

Oakland Unified School District

Board of Education
Paul Robeson Building
1025 2nd Avenue, Suite 301
Oakland, CA 94606-2212
(510) 879-8199 Voice
(510) 879-8000 Fax



DRAFT

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, December 19, 2007

4:00 PM

Hunter Hall, 1025 2nd Avenue, 4th Floor, Oakland, CA 94606-2212

State Administrator and/or Board of Education

Vincent C. Matthews
Interim 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: ShaCora Cowart and Markeshia James
Staff: Edgar Rakestraw, Jr., Secretary, Board of Education

Aye: 1 - Vincent Matthews
Nay: 0
Recused: 0
Preferential Aye: 0
Preferential Abstention: 0
Preferential Nay: 0

State Administrator and/or Board of Education



[07-1739](#) Minutes - State Administrator and/or Board of Education - November 28, 2007

Ratification by State Administrator of sections J, N, O, Q, S - 07-1470 of the joint State Administrator and Board of Education Regular Meeting Minutes of November 28, 2007 and ratification by Board of Education of said Minutes sections P, T,V and joint ratification by both of all other sections, prepared by Secretary and staff shortly after said joint meeting.

Attachments: [Document\(s\)](#)
[07-1739 - Minutes - State Administrator and/or Board of Education - November 28, 2007](#)

R. Unfinished Business

State Administrator



[07-1530](#) 2007-2008 Schools Portfolio Management Report - Part I - School Closures

Adoption by State Administrator of Resolution No. 0708-0136 - Approving School Closures Effective 2008-2009 School Year.

Attachments: [07-1530 - School Portfolio Management Report - Part I.ppt](#)
[07-1530 - School Portfolio Management Report - Part I.pdf](#)
[Document\(s\)](#)
[07-1530 - 2007-2008 Schools Portfolio Management Report - Part I - School Closures.pdf](#)

Interim State Administrator Vince Matthews reiterated his commitment to our annual school portfolio process which says that all children deserve access to quality schools. Rather than accepting a status quo which allows schools that are failing our students to continue to exist, this process forces us to deal with the data head on and have the courage to make difficult decisions which are in the best interests of students. This process looks deeply at enrollment trends in each neighborhood to ensure schools are financially sustainable and are able to provide a quality education to students. This process creates a space for authentic community engagement into our decisionmaking. The recommendations presented by staff last week were a result of their fidelity to our school portfolio management process under current board policy. The process was led by our Chief of Community Accountability and the Network Executive Officers. Based on their input, the recommendations presented to him last week were appropriate. As a collective

staff, we have come together over the past week to reflect on how this process fits within the broader work that must be accomplished in Oakland to ensure equity of access and fiscal responsibility.

Kirsten Vital, Chief of Community Accountability, said staff has been refining its process for annually reviewing district schools based on Coherence Governance Policy OE12. On an annual basis, staff defines a list of focused schools based on analysis of schools against quantitative criteria for its academic quality and enrollment. The academic criteria is consistent with the criteria used in our tied accountability and support system. The list of schools presented to the Board on October 10, 2007 represented the 2007 focused schools list. Following the identification of the focused schools, staff engaged in a three-month process which included community engagement and an analysis of qualitative factors to determine the appropriate solution for each of the schools. A recommendation on December 12th constituted the annual monitoring offered against the board's portfolio management of schools operational expectation under the Coherence Governance policy. It is the responsibility of staff through our annual review of the portfolio to make recommendations regarding any school closures based on individual schools' sustainability and capacity to meet quality standards. It is our job to guarantee and improve schools in every neighborhood. Current board policy defines neighborhood students as having first priority for neighborhood schools. As such, we have an obligation to ensure that all neighborhood schools are of high quality, sustainable, and that there are alternatives for families. Based on this policy, staff evaluates individual school's sustainability and capacity against the following criteria: Is the school demonstrating the capacity to provide a quality option to neighborhood families? Are there children from the neighborhood choosing to attend that school? Are there enough students living in the neighborhood currently and projected to justify the existence of a sustainable school?

Ms. Vital said if we do not believe that an evaluation of these criteria justifies that a school should continue to stay open, staff has an obligation to recommend closure. She appreciates the quality work of our Network Executive Officers who deeply know the educational quality programs of our schools. They know their schools very well, as well as their leaders, teachers and staffs.

Ms. Vital said although there is diversity at many schools and although it has increased under the current options policy, the reality is that the ethnic racial socio-economic demographic at most neighborhood schools continue to approximate the demographic of the students living in that neighborhood. This trend is particularly true in schools which are not providing a quality education for neighborhood families. Although many students from the schools are opting out though the options policy, new families are not necessarily opting in from other neighborhoods. We heard the community and we went back to the drawing board. During the course of this year's school portfolio management process, staff has raised qualitative concerns around the ethnic racial composition of schools being considered for closure. We just recently examined this data in the context of schools which have been closed over the past four years. The data indicates a disproportionate number of school closures taking place in predominantly African American neighborhoods. The decisions regarding Sankofa and Burckhalter were very difficult for staff to make. We have listened carefully to the voices from the community.

