

Oakland Unified School District

Board of Education
Paul Robeson Building
1025 2nd Avenue, Suite 108
Oakland, CA 94606-2212
(510) 879-8199 Voice
(510) 879-8000 Fax



ACCESSIBILITY OF AGENDA AND AGENDA MATERIALS

Agenda and agenda materials, if any, associated with this meeting are accessible on the Board of Education's World Wide Web Site at <http://webportal.ousd.k12.ca.us> or from any computer terminal in the Office of the Board of Education at the above-stated address.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT COMPLIANCE

Individuals requiring a reasonable accommodation to participate in meetings other than handicapped access, should notify the Office of the Board of Education seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting at either (510) 879-8678 (VM); or boe@ousd.k12.ca.us (E-Mail); or (510) 879-8739 (TTY/TDD); or (510) 879-8000 (Fax).

Minutes (Long)

Wednesday, November 05, 2008

5:00 PM

Special Meeting

**Board Room, Paul Robeson Building, 1025 2nd Avenue, Oakland, CA
94606-2212**

State Administrator and/or Board of Education

***Vincent C. Matthews, State Administrator/Trustee and/or
President David Kakishiba and Vice President Alice Spearman
Directors: Kerry Hamill, Gregory Hodge, Gary Yee, Noel Gallo, Christopher Dobbins
Student Directors: Shannon Chase and Cecilia Lopez
Staff: Edgar Rakestraw, Jr., Secretary, Board of Education***

A. Call To Order

President David Kakishiba called the meeting to order at 5:03 P.M.

B. Roll Call

Roll Call: Present: Cecilia Lopez, Shannon Chase, Gary Yee, Noel Gallo, Christopher Dobbins, Alice Spearman, David Kakishiba and Vincent Matthews

Absent: Kerry Hamill and Gregory Hodge

C. Unfinished Business



08-2543

School Portfolio Management Process and Modified Criteria

Presentation outlining the School Portfolio Management process and modified criteria based on Board direction from the 10/8 Board meeting. The revised criteria has a primary focus on academic performance and enrollment trends with a consideration of the fiscal viability and equity factors of a school. The presentation also includes the list of Focus Schools.

Attachments: [08-2543 - School Portfolio Management Process and Modified Criteria.ppt](#)

Kirsten Vital, Chief of Community Accountability, used a PowerPoint presentation to review the tiering, accountability and support system, framework, criteria, and process for Phase I and Phase II to be used this December and in December 2009 for the Board to make a decision around schools. She said staff is held accountable through Operations Expectation 14 (OE14) for meeting all the responsibilities. Tonight's recommendations are based on the goal of assuring the availability of a diverse portfolio of high quality schools for students and families within neighborhoods and district wide. It specifically addresses OE 13. We look at quality, enrollment and facilities capacity; then programmatic diversity. As schools are in the "blue" and "green" tiers, they have greater flexibility. Those schools that are in the "yellow", "orange" and "red" tiers have increased monitoring and support. She and the Chief Academic Office works with the NEXO's to determine how we differentiate the support and intervention for individual schools. We tier the schools in terms of absolute performance. We are looking at AYP and meeting requirements of No Child Left Behind. We also look at accelerated student growth and the value of a school for the student for one to four years. We look at the difference between the lowest performing subgroup and the highest performing group at that school.

Ms. Vital stated the number schools in the "blue" tier increased from 4 to 9 this year. The number of schools in the "green" tier increased from 10 to 18. The number of schools in the "yellow" tier decreased from 35 to 23 this year. More schools are in the "red" and "orange" tier and we have a lot of work to do in our secondary schools.

Ms. Vital said our greatest gains were in elementary schools in ELA and in Math in

“orange” and “red” schools and where we are providing the greatest monitoring and support. The question always is: What is a Focus School and how does a school get on this list? The process identified schools primarily on academic performance. We started only with “red”, “orange” and “yellow” schools. Finally, we reviewed the financial viability which is a new criteria added this year per Board direction and equity as an additional factor to consider and whether students would be able to be absorbed into their mega boundary. All of our 20 “red” schools have been identified as Focus Schools for 2008-2010. In addition, some “orange” and “yellow” schools were identified for academic and enrollment reasons.

Ms. Vital said over the years a number of intervention alternatives were used. The School Portfolio Management process is not about closing schools. It is about improving schools by improving the academic program, giving differentiated support and intense monitoring. Currently, there are a number of schools going through a restructuring process and a Cambridge two-day review. Sometimes, we redesign schools and incubate them through a year-long process, then reopen them either as a K-3 and phasing out a 4-5; or we open them as a 6, then a Grade 7 and grow them as a middle school; or sometimes, we have opened a new school. We have also phased out schools. Sometimes we have reduced schools. As an example, Sankofa was a K-8 school that was reduced to K-5 to improve the school. Some schools are closed and the facilities would be used for another purpose.

Ms. Vital said she is proposing a two-phased approach:

- Phase 1: Given the short timeframe this year, two Focus Schools (which were part of a continued discussion from last year) have been identified for possible significant interventions this year with a Board decision December 2008. In addition, “red” schools in PI 4 and PI 5 will be going through a restructuring process. Ms. Vital said we are significantly intervening everyday to support and improve these schools. We do know that we need to make some long-term and short-term decisions about the schools either this December or in Phase 2.*
- Phase 2: A second list of Focus Schools have been identified for continued engagement, monitoring and support over the next year in which staff is asking the Board to make a decision about intervention alternatives in December 2009. She is proposing a community conversation in Oakland neighborhoods.*

Ms. Vital said there is a heavy emphasis on Academics on the actual tiering. If schools are not closing the achievement gap, they do not have student growth, they are not meeting their AYP, and we do look at enrollment and the mega boundary access. We carefully look at the facilities capacity. Are they meeting the facilities capacity based on the size of their school? We have added financial viability and the fiscal team has done some work on cost per student. We have about 21 schools currently with negative balances. There are many that are barely making their budgets with minimum staffing and programmatic options.

PHASE 1

Ms. Vital said she is proposing that we examine both quantitative and qualitative data including the Cambridge school reviews, classroom observations, student-staff focus groups, interviews and site visits. We will then make a judgment to establish a next step recommendation by this December for Peralta Creek and BEST Schools which were identified as Focus Schools last year. Both schools' budgets are in the red. Peralta Creek

has had an enrollment decline from 161 for last year to 68 this year which causes an inability to offer quality programming for students. They only have three teachers. It is difficult to provide staff support and professional development resources. This school is in its third year. We started with 6 and 7, and then shrank it to 8. It currently shares a campus with Life Academy and United for Success that has over 350 students. One of the dilemmas for Peralta Creek is even though there is a potential enrollment of 1200 students in that neighborhood, many of the families do not choose the Calvin Simmons campus. Part of the conversation is: Do we potentially look at phasing out this school, then return to phasing in a school once we move Life Academy?

Ms. Vital said BEST High also has had enrollment decline. If we adjust for the reduction of the 64 ninth graders from 2007-08, the school still has lost 141 students. It is in the red financially and it is struggling to provide an academic program. In the McClymonds area, we have 860 neighborhood students and 372 of them are enrolled at the McClymonds campus. Another 150 of the students attend BEST. Last year, we had more than 200 enrolled at Tech. The others attend schools throughout Oakland. We are having difficulty attracting the neighborhood families to that school. The facilities cap at BEST is 379 and the current enrollment is 110. There are currently three academy programs that we need to look at, including Culinary Arts, Construction, Transportation and Logistics. They have a mixed API growth at BEST. They were at 486, went to 551, then down to 490 last year. The school is struggling and it is in the "orange" category in its third year. There is a decrease from 18 percent proficient in ELA and 4 percent in Math for last year. We are seeing a drop in this school.

Ms. Vital said she is proposing solutions by January for the following schools. We would like to consider a relocation facility decision for Tilden School. There is a need to address a long-term facility for that school because they are currently on a campus where we had to shrink the campus so they are only on the middle part of John Swett campus. We are no longer using the campus below or the portables above. Is there a way to merge some of the Tilden programs? We have asked the Board for direction to come up with a Task Force in order to come back with appropriate options for Tilden. We already have a Task Force for Life Academy. Long-term facilities recommendations will be brought to the Board in January or February. At La Escuelita, we are considering a School Improvement Coach as they build their new school because they will be gaining enrollment. The new school will house 360 students.

Recommendations:

Phase 1: December 2008 Decision Focus Schools

- Two focus schools have been identified for this year, in which decisions regarding significant interventions will be made December 2008.
- In November, NEXO's will lead 2-3 engagements for these schools to gather feedback.
- Superintendent, CCA and Network Officers will evaluate appropriate solutions for each focus school based on input from community engagement and close review of quantitative AND qualitative data.
- On December 10th, the Superintendent and CCA recommendations will be presented to

the Board.

- On December 17th, the Board will be asked to make a decision regarding the recommendations.

Ms. Vital said in Phase II she is proposing community conversations across the District regarding the improvement of particular schools: red schools, underperforming schools and schools that are struggling in enrollment to figure out regional solutions. We would have the engagements through the spring and come back to Board in May with a progress report. We would run the data in September then come back to Board in December 2009 with formal recommendations for the Board.

Ms. Vital said there are 16 schools going through a Restructuring process in the next year based on P I requirements under NCLB. This will include Cambridge School Quality Reviews and developing and implementing a restructuring plan and budget that may involve redesigning the programs at a school. The Restructuring Process starts with the "State of the School" community conversations with Board Members. The Schools will be going through the Cambridge visits to get to the root causes of what is happening at the schools. An individual plan for each of these schools will result that will focus on improving teaching and learning in the classroom. The goal would be that they continue to lead the engagements so that communities understand why the schools are in the situation and what they can do to support their children. Based on the information we collect, we would be coming back to the Board with recommendations next December. Not all the schools in PI 4 or PI 5 are included in the list. Only "red" schools are included. Some have already gone through a restructuring process. Some schools' academic performance via the tiering system indicates progress and growth in gap and do not require a significant restructuring conversation. These schools include Allendale, Lazear and Bret Harte.

