Redwood City 2020 Leadership Council Meeting
Redwood City Main Library, Community Room (2nd Floor)
1044 Middlefield Road, Redwood City
Wednesday, May 18, 2016
9:00am – 10:30am (Public Meeting)

Executive Summary of the Leadership Council Meeting Minutes

• **Communications:** There were no oral communications or public comments.

• **Minutes:** The March 16, 2016 meeting minutes were approved as submitted.

• **Cradle To Career Pipeline:**
  - A video of the 1996 Barn-Raising town hall hosted by Redwood City 2000 was shared as the introduction to the Cradle to Career Pipeline.
  - Hillary Paulson, Shelly Masur, Alan Sarver, and Jim Lianides presented synopses of Pipeline elements, including the Results and Indicators, Multi-level Collaboration, Guiding Principles, Core Elements, and Pipeline Linkages.
  - Alisa MacAvoy presented a summary of the proposed formation of a Stewardship Committee.
  - The Council expressed agreement with the vision and high level concepts of the Pipeline of Success. The Council agreed that the next steps for the Cradle To Career Pipeline would be to refine the details of the implementation stage, including learning and convening; to continue to think about the order of Core Elements; and to further evaluate the structure and role of the proposed Stewardship Committee.

• **Financial Update:**
  - Jana Kiser reported a decrease in core memberships for FY2016-17, as First Five San Mateo County is not renewing, and San Mateo County will pay $25,000 for a combined membership for both Human Services Agency and County Health System.
  - Jana Kiser presented a 2016-17 draft budget showing a $55,000 deficit which the Finance and Development ad hoc committee will work to address by exploring the potential of attracting new members, hosting a fundraiser, and considering multi-year memberships.

• **Member Announcements/Good News/Kudos:**
  - Hillary Paulson reported the city of Redwood City Human Concerns Committee is hosting forums regarding the increased price of housing. Alan Sarver reported the good news of an upward trend in graduation rates in California.

• **Next Steps:**
  - The next meeting will be a combined Leadership Council/Executive Team meeting on August 17th from 9:00 A.M. – 10:30 A.M. in the Community Room of Redwood City Main Library.
  - The Executive Team will meet on Wednesday, June 21st, 9:00 AM. – 10:30 A.M.
DRAFT MINUTES


Executive Team Members Present: John Baker, Amy Gerstein.

Others Present: Chris Beth, Carol Marks, and Derek Wolfgram.

Welcome and Introductions

- Hilary Paulson welcomed all attendees and commenced the meeting.
- Ms. Paulson welcomed Shelly Masur as a City Council member, rather than School District Trustee.

Oral Communications

- There were no oral communications or public comments.

Draft Minutes

- Hilary Paulson asked for a motion to approve the draft minutes from the Leadership Council meeting held on March 16, 2016.
  - There were no changes or omissions suggested.
  - Alan Sarver motioned for approval of the minutes and Alisa MacAvoy seconded.
  - Stacey Wagner and Shelly Masur abstained from voting, as they did not attend the meeting; motion passed 6-0.

Cradle to Career Pipeline of Success – Recommendations

- Jana Kiser began by indicating an archival Redwood City 2000 video of the 1996 “Barn-Raising” town hall event would be presented, followed by discussion of the recommendations presented by the Community Schools Workgroups that have taken place over the past year. The video can be seen at the following link: https://youtu.be/SMlaQUqlgW.
- Ms. Kiser noted that the video highlights the consistency of Redwood City 2020’s work over the years, including the importance of partnering with youth, and the progress made in addressing the issues brought up in the video. She reminded attendees that in the last six weeks Redwood City 2020 has held four youth development trainings through the community to ensure the community’s high standards of positive youth development.
continue. The video spoke of divisions in the community, and Ms. Kiser pointed out how the work of Redwood City Together now bridges those divides to build understanding and empathy. The video also spoke about schools, which were the subject of some of the early conversations that fed the collaborative’s early work and thinking around Community Schools work.

- Anchoring the collaborative work of the 1990s to Redwood City 2020 today, Ms. Kiser stated that the collaborative is at a stage where it will discuss the amplification and building of Redwood City 2020’s work, including recommendations for school-based wrap-around services and partnerships.

- Most Leadership Council members are aware of the Community Schools Workgroup which started last year and came from a charge from the Leadership Council and Executive Team after a strategic planning process in which broad conversations were held around the priorities of the collaborative. The first of three priorities was named as Community Schools Expansion and Sustainability. The charge was to explore expansion and sustainability of the current community schools; funds and staff support were received from the Grove Foundation towards intentional efforts to convene diverse partners to explore sustaining and expanding Community Schools work. The result went beyond building on the Community Schools work, with new thinking that creates a Pipeline of Success using the spirit and Guiding Principles of Community Schools. The proposed Pipeline is broader than any one strategy and includes a geographic focus, with the goal of everyone in the community – from cradle to career – will be supported in success by the collective impact of this work.

- Ms. Kiser has asked members of Leadership Council and Executive Team who participated in the Workgroup to share their perspectives, noting that the members of both leadership bodies had either directly participated in the process or had carefully selected the appropriate staff member(s) to attend and shape the recommendations. Ms. Kiser also highlighted the extra participation of the Executive Team members to vet and improve the Workgroup’s recommendations. This process improved the Workgroup’s recommendations.

