

**Our mission is to transform the public school system so that all district and charter students have access to high-quality public schools.**

**CONFIDENTIAL – DO NOT SHARE**

**Minutes of LAAC March 2018 Meeting**

Wednesday, March 7, 2:00pm – 4:00pm

CCSA LA Office

|  |
| --- |
| **Attendance** |
| **Present** | LAAC Members: Cristina DeJesus (Green Dot), Vanessa Jackson (Collegiate), Emilio Pack (STEM Prep), Parker Hudnut (ICEF), Caprice Young (Magnolia), Yvette King-Berg (YPI), Valerie Braimah (City), Ana Ponce (Camino Nuevo), Ted Morris (Endeavor), Pam Magee (Palisades), Oliver Sicat (Ednovate) *arrived at 2:30pm*, Mark Kleger-Heine (Citizens of the World) *arrived at 2:30pm*LAAC Members present via phone: Brian Bauer (Granada Hills) *until 3:15pm*, Erin Studer (CHIME) *until 3:30pm*CCSA Staff: Cassy Horton, Jennie Shin, Keith Dell’Aquila, Chris Copolillo, Jason Rudolph, Ebony Wheaton |
| **Not Present** | Jackie Elliot (PUC), Marcia Aaron (KIPP), Irene Sumida (Fenton) |
|  |
| **Reminders** |
| **Next LAAC Meeting**Wednesday, April 412:00 – 2:00pmCCSA LA Office |
|  |
| **Welcome** |
| Emilio framed today’s meeting as a follow-up to February’s discussion regarding updates to the north star priorities. Goals for today include examining and agreeing on those updates, as well as making individual commitments to taking action and supporting the work to move these priorities forward.  |
| **[Action Item] Updates to North Stars** |
| LAAC members spent 5-6 minutes quietly reading and reviewing the updated north stars document, which reflects the changes discussed during the February meeting. The group discussed and voted on each north star separately, as follows. DRL:* Emilio: We achieved our original goal. We updated the goals to reflect the goals of the Applicable Policies Working Group.
* Will we get to univeresal DRL approval by April 3?
* Update from today’s meeting of Applicable Policies Working Group?
* Cassy provided background and updates: We were never going to get really deep on content with this group. The goal is to agree on the list of applicable policies, and flag a few for needed updates. We might actually get to universal DRL tomorrow, at the final session of the Working Group. It’s a test of whether Dr. Gipson can facilitate this conversation to agreements. With this group, we are bringing in people who are new to some of this.
* We are on track to agreement on the list of policies.
* Universal DRL – is it approving the concept or the actual universal DRL?
	+ Both.
* The list of applicable policies is agreeable, it’s the implementation that causes concern.
* Where does wanding fall?
	+ In the discipline policy.
* Can we see a list of the policies?
* Who are the 12 charter leaders of the Applicable Policies Working Group? How were they chosen?
	+ Jose shoulder tapped them.
* Did we ever figure out if there are other working groups happening, pulled together by Jose?
	+ Jennie/Cassy asked Jose, and he said the language working group (which we had heard about, and which includes Gayle at MLC) is the only one.
* We want to make sure the charter community has agency in things like this.
* Has to be made really clear to the Board that we are agreeing to the list of applicable policies, but these 2 (Policy on Charter Authorizing and Administrative Procedures) need to be refreshed. The deadline we want is June 30.
* Regarding collective action, do we have the big organizations up for a renewal to make that happen?
	+ Yes – Alliance, Green Dot, others.
* Vote: All voted to approve this north star as updated. Valerie and Ana added concern with timelines as proposed.