Ms. Vital said additional schools where she would like to see community conversation include all of the Castlemont campuses. We are seeing very flat growth at EOSA, Leadership Prep and CBITS. All of the budgets are in the red, except for EOSA. Part of the discussion will be if we are giving access to every student to A-G? What can they afford? The conversation needs to be how do we improve these schools? They have had mixed API. At EOSA they started at 493, went to 521, dropped to 478. At Leadership Prep, they are at 518, went to 543, and dropped to 523. YES increased their API from 431 to 521 and went to 537 this year. They are not on the same campus but share students from that area. At CBITS, we saw some growth in ELA this past year and we have seen more of a decline. They have a mixed API. They started at 526, dropped to 485, and went back up to 526. The enrollment of these schools changes from 288 students to a high of 325.

Ms. Vital said included on the list for enrollment are Sankofa, Burckhalter and Howard. These are all "yellow" schools. Sankofa has improved since we shrank it to a K-5. They only have 110 students. Though their budget is not in the red, they are only affording teachers, their principal, and very little clerical staff. Their API has increased dramatically to 691. Their budget does not allow them for coaching or professional development. Currently, they are in safe harbor in terms of program improvement status. Burckhalter enrollment is at 151. Their facilities cap is 235. Their budget is in the red. They have seen enrollment decline up to 20 students in the last four years. One-half or 81 students come from the neighborhood out of the 150. They have had mixed API growth

from 750, down to 686, then back up to 696.

Howard has enrollment of 206. Their facilities cap is 426. Their current budget has not been in the red. Half of the students come from the neighborhood and they do not have funds for coaching or professional development. The API has dropped from 722 to 672, and then went back up to 717. This is a "yellow" school.

Enrollment and Academic

Explore has enrollment at 240. They are exceeding projections in every grade. They have about 97 students from the King Estates boundary. She has heard board discussion about not having a middle school in the King Estate boundary. The school has mixed API growth. The school's API decreased from 599 to 586, then to 588. They are in P I 2 status. We have not seen student level growth. More students have declined in the performance bands, rather than increased.

Far West is an alternative school. Their enrollment is 174 this year. One-third or 53 out of 174 students are from the Oakland Tech boundaries. We have seen a decline in enrollment from 30 over the last year and 40 over the last four years. The facilities cap there is over 200. They do have a 29 percent CAHSEE pass rate, and they also have a 20 percent CST proficiency rate in English Language- Arts. They have 3 percent in Math Proficiency and a 12 percent CAHSEE math proficiency rate. There has been little API growth. It has been at 518 to 548. There has been little or no student level growth in the last three years. More students have declined in the performance band than increased.

Phase I

BEST - Propose a solution in December 2008. BEST has been struggling in academic performance as well as enrollment loss. The other school on the campus is EXCEL. Is there a difference between the two schools? EXCEL does have the higher ELA, CST rate and higher API by 62 points. These are budgets that both are in the red.

Peralta Creek would be the second school to be looked at. Their budget is in the red. We did see a three-year growth in Math and ELA and modest growth in math last year. It is such a small school and the fact that we are using the facility for Life Academy for the next couple of years until a permanent site is found, we would need the community conversation at United for Success because it would mean increasing the enrollment at United for Success by 50 or 60 students.

Phase II

Community Conversations

Ms. Vital said North Oakland is struggling with Claremont Middle School. They are in PI 5 status. Although their budget is not in the red, they have had mixed API results, in terms of slight declines from 632 to 622 to 619. They have proficiency rates in ELA of 28 percent; math 17 percent. Only 202 students at that school come from that neighborhood. She is proposing having the conversation as to what it would take for families to stay in North Oakland to continue from fifth grade to sixth grade. Do we need to use facilities differently? We have to look at Sankofa because it is a small school. It has 100 students. The facilities capacity is almost 300.

Ms. Vital said it is proposed to have the community conversation in West Oakland on declining enrollment, particularly at MLK. MLK has been a Focus School for the past two years; last year it was based on enrollment. While academic performance is similar across the schools in West Oakland, MLK is experiencing a greater enrollment decline with a loss of 31 students last year and 142 over the past 4 years. PLACE at Prescott lost 20 students and Lafayette has increased its enrollment. There has been modest API growth. It goes from 612 to 640 to 645. PLACE at Prescott was the only school that met its AYP the year before. In the last two years, MLK has had no growth; more students have decreased in performance band than increased in math and ELA. There was a small increase in the three years and funding is very tight in these schools. The school does not have funding for professional development, field trips and there is no attendance clerk. There is a temporary employee at the school and the school is barely covering the costs. We are looking at a community conversation to say what do we do in West Oakland? All three budgets in West Oakland are in the red; Lafayette and MLK are also in P.I. 4.

