Alameda Community Learning Center

**Governing Board Meeting Agenda**

 **May 7th, 2014 – 6:30 PM**

This meeting will be held at ACLC: 400 Grand St. Alameda, CA 94501

**­**

1. **Public Session (ACLC)** 6:30 PM
2. **Call to Order & Attendance**

Meeting is called to order at \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Board Members Present Absent

David Hoopes, ACLC Lead Facilitator \_\_\_x\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_

Molly Fenn, ACLC Facilitator \_\_\_x\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_

Gabrielle Baumgartner, ACLC Facilitator \_\_\_x\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_

Bara Waters, ACLC Parent Member \_\_\_x\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_

Catherine Pauling, ACLC Parent Member \_\_\_x\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_

Patrick Melendez, ACLC Learner \_\_\_x\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_

Sophia Moore, ACLC Learner \_\_\_x\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_

Raeann Johnson, ACLC Community member \_\_\_x\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **Review and Approval of Agenda**
	* 1. **All in favor except Patrick (no), Sophia (abstain)**

1. **Presentations from the floor** 6:35 PM

PRESENTATIONS FROM THE FLOOR - At this time any person wishing to speak to any item not on the agenda will be granted three minutes to make a presentation to the Board of Directors.

1. Dave Hoopes:
	1. Thank you to community for participating in discussions regarding site change, school organization and values.
	2. Thank you to Eryn Kjelland, School Counselor, for smooth implementation of new testing procedures.
2. Bara Waters: Thank School Board for 11-year lease
3. Lynn Kameny: Reviews of Senior Portfolios
	1. Some board members did not get Google Doc (Sophia, Patrick, Catherine) to provide feedback on portfolios. Dave will resend. Two people turned in folders—Bara and Gabrielle (?)
4. Gabrielle B: Concerned about the master schedule being completed in time for Board to have input.
	1. Dave: Working on it. Meeting with facilitators about it next week.
	2. Molly: At the previous board meeting there was concern about the master schedule allowing seniors time to access college courses. Want to have input from learners about being able to take college courses.
5. Lynn Kameny: I am on the organizing team for NAU (Nea ACLC United). Yesterday was a difficult negotiating day. Some facilitators don’t have a contract and are not sure if they have a job for the next year. I hope that in future, facilitators could be notified in a more timely way about contracts and have better job security.
6. Catherine Pauling: At the last meeting we discussed that Patrick’s resolution was not put on agenda, that it was filtered by David. Would like Board to have direct access to proposals for its agenda, before they are filtered by consultations with lawyers or CLCS. The Board should honor requests from community. Asks to put this resolution back on the agenda.
	1. Patrick: There has been reoccurring delay on getting this item on the agenda. As I said last month, I would like to have it as an action item. The Board does not have to vote on it, if it is deemed inappropriate. Bylaws state that any Board member—in fact, anyone—can put something on the agenda. It must be respected. This bylaw has been broken three times. Also, the letter from lawyers states that CLCS Board members were present at first meeting so they have already heard concern. But nothing has happened. Secondly, cost of lawyers has been mentioned. Could have avoided this if lawyers were not consulted before the discussion happened. I don’t want to do anything illegal. If illegal, then completely willing to revisit. Letter states that this resolution would require CLCS Board to schedule extra meetings, but this is only a suggestion. CLCS Board does not have to respond to or act on it. Third, the letter states that this pits ACLC Board against CLCS Board—to the contrary, it is intended to improve communication and relationship. Fourth, states that ACLC Board has no authority in this matter, but this is only input from a the community, offered in an advisory capacity. Finally, states that this violates the Charter, but it does not violate the Charter because it seeks only input to, not authority over, any areas addressed.
	2. Jenny: Last month you (Patrick) requested to know which specific laws the resolution violated. Were you given that?
		1. Patrick: No.
	3. Catherine: David, why do you think you have authority to decide the status of agenda items (discussion, action) or even whether they are on the agenda?
		1. David: This is all in my letter. It was not appropriate.
		2. Catherine: It is not all in the letter. Why not even allow discussion?
		3. David: There was a two-hour discussion.
		4. Catherine: Voted to bring it back for a vote.
		5. David: There was never a vote. There was a request. I do not want to be viewed as censoring the item. But a vote on this item is not appropriate. It violates our Charter.
		6. Catherine: But if a learner is on Board, and requests continued discussion, then we take the time to do it. There is a disconnect between the ACLC and CLCS Boards. That is a fact. Patrick’s resolution is seeking to remedy that. Even if it is not the right approach, we could discuss, seek another approach. Revise. Then vote. If only follow law, then would still have slavery in this country. It is not illegal to discuss.
		7. Dave: I was happy to put it on as a discussion item.
		8. Catherine: Leading to a vote.
		9. Dave: That is the problem. I can’t set up the Board to do something that violates the Charter.
		10. Catherine: Making it an action item does not immediately make it illegal. You are censoring, filtering. Who directed you?
		11. Dave: You saw the letter from the attorney. I also consulted with two other attorneys who gave same opinion.
	4. Bara: I am concerned that Charter renewal is upcoming. Worried about doing anything that would undermine that. Facing another move, time to pull together. This is a power play issue. It is divisive. It is not a good time for this. Parents come to you. They also come to me saying that they think a small group of parents is trying to hijack our school. This is not productive. Not a good time to be divisive.
	5. Camila: The resolution is a reponse to divisiveness that already exists. Resolution trying to alleviate the tension, not create it. We’ve noticed that there is mistrust with CLCS board. This is meant to engender transparency and therefore trust. No Board member has the right to take things off the agenda. There are varying views. That calls for a vote.
