 227:12	119:16,19,21	year-old 160:22	214:2,4 215:6,9
115:17 116:2,10	228:2	120:10,14,17	yellow 170:12,20	217:13
122:5,22 123:16	works 21:9 83:22	123:8 124:15,19	yeses 68:15	15th 145:8
123:22 130:1	102:18 167:5	127:18,19,21	young 87:5 98:9	15-year 42:5 80:21
132:3 135:8,11	174:1	128:6,7,12,16,19	140:7 149:13	145:4
136:6,10,19 137:2	world 95:19	134:17 135:14	172:2	15-20 176:7
137:7,10,13,15	worse 196:6	136:13,18 138:15	younger 89:7,8	151 137:6
140:4 172:7	worth 101:22 102:8	139:13 145:8	172:18	16 99:8
176:20 186:15	102:10 103:19,21	147:7 149:11	youth 45:21 100:9	16-21 45:9
197:19 198:1	103:22 158:12	151:10 154:5,6,22		18 169:22 184:16
210:4,9 211:20	188:18	157:10,10 160:21	\$	200:22
216:12 219:14,18	worthwhile 26:13	161:11 165:16,17	\$25,000 2:5	180 3:6,8
219:20 223:22	32:1	170:5,6 171:19	\$35 171:19	19th 211:16 222:5
224:7 229:1,21	worthy 31:14	179:4 181:20	\$40 171:19	19-year-old 160:22
word 19:12 31:6	wouldn't 55:4,17	182:5 184:2	\$50,000 183:21	1998 159:14
228:5	62:7 63:9 64:5	185:16 188:6,11		
words 105:14	87:7	192:22 195:8,17	<u> </u>	2
work 11:19,20,21	would've 55:16	195:18 199:14	1216:14	2nd 204:20
12:4,10 13:14,18	117:3	200:20 202:10,13	10 102:8,10	2-week 195:8
14:2,4 15:17,20	wraparound	203:2,2,3 204:16	10th 199:14	20 102:5 103:7,19
16:17 18:16 21:17	150:20 155:19	204:18 205:3,4	10-year 3:6	103:22 125:16
23:8,11,14 26:19	write 69:21 92:10	214:12 217:8,12	10-1/2 160:21	226:1
27:16 28:14 33:11	written 39:15	217:13 221:20	10:00 208:1	20th 211:12
36:1,13,18 37:4,7	51:15 80:15 108:7	222:1,11,18	10:39 230:3	200 3:10
42:12 44:19 74:4	156:9 166:22	225:20	10:40 230:5	2011-12 59:4
74:18 98:12 113:4	222:8	years 9:15 26:22	100 101:15 108:9	2011-2012 53:2
129:8 130:5	Wrong 228:20,22	32:5 43:2 52:6	108:10,11 208:17	59:1
150:18 151:9,12		54:21 55:17 65:14	104 200:5	2012 133:7,14
155:8 170:17	X	65:15,20 67:9,18	11 133:7 146:7	2012-2013 51:7
175:5 181:12	X 26:7	73:12 74:22 77:6	11-12 60:16	82:8 98:20
188:19 189:4,12	T 7	77:13 86:12	112 2:19	2013 1:9 2:9 52:17
189:17 190:8,12	Y Y	108:12 112:20	12 133:9 146:7	53:7 99:8,11
196:16 197:10	Y 26:8	113:5 117:15,15	12th 221:16	119:20 138:10
worked 38:6,7 70:8	year 12:11 26:18	122:11,14 124:2	120 166:3	141:12 217:8
88:19 165:5	38:4 51:8 52:1,2,4	145:5,12 151:12	126 2:20	2013-14 109:8
184:16 198:19	52:8,9,15,17,20	152:14,21 153:14	13 68:20	2013-2014 2:10,12
working 8:21 9:1,4	53:2,17,17,21	155:12 158:11	13-14 90:7 120:10	110:11 124:14
21:1 36:15,16,19	54:5,10,13,20	160:7 161:5,14,14	120:18 181:20	127:1 138:15
37:22 38:5 42:8	55:11 56:6,9 59:1	166:4 170:2,6	134 2:22	2014 2:14 52:18
43:2,14 44:2,11	62:1,18 63:4 65:4	180:14 192:22	135 2:23	76:22 120:4 217:8
44:15 62:11 63:2	65:4,10,11,18	203:13,14,17	14 68:21	2014-2015 127:21
	67:17 70:1,13		14th 1:13 211:14	

_			Page 261
21.52.2.22.12	F0 22 11 11		
21 53:3 80:10	50 32:11,11		
211 3:13	52 2:7		
212 3:16	53 2:9		
217 3:18			
220 3:20	6		
225 137:9,12	6th 194:21		
24 51:18 71:7 76:20	60 71:16,18,22 73:9		
80:14	73:21 74:3,17		
24th 211:7	63.8 61:9		
	64.3 61:18		
25 126:8 138:10			
176:9	65 61:10		
25,000 6:7	65.3 61:9		
29 1:9	65.6 61:18		
29th 208:1,12			
,	7		
3	7 2:3,6 173:8		
3 69:19 106:22	7.5 127:8 128:15		
123:7 206:20	7:00 1:13		
3-year 51:10 53:18	7:10 4:2		
57:2	70 2:10 102:1,22		
	103:1,16 104:2		
3-year-olds 83:15	73 2:13		
30 69:5 84:1 91:9			
92:9 103:21 126:8	75-80 173:9		
126:22 211:5	78 2:14		
30th 211:10			
30-day 2:15 51:14	8		
80:13 83:1 91:4	8 2:5 173:8 188:1		
30-35 176:10	205:14		
300 214:22	80 218:5		
316 140:6	82 2:12 111:17		
	84 2:15		
325 164:22	85 2:17 111:17		
33 56:6 67:5			
33.3 54:4	9		
3333 1:13	9 92:19 101:5		
35 126:22	102:17		
4	90 148:21 169:20		
4-year 168:20	92 111:18		
169:16,21	95 111:18		
40 200:21 217:17	97 137:6		
45 217:18	99 2:18		
217.10			
5			
5 3:6 127:8 141:12			
173:8			
5th 194:21			
5-year 128:17			
5.0 128:15			
	l		

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Public Meeting

Before: DC Public Charter School Board

Date: 07-29-13

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

Mac Nous &