Ms. Vital said the regional conversation in East Oakland is for Explore and Frick. Do we need a middle school in the King Estates boundary? Explore serves the King Estates boundary but is not within that boundary. Frick is in an API decline. It goes from 594 to 595 and down to 557. There is little student growth. We see more students decrease in the performance band than increase in math and ELA in the last two years. We saw modest growth in the three-year growth for the third year. They have targeted intervention for students struggling in math and they are starting to learning cooperative learning groups that have proven successful for African American populations and students. We are working to improve these schools as we have the community conversations.

While there has been substantial higher enrollment at Explore compared to the projections, the school is still at 240 which is a small school and they have mixed API growth. They went from 599 to 586 to 588. They have no student level growth. More students declined in the performance band than increased in performance band at Explore.

Ms. Vital said in East Oakland, the conversation is around Madison. Madison is a P.I. 5 school. It was identified as a Focus School last year based on academic performance. It has seen some progress. It has been steady and slow. It made modest gains in API from 551 to 604 to 619 this last year. Proficiency went from 17 percent in ELA to 19 percent; and in Math 15 percent to 26 percent. In Algebra, three years ago we were at 0% proficient; last year they were at 28 percent proficient. We do see strong results at Sobrante Park. There are 264 students at the school and we had enrollment decrease from 46 students in one year and 125 students in the last four years. It is challenging for this school. They are in the red financially. It is challenging to provide resources for staff on its own. The Network Office paid for some math and ELA coaching. We recognize that this is the only middle school in the region and we would have to provide a middle school option to families in this isolated area.

At Castlemont, we understand at these conversion high schools that we have put conditions in place. We have a lot of work to do in the instructional program. All of the schools on the Castlemont campus, including Y.E.S., are in P. I. 3 status. They have proficiency rates from a low of 9 percent to a high of 35 percent in one of the schools. There has been flat growth in all of the schools, except for Y.E.S. and there has been some growth and increasing APIs. The other schools have had mixed API over the past four years. The API

for Y.E.S. has grown from 431 to 521 to 537.

Ms. Vital said when these schools are not making their budgets, they are unable to provide the kind of coaching services and support to improve instruction.

At Fremont, the Architecture Academy is a "green" school. It is not in any Program Improvement status. For Robeson and Media Academy, they have struggled and are in P. I. 4 status. Robeson went from 496 to 513 to 483. There is no student growth at Robeson. More students decrease one performance band than increase for Math and ELA for the past three years. At Media, we see mixed API growth from 498 to 550 to 519. We don't see the student level growth in terms of more students decreasing one performance band again like Robeson than increasing in both ELA and Math.

At Mandela, we see mixed API growth from 535 to 552 to 528. We did see a slight enrollment decline at Media and a vast enrollment decline over the past four years at Robeson. They lost almost 120 students over the past four years. The API for Architecture Academy has just gone up from 596 to 621 to 638. We are seeing more students at Architecture growing in ELA at least one band than decreasing. Math has been on the steady growth.

Ms. Vital said in downtown Oakland, Garfield, Roosevelt and Westlake are in need of a restructuring process to better identify and address the needs of their students. The Garfield School community has begun to educate themselves on "P. I." and potential school reform and improved teaching and learning. They are "red" in the achievement gap. Their lowest subgroup in performance is the Latino students and there is a 40 point gap. There has been no API growth though they are currently at 705. There has been some ELA level growth in the past two years and in Math more students have declined than increased.

At Roosevelt, there has been no API growth. It was at 654, 647 and 651. Their lowest subgroup is the African American students with 117 point achievement gap, 534 versus 651 at Roosevelt. Enrollment has decreased at Roosevelt by 146 students. It is still a large school in Oakland at 655.

Westlake has some API increase from 648 to 675 to 680 in this last year.

Ms. Vital stated all of our comprehensive high schools are going through a restructuring process and these are budgets that are in the red. They all have mixed APIs across the Board and they are in the process of restructuring a plan. Some of the core challenges at Skyline include increasing first line student learning and improving the monitoring and support of teacher practice. They have hired the Stanford redesign network to facilitate the restructuring plan and process. They are working on improving the quality of classroom instruction.

Oakland High is doing a listening campaign to look at which areas it is struggling with and strategies for school improvement, such as a focus on small learning communities, advisory to keep students engaged and in school. They are also in the process of self study through WASC.

Oakland Technical has already instituted a ninth grade small learning community with a

purpose of increasing ninth grade engagement and achievement. These conversations will continue as we finish the Cambridge reviews in these schools.

Ms. Vital stated we would like to review the facilities considerations at Tilden. The Board has directed staff regarding Life Academy and to provide some school improvement, coaching, and support at La Escuelita.

Tilden School has an 80 percent general education population and 20 percent special needs. Special Education staff is looking at a long-term plan to rebalance special education students across the district. Some schools have no special education students and some have up to 35 percent.