Ms. Vital said the data on historical trends and school closures and which shows a disproportionate impact on African American neighborhoods has been an additional very important factor for our consideration. Staff continues to stand behind the recommendation that Sankofa and Burckhalter should be closed based on current Board policy and on the thorough evaluation of enrollment and academic factors, both qualitative

and quantitative. However, staff also recognizes that in the absence of any changes to current Board policy, the reality is that the annual evaluation process will continue to disproportionately target schools and neighborhood where enrollment trends are declining and schools are not demonstrating the capacity to serve students. Historically, these neighborhoods have been predominantly African American. As such, staff recommends that decisions about these school closures be postponed until deeper Board policy work can inform where students are living in Oakland and where they are attending school. Potential factors for consideration regarding the interdistrict enrollment policy may include: Should there be total open enrollment across the District? Should there be a certain percentage of Options seats at each school? Should siblings have the highest priority for seats within a school? Should a certain number of seats at a school be reserved for free and reduced lunch students or for students from P.I. schools? Are there other legally permissible prioritizations that encourage and promote diversity? This is the work we are proposing to do over the coming months.,

Ms. Vital said although staff is recommending that Sankofa and Burckhalter Schools remain open for 2008-09, it is very important to note that this recommendation does not undermine all of the concerns regarding the academic performance and enrollment targets at these schools. Staff will continue to evaluate any interventions that can improve these schools' ability to provide a quality education for students. It also is important to note that in the event that the Multi-year Fiscal Recovery Plan recommends school closure, these two schools will continue to be on the list based on their current data. In addition, staff is recommending that we need the multi-year fiscal recovery plan, so that we are very clear how many of our schools we can sustain and afford in a school district and to get clear on how big or how small can these schools be. What is the sustainable size?

Ms. Vital said on behalf of the Network Officers, she recommends taking a pause and postponing the closures while we reflect on our policies and get clear about the multi-year fiscal recovery plan.

Director Hodge thanked staff, the public and parents who came out last week to let us know how they felt about their schools. The recommendation from staff makes a lot of sense and it addresses the issues of race and equity. What other kinds of things can we do to support the schools to serve those students better?

Ms. Vital said part of the concern at Sankofa is that it is a very small school. It is almost \$100,000 in debt. The Network Executive Officer has provided lots of time and attention to that school. Professional development and support have been provided to the principal and school. The school needs to consider a literacy program and potentially doing Reading First support work. For Burckhalter there are similar issues regarding sustainability of size of the school. They can't afford literacy coaching services because of their lack of A.D.A.

Director Hodge stated as we look at this as a Board, that we start looking at student weighted budgeting as well to add additional resources for the social and community stresses that schools are going through to ensure that when we start a new school, we made an investment and we need to continue that investment until we see a return. The return is in our children. From an equity perspective we need to do a lot more in terms of financing schools that are small and have a lot of needs and are serving kids.

Director Dobbins said we heard what the community said and we want to help. We all acknowledge the problems at Burckhalter. What are we going to do about the new housing developments? That is a big issue for him. As policy, he would like the Board work on

long-range projections for the new housing developments.

Vice President Spearman said it appears that staff is still recommending go forward with the Advanced Path. Ms. Vital said that is off tonight's agenda to and will return in January with a contract. The principal would like to speak on behalf of Advanced Path. Vice President Spearman noted problems on the Castlemont school site and had concerns with starting a program to recover drop outs and drop out prevention. She cautioned staff as to the placement of Advanced Path. She said we have behavioral problems, community problems and a staff member was attacked last week by family members of a student. She questioned the propriety of putting the program on this campus. She asked staff to consider putting the program on another site.

Director Gallo agreed with comments made about locating a drop out academy on the Castlemont campus. From the parent and student body perspective, there are already enough challenges and distractions on the campus that we do not need to add anymore. Their issues and attention and direction may not be the same as those who are thinking about doing well.

Director Hamill spoke of the school portfolio process and all the variables that make it difficult for a school to survive. We have invested money in Sankofa and she wants the District to honor our investment by ensuring the school is successful. We need to let the kids know that it is a place that is going to stay and grow and thrive.

Speaker Comments:

Sherri Moore said she went to school in Oakland all of her life and she has family members that attend Sankofa. No school should be considered for closure ever unless there is something wrong with the staff. The schools should be improved only. The schools need more teachers and more funding.

Ward Rountree, Executive Director, OEA, said the pattern of this direction should be of major concern to all of us. He said Slide #4 says that under the current Board Policy, analyses of schools which are underenrolled and underperforming has resulted in a disproportionate number of school closures in predominantly African American neighborhoods. That should be of major concern to all of us. If this is true, the Board Policy needs to be changed. From 2003 through 2007, it seems that we have again evidenced systemic racism in this community and it is unacceptable that this kind of Board Policy and this kind of action be it by the State Administrator, the State Government or the local School Board is totally unacceptable. Equity does not mean an equal share. He asked why Sankofa is \$100,000 in debt? Burckhalter is on the cusp of being in debt. We should not continue to perpetuate the systemic racism that we have seen in this country.

Betty Olson Jones, President of OEA, said the evidence was very flimsy which was presented at the last board meeting for Sankofa and Burckhalter. The information on enrollment and academic rigor was misleading. The schools had been told by their Network Executive that they were doing great and that it was a question of enrollment and finances. It is troubling that the school had to suffer through this for the last week and last few months, when, in reality, it should have been dealt with completely differently. It is troubling to see that the predominance of schools that have been closed in the last few years have been African American. It is surprising that it was found out the in the last week and that it was not at the basis of any recommendations that were made.

Kim Shipp said this is movement in the right direction in listening to the community. There

is opportunity for people to rally behind the two schools for life support. A principal should not have to sell their school. The Options process is not working. Many families are not choosing their neighborhood schools.

President Kakishiba asked about the disposition of this agenda item. District Secretary said the initial placement of this item was a resolution which was an action item. The recommendation has changed subsequent to the posting of the agenda. The subsequent change that staff has announced cannot be acted upon because it was not noticed. It will have to be carried over to the next meeting. The recommendation in the resolution was to close the two schools.

President Kakishiba said the School Board has a responsibility to take a hard look at all of the schools that we operate and to ensure the quality at school sites are the best that they can be; and that the School Portfolio management process has been wild. Staff has been recommending school closures for a variety of reasons and it is jacked up. Yet, the rankings of yellow, green, red and staff trying to conduct an analysis based on a number of different measures to see whether schools are healthy, is something that the citizens of Oakland deserve and demand. The work of staff in this area gets better each year. It is incumbent upon the Board to reexamine its board policies around Open Enrollment and boundaries. We need to work with staff to get a sensible multi-year recovery plan back in place and that needs to be done by this Spring.

Regarding Advanced Path, if we are talking about drop-out recovery plans, it is more than classroom instruction. We need wrap-around, personalized support for the students and families. We need different schedules for the students. The fact that Advance Path is next door and they have comprehensive school based health clinic and it is a different setting; the potential for a partnership for wrap around support services is a possibility and staff might want to take a closer look at that.

Director Hodge made a motion to not adopt the original recommendation to close Sankofa and Burckhalter schools. Director Dobbins seconded the motion. Secretary Rakestraw said the General Counsel has given advice that the board vote for this particular area is advisory.

The motion was approved to reject the staff recommendation to close Sankofa and Burckhalter.

Vice President Spearman said we do not want Advanced Path to be located on the Castlemont campus. Director Hodge said Vice President Spearman's recommendation is not part of his motion.

Interim State Administrator Matthews said he supports the staff's adjusted recommendation regarding Sankofa and Burckhalter to keep the schools open for the 2008-2009 school year. However, it is important to note that while he supports this recommendation, he continues to be deeply concerned about the quality of education and underenrollment at each of the two schools. The fact that only 28 percent of the families living in the Burckhalter neighborhood select the school is a clear indication that there is an issue with the education being provided there. This reality was evidenced in academic data with the school's API dropping by 54 points this year. Sankofa added a grade to its K-5 program and yet the enrollment decreased by 4 students. With a \$100,000 deficit on top of \$133,000 of TIGG small school funds being invested, the school is clearly not self-sustainable at its current size of 115 students. Academically, only 13 percent of the school's students are scoring proficiently in Math or English Language Arts. He did not hear comments by

families which said their child is receiving a high quality education, reading at grade level, computing on grade level. The school communities need to take ownership of improving their schools. The two schools will continue to be on our focus list and significant interventions may be necessary to ensure they provide quality education for students next year. He strongly urges the Board of Education to revisit its current policy regarding intradistrict transfer so that we can ensure equity of access to quality programs. He is directing staff to complete the multi year recovery plan with a clear recommendation of how many schools this District can afford to keep open. In the event that the plan has recommendations for a number of schools which must be closed, and if they do not change, Burckhalter and Sankofa will continue to be on the list of possible closures based on our data analysis of quality of program and underenrollment under current Board Policy.

Interim State Administrator Matthews stated he is not approving the resolution for the closure of Sankofa and Burckhalter Elementary Schools. He is considering the continuation of monitoring and support recommendations presented on December 12th Board Meeting for Martin Luther King, Jr., Lafayette, Howard, Peralta Creek, Explores, BEST and YES and that will be at the January 9, 2008 Board Meeting. He is considering Bunch's transition to a continuation school per the December 12, 2007 recommendation. He is also considering the decision regarding Advanced Path and that will be on the January 9, 2008 agenda.

A motion was made by Gregory Hodge, seconded by Christopher Dobbins, that this matter be Adopted. The motion failed by the following vote:

Votes: Adv Aye: 0

Adv Nay: 7 - Kerry Hamill, Gregory Hodge, Gary Yee, Noel Gallo, Christopher Dobbins, Alice Spearman and David Kakishiba

Adv Abstain: 0

Aye: 0

Nay: 1 - Vincent Matthews

Recused: 0

Absent: 0 - ShaCora Cowart and Markeshia.James

Preferential Aye: 0

Preferential Abstention: 0

Preferential Nay: 0

Board of Education



07-1476

Oakland Schoolyards Initiative

Adoption by Board of Education of Resolution No. 0708-0140 - Oakland Schoolyards Initiative.

Attachments: [Document\(s\)](#)
[07-1476 - Oakland Schoolyards Initiative.pdf](#)

Don Neuworth, Executive Director of Urban Ecology, is working with three District school in planning the Schoolyard Initiative for a fourth school. He urged the District to adopt the resolution to bring the opportunity to all Oakland schools. The importance of this is to give the ability of the District as a whole to leverage the bond money with private foundation money and other public funds to maximize the ability of the District to provide safe, healthy and green school yards. They are presenting working with Garfield, Urban Promise Academy, Manzanita at the present time.

Paulette Smith, teacher, Garfield Elementary School, talked of the physical improvements at Garfield in the past couple of years due to the school community working together. Everyone feels Garfield is a special place. She supports the resolution.

Mark Triplett, Assistant Principal, Urban Promise Academy, urged the Board and State Administrator to approve the resolution. The students at Urban Promise do not have any "green" space. It is all pavement.

Director Gallo said this is a tremendous opportunity for the citizens of Oakland to get involved in your local schools. This is one initiative that all of us can rally behind because it will impact those schools that need beautification, green space, playing areas, and play structures.

Mr. Neuworth said the opportunity is to bring additional funds into the school district. We have been able to leverage the existing bond money so that it meshes with the City's investment in the parks adjacent to the schools and bringing in volunteer work from the parents, corporate sector, and foundation money to pay for the costs.

The motion was approved.

A motion was made by Alice Spearman, seconded by Noel Gallo, that this matter be Adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Votes: Adv Aye: 0
 Adv Nay: 0
 Adv Abstain: 0
 Aye: 7 - Kerry Hamill, Gregory Hodge, Gary Yee, Noel Gallo, Christopher Dobbins, Alice Spearman and David Kakishiba
 Nay: 0
 Recused: 0
 Absent: 0 - ShaCora Cowart and Markeshia.James
 Preferential Aye: 0
 Preferential Abstention: 0
 Preferential Nay: 0



07-1561

2007-2008 Schools Portfolio Management Report - Part II - Adjustment of Middle Schools Attendance Boundaries

Adoption by Board of Education of Resolution No. 0708-0134 - Adjusting middle schools attendance boundaries, as specified.

Attachments: [07-1561 - 2007-2008 Schools Portfolio Management Report - Part II.ppt](#)
[07-1561 - 2007-2008 Schools Portfolio Management Report - Part II.pdf](#)
[Document\(s\)](#)
[07-1561 - Middle Schools Attendance Boundaries Adjustments.pdf](#)

Director Hodge asked for clarification and rationale of whether this item is a decision for the Board of Education or of the State Administrator. District Secretary Rakestraw stated, based on advice from Counsel, the Board has the responsibility of actual approval of the next two items. President Kakishiba said it is explicitly stated in Area I under Community Relations in the Coherent Governance policies.

Kirsten Vital, Chief of Community Accountability, said all of the questions asked by the Board of Education are in the materials provided to the Board. Staff is making their

recommendation based on current Board Policy of Neighborhoods. Staff made its formal report on December 12, 2007 and responded to board questions on school closures and boundaries.

Juwen Lam, District Demographer, stated the middle school boundary proposal was brought about as a result of our belief that all neighborhood children should have access to their neighborhood schools. Any boundary shift impacts other boundaries. The middle school boundary proposal would begin the process of optimizing the number of residents in each boundary and the number of seats available at each school in the boundary.

Director Yee said the proposed boundary shift will affect at least five middle schools. He asked about community engagement. Ms. Vital said letters were sent to every fifth grade family affected by the boundary shift. There were meetings with middle school principals with their Network Officers. Director Yee asked about an estimate of impact on social demographics on students who would be affected if the proposal would be implemented? Ms. Vital said we do not at this point. This recommendation was based on the Neighborhood First policy. Director Yee said there is confusion by parents about their school attendance areas. Hillcrest is more critical because of significant overcrowding. Ms. Lam said in the 2006 school year, the Calvin Simmons area had the facilities, of all the middle schools that were in that boundary, that had the facilities for, they had 1,309 seats and they had 956 residents. The facilities were greater than the number of residents. That was taking into account some changes in the middle school seats that happened last year. In the Havenscourt area, there are a number of residents that if they all chose their neighborhood school there would not be enough seats in the Havenscourt area to accommodate all the residents in that area. Director Yee stated the need to move carefully and have the policy discussion out in the open, then based upon consensus of the newly elected board around that policy, to help set the standards for the readjustment and the optimization. Ms. Vital said it would make sense not to change the boundaries if in fact we were changing the policy. Because families choose out of their neighborhood, we don't have that level of overcrowding. Forty percent of families choose outside of their neighborhood school.

President Kakishiba reminded the Board that Directors Hamill and Yee were to lead a Board Committee to recommend policy language on open enrollment/school boundaries to the Board of Education. Staff has presented a recommendation to make boundary changes of our existing policy; but since we are in consideration of possibly changing our policy, we do not need a lot of discussion unless we are going to backtrack what we said in October. We should table this motion/resolution until the board committee completes its work and comes back to Board.

Motion by Director Hodge to table this item, Seconded by Director Hamill.

Director Gallo recommended that the two directors develop a task force to be able to engage the public throughout our middle schools to come up with a broader solution to deal with boundary changes by September 2009.

District Secretary Rakestraw said there was no pending motion so there was nothing to table.

Director Hodge withdrew his motion to table.

Motion by Director Hodge, Second by Director Yee, to approve the item.

Motion by Director Hodge, Second by Director Yee, to table the item on middle school boundaries.

AYES: Gallo, Dobbins, Hamill, Hodge, Yee, Spearman, Kakishiba

Speaker Comments:

Amy Colt-Lacayo said she has a fifth grader in the OPS and she did not get a letter about any boundary changes and her address is one of those that would be changed. She teaches at Bret Harte Middle School. She became aware of the proposed changes in the last few days. They are uncalled for and would have huge repercussions with Bret Harte. She lives on Coolidge, but she would be changed to the Montera attendance area. She lives 3 blocks from Bret Harte. Bret Harte is fighting to stay large because of the variety of programs offered at the school.

Leslie Johnson-Gelb, Bret Harte parent, said the boundary change would increase the socio-economic homogeneity of their school. Oakland should not be moving toward segregation. The boundary proposals do not make sense of what we want for our students.

Michael Pendleton, parent, Bret Harte, asked the Board to reject the boundary change proposal. There is a significant lack of rationale for the basis of the change. There is no problem identified. Bret Harte has Highway 13 as a natural boundary between the Hills and the Flatland areas. Under the new proposal, his house which is at the corner of Norton and Wisconsin and the house two houses away would be in two different middle school attendance areas. The new boundaries would create a Montera Middle School boundary at 3960 Coolidge Street which is two blocks away. The boundary adjustments are laughable at best and not very well thought out.