- Ms. Kiser stated the Leadership Council and Executive Team received via email a high level narrative about the vision that the Executive Team refined from the Workgroup recommendations, and that more details will follow during the implementation stage. In respect of time, the focus today is on the “why,” the “what,” and the “vision.” The “how” is articulated as a straw model to think about during implementation. Ms. Kiser stated that the goal for today was to come to a consensus on the high-level concepts of the proposed Pipeline, noting too that the August joint Leadership Council and Executive Team meeting could be used for further discussion as necessary on the implementation details or high-level concepts. It is hoped a consensus can be reached on the larger ideas at this meeting; the discussion can be continued at the August joint Leadership Council
and Executive Team Meeting. The consensus-building topics for the Pipeline of Success are as follows:

- **Results and sample Indicators**: Derived from the high level results as generated by the Workgroup and refined by the Executive Team, with narrowing of indicators to come in the future.

- **Multi-level Collaboration/Guiding Principles/Core Elements**: Derived from literature on Community Schools, Promised Neighborhood Initiatives, and collective impact, but tailored for the Redwood City/North Fair Oaks community to include the breadth of the Pipeline; this includes, but is not confined to, Community Schools as a strategy.

- **Linkages**: Recognizing the importance of linking partners together, the Pipeline would accomplish this in six intentional ways. Although details for implementation exist, the focus today would be vetting the ideas behind the six intentional linkages.

- **Next steps for the proposal**: Proposed formation of a stewardship committee that would guide the implementation as a working committee bringing ideas forth to, and working closely with, the Executive Team and Leadership Council. Ideally, the stewardship committee would have members from the Leadership Council and Executive Team, as well as volunteers representing various sectors.

  - Jana Kiser noted that the timing for the meeting was somewhat flexible, to allow for ample opportunity to discuss the Pipeline recommendations.
  - Jana Kiser asked Hillary Paulson to speak about her participation in the process.

  - Hillary Paulson shared that she participated in both the large Workgroup and smaller ad hoc group meetings, and the participants were actively involved; she noted in particular that one could watch the transition from thinking of Community Schools programming to a discussion of where the gaps are in the community. She highlighted that she saw instances where organizations at the meeting were unaware of important services that others were providing to the community. Ms. Paulson reiterated that the collaborative understands children are most successful at school when they not only have a healthy, safe school environment, but also have a steady, safe and healthy home environment. It is the goal of the community schools to connect services to families so they are able to achieve those goals. An example given was the Sparkpoint program at Taft School, which supports families’ financial stability by providing tools and trainings to families, e.g., how to save money, where to keep money, and how to manage a budget. Programs like these, as part of the wraparound services through community schools, have given crucial physical and mental health support to youth and their families. Ms. Paulson noted that the continuity throughout the community of these wraparound services is one of the goals of the Pipeline. Ms. Paulson acknowledged that some Council members have read the detailed initial
Community Schools Expansion and Sustainability document and, while it is not
tabled, it is ready for the next steps. In creating those steps, the Workgroup
determined it was necessary to do something different to serve youth from cradle
to career continuously and holistically. The Workgroup and the Executive Team
identified that community schools alone would not be able to fully support, for
example, children aged 0 to 3 years and youth going into to programs at Canada
College and beyond. Thus the Workgroup shifted to a broader focus on the linked
and continuous holistic services of the cradle-to-career Pipeline, with community
schools as an important strategy within that Pipeline.

- Jana Kiser stated that for most attendees this is a review, as content
feedback was received from the Workgroup along the way from forty very
active members, plus a network beyond that was reading what was
produced; the recommendations then went to the Executive Team in
February. She expressed appreciation that the Executive Team added an
extra meeting in March because the group felt it was an important topic. Ms.
Kiser noted the additional group and individual conversations and feedback
beyond the formal meetings. Executive Team members read the content,
vetted it and improved upon the recommendations. Ms. Kiser stated the draft
emailed to attendees in preparation for today’s meeting was the latest
version, which is a vetted version with high-level ideas; the intention today
is to discuss these ideas and to, ideally, reach consensus and move into
further defining the details of implementation.

- Hillary Paulson reported the Workgroup meetings were important to the
participating organizations because it offered an opportunity for discussions
between organizations offering services to identify the gaps and alignments in
services offered and community members served, as well as the difficulties in
those processes. She offered an example of one family with a child in special
education who knew how to negotiate the special education and mental health
processes, but the family whose child needed mental health services beginning in
8th grade or high school did not know how to begin the process when the student
needed support.

- Jana Kiser referred attendees to the Pipeline handout included with the agenda. The
handout was a roadmap of the Pipeline - a synthesis of the big ideas anchored in the
detailed recommendations paper. She reiterated one important piece of the evolution of
this work was that it shifted from sites as community schools to an integrated
community-wide effort; this represented the next wave of articulating the community-
wide plan by amplifying the work and examining where the holes may be in a more
sustainable and intentional way. She noted this included the opportunity to have financial
conversations regarding withstanding waves of fiscal downturns, and more. Collectively,
the Pipeline articulates a community-wide goal and ensures that the five results are
sustained. Ms. Kiser introduced Shelly Masur to speak on the results and shared indicators.

- Shelly Masur shared her enthusiasm in discussing this topic, and noted that she understands it may be difficult for others to envision their role in the work if the work is entirely school-centered. She was pleased to witness the evolution of the work and that all partners agreed upon shared accountability to collectively take responsibility for the wellbeing of children, youth, and families in the community. She stated complex problems require all partners to work together, and that the video presented showed the attendees the importance of working together and recognizing constituents that no one had heard from prior, and while the problems identified in the video are better now, there remains more to do. Ms. Masur reiