

Rochester Board of Education

Quality Assurance Committee

October 13, 2004

Board Committee Members Present

Domingo Garcia

Willa Powell

Other Board Members Present

N/A

Agenda

- I. CSPD (Comprehensive System of Personnel Development) to support special education – for review and approval; Quality reviews of Schools 22 and 45 and how these link to CSPD for entire District
- II. Hillside Work Scholarship Connection Contract – for review and approval and forwarding to full BOE as resolution
- III. Expansion of Student Support / *Student and Family* Support Centers (RFP & contract) – present process and status
- IV. UR School of Nursing contract – for review, approval, and forwarding to full BOE as resolution
- V. Next Meeting Date
- VI. Additional Agenda Item Added on School Choice by Commissioner Powell

Presenters

Dr. Rivera

Annette Gantt (Hillside Work Scholarship Connection)

Marjorie Lefler (Health & Human Service Systems)

Staff Present

Barbara Jarzyniecki

David Silver

Jana Carlisle

Marjorie Lefler

Meeting convened at 1:10 p.m.

Prior to presentations, QA Committee Chair Garcia and QA Committee Staff Liaison Carlisle discussed the desire on the part of the Committee to receive any documents pertaining to future QA meetings at least 48 hours in advance of presentations. Ms. Carlisle did indicate that written summaries relating to agenda items II, III, and IV were forwarded to BOE in the Friday Board packet but that actual presentations were not given that they were not available and that the expectation was not known. There was agreement to provide such materials in advance of future meetings.

Agenda Item I: CSPD and Quality reviews of 22 & 45

Agenda Item I was not covered as State Education representative was unable to attend at last minute. This agenda item was to be rescheduled for November meeting. David Silver indicated that by law, the CSPD must be presented to the Board but not necessarily approved by the Board. He further indicated that Chris Surriano from State Ed. would come to present but was unable to attend today's meeting.

Rochester Board of Education

Quality Assurance Committee

October 13, 2004

Agenda Item II: Hillside Work Scholarship Connection presentation

Dr. Rivera introduced Annette Gantt, executive director of Hillside Work Scholarship Connection, and the role that HSWSC has played in the District over the years.

Ms. Gantt provided an overview of HSWSC:

- a history of the program
- its outcome objectives
- its service delivery strategies – including its youth advocate model and relationship between educational attainment and employment
- some information on employment retention of students
- a summary analysis conducted in 2003 by Center for Governmental Research – which highlighted the impact of HSWSC on participating students' graduation rates – and
- the evidence of student need

Handouts include a copy of Ms. Gantt's Power Point presentation, an executive summary of a HSWSC report to the RUMP group and the lengthier report to that same group.

Commissioner Garcia posed the following question to Ms. Gantt: Where are students employed? and whether or not these employers employed more than 10 students?

Ms. Gantt responded that there are no other employers (other than Wegmans) that hire more than 10 students and that some of the other employers include Bill Grays, Wendy's, Preferred Care, retail establishments, and nursing homes.

Commissioner Garcia wondered if, in establishments other than Wegmans, students were primarily employed at fast food establishments.

Ms. Gantt said, "no," that other establishments included retail, health care, and nursing homes.

Commissioners Garcia and Powell requested information on the entire number of students who started with HSWSC – not just those graduating – and the estimated dropouts from HSWSC and the District

They also requested information on graduation rates, which Ms. Gantt indicated was included in the RUMP group report handed out during the meeting.

Commissioner Garcia asked how long the program had been in existence.

Ms. Gantt said, "17 years."

Commissioner Garcia asked, how many students have been affected in the 17 year period?

Ms. Gantt indicated that thousands of students had been affected in both the District's former middle schools and now in its 7-12 high schools. Ms. Gantt also indicated that she would provide additional information on the exact cohort numbers and outcomes.

Dr. Rivera summarized the HSWSC proposal as one toward which the District would contribute \$300,000 with the assumption that there would be a match from the business community of at least that amount to expand the program to 300 students. He further mentioned that the District and HSWSC "have talked about expanding the program to include some students whose GPAs are slightly above and slightly below the 2.0

Rochester Board of Education

Quality Assurance Committee

October 13, 2004

GPA threshold set by HSWSC." He also emphasized that the expansion of youth advocates is one of the Superintendent's Board-approved goals.

Commissioner Garcia asked about the total cost of the program.

Dr. Rivera referred to a spreadsheet that was handed out during the meeting (included in the RUMP group proposal) and that the amount was approximately \$800,000 to expand the program by 300 new students.

Commissioner Garcia further inquired about how the United Way funds are driven to support HSWSC.

Ms. Gantt indicated that HSWSC is its own 501C-3 and that funds are allocated directly to HSWSC, not necessarily through Kids on Track.

Dr. Rivera also identified that the State had, in past years, earmarked funds of up to \$1.5 million.

Ms. Gantt indicated that HSWSC is awaiting word of state funds for this academic year.

Commissioner Powell proposed that the Board's support of a contract with HSWSC should be written for \$300,000 with the requirement of a "match" and considered the District dollars to be supplemental but in no way to supplant private funds.

Ms. Carlisle indicated that the resolution would be written as such.

Commissioner Powell motioned to approve the forwarding of the HSWSC resolution, Commissioner Garcia seconded it.

Agenda Item III: Student and Family Support Centers

Ms. Lefler presented an historical perspective on Student Support Centers in the nineties in two District schools and that the District now has a system of 12 schools. She further indicated that up until now, the Student Support Centers have not cost the District money (with the exception of the .5 FTE match to the United Way contribution which began in 1996) but that the District has contributed their own time and support, as well as phones, and space.