	6. Patrick: We are not deciding on this issue, only giving a recommendation. It is advisory, not a policy vote. The letter says we can’t require that Board to meet. Nothing in the resolution requires them to meet. It is only a request. They are in charge of governance, so nothing ACLC board votes on in this area can be policy. Can only be policy if CLCS board votes on a governance issue. Just as Curriculum & Standards committee makes recommendations to this Board but cannot make policy. This is only a vote to recommend something. Same system, more communication. That is what we are asking. What you have said is an opinion. You decided to keep this item off the agenda as an action item because it is illegal. That is an opinion and therefore you have violated the bylaws. All of this discussion could have been part of the discussion on the action item. You could have stated all your arguments in that discussion. Do you have any reflections on what you have done. Do you stand by it?
	7. Dave: I don’t want to volley back and forth. This is the right thing to do for the Board. [Starts to be a back and forth—Dave withdraws from discussion].
	8. Molly: You have said the discussion has legs. I have read your letter and understand your concern for not wanting it as an action item. At the same time, I feel that there is an issue that is seeking to be addressed. When people go to CLCS Board many feel that they talk but are not really heard. If you say to go to CLCS board with it, that is the very place where people feel powerless and unheard. So what do you recommend? Where should Patrick or others go with this concern?
	9. Dave: I would like to work with Patrick to take this to Joan Uhler and get it as discussion at CLCS Board. It could go to sub-committee or the resolution could even be voted on. Let’s reach out to Joan, walk her through this resolution, assume that they are listening. I think they are. That is the process for changing the timeline for decision making.
	10. Joyce: As I understand it, this was the vehicle for getting it to the CLCS Board, not just from an individual, Patrick, but from the Board as a whole. This was just a way to get the information over to them, to get some legs to begin with. I don’t understand why it is illegal, when it is just a request.
	11. Dore: I have the same question—how is a request to the CLCS Board illegal?
	12. David: The resolution calls on the CLCS Board to hold extra meetings. The language of “request” is very unclear. It sets a precedent for this Board to make decisions on governance issues, which is a bad precedent. It is also ineffectual because this Board has no authority over governance. I think it is an appropriate conversation to have—where can the ACLC Board weigh in on decisions made by the CLCS Board? Where is the appropriate place for that?
	13. Dore: But we can’t discuss it?
	14. Dave: I would love to have discussed the revised version tonight. But Patrick is insisting that it is an action item. So that puts us in a tough place. It is the legal opinion of three people who do this all the time that it would not be responsible to have as an action item.
	15. Dore: The language says “request”? How is that unclear, why not OK?
	16. Dave: It pits the two Boards against each other. And sets precedent that this Board will take up items that are either ineffectual or address a governance issue. I know this answer not enough for some here.
	17. Catherine: With how many people does this not sit well? Several (5 or so) raise their hands.
	18. Dore: And why it does not sit well is because there is a feeling that this Board has no power. Everyone comes here, we want them to feel that it is worthwhile. I understand that you feel in a tough position, but you did not have to be. You could have let this Board vote and then let CLCS and their lawyers deal with it.
	19. Patrick: I am confused by repeated reference to the old resolution. I requested to have the revised version on the agenda as action item. The item up for question is not the old resolution, it was the revised version. I wanted it as an action item. To disallows my request to have it as an action item, this retraces past events—how the resolution has been repeatedly disallowed as an action item. Did you look at the revised version? It addressed your concerns. It did not give this Board any authority. We have such a narrow point of view on what this Board can discuss—graduation requirements, day-to-day issues like card playing, etc. Why would I spend five hours on a Wednesday night to discuss that? But this is just what the Board has authority over, not what it is allowed to discuss. Board’s limits of authority are not the same as limits on items it can discuss.
	20. Jenny: Nea created 2009. Our jurisdiction was changed with creation of CLCS Board. Three years ago, there was concern that ACLC community and Board no longer have enough input. Three years ago. When changes are made, as Bara said, is when people start taking notice. Yes, when there is change is when people get concerned and want to have a voice. This is not a power play. It is a proposal for communication and unification. I have seen many proposals put forward to CLCS in interests of communication, they have not been taken up. They are called ineffective, irrelevant. Should be respected. If this effort is not passed, then what can we do? At what point will this concern be heard.
	21. Jennifer: I am on CLCS Board. Right now I speak as a community member. I appreciate the efforts to bring this issue to forward. Recently, CLCS did listen to the community wish to not merge Nea and ACLC. I recommend to Patrick to get people to sign a statement. Bring it to the Board as a group of individuals, rather than as the ACLC Board. Great. We need to improve communication. One challenge of having a Board is that it is the Board’s job to have their meetings in public. You are conducting your business in public, allow for public comment, but not responsible to respond to every comment that is made. Understand that can be frustrating. We also have a good example of a task force that has been created—another way to bring an issue that needs attention to be brought to the Board for attention
	22. Molly: Jennifer said that Board’s job is to conduct business in public and therefore not always interactive because that not appropriate. What are ways, other than Board meetings, where community members can get the voice and participation that they crave. I would suggest that perhaps look at our committees and whether we can use those in new ways to allow community members to lead as they want.
	23. Joyce: What is current means for communication between ACLC and CLCS Board?
		1. Dave: Great question! Aside from just going to the CLCS Board meeting--that is the discussion that needs to happen.
		2. Jennifer: current mechanism—there are lead facilitators and learners on the Board—but currently reviewing whether paid employees can sit on the Board. We do have intentionality around CLCS Board members coming to ACLC/Nea Board meetings. One thing about committee structure—if it is a Committee of the Board then under the Brown Act. A separate committee reporting to the Board but not part of the Board would have more flexibility.
		3. Having a representative from the institution not enough. Need a person who would have attended various meetings.
	24. Patrick: I will be resigning as of tomorrow morning due to personal concerns and feelings.

PRESENTATION ON AGENDA ITEMS – Any person wishing to speak to any item on the agenda will be granted three minutes to make a presentation just prior to the discussion of the agenda item.

1. Dave Hoopes: We are moving to Woodstock for sure next year. The 11 year lease is great. Learners who start in 6th grade are assured of having that site for their entire middle-high school career. Facilitators discussed how to divide the site. We’ve reached a lot of consensus—had a constructive healthy meeting.
	1. Lynn: Yes it was a good meeting. We got a lot done. It was well-facilitated and we came to a consensus on the broad strokes, bodes well for future working together
	2. Molly: productive, clarity on views of both groups of facilitators
	3. Dave: both schools will have own Center. It will be a squeeze next year, but the following year, 2 or 3 more classrooms will become available. We have the long-term lease and a little more elbow room later. It is a financially viable agreement (which is less assured when outside of Prop 39 framework) but we have locked in a reasonable rate; also ways to save costs when both schools on same site (share janitorial, tech support costs);
2. US News & World Report made us a “bronze” school again—don’t qualify for Silver or Gold because lack of AP classes. They have our API wrong. Have asked for correction.
3. Great college acceptance news, PiE Robotics won award, Engineering team won award, science fair lots of awards, one learner, Harrison Coorey, placed at State level

