

Oakland Unified School District

Board of Education
1000 Broadway, Suite 680
Oakland, CA 94607-4099
(510) 879-8199 Voice
(510) 879-2299 eFax
(510) 879-2300 eTTY/TDD
boe@ousd.org E-Mail



ACCESSIBILITY OF AGENDA AND AGENDA MATERIALS

Agenda and agenda materials are accessible at <http://www.ousd.org> or from any computer terminal in the Offices of the Board of Education and Superintendent, 1000 Broadway, Suite 680, Oakland, CA 94607-4099

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT COMPLIANCE AND LANGUAGE SERVICES

Individuals requiring interpretation or translation services or a reasonable accommodation to participate in meetings should notify the Office of the Board of Education seventy-two (72) hours prior to the meeting at either (510)879-8199(VM); or boe@ousd.org (E-Mail); or (510) 879-2300 (eTTY/TDD); or (510) 879-2299 (eFax).

Meeting Minutes Long - Final

Tuesday, March 1, 2016

5:00 PM

**KDOL TV Studio, B-237, Met West High School Entrance, 314 East 10th Street,
Oakland, CA 94606-2291**

Measure N - College and Career Readiness Commission

David Kakishiba, Chairperson

Members: Lacy Asbill, Gregory Cluster, Michon Coleman, Gary Yee

measurencommission@ousd.org

A. Call to Order

Chairperson David Kakishiba called the meeting to order at 5:07 P.M.

B. Roll Call

Present 5 - Member Michon Coleman
Member Lacy Asbill
Member Gary Yee
Vice Chairperson Gregory Cluster
Chairperson David Kakishiba

C. Speaker Request Cards/Modification(s) To Agenda

None

D. Adoption of Commission Minutes

None

E. Adoption of the Commission General Consent Report

None

F. Unfinished Business



[16-0294](#)

Measure N Commission - Proposed Request-For-Proposal - Third-Party Evaluator

Approval by the Measure N Commission of Request-For-Proposal (RFP) for a Third-Party Evaluator.

Attachments: [16-0294 Measure N Commission - Proposed Request-For-Proposal - Third-Party Evaluator](#)

Preston Thomas, Network Superintendent, High Schools, gave a report on the Request for Proposal regarding the evaluation study that will address the following area:

- *School and Pathway quality and function*
- *Student and school-level academic performance*
- *Academic rigor*
- *Quality of teaching and instruction*
- *Quality of school leadership and system supporting implementation*
- *Family and community engagement and satisfaction*
- *Aligned district systems that directly support school and pathway quality and functioning, and student and school academic performance*
- *Background – Measure N Overview*
- *Scope of the evaluation study*
- *Evaluation Design Focus*

John Wakin, from Linked Learning Office, spoke about the scope of the evaluation study

which, focuses on the immediate audience for the evaluation. He also spoke about the evaluation design focus, which is a design & implementation evaluation and outcome evaluation.

After the report the Commissioners and staff discussed about:

- Want to make sure that the Commissioners can report to the community the steps that the Commissioners took to ensure faithful use of the funds
- Will there be an internal Audit or external Audit?
- Want to be sure that which part of the evaluation the Commission pays for and which part of the evaluation the district is responsible for in its normal processes
- A Third-Party independent evaluation could give the Commission extra eyes and ears around how implementation of Measure N at school site level and at City wide district level; would be helpful for both staff, Commission, and Board to be able to make adjustments and improvements to the overall implementation of the Measure
- Interested in qualitative goals around numbers of student's serve
- Interested in finding out the extent to which the schools embrace Linked Learning as a transformative process in high schools
- Want to see students, staffs, and families as a stakeholder
- Career opportunity
- The goal of qualitative and quantitative study is to give the Commission compelling information to go back to voters as to why this investment matter and made a difference and why Oakland Unified was trust worthy in receiving these funds and being a good steward of them
- Learning strategies around different school sites around what worked and what didn't
- Investing money from the 10% of Measure N to support school leadership teams to be better leaders – Good plans, good outcomes
- Having stipend for students when work is being done
- Worry about the financial Audit of the money going to Charter schools and having oversight accountability – That money can be slipped in as supplanting very easily

There was no Public Speaker(s)

Discussed

16-0280

Measure N Commission - Proposed Commission Process - To Receive 2016-2019 Education Improvement Plans

Approval by the Measure N Commission of proposed Commission process to receive and consider proposed 2016-2019 Education Improvement Plan from district-operated and charter-operated high schools.

Attachments: 16-0280 Measure N Commission - Proposed Commission Process - To Receive 2016-2019 Education Improvement Plans

Chairperson David Kakishiba spoke about the proposed process to received 2016-2019 Education Improvement Plans and asked does the Commission want to hear from school leadership teams a presentation about their proposal and budget and have opportunity to interface with the teams and the consensus was "Yes".