Commissioner Garcia inquired about what Student and Family Support Centers actually do.

Ms. Lefler responded that the Centers work with collaborative agency partners who work in District schools to provide services, based on a needs assessment, to District students. Services include social service, mental health, crisis counseling, and other "supports".

She further explained that there has been a Request for Proposal by the District to provide both coordination and monitoring of all Student and Family Support Centers as well as to deliver services at Edison and Franklin. The coordination and monitoring includes moving ahead with standardized data collection so that the District can better evaluate the impact of these centers. She stated that Dr. Rivera had intended to identify a recipient for the RFP in the summer but that, due to the budget cuts, this effort was put on hold until the spin up monies were earmarked for Rochester. Ms. Lefler explained that the RFP was sent to all Youth Council members and that the District received five proposals back. She convened a team of reviewers including an individual from the Rochester-Monroe County Youth Bureau, herself, the United Way, an individual from

Rochester Board of Education

Quality Assurance Committee

October 13, 2004

Monroe County Department of Mental Health, a Division Chief from School Development and Operations in the District and a Student and Family Support Center Coordinator from Edison.

Ms. Lefler explained that the process was to rate the proposals using a rubric and then that the review team met to summarize their findings. She indicated that the team invited in the top two applicants.

A two page summary of the process was shared with the QA Committee members.

Commissioner Powell expressed concern about the process used by the District and felt there was a "pattern" that boiled down to two organization names being forwarded to the Board. She would have thought all providers who had responded to the RFP would have been brought in.

Ms. Leffler responded that there was a huge difference between the applicants and that such an approach would have made sense had there been any comparison between the top two proposals and the other three.

Ms. Carlisle asked Board members to consider the fact that the District developed a process, a rubric and reached – with a team of experts in the field – consensus on which agencies to further interview.

Commissioner Garcia expressed concern about the diversity of the panel of experts and asked that the District take steps to rectify such concerns. He further requested data of the number of visits made to Student and Family Support Centers and the racial and ethnic breakdown of the students who visited.

Ms. Carlisle indicated that the District could organize a second review of the proposals with an ethnically diverse group, not just a group that was diverse from an agency / provider perspective. She also said that some of the diversity of reviews could be achieved among the school based planning teams that would next interview the top two applicants.

Commissioner Garcia indicated that he was not asking for the District to re-do its process but rather to consider his concerns moving forward.

Ms. Carlisle indicated that the District would build such a step / consideration into future reviews and review teams.

Agenda Item IV: University of Rochester School of Nursing Contract

Ms. Carlisle indicated that the District had hoped to present the details of this contract to forward as a resolution at the October Board meeting, however, the discussions with UR would not be finalized for another day or so.

Added Agenda Item: Parent Preference / Managed Choice

Commissioner Powell brought an agenda item to the table, which was to suggest the Board authorize a second amendment / resolution at this time addressing the following "transition year policy amendments" to the parent preference / managed choice policy including:

- a second transition year before determining if the boundaries used for neighborhood / home school proximity preference should be changed from the transition year amendment (use existing District home school boundaries) to the original policy the ½ mile concentric circles around each District school); and

Rochester Board of Education

Quality Assurance Committee

October 13, 2004

- a return to the original policy's language in regard to the percentage of seats in the lottery reserved for neighborhood / home school proximity preference be changed from the transition year amendment (70%) back to the original policy (60%).
- That District staff should actually commence working on the analysis to determine how to implement the ½ mile concentric circles around each District school.

She further indicated that in conversations with the District's facilities planner (Andy Wheatcraft) that he would present the BOE with maps that use the midpoints of different planning blocks as the actual boundaries instead of pure ½ mile concentric circles in order to address some original concerns about the ways in which concentric circles fell. She also asked Mr. Wheatcraft in her meetings with him to identify safety issues and to make recommendations where safety issues were a concern.

Ms. Carlisle expressed some surprise and concern about Commissioner Powell's interest in forwarding such a resolution at this time given Dr. Rivera's intent to commission an evaluation to make recommendations to the Board in December and that there could be serious public dismay if this was a quickly forwarded resolution without any prior warning or discussion. She further expressed dismay that this was an agenda item added at the last minutes and that the appropriate staff were not present to respond.

Ms. Powell continued to express her concern that insufficient staff work had occurred in determining the neighborhood school issue.

Ms. Carlisle responded that, if the concern was that, Commissioner Powell desired reassurance that the District was indeed moving forward to evaluate and recommend whether or not to continue the transition year policy amendments, that the District was indeed moving forward and could thus reassure the Commissioner that action was being taken. Ms. Carlisle further suggested that there could be discussion of the evaluation at the November QA meeting.

Agenda Item V: Future Meeting Dates

Ms. Carlisle and Mr. Garcia discussed the desire on the part of the Superintendent to convene another quality assurance committee meeting during October to review the UR School of Nursing contract, and possibly the ERS and Altreya contracts if they are not covered in separate meetings between the Superintendent and Board, and possibly the Student Support Center contract if it was ready.

Commissioner Garcia indicated a willingness to have another meeting but that his schedule had limited availability. Ms. Carlisle and Ms. Rohring were to work on scheduling this additional meeting.

The Schools of Choice evaluation, the CSPD / Special Education Quality Review, and Student Support Center contract were identified for the November Board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Action Items:

- Ms. Gantt to provide information on the entire number of students who started with HSWSC, and the estimated dropouts from HSWSC and the District.
- Ms. Gantt to provide additional information on the exact cohort numbers and outcomes.
- The District shall consider ethnic diversity on its panel of experts and other workgroups, taskforces, and panels on a go forward basis.