Oversight:* Cristina: North star has been updated to reflect Applicable Policies Working Group and opportunities before us. We have outlined actions we can take to ensure we get to our desired outcomes.
* Appreciate the aggressive timeline. Cannot wait until August to learn what the plan is.
	+ But how long will it take charter community to come to agreement on changes?
	+ We have been talking about this for a long time, about a year and a half.
	+ Keith: We have a really good handle on the changes that we want to see. I agree the timeline is aggressive, but I think there’s a shared understanding on what the changes should be, and I think aggressive is the right strategy here.
* What happened to NACSA?
	+ Nick backed off of it. Seems like he wants to use the working group process, with Frances now in charge as district’s representative.
	+ For how long? Is there a time limit?
	+ Caprice: Why don’t we get Margaret Reyes? She would be the right person to do it, given previous work. And she consults on this.
	+ Cassy: If the working group is not effective, we can go back to Nick and tell him to bring in NACSA because this isn’t working. Someone who is not in the weeds of this relationship could be helpful.
	+ Be cautious about NACSA. They were in Washington – didn’t go well.
* Want to make sure we have clear deadlines about changing the process, not just the criteria.
* Cassy debriefed the group on what happened at yesterday’s LAUSD Charter Board Meeting. Ref announced that he will have a resolution on charter policy. We did not know this and did some data gathering. Jose knew some, but very little. Ref is very willing to work with us. He doesn’t know what’s going on with the working group.
* Yvette: Vladovic was at Shirley Ford’s memorial. I talked to him and said we’ll need your support in order to get things done, in the spirit of Shirley. And he said he’s open.
* The introduction of this resolution would probably be April 3, the same meeting when DRL is scheduled for approval.
* Should we expect any sort of a surprise on this resolution? What might that be?
	+ Yes we should be prepared, but we don’t know. We just found out about it yesterday.
* On the renewals, benchmarks can still be layered on.
* Vote: All voted to approve this north star as updated. Mark asked that we have more discussion on the renewal criteria.

Facilities* Cristina: This north star has been updated to reflect the proposal we are working on with Nick. We are also adding in pressure to make sure we get movement and are not simply waiting on a new superintendent.
* What if we were to ask for a board informative on what data is currently captured electronically and transparently? That would at least put it on the table.
* What is the cost benefit analysis? What is our leverage here? It’s not like DRL where we can submit without it. I think our leverage is money. Money that our sector can bring through long-term partnerships.
	+ Oliver: We did go deep into that analysis. It works well for people who fund us. Not necessarily for the district. This district was on the brink of bankruptcy, about to close schools, and no one cared.
	+ Cristina: For Inglewood – they told us it won’t resonate because you’re also taking student funding at the same time.
	+ But will this board care? Even if the voters and the community doesn’t care.
	+ If we think money would move things, then UTLA would not be where they are. There is a recent quote from Alex Caputo-Pearl about co-locations. Dollars and cents don’t make sense over there.
	+ Ebony: We did do the cost benefit analysis.
* Maybe we need a goal around the strategy to get everyone to commit to this as important.
	+ There are some leverage points. The bond.
* Timeline for public database seems aggressive.
	+ The policy is in place, it just needs to happen. Nick’s resolution.
	+ The board informative (suggestion above) would say we don’t have a clue what space has what.
	+ They do have the eCARS. The question is how good is that data.
	+ We have to be careful of advocating too strongly because this is all likely to lead to some school consolidation and we could be seen as an organization that is advocating for this. That will give UTLA all the fodder they need. And we may ultimately take over operations of those schools.
* Vote: All voted to approve this north star as updated, with some concern about timelines

Relationship Building* Emilio: This north star has been updated with more of a focus on intentionality, not just setting up meetings. Folding in superintendent search. Building relatinoships with board members we haven’t yet. And goals for 18-19 such as building relationships with local area superintendents.
* Cassy: Recent update is that Jed has an interview with the LA Times on March 14th. This is new and we have a quick turnaround. Want Jed’s talking points to align with a statement that we’re working on, which would be based on the survey you all took.
* When would the statement come out?
	+ Very quickly. Might want to read it at Tuesday’s board meeting.
* Feels like this is all focused on LAUSD.
	+ We do have a sub-priority for non-LAUSD relationships. Did not make it to the top 4 when we voted in August.
	+ We could fold this in.
	+ Could we really focus on LACOE? I think that is more critical.
	+ Yes we are doing that, talking to Alex. We can continue doing this. With the DRL piece and appeals, making sure we have a safe space to land. But it’s also about priroities – do we have the capacity in this group to do all the things?
* Vote: All voted to approve this north star as updated, with the addition of other, non-LAUSD relationships.
 |
| **[Action Item] LAAC Engagement in North Star Priorities**  |
| LAAC members voted to affirm each of the 4 commitments listed on the agenda. Make Board Member Calls* CCSA will do asset mapping to help this.
* Vote to commit to making calls, and indication of which board members each LAAC member can call:
	+ Emilio: Yes – Kelly, Ref
	+ Caprice: Yes – any
	+ Oliver: Yes – 4 and Vladovic
	+ Parker: Yes – 4 and McKenna
	+ Ted: Yes – Monica, Nick
	+ Pam: Yes – Nick, Ref
	+ Mark: Yes – any
	+ Ana: Yes – Monica, Ref
	+ Valerie: Yes – Nick, Monica, and I live in Schmerelson’s district and know Sharon in McKenna’s office
	+ Yvette: Yes – Vladovic
	+ Cristina: Yes – all including Vladovic and can try McKenna
	+ Venessa: Yes – Monica

Public Testimony* Can Jennie send us calendar invites to all the board meetings?
* Can CCSA provide wireless hotspot for the board meetings?
* Cassy gave an overview of upcoming meeting dates and overlap with north star goals.
* CCSA will facilitate a sign-up process after this meeting. Everyone will sign up to either show up or send someone.
* Preliminary sign-ups:
	+ March 13 – Oliver
	+ April 3 – Ted, Yvette, Oliver team, Mark (will be there for material revision), Pam, Valerie team
	+ April 10 – Emilio, Cristina, Valerie, Vanessa, Parker (or teammate)
* Aim for 5 people at every board meeting. We will also reach out to the broader charter community.

Working Group* Commit to joining Facilities working group: Pam, Mark, Valerie, Cristina, Emilio, Parker, Caprice
* Commit to joining Oversight working group: Everyone else present

DRL Pushback* If you do not have a renewal or new peititon, are you willing to sign a letter in support?
* If you do, would you commit to that kind of backstop, submitting with no DRL? Hopefully, we do not have to do this, if everything else works. This can be tentative, as of today.
* Do we have four votes on the board?
	+ Only one school did not get approved during DRL pushback, and it wasn’t because of DRL.
* We might have 7 votes on universal DRL.
	+ Can’t imagine any board member would support no DRL and no MOU.
	+ We are not advocating for no DRL, just not including it as a collective protest action. The point is not to negotiate DRL. The point is to get to one, universal version of DRL.
	+ In order for that to be effective, we all have to submit our charter petitions really early in the year. We just all have to be aware that we might not have our test scores yet.
* Discussion of appeal pathway. If you are approved at LACOE, the next renewal is submitted to LACOE. If you are approved at state, the next renewal is submitted back to LAUSD.
	+ For the group in the Fall, creating an alternate pathway for authorization at the county was really appealing. Might not be the same for this group.
* CCSA can try to help with consultants for new petitions.
* Material revisions would likely not work because there is no appeal pathway.
* Vote to commit to submitting without DRL, if necessary to achieve goals:
	+ Cristina: Yes.
	+ Emilio: Don’t have a renewal charter but support, and would consider throw-in petition.
	+ Vanessa: Support. Might have a material revision but that won’t work.
	+ Caprice: Yes, two renewals.
	+ Oliver: Submitting two new petitions, maybe not by September. But support.
	+ Parker: Yes, one renewal.
	+ Ted: Yes, we are renewing.
	+ Pam: Support. Material revision.
	+ Mark: Support. Our material revision is probably too early – April.
	+ Ana: Yes, renewal. But I have a FUA tied to it so I need to check if there are any conditions.
	+ Valerie: Support.
	+ Yvette: Renewal for Bert Corona, the only concern I have is leaving the SELPA. Losing those revenues would be drastic.
 |
| **[Action Item] LAAC New Member Application Process** |
| Jennie provided a brief summary of updates made to the application process, based on feedback from the February 14th meeting:* Changed format of the application from a letter of interest to brief answers to a short list of questions, to be potentially followed by an interview. This is meant to prevent applicants from self-selecting out of the application process at this stage.
* Edited questions to ask about applicants’ past participation in successful advocacy more broadly, rather than just charter community collective advocacy efforts. This is meant to be inclusive of more charter leaders, including newer charter leaders.
* Addition of LAAC’s commitment to racial, ethnic and gender diversity in application materials.
* Addition of a selection rubric.

LAAC members unanimously approved the updated application process, knowing there are a few pieces, such as school performance in the rubric, that still need work.  |
| **Closing** |
| The next LAAC meeting is on April 4th. Prior to that, the LAUSD Regional Meeting is on Monday, March 26th at the CCSA Conference.  |