Shawna Brekke-Read, parent, Bret Harte, said she lives in the Redwood Heights neighborhood. With the proposed boundary change, it would move her into the Montera Middle school attendance area. There is the perception that their property values would increase. She said Kirsten Vital was at their school on Friday and she found out about it after Ms. Vital had left.

Steve Weinberg, teacher, Frick Middle School, and a 39-year employee of the District, urged the Board to reject the proposal for middle school boundary changes. We are in a bad real estate market and people will want to take advantage of anything they can find to help sell houses.

A motion was made by Gregory Hodge, seconded by Gary Yee, that this matter be Tabled. The motion carried by the following vote:

Votes: Adv Aye: 0
Adv Nay: 0
Adv Abstain: 0
Aye: 6 - Kerry Hamill, Gregory Hodge, Gary Yee, Christopher Dobbins, Alice Spearman and David Kakishiba
Nay: 0
Recused: 0
Absent: 1 - ShaCora Cowart, Markeshia James and Noel Gallo
Preferential Aye: 0
Preferential Abstention: 0
Preferential Nay: 0

[07-1730](#)

2007-2008 Schools Portfolio Management Report - Part II - Postponing Adjustment of the Hillcrest, Chabot and Montclair Elementary School Attendance Boundaries to Reduce overcrowding at Hillcrest Elementary School, Et Seq. (Alternative Motion)

Adoption by the Board of Education of Resolution No. 0708-0135 Adjusting the Hillcrest, Chabot and Montclair Elementary School Attendance Boundaries to reduce overcrowding at Hillcrest Elementary School.

Attachments: [2007-2008 Schools Portfolio Management Report - Part II.ppt](#)
[2007-2008 Schools Portfolio Management Report - Part II.pdf](#)
[Document\(s\)](#)
[07-1730 - Postponing Adjustment of the Hillcrest, Chabot and Montclair Elementary School Attendance Boundaries.pdf](#)

Kirsten Vital, Chief of Community Accountability, said the recommendation is to adjust the Hillcrest, Chabot and Carl B. Munck attendance boundaries as described in the resolution to reduce overcrowding at Hillcrest Elementary School.

Director Hamill stated she wished to make an alternative motion and she read the following statement: A clear and transparent enrollment process is essential for all families. Board policies which drive the current enrollment and assignments through the Options Process are currently being reviewed by a Board subcommittee with District staff to ensure that they fully reflect the goals and objectives of the newly empowered School Board. The process of modifying OUSD boundaries should be postponed until Spring 2008 to give the School Board and staff time to reach consensus on Board Policy related to enrollment, boundaries, the District's Open Enrollment process and the City's need to be certain that we ensure access to a quality education for all of our students.

MOTION by Director Hamill, SECOND by Director Hodge, that the Board postpone a decision regarding a boundary change for the Hillcrest K-8 school attendance area until the conclusion of the Board's work of reviewing its current enrollment policy. And that the issue of overcrowding and enrollment at Hillcrest and potentially other Oakland Schools return to the Board for future consideration not later than April 2, 2008. During the intervening months, staff and members of the School Board will conduct meetings with the Hillcrest-Chabot-Montclair-Kaiser and all other school communities potentially affected by the overcrowding to review future enrollment projections and other factors which may arise. During the intervening months the District should access and explore any and all alternatives which could allow an increase in the supply of K-8 spaces in North Oakland and possibly expand the number of students who may attend Hillcrest School. For the 2008-09 school year, all families within any OUSD overcrowded attendance area not placed at their home school will be redirected through the District Open Enrollment process to their next closest neighborhood school.

Board Discussion:

Director Hamill thanked staff and other people who have participated in the process. We are not done yet and we have to keep working until we get to the best solution. She spoke of the impact in shifting boundaries and all participants from adjoining neighborhood need to be brought into the process and get as much consideration as the school which they originally started with. There have been ideas which have surfaced and we wish to spend more time to ensure we have considered everything in order to get to the best solution. She said collapsing the middle school program at Hillcrest does not solve the problem. She said staff conducted an analysis which showed the area was overcrowded even if the middle school space was eliminated which would destroy something that works very well and is very healthy in this District, which needs to rebuild itself by building on what is

healthy; and we would still need to redraw the boundary. We do not have an easy answer and we have to keep going. This problem has to be solved comprehensively. There is a need for flexibility and cooperation as we go forward. And the bottom line is if we ask people to be cooperative, we need to ensure to talk to them and that they understand what their future enrollment looks like.

Director Hamill said the Board is not clear that every option has been explored,

Director Yee stated he had a friendly amendment to the motion. We just went through a tabling of the middle school boundary discussion and he and Director Hamill were assigned to look over the policy implications. He is assuming that the work would be sufficiently brought in scope to include those boundary issues, too, and not be limited to Hillcrest, Montclair, Chabot issues. He would rather talk about the more broad policy implications and leave it to staff to make the specific boundary recommendations. Director Hamill said that was her intention, too. The issues brought up by the speakers regarding the lottery and open enrollment window. He asked if Director Hamill had language which would address the immediacy of the open enrollment window? She said the last sentence is meant to address that in that for the 2008-09 school year, all families within any OUSD overcrowded attendance area not placed in their home school will be redirected through the Open Enrollment process to their next closest neighboring school. Director Yee asked if that would leave the school boundaries intact until the Board finished their discussion. Director Hamill said this addresses a different problem. Director Yee said the discussion that Director Hamill is asking us to do is one that has broad policy implications and is not about a particular boundary and it has to do with K-12, K-6, K-8, middle schools, choice and open enrollment. Under that proviso, he does not see the Bret Harte parents and Mr. Weinberg, but he is hoping that their concern about us tabling that the parents of the middle school community would also have the kind of insecurity that the Hillcrest parents would have if we have this open discussion. He is asking if he can tag that understanding to Director Hamill's motion and he would be happy to support it. Director Hamill asked if he meant that we would not redraw any middle school boundaries? Director Yee said "any boundaries." without engaging the affected school community in a thorough discussion. She said she would add that to her motion.