Ms. Vital spoke of budget implications to address interventions that may be made. Phasing out schools is dependent on how the facility is used and the administrative cost. If we were to incubate revision of a school, there is a cost to that as well. There is a difference between incubation and revisioning is the cost of an assistant principal. In the past when we have incubated a school, we have provided the school with an assistant principal to support the principal as they work with the design team. There is an investment to any Board decision. There is a cost to phase out or close a school which includes the moving costs for staff, temporary workers for H. R. for employee changes, community engagement costs, and utilities costs.

Ms. Vital said staff is requesting the Board to adopt the report with the recommendations for Phase I and Phase II School Portfolio Management Process of community conversations; then adopt the recommendation to create a Tilden Facilities Task Force to bring back a recommendation for both Tilden's current facility solution and then relocation alternatives and future use recommendations for the John Swett campus.

Interim Superintendent Roberta Mayor said this is part of the District's ongoing assessment of its schools to ensure quality schools in the Oakland District. This is the school management portfolio process. When we went out to the community to solicit feedback on how to identify schools that we might need to take a look at, in terms of whether they were fiscally viable and whether they were providing quality services, the information that came back to us from the community is that we focus primarily on the academic achievement of the schools. That is at the core of this entire school portfolio management process. We are looking at other considerations, such as fiscal liability and equity. We are primarily looking at the tiering situation and it is part of an ongoing process and is something the District will be doing every year to examine how schools are doing and making recommendations to the Board about what schools might need restructured intervention.

Director Dobbins asked about the decision to break up the three comprehensive high schools. Who chose the new school names? Ms. Vital said that decision was made approximately six years ago. The school names were chosen by the schools' design teams and ratified by Board or State Administrator. Director Dobbins said we are all small school proponents although we have not realized the gains we thought we would have with the small schools. With Skyline, that option does not look as exciting as it had, because we have not seen it pan out in terms of academic growth at the small schools.

Director Dobbins asked about the decision next December on the Focus Schools. He visited Burckhalter School today and they are concerned. Burckhalter has started

enrollment of Special Education students. He asked how staff will reconcile the space issue with the enrollment of more Special Education students. Ms. Vital responded the District housed Special Education students wherever there was space. We are reviewing what is the best programmatically for special education students and what does that mean for facilities needs? What does that look like across the District so that we are not just putting programs where there might be space which is what has occurred. We are looking at the situation programmatically so that Special Education students have a continuation of program so that they are not going K-3 at one place and 4-5 somewhere else. There is a lot of that happening and we are trying to look at a two-three year plan to rectify that. She said Burckhalter has taken on greater Special Education students for the facilities capacity because of declining enrollment in general education students. She said Skyline is not looking to break down into small schools that would have separate CDS codes. They are looking at smaller learning communities to personalize instruction without necessarily breaking into individual schools.

Director Dobbins said there are three middle schools in close proximity with each other. An option for Explore would be to reconfigure to a K-8. Or if we are going to move Explore, the school would be better served at King Estates.

Last year there was discussion about changing Burckhalter to K-8. The Maxwell Park school community wishes to change to a K-8 as well. Ms. Vital said we need to ensure there is a middle school within that boundary. Additionally, it also adds to the Castlemont conversation as enrollment declines. There is a question about the need to have four Castlemont Schools versus three schools. We will be looking at that based on academics. She is cognizant that we do not lose enrollment by phasing out or closing schools. Our data shows that we keep the students for the most part. The only school that we closed that we lost students was when we closed East Oakland Community High School and many of those students chose to enroll in a charter school that had an independent student program.

Director Gallo said our children have a right to the best. That should not be a political discussion. Oakland schools will be in much financial difficulty in the coming years. How are we going to ensure that a quality teacher in every classroom continues to be present, especially in the flatland school areas and the low performing school areas? How will this Board and this Superintendent insure that those kids that deserve the most get the quality teachers at this time? The bottom line is that the District is underenrolled and we need to make some very difficult financial decisions that are not going to be acceptable by everybody. He asked staff to provide financial impact to the District for Phase I and Phase II recommendations.

Director Yee also asked for information on the true savings for Phase I and Phase II. The following questions were asked by Director Yee: (1) If some action was taken on Peralta Creek, where do the students go? We need to assure parents that the students go to a school which has equal or better performance than the school they are leaving. (2) Where do the staff go? How do we make the decisions around staff? We need to have a clear understanding of where staff chooses to go and receiving schools how much say they have and that is a policy question that is very important and there are contractual obligations. Those need to be put clearly on the table so that everyone can see what they are and to what extent we can mitigate some of the possible effects. (3) What are we going to do with the facility? Is there a clear plan before the facility gets vacated for what the facility will be used for? (4) He is requesting quantification of the costs of disruption. After we have

done all that, then we can assess the actual cost savings.

Director Yee asked about the exit management plan and the calendaring for Phase I and Phase II: Where is the completion of the Asset Management Plan? Without seeing how the total district looks in terms of its assets, it is difficult to make these decisions about individual schools, except for academic harm to the students.

State Administrator Matthews stated the process is ongoing and we will be continuing forward because the Board has already given approval to say this is the process that they wanted in the selection of schools.