Executive Director’s Report:

1. Collective bargaining meetings continue. We’ve learned a lot. Signed off on a number of things, but yesterday ran into a place where it was not great. Heavy things yet to go. We await NAU counterproposal.
2. 11-year lease agreement. [Dave: want to note, good and bad things about move, but nothing bad about 11-year lease]
3. MOU for Boys & Girls Club to be approved by CLCS Board on May 29th. We will get Boys & Girls Club space (gym) 8am to 3pm.
4. Nea revising job descriptions for COO and Lead Facilitator. Will do search to fill these positions.
5. Nea went through Charter renewal this year. ACLC next year. Material changes to charter—regarding out-of-district siblings going to top of out-of-district list.

Curriculum Committee: (Gabrielle)

1. Focusing on math, looking at Common Core standards and practices. Purchased some reference books. Planning various indicators to be used to place learners in math courses. Will have rigorous 8th grade algebra, geometry, and then 9th grade algebra ii/statistics course. Having talked to other schools, think ACLC is ahead of the game.
	1. Bara: what about learners having to shift gears?
	2. Gabrielle: state is giving 2 years to transition. We are aware. This year went back to cover statistics to align with new standards. Smarter Balance testing worked well. Test did respond to learners by giving more difficult questions for those who did well.
	3. Dave: there’s no “gotcha”, there is transition time; school or learners will not be penalized during this transition; on other hand, we have strong team, learners will be allowed placement at their level
	4. Gabrielle: caution anyone who wants to speed up the process, to test and skip something not best thing for young minds

Leadership Report (Patrick)

1. Planning diversity day—learners teach classes, meditation, ultimate Frisbee, art. Long tradition. Very fun.
2. CCCs going well—recently, bike safety CCC, non-denominational egg hunt on the beach (ideas for how to do differently next year), multiple field trips happening—Linked In, Google, Stanford, Marine Biology research vessel trip,
3. L2L fundraising sending great proposals to leadership about funding local animal shelter
4. Library created by Adam Orla-Bukowski, ready for checking and reading, Eagle Scout project
5. (Molly) Patrick conducted his senior project “Preparation Day” where seniors led groups educating them about next steps. 8th graders learned about high school, 9th and 10th learned about college readiness, 11th graders learned about college application process. Really crucial part of our model exemplified—learners learning from each other and teaching each other
	1. Gabrielle—learners gave same info that adults might give, but the learners took it in a different way when it comes from peers
6. Revisiting way that people get into leadership. May do away with quotas per grade. Current proposal will be revised many times, but plan is to get rid of quotas, but keeping in mind diversity in terms of gender, race, background, grades, etc. Hotly debated in leadership right now, but good conversation and communication. Have been proud about quality of discussion toward consensus.

Personnel:

1. Dave: Kumi Hodge resigned. Megan Elliot will step in and take over intervention role, Kumi’s floor duties, lunch time supervision. Bernice Johnson will take over his Learning to Learn classes—trained in 180 degrees program.

Finance:

1. Dave: Brought summary, sans private personnel info on salaries, etc. Lots of budget changes, especially because of move. Main changes: budgeting for 359 learners, graduating class of 27, bringing in 60 sixth graders.
	1. Molly—too much salary info is missing. Board needs that info. We are public employees.
		1. Dave—I erred on side of caution, because salary info did not have names but some people too easily identified.
	2. Dave: Next year, some gains in budget. ADA gain—number of learners and per learner. Paul Bentz salary. Facilities costs—not paying for portables next year ($30,000). Move bid for this year less than last year. We will be better at the move. So moving costs lower. Insurance fees a bit lower because schools on one campus. Reduced costs for internet, janitorial, tech (managing one large network rather than two separate ones).
	3. Some rising costs: Staff person to work specifically with ELL, credentialed, highly qualified. Still need to craft position, but budgeting for credentialed person to work with those who struggle, and who are acquiring English. Full-time assistant lead facilitator who will teach but also handle testing, disciplinary issues, communication. One additional facilitator—not sure what discipline.
	4. Going to be a settlement cost to leaving this site. District wants carpet removed, paint (white is too bright), etc. Negotiating with district on this.
		1. Joyce: Was there a cost when left Encinal?
		2. Dave: Yes, but we negotiated it way down. Doing that again now.
	5. Need to make tech improvements in the center. Thin clients not reliable. Thinking about getting wireless computers for Center rather than rewiring new building—wiring is part of the unreliability of current system. What think? Spend a bit more money to get wireless (get out of business of thin clients) or try to keep this system running.
		1. Camila: yes, should be a priority
		2. Joyce: applaud this
		3. Catherine: going from desktop to laptop keyboard affects timing for testing, etc
	6. Molly: Want to represent facilitator viewpoint—idea of another facilitator, lead facilitator not necessarily good or bad; but wondering why these items did not come from Personnel committee
	7. Gabrielle: learners want more contact with facilitators; personal relationships improve learning, discipline, obviating need for more administrative personnel; in past, administrative tasks divided among facilitators; we are moving away from that to more traditional model
	8. Jennifer: [missed—how to agendize something]; income for facility improvement came this year to be spent next year; so $50,000 difference to bottom line; officially restricted, so can be carried over but then expenses should also be carried over; health and welfare benefits increasing due to Obamacare, and worker’s comp going up so that should be reflected in budget; we should request a quote for worker’s comp; Common Core pot of money received this year but expenses increasing next year—do we need to roll that $60,000?
	9. Dave: Yes, we have more buying to do.
	10. Jennifer: rent? Where’s is AUSD’s rental—wrapped into oversight?
	11. Dave: yes
	12. Jennifer: labelling of PowerSchool and EdTech a bit misleading—EdTech charging $90,000, not $15,000.
	13. Interest expense: When budget should act as though line of credit fully drawn; only showing $1500 for interest, should be much higher; wipes out “profit”; bank will be concerned
	14. Dave: not borrowing next year
	15. Jennifer: but you need it to be renewed, might not reach enrollment goals, other risks
	16. Dave: yes, but many budget savings that are not in this budget yet
	17. Jennifer: [missed—question about what bottom line includes or does not]
2. Catherine: question about enrollment—jump in 10th grade?
	1. Molly: clarifies that we are graduating out smaller classes
3. Joyce: concerned about putting funds into another administrator, if that means that person would cover a lot of floor duty, leading to less interaction between facilitators and learners on the floor
	1. With added facilitators, and reducing 8th grade class size, we will be able to increase time in the Center for all facilitators;
4. Catherine: possibility to consider other option?
5. Dave: feel strongly that need assistant lead facilitator; hard to be full-time facilitator and carry admin duties; union negotiations will cover this too
6. Bara: Instead of looking at it as hierarchy, can see it as a support. Have heard from facilitators that they feel stretched thin; this would allow them to focus on teaching; have always had assistant lead facilitator role; if that person can also teach, then lessens teaching load on others
7. Catherine: my concern is whether it is home grown, someone who understands the model vs someone from outside; will they bring a more hierarchical approach
8. Molly: tension between wanting to have democratic model and having people stretched too thin doing everything; if bring in this new position, then need to be inclusive and intentional in designing that job description; it should happen in Personnel Committee where learners, facilitators, parents all have a voice
9. Joyce: recommend that we look in-house for lead facilitator

6:50 PM

1. **Consent Agenda** 7:10 PM
	1. Approval of check register for March 2014
	2. Approval of March, 2014 minutes
	3. Approval of April, 2014 Minutes
		1. Molly—change to March minutes, p 12, says I said “learners not allow CLCS board” unclear, did not say that, would like to strike that sentence
		2. Dave—motion to approve consent agenda with striking sentence that Molly designated
		3. Molly—seconded,
		4. approved unanimously