Director Hodge said we ought to be making a set of decisions that is grounded in a more comprehensive view of the Options program, how open enrollment works, overcrowding, elementary, middle school, and high school boundaries as opposed to doing a piecemeal approach.

Director Dobbins said he supported the motion to table. He said the K-8 program at Hillcrest has been around since 1993 and it is working and is part of a larger discussion.

Director Gallo said the decision we make will be that the students and families will feel the impact of the decision in the opening of 2009 school year and the discussion will be taken out to the schools and participation will be across the city.

Vice President Spearman confirmed that we are moving this off until the 2008-09 school year for the decision of any adjustment of any boundaries and that we will engage all school communities.

President Kakishiba said we are talking about a focus on enrollment policies. For the 2008-09 process? Director Hamill said for the upcoming school year for overcrowded schools is that students that do not get placed in their home schools will automatically be placed in the next closest neighboring school with available slots. President Kakishiba

said the current policy addresses if there are available seats, but in terms of the priority?

Director Hamill said she has been informed by staff is that with redirection there are enough seats. She has been assured that it is not a problem. Her understanding for the next school year, there are enough seats to redirect any overflow from the Hillcrest overcrowded attendance area into their closest neighborhood schools.

Kirsten Vital said based on the policy, it's then neighborhood first. If we change the boundary, then change their neighborhood, then it would be first priority. If they were redirected, they would fill out an options brochure under Open Enrollment, they would be part of the open lottery system. That is the current administrative regulations.

Director Hamill said she is proposing language that will apply for the next school year. When we have discussed redrawing the boundaries, she asked the question about whether there is space. It was not her intention to redraw boundaries and then not have enough room for the redirected spaces. The whole point of redrawing boundaries was that she was assured that there was room in another school in their next closest neighboring school. Kirsten Vital said there is space in the neighboring school, but how we did that analysis was they were then the neighborhood students. As a neighborhood student, they get first priority. As a non-neighborhood, non-sibling, non-P.I., you are then in a lottery which is the fourth priority.

Director Hamill asked, according to the resolution and with Board sanction for this year while we are in this state with the overcrowding issue at this one overcrowded school, the only overcrowded school we have, if we can it according to the way the resolution is written?

Kirsten Vital said the dilemma is that they would then be under the Non-Neighborhood siblings prioritization. When we looked at these seats and did the analysis, it was based on them being the first priority and looking at the number of seats there would be for neighborhood, and then non-neighborhood siblings. There is no exact guarantee in the lottery system. Director Hamill said we assume that the current siblings would have been bounced out? Currently-enrolled siblings would be bounced out.

District Demographer Juwen Lam said we took into consideration the Hillcrest Kindergartners that would have been redistricted that were in the proposed boundary would now be neighborhood students and they would have first priority over the non-neighborhood siblings. When we look at how many non-neighborhood siblings would be applying to the school based upon principal feedback and how many non-neighborhood siblings would be applying, the analysis showed that it would work. However, we would have to go back and do additional analyses if those students are now different in the priority ranking. If they are now not considered neighborhood students, this would require additional analyses. Director Hamill said she did not understand that because it is the same number of families and same number of bodies. Kirsten Vital said it is an open lottery system unless we were to change that in order for them to have some prioritization above that. Otherwise, what happens is the computer system goes through that prioritization - neighborhood first - non-neighborhood sibling - any P.I. student that is applying for those schools then fills those seats, then it's an open lottery.

Director Hamill asked if it is possible for them to accept the Board asking staff to change that for this year? Kirsten Vital said it is not her accepting it and she is looking to General Counsel for the amendment to Board Policy.

District Secretary Edgar Rakestraw said the motion is a change in policy, and if adopted, would be the policy directive.

The following members of the audience addressed the Board and the State Administrator on this issue:

A community member said she is concerned that the OEA recommendations could have an effect on the racial diversity of Hillcrest. The 4th and 6th grade classes that her children are in have more than half of the nonwhite students living out of the boundaries that were suggested. She also asked the Board to consider the boundary adjustment effect on elementary students trying to walk to school. The proposed boundary would require students, if they were redistricted to Montclair to cross over a very busy highway. Many of the kids who live on the other side of Broadway Terrace live within a couple blocks of the school are out of the attendance boundary.

A parent said the redirected students should be sent somewhere that is nearby and not to the bottom of the heap. They support continued process and outreach that all affected schools are involved and that the District staff investigate the impact of their suggestions and decisions if they move along a line or if they can find excess capacity for Hillcrest kids or Montclair kids if that school becomes overcrowded.

Simon Cawley, parent of a Hillcrest Pre-K student, said he supports the comments made by the previous two speakers. As a parent who is applying for a position at the school and potentially facing redirection, he asked what is the process by which they will find out what is the fate and when will the decision be made?