Ms. Vital said what is different is that she is proposing a two-year process. Normally, it is an annual process. Peralta Creek would be exiting 8th grade and going on to a high school. Regarding fiscal impact, we can calculate the individual school's exact savings. Slide 35 of the Power Point is the possible savings.

Vice President Spearman stated her concerns about the process used in selecting the areas to create the schools. One area has several high schools on one campus and only one is not a "P. I." school. When we decided to incubate Explore and a school in District 7, we closed a middle school in District 7 to put the incubation school on that campus. A high school was taken from another area and put there. Another high school was created and put there and the middle school was displaced to another area. She said District 7 deserves a middle school in that area that will serve the children that live above MacArthur Boulevard. What are we looking to do? What did the District do to engage the community? If they do not have the staff to support the operation of the school on a day-to-day basis, what are we going to do to have community engagement?

Ms. Vital said we are looking to improve Madison Middle School. Focus Schools receive a lot of support and we engage in community conversation so everyone understands what is happening at that school and so that parents can play a role in partnering with the school to improve instruction. The enrollment at Madison continues to decline and one of the elementary schools next door is doing very well. For the Board's engagement, we have provided support. Individual schools have done outreach. While we are doing portfolio management we are able to bring 30 to 200 families together at a school in order to have a conversation about what to do. She said the conversation would need to be held with Sobrante Park families in 4th or 5th grade so that they do attend. Having conversations with Lionel Wilson Charter school families, many of the students would have gone to Madison and did not choose Madison; instead chose the Charter School which has an API of 735. We need to think about how we keep Sobrante Park families and what does improvement look like at Madison so families do choose that school.

Vice President Spearman asked how can we talk about Castlemont and Y.E.S. School in the same conversation? Ms. Vital said part of this conversation is tied to Explore. If we want a middle school on the King Estates campus, then we would need to rethink how many Castlemont schools we would need. We have declining enrollment. Many students at Y.E.S. are from the Castlemont or Fremont area. Vice President Spearman said community engagement is scheduled this Saturday with the Y.E.S. School and next Saturday with all three schools on the Castlemont campus. Regarding EOSA, why don't we take some of the students that we are phasing out and have those students directed to a school that has an art or music focus? Ms. Vital said we do that with our eighth grade families in

the Options process and recruitment is based on the school's thematic theme.

President Kakishiba said Director Dobbins had to leave for another meeting and will be returning later on this evening. Director Gallo is going to have to leave as well.

Public Comment:

Jody London, Board-Member Elect, offered the resources of Chabot Elementary School and the Long-Range Planning community at that school which is a model for how other schools should be doing community involvement around facilities improvement projects. She said Far West is the only alternative high school in the North Oakland area that we are talking about tonight. She asked for numbers on the scores for those students if they had remained at the schools they were attending before they chose an alternative high school. She asked about our efforts to reach out and market to the school neighborhoods?

Tania Kappner, OEA, said if we are talking about how to improve schools with the most needs, that is what we should be talking about which is very different than talking about school portfolio management. The 20 schools on the list include the three comprehensive high schools. We need to relieve the debt and we should be fighting for the money to come to Oakland. We should be fighting for cancelling the debt. We need to fight for real resources for the schools. There should not be any school closures.

Mark Airgood, OEA, urged the Board to vote against the portfolio plan. There have been too many questions about the plan and there are too many contradictions. "School phase out" is listed for Madison; "Lease or Sell Any Additional Facility Space Created" is listed for Madison. He does not see how those two items would improve Madison. There is no attendance clerk at MLK. He does not understand how the District can leave a school without an attendance clerk. If we are not giving the school the resources, we are setting them up for failure. He asked Board Members to sponsor a public hearing to include testimony on what is going on in all of the different programs around the city, including the charter schools. The charters are left out of this conversation

President Kakishiba said this item is for presentation only and not for Board action. The feedback from the Board is getting a bottom line as to what the financial cost to be saved by any kind of fazing out based on Phase I recommendations. The five questions by Director Yee are things that need to be answered, as well as comments by the Vice President. As we go forward in Phase I and Phase II the depth of getting parents and staff involved in the discussion about what is happening with the school as reported by Vice President Spearman that four parents attended a community forum at one of the schools, is going to have to be a lot better than that as we move forward. Staff recommendations and an update will be scheduled for the December 10 board meeting with subsequent action on December 17.

Discussed and Closed

Roll Call (Staff Observation)

Christopher Dobbins absent at 5:56 P.M.

Roll Call: Present: Cecilia Lopez, Shannon Chase, Gary Yee, Noel Gallo, Alice Spearman, David

Kakishiba and Vincent Matthews
Absent: Kerry Hamill, Gregory Hodge and Christopher Dobbins

Roll Call (Staff Observation)

Noel Gallo absent at 6:31 P.M.

