



**DRAFT**



**DEEL LEVY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, January 12, 2016**

**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Bruce Harrell, Rick Burke, Hueiling Chan, Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis, Kevin Washington, Saadia Hamid, Larry Nyland, Allison Wood, Elise Chayet.

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Dwane Chappelle (DEEL), Sid Sidorowicz (DEEL), Isabel Muñoz-Colón (DEEL), Christy Leonard (DEEL), Laurie Morrison (DEEL Consultant), Dana Harrison (DEEL), Kacey Guin (DEEL), Waslala Miranda (CBO), Kathryn Aisenberg (DEEL), Adam Petkun (DEEL), Brian Goodnight (Council Central Staff).

Dwane Chappelle called the meeting to order and introduced himself as the new Acting Director of DEEL. Introductions were made and the minutes from the December 8, 2015 LOC meeting were approved. D. Chappelle reviewed the agenda which included the Annual Report Structure presented by Sid Sidorowicz and Isabel Muñoz-Colón.

Sid Sidorowicz presents a new approach to the annual report.

Presentation Agenda:

1. Propose a new structure for annual reporting
2. Solicit feedback from LOC members
3. Determine structure for February meeting and future annual reports

Guiding Questions:

- What are you most interested in learning from an annual report?
- Does the proposed structure provide sufficient detail for you to get a sense of the relative success of the investments?
- Are the data presented easy to understand?
- Would you find value in links to more detailed results?

Kevin Washington asked if the high level report would give people a view of what was successful and what was not. The big report provides detail about what worked and what did not work which informs the world view of the committee.

Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis asked if DEEL could look at different school programs in total and find a link between the programs that produced successful results. A summary of school programs together is something she would like to see. Isabel Muñoz-Colón replied that a good example of this is how key summer learning is for the success of students. We need to make sure that we continue to encourage our elementary schools to apply for summer learning and that schools have a summer learning strategy. DEEL also has conversations

about leveraging the other pieces around health and the results that we are getting around health sites located at schools that have other investments, leveraging funding versus working in silos.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis stated that the terminology in the draft needs to be more consistent. An example is how the word “measure” is being used in the draft table. Another important thing needed which is critical is an explanation of what the outcome are so the committee can get a better sense of what you are talking about.

Rick Burke stated that when you see a no or yes, there are two dimensions. One is how many schools met and the other is the average performance of the schools. Is there a way to cross-reference that? If many schools didn’t meet their targets that’s an indication that speaks to program efficacy. If a large group of schools did and a large group didn’t, that’s an indication of implementation efficacy. We need to differentiate between those if there is a way to tease that out at a high level.

K. Washington asked since you broke out the information for Innovation investments in Middle School, are you planning to do the same thing in the other four categories of investments as well or not? I. Muñoz-Colón replied that Innovation is the largest investment so we wanted to give more detail on that particular investment. We could break out the other four but it would result in a busier slide. If this type of information is desired by the committee we could work on the break out or other alternatives.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis stated that the problem is the old version was too detailed and the information provided in the summary is too summarized. The information could be meaningless and may not even be worth putting on paper.

S. Sidorowicz replied that DEEL would like to use the annual report meeting to find out what the committee wants to know in subsequent meetings. In subsequent meeting we would dive deeper with more information about individual schools, measures, etc. We are in the process of determining the type of report to generate, however we would like to avoid posting reports that need a lot of explanation since these reports are posted on a public website.

Larry Nyland asked what DEEL is learning about indicators that matter the most. While we want to set and accomplish goals it seems we would want to measure the quality of the indicators. Let’s hope that out of this would come best practices.

S. Sidorowicz replied that we have done some work around why we use the measures that we have. The Mary Beth Celio report that has led to many of the measure that we have around passing all courses, passing core courses, attendance, discipline, getting from 9<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> grade on time.

Saadia Hamid stated that she would like to see more in the area of social emotional support and would like more explanation on exactly what that means. Does it refer only to support from nurses or does it invite supporting families and students at different levels as well? We need to look at new ways of supporting this area which is an important area that is usually lost in generating numbers. L. Nyland replied that at the district he sees some

schools being very intentional on social emotional supports. He knows of schools that make a map of students that have needs, determine best interventions, and target specific staff with individual students. S. Sidorowicz replied that we might include social emotional stories as one of our vignettes later this year.

K. Washington asked if in moving to this new format we will be able to have more time at the end of the meeting to answer questions and have discussion around problematic elements that DEEL sends to the committee in advance of the meeting. The committee could come to the meeting prepared to discuss two or three questions.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis stated that we never hear what the school district thinks about these programs and what they see as successful from their perspective. It's an important discussion and one of our meetings should be for the school district to give feedback to all of us about what is working from their perspective. S. Sidorowicz replied that we hear a lot of district feedback at the LOC site visits.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:20pm.