President Kakishiba said questions would be dealt with at the end of this presentation.

Darcy Brown-Martin, Hillcrest parent group, said the Hillcrest community invites process and input from all schools affected by any solution to their problem which will be a larger Oakland Unified problem affecting many schools. Circumscribing enrollment at Kindergarten at Hillcrest next year is essential for the well-being of the school. Kids at Hillcrest are getting a superior education and the community wishes to continue to support that. They cannot accommodate every student who wishes to enter the school; it is their hope that the District will make it possible for those kids to be accommodated at another school where they will also get a fine education. It is their hope that in the short-term that there will be certainty for the families who are going to be looking for letters in the mail in March about where their children will be attending school.

Tamara Morrish, Chabot parent, said the motion needs to be very clear about what happens if someone does not make it into their neighborhood school and they get bumped to their closest school. What is the priority for siblings? She said Chabot has transfer families and they do not differentiate them from their neighborhood families. The Chabot community has asked for a scenario of what it would look like if the middle school was phased out at Hillcrest. OUSD staff presented a proposal that showed that it would not work. There is a way to have classes structured for a K-5 program at Hillcrest. To date, they have not received that plan from the District. Regarding the space at neighboring school, she said they do not have confidence in the data and they would like to see incoming Kindergarten mapped out for four years. Two years ago, Chabot had an enrollment problem and ten families were affected; siblings of transfer students were waitlisted and they ended up with a Kindergarten class of 27 kids. Eliminating the middle school - something that works - we do not wish to dismantle it. What does that mean? Those kids at Hillcrest, just like the kids at Chabot, if they had a middle school at

Chabot, they would be high performing whether they were at Chabot, Claremont, Montera, Bret Harte, they would still be high performing. Something that works and not dismantling it, she does not understand that. If that means the students will not go to a private school...they do not understand that. The middle school came into being when there was an underenrollment problem at Hillcrest. Now there is an overenrollment problem. Why would you not consider phasing out the middle school when there are parents who have worked very hard, if people can get the maximum benefit of the middle school grades, but slowly phase it out. If you cannot support your K-5 population in your neighborhood and you have middle school grades, there are three great middle schools with options nearby, it is difficult to understand why there is no consideration for the scenarios being presented for how that would play out in the next few years.

Aquacena Lopez spoke in support of the proposal as stated by Director Hamill. She said this is a good opportunity to expand upon something that is working, is good for our families, making it bigger and having more people participate.

Joshua Newman, Montclair parent, gave his concerns about the process. They had two days' notice to evaluate this proposal. Although Director Hamill's proposal is well intentioned, they had two minutes' notice to understand it. They need more time and he requested postponing action until January which will not affect the options process. There are substantial problems with it. They had six spots this year in the Kindergarten class which were not taken by siblings and by students who were retained. The proposal would problem bring about ten or fifteen students, plus they do not know what it means to send students who are geographically closest to their school. Is that larger than the redistricting proposal or is it less than the proposal? In two minutes, they cannot figure it out. As he understands it, this is going to get lower priority to Program Improvement (P.I.) students who come to Montclair than it would give to redirected Hillcrest students. That is a big policy decision to make in two minutes' notice. He asked the Board to give some time to the community to evaluate the proposal and for staff to have some meetings with the community. Last week, they did ask staff to meet with them and they have not had a chance to do that. There is time to put this over for a month and there is a need to put it over for a month.

Mary-Ann Piette, Hillcrest School Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC), commented about the overcrowding at Hillcrest. They have had large Kindergarten classes for the last few years. They have 35 kids in their fifth grade. They have a middle school that is growing. Kids are staying longer because it is a very successful school. More and more kids are going to Oakland Tech as well. They have been investing a lot of effort in the middle school.

Wendy Moorison, PTA President, Montclair Elementary School, asked whether there will be caps and if the caps will apply to all schools? She understands the overcrowding issue at Hillcrest, but she does not understand why Montclair should receive 67 students next year. What will happen when Hillcrest is overcrowded? Will those students automatically come to Montclair regardless of space? Last year Montclair had 14 open seats and six were filled with siblings. Last year, there were two retentions. Every year, their enrollment has increased. She does not see the space available for kids coming their way. Her understanding is that this will be looked at in Spring 2008 for implementation in 2009. It does not address what will happen next year. The data is shaky and she would like to see more data about their neighborhood and exactly how many kids are coming to Hillcrest?

Andrew Thomas, Hillcrest parent, said delay is the biggest problem at Hillcrest and we need to take some action tonight. They need reassurance about what is going to happen.

He supports the motion by Director Hamill. Clarification was requested as to how the redirection process is going to work. There needs to be a balancing process and they are feeling the crunch today at Hillcrest with a series of overcrowded Kindergarten classes over the last two years. They have talked about a cap of 40 at Hillcrest. He asked for action tonight so that the parents are aware and can start planning with District staff where people are going to be next year.

Joanne Karchmer, Hillcrest parent, spoke of ample and meaningful community process. She supports the exploration of all facilities available to address the problem and means to make the hill schools more accessible, rather than more exclusive.