Roll Call: Present: Cecilia Lopez, Shannon Chase, Gary Yee, Alice Spearman, David Kakishiba and Vincent Matthews
Absent: Kerry Hamill, Gregory Hodge, Noel Gallo and Christopher Dobbins

Recess

President Kakishiba at 6:31 p.m. announced that the Board lacked quorum with the absent of Director Gallo; that Director Dobbins is expected to return any moment; that he will recess the meeting for fifteen minutes.

Reconvened

President Kakishiba reconvened the meeting at 6:51 P.M.

Roll Call (Staff Observation)

Director Dobbins returned at 6:51 p.m.

Roll Call: Present: Cecilia Lopez, Shannon Chase, Gary Yee, Christopher Dobbins, Alice Spearman, David Kakishiba and Vincent Matthews
Absent: Kerry Hamill, Gregory Hodge and Noel Gallo

D. New Business



08-2595

Policy Review - Policy Type: Results (R) 03 - Citizenship

Approval by Board of Education of staff interpretation of Policy Type: Results (R) 03 - Citizenship and change of name to Social Responsibility.

Attachments: [08-2595 - Policy Review - Policy Type: Results \(R\) 03 - Citizenship.pdf](#)
[08-2595 - All City Council Review - Policy Type - Results \(R\) 03 - Citizenship - All City Council Presentation.ppt](#)

Student Director Lopez stated student's defined citizenship in our high schools. Teachers currently have the power to decide if we are good or bad citizens. This is often based on attendance, resistance, conflict, opinions, or how conformist a student is to the rules and their surroundings. Some teachers choose to lower academic grade for "citizenship" issues. Citizenship status quo values and measures conformity, assimilation, or silence. The status quo around citizenship must be eliminated. If we are trying to produce good

human beings, we need to place the responsibility on both the individual student and the school to develop citizenship. Currently, citizenship is not taught or developed in students. Citizenship status quo is something that is expected, but not developed and nurtured.

Student Director Chase said the new notion of citizenship should be defined as social responsibility. Being socially responsible means having the self-discipline and self-determination to take responsibility for ourselves and others. It is an ethical and moral obligation. It means believing that we determine our own destiny and can control our own future. Social Responsibility means going above and beyond "following the rules" that students are conscious of and exercise their rights and responsibilities. It also means that students organize themselves to change unfair policies and rules. Social Responsibility means we consider and act on behalf of the greater good and well being of the community--in our case our school community. It means being responsible not just for our own behavior but the actions of others. Being socially responsible means being proactive about a problem, and finding solutions. Most importantly, social responsibility is something that is developed, not something that is inherent, or something we are born with.

Student Director Lopez stated social responsibility is a result of student empowerment. We see Student Empowerment as the development process and method that involves the school adults and individual students, to arrive to Social Responsibility. Student Empowerment requires adults and students to work together. Meaningful student involvement is the process of engaging students as partners in every facet of school change for the purpose of strengthening their commitment to education, community, and democracy.

Student Director Chase stated, as students not all of us are born empowered or supported to be empowered. Students must learn what social responsibility looks like. They need to feel like they belong in school and supported to be socially responsible. This process/practice is called student empowerment. A Student Empowerment approach produces self-disciplined, self-determined, socially responsible young adults. Student empowerment requires youth-adult partnership for students to be meaningfully engaged.

Student Director Lopez clarified social responsibility is something that is developed. The development process is called Student Empowerment, where adults support the development of students, and meaningfully engage students as partners, share power and decisions, and students learn about become more socially responsible at greater level. Their skills and motivation only get stronger and stronger.

Student Director Chase reviewed the five key indicators for Social Responsibility. Through Student Empowerment methods, we believe we will develop Social Responsibility: Resiliency and Violence Prevention, Multiracial Understanding, Academic Engagement, Leadership Skills, and Civic Engagement. Our Meaningful Student Engagement (MSE) Leadership classes are structured to produce these results, as they were developed using the MSE student empowerment standards. And, these standards were developed in collaboration with students and community partners. Students will learn social responsibility and develop in these 5 areas, through a leadership class. We are advocating that by the time a student graduates from OUSD they take a leadership class, where they have the structured opportunity to develop resiliency/violence prevention skills, multiracial understanding, leadership skills, civic engagement, and strengthen their commitment to academics.

Student Director Lopez stated some schools already expect and support students to develop social responsibility. We asked other students what their school currently does to capture or document Social Responsibility indicators. The measures for the 5 indicators will measure beliefs and attitudes, skills, and behaviors. Under Resiliency and Violence Prevention, schools collect school wide data, but not individual data. We can use the number of suspensions to measure how well a school is developing violence prevention skills in the student body. On an individual basis, students can be surveyed at the end of the year.

Student Director Chase stated most students didn't know if their school or teachers collected evidence of multiracial understanding, but believed it was important to do so. Under this measure, a school should document the number of students enrolled in Ethnic Studies courses, and/or the number of students participating in Ethnic Studies workshops. At the end of the year, the school could collect individual student surveys. This data is actually already collected by Youth Together at Skyline, YES, Castlemont, and Fremont, for their student participants only.