-There will be three meetings; each a 2 ½ to 3 hours meeting

-Mr. Thomas spoke about what will be in the presentation from each high school:

1. Statement of the problem
2. Three-Year Student Outcome objectives
3. Theory-of-Action
4. Key Strategies

5. Annual Benchmarks for Strategy Implementation
6. Budget

Director Jody London, made a comment that the Academy design and development is not necessarily driven by student interest.

Discussed

Aye: 5 - Member Michon Coleman
Member Lacy Asbill
Member Gary Yee
Vice Chairperson Gregory Cluster
Chairperson David Kakishiba

Non-voting: 0

Enactment No: 16-0469



16-0281

Measure N Commission - 2016-2017 Budget Allocations - High Schools

Presentation to the Measure N Commission by District's Senior Business Officer or designee of proposed 2016-2017 District budget allocations for High Schools, in comparison to 2015-2016 allocations.

Attachments: 16-0281 Measure N Commission - 2016-2017 Budget Allocations - High Schools

Preston Thomas, Network Superintendent of High Schools gave an introduction by stating right now the schools have received their preliminary budgets.

Ruth Alahydoian, Chief Financial Officer gave a presentation on the proposed 2016-2017 District budget allocations for High Schools, in comparison to 2015-2016 allocations regarding:

- \$514 million is the General Fund budgeted expenditures
- The general fund of which 76% is unrestricted and 24% are restricted
- Some Measure N budget is in the restricted portion
- Unrestricted expenses – About 59% go directly to school sites, 31% are school site supports
 - 8% are spent on infrastructure
 - \$6 million, 2% that goes into repaying the state loan
 - Key changes next year - Try to provide more resources to be flexible to school sites
 - Based on the Governor's proposed budget the District is expected to get 16.7 million unrestricted on going dollars
 - 65% of the \$16.7 million are committed to labor agreements
 - It leaves \$5.8 million that is available to add to existing programs or to add new programs to the schools
 - \$5 million in cuts from the central office that will be added – proving \$10.8 million additional resources to school sites
 - \$3.5 million goes to Call for Quality Schools
 - \$3.2 million directly to schools
 - \$2.1 million Educator Effectiveness – District Wide Program - Evaluating teacher growth
 - \$1.7 million targeted, but directly to school sites for libraries
 - Allocations to school are in dollars, not Full Time Equivalent (FTE)
 - Some "Appeals" criteria built into Base Allocations
 - Pilot schools for Special Ed Inclusion
 - Certain allocations made using School Performance Framework (SPF) Designations

- Intensive Support Schools (ISS) will receive additional resources
- School Site Allocation: BASE Teachers
- School Allocations: Supplemental & Concentration Funding
- School Site Allocations: Restricted Funds
- \$5.3 million additional funds allocated based on SPF designation
- Appeal – Increase base staffing based on program
- Trades – trade, combine, or add to existing positions using existing allocations
- Loans – increase base funding based on revised enrollment projections
- Counselor and Assistant Principal

After the presentation, the Commissioners and staff discussed:

- No school will be under pressure to use Measure N funds to supplant as opposed to supplement
- There will be programmatic analysis of the allocation
- How is the money being spent? Activities? Additional Student Services? Additional management?
- Wanted to shift the outcomes by providing more supports to school sites
- Outcomes will have to be deeply connected to future funding or a new cycle of planning

There were no Public Speaker(s)

Discussed

[15-1358](#)

Measure N - Policies - Allowable Use of Funds

Approval by the Measure N Commission of Policies for Use of Measure N Funds.

Attachments: [15-1358 Measure N - Policies - Allowable Use of Funds](#)

Chairperson, David Kakishiba presented the legislative action requested that was discussed in February and a new legislative action was added, which state, "Enable every high school and Measure N administration to rollover all unexpended Measure N budget allocations from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year, and for a period not to exceed three consecutive fiscal years".

After, a discussion was developed with the staff and Commissioners:

- What happens if schools try to save their money because they see that there will not be other funding's coming in and they don't want to lose their staff due to funding
- Want schools to feel comfortable in May coming to the Commission asking for some of the money with no fear that the rest will be inaccessible to them, so the Commissioners can see high quality plans
- The intent was creating conditions at a school level where there can be really thoughtful and intelligent budget planning done, without the fear of use it or lose it

There was no Public Speaker(s)

Discussed

G. New Business

None

**H. Public Comments on All Non-Agenda Items Within the Subject
Matter Jurisdiction of the Commission**

None

I. Introduction of New Legislative Matter

None

J. Adjournment

Chairperson David Kakishiba adjourned the meeting at 7:15 P.M.

Prepared By: _____

Approved By: _____