Heather Rascher said everyone wants a degree of certainty which can be achieved without redistricting. She does not see any reason to draw the boundaries as they have been drawn. The LRPC has not supported or drawn the boundaries as has been drawn on the map. Many people find that the boundary divisions are over restrictive and cut out more children than is necessary and will direct more children than is necessary. She noted that seven percent of all Hillcrest children are from Chabot and Montclair. Why are those children going to Hillcrest when people in the Hillcrest attendance area are being redirected to Chabot and Montclair Schools? If the District is prioritizing neighborhood schools, we should be allowed to attend our neighborhood school. If Chabot and Montclair are exact equals as is proposed by the Redistricting, then why are those children being allowed to attend Hillcrest? It seems hypocritical. It seems hypocritical to support a K-8 model for Hillcrest alone, yet not allow Montclair, Chabot or any other District school to develop a K-8 model and given the resources to develop a successful model. She requested answers to her questions as to the disparities for Hillcrest children and the rest of children in the District.

Jim Glosli, Montclair parent, said an accelerated process of review over the next month to six weeks is needed for input from the communities to explore the consequences of decisions. He recommends an effort by staff to engage the community in the upcoming weeks regarding the redirection process.

Krystal Bowen, Parent of Pre-K student at Montclair, said Board Members and the community have not had enough time to consider Director Hamill's proposal. Her concern has always been with the process. All of the communities have not had an opportunity to fully explore the ramifications of any of the proposals. It affects the students who are not going to be allowed to come to these schools as part of the Options Program. Those students are not going to be allowed from the Program Improvement schools to come to their schools. All of the options need to be fully explored before any proposal can be considered or adopted by the Board. She asked the Board to take more time to consider the Hillcrest situation and to engage the school community which will affect the needs of other school communities.

Kirsten Vital was asked to respond to speaker questions. Ms. Vital said the motion on the table would mean parents would fill out the Options Brochures and it would be neighborhood, then the Hillcrest families would have their next priority to be redirected to the next closest schools. And that would also be the same for any overcrowded school. The Options Brochures are due back on January 15th. On March 1st letters would come in the mail across the District to all families and by a date certain in May, that would come in the letter, families would then need to register at the school that they would get. Staff would be working on a draft scope of work around these policies with the Board directors on the subcommittee.

In response to President Kakishiba, Director Hamill said the intent of her motion does not include a cap. She wrote her motion with some flexibility so that staff could work it out. President Kakishiba asked the following question regarding the redirecting of Hillcrest residents into other schools: If there are 20 students that needed redirection and all 20 of them said they wanted to go to Chabot, and there is insufficient space, does her motion say we are guaranteeing that parents get to have their second choice?

Director Yee said this is a problem with the Board trying to make administrative procedures. The whole effort of Ms. Vital and our demographer was to create a set of reasonably, defensible administrative procedures based on failed board policy. He and Director Hamill are advocating us to revisit the failed board policy so that we allow sufficient time for staff to make appropriate administrative procedures. The main thing he understood from Director Hamill's comments and her motion is that we delay any administrative procedures which would change the boundaries until we have looked at the policy. We have to rely on staff at the sites and in Central Office to come to some accommodation around these nuances. There are many details regarding siblings, out of district, special education, P.I. siblings, etc., which are hard to adjudicate in a motion on the floor. The most important thing is to say we take seriously the responsibility of making the policy and we will do it by a date certain.

Director Hamill said the same people who did not want us to pass the motion tonight did not want us to pass the boundary change either. We have a lot of families who are the neighbors of these two schools and they have to go some place. This, as an alternative, will work and not affect the siblings that are coming in.

President Kakishiba called the question and the motion was approved unanimously.

A motion was made by Kerry Hamill, seconded by Gregory Hodge, that this matter be Adopted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Votes: Adv Aye: 7 - Kerry Hamill, Gregory Hodge, Gary Yee, Noel Gallo, Christopher Dobbins, Alice Spearman and David Kakishiba
Adv Nay: 0
Adv Abstain: 0
Aye: 1 - Vincent Matthews
Nay: 0
Recused: 0
Absent: 0 - ShaCora Cowart and Markeshia.James
Preferential Aye: 0
Preferential Abstention: 0
Preferential Nay: 0

S. New Business

State Administrator



07-1468

**Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) - Oakland Housing Authority -
Oakland Schools Police Department**

Ratification by State Administrator of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the District and the Oakland Housing Authority, for the latter to provide dispatch and records management services to the Oakland Schools Police Department, for the period of November 29, 2007 through November 28, 2009, in an amount not to exceed \$193,620.00.

Funding Source: General Purpose

Attachments: [Document\(s\)](#)

District Secretary Edgar Rakestraw stated a request from staff has been received to table this item.

Tabled

T. Introduction of New Matter



[07-1742](#) East Oakland Leadership Academy - Petition and Proposed Charter

Presentation of East Oakland Leadership Academy - Petition and Proposed Charter.

Attachments: [Document\(s\)](#)

[07-0742 - East Oakland Leadership Academy - Petition and Proposed Charter.pdf](#)



[07-1743](#) Oakland Charter Academy - Petition and Proposed Charter

Presentation of the Oakland Charter Academy - Petition and Proposed Charter (Renewal)

Attachments: [Document\(s\)](#)

[007-0743 - Oakland Charter Academy \(Renewal\) - Petition and Proposed Charter.pdf](#)

U. Report of Regular Board Members

Director Dobbins reported that the Skyline Performing Arts Academy had a tremendous performance at last week's play. They also had a great Winter Concert. He recognized Melrose Leadership Academy for the tremendous partnership with their Maxwell Park Neighborhood Association. The event was well attended. He visited Burckhalter this morning and saw their Winter Concert. The kids are tremendous. Carl B. Munck won an award for their Title I program and all staff were congratulated for their efforts.

V. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned the meeting at ___ p.m. in memory of Sergeant Lemarr Anthony Larry.

Prepared By: _____

Approved By: _____