**7. Action Items** 7:15 PM

a. No action items have been requested for this agenda

b. Graduation modification for learners with IEP’s

 a. Dave: discussed this last month [went to get hard copy]; one significant change from last month version—new second paragraph; this comes from Carrie: changing graduation requirements for level 1 or 2 ELL to be equivalent to Alameda Unified rather than current requirement that they be UC-ready as is requirement for other learners

Motion to pass

Seconded

Passed unanimously

**8. Discussion Items** 7:20 PM

1. **LCAP –**California State Board of Education approved spending regulations

and a template for the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) that support

local implementation of the Local Control Funding Formula. All local educational

agencies (LEAs) must develop their first LCAPs and submit them with an approved

budget by June 30, 2014.

Dave: Have received input from facilitators and parents; this is draft—have more work to refine it; many goals from WASC process carry over well to the LCAP goals; parents will get more details next PAC meeting, survey will be sent out. To name the goals—

* + Need to engage more with low-income and EL Learners:
		1. Increased access to counseling and peer counseling
		2. Making sure all learners engage with democratic processes
	+ Professional development for facilitators
		1. Strategies for teaching EL Learners in mainstream classroom
	+ Are we engaging all learners in project-based learning model
	+ Increase academic achievement for at-risk learners
		1. Need better data, ways to track it—facilitators and parents suggest more attention to reading levels and how they change across the year
		2. Can celebrate achievement progress and catch lack of progress
	+ Build out our SST process—assistant lead facilitator position could take some burden off of Eryn—such as testing, data, SSTs, and 504s; SSTs and 504s for emotional issues are well-nested with Eryn as counselor, but 504s and SSTs for disciplinary issues better situated with an assistant lead facilitator
	+ Improve achievement of learners who fail to progress in math
		1. Identify through assessment
		2. Professional development for math team
		3. Engage by connecting math to real world issues
	+ Want to have this conversation with leadership learners too
	+ What are Board members thoughts on these three main actions carry out the five goals in support of EL, low-income learners and those who are foster children:
		1. Data tracking--assessments
		2. ELD facilitator
		3. Assistant lead facilitator
1. Bara: glad to see this focus, living with a former ACLC learner paying price of not getting attention needed; ACLC good with high flyers but need to strengthen interventions for those who are not
2. Molly: are we going to be approving budget items or just these goals
3. Dave: will be approving the goals, the plans, the measurable; no $ signs attached
4. Gabrielle: head is spinning from amount of change going on: renewing charter, WASC, moving, contract negotiations, LCAP planning, etc. Worried about rushing through information too quickly to make good decisions; overwhelmed; worried that we will drop something and get caught
5. Dave: yes, a lot going on, but Charter, WASC, LCAP discussions do overlap

**Adjourn at 9:51** The next ACLC Board Meeting is scheduled for June 4th, 2014

THE ORDER OF BUSINESS MAY BE CHANGED WITHOUT NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that the order of consideration of matters on this agenda may be changed without prior notice.

REASONABLE LIMITATIONS MAY BE PLACED ON PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The Board of Directors’ presiding officer reserves the right to impose reasonable time limits on public testimony to ensure that the agenda is completed.

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS MAY BE MADE

Notice is hereby given that consistent with the requirements of the *Bagley Open Meeting Act*, special presentations not mentioned in the agenda may be made at this meeting. However, any such presentation will be for information only.

REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION WILL BE PROVIDED FOR ANY INDIVIDUAL WITH A DISABILITY

Pursuant to the *Rehabilitation Act of 1973* and the *Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990*, any individual with a disability who requires reasonable accommodation to attend or participate in this meeting of the Board of Directors may request assistance by contacting Community Learning Center School, Inc., 210 Central Ave. #603, Alameda, CA 94501, phone (510) 521-7543, fax (510) 521-7350.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

For more information concerning this agenda or for materials pertaining to the board meeting, please contact Community Learning Center Schools, Inc., 210 Central Ave. #603, Alameda, CA 94501, phone (510)263-9266, fax (510) 521-7350, during school hours