Student Director Lopez stated Academic engagement data is already collected at most schools. We can look at Attendance, GPAs, Graduation Rates and seniors' UC/CSU eligibility. We can also look at how students self-report improvement in their academic engagement by asking questions on the end of year survey.

Student Director Chase said Leadership is another indicator where most students didn't know if their school or teachers collected evidence, but believed it was important to do so. At the end of the year, the school can collect individual student surveys that ask questions.

Student Director Lopez stated under civic engagement, students were not sure what their school did to collect evidence, but thought it was important to do so. Having seniors complete and mail their voter registration cards is one way to show they want to be civically engaged. For the senior projects, we can add a community or action project requirement, like at Met West. In addition to writing their senior thesis paper, they can intern somewhere or work on an action project that gives back to the community, in their area of interest. During the senior exhibition, students could present their paper, and present their portfolio or showcase their internship.

Student Director Chase read the four recommendations from the All City Council:

- That citizenship be redefined to mean social responsibility.*
- That student empowerment standards be used to develop social responsibility, through a Leadership Class.*
- That five 5 Key Indicators be used to measure social responsibility.*
- That evidence of measures include an action project component in the Senior Project requirement similar to MetWest senior project and internship.*

Director Yee asked the student directors if they spoke to instructional staff to determine how the recommendations might be implemented. He said he was excited about the quality of the work and he is looking to hearing more. Student Director Chase said they are looking forward to Ethnic Studies classes.

Vice President Spearman said all students should be required to take a multicultural class. If we are going to create these programs, how will they be funded? If we make a course a requirement for students, what do we do to ensure that all students participate? If we make these a part of a senior project, how do we ensure that everyone has a senior project. If we are asking students to be socially responsible, everyone needs to participate in these classes.

Andre Wilson, President of All City Council, said we want to be creative in implementing this. We were thinking about action based advisories or implementing after school leadership programs.

Oscar Wright said that education is a combination of high academic skills, high morals, social and spiritual values. Kids have to be taught. This should be an ongoing process starting at Kindergarten and should be mandated.

Linda Dawson urged the Board to stick with the current language in the Board Policy. The students used that language and the stated values. She asked Board Members to review the interpretation and see if it is reasonable for application for students K-12.

Vice President Spearman asked about the strategies to implement the policies. Linda Dawson said the strategies would be staff's job to resolve.

Brad Stam said there may be strategies which would require schools to report and provide evidence that they are having students grow in these areas. Director Yee asked staff for assurance that Instructional staff and faculty have had some contact and support for it. Brad Stam said staff has been engaged with the students and it has been a great experience and he looks forward to continuing to work with them. He is comfortable with the interpretation. The indicators need significant more discussion and exploration.

President Kakishiba said the Board has cancelled its December 3 board meeting. The two Operational Expectation reports, Portfolio Management and Student Discipline, will be moved to a Special Meeting on December 10. He asked staff to present the "indicators" at the December 10 board meeting. Brad Stam said a substantive list can be brought to the December 10. The larger items that the students are recommending would take many months or years to engage.

We are doing preliminary work with the senior project and calibrating it across school sites. There is a lot of communications to take place with teachers and there is a lot of inconsistency from school to school.

Vice President asked if the Board Policy could be amended to change the Results from "citizenship" to "social responsibility". President Kakishiba asked staff to place the amended policy on the General Consent Calendar.

Linda Dawson said the next step is for Brad Stam to bring back indicators and if the Board agrees with those, then the next step is to establish a baseline and target, acknowledging you can't do everything, and that falls under capacity building.

A motion was made by Gary Yee, seconded by Alice Spearman, that this matter be

Adopted as Amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Votes: Adv Aye: 0
Adv Nay: 0
Adv Abstain: 0
Aye: 4 - Gary Yee, Christopher Dobbins, Alice Spearman and David Kakishiba
Nay: 0
Recused: 0
Absent: 3 - Kerry Hamill, Gregory Hodge and Noel Gallo
Preferential Aye: 0
Preferential Abstention: 0
Preferential Nay: 0

**08-2596****Policy Review - Policy Type: Results (R) 04 - Life and Workplace Skills**

Policy review and possible adoption of modification of Policy Type: Results (R) 04 - Life and Workplace Skills.

Attachments: [08-2596 - Policy Review - Policy Type: Results \(R\) 04 - Life and Workplace Skills.pdf](#)

Linda Dawson of the Aspen Group said this was the work put together by the Board. Reference was made to Expect Success that All Students will Graduate Prepared to Succeed in College and in the Work Place. The Board expanded on that at the Board Retreat about what parents and citizens would expect students to know and be able to do in life and at work; that the Board got more extensive with 4.1 to 4.7. Linda Dawson suggested giving this to staff for interpretation.

President Kakishiba asked staff to schedule the interpretation for (R)4 for early 2009.

Tabled to a Date Certain

E. Adjournment

President David Kakishiba adjourned the meeting at 7:51 P.M.

Prepared By: _____

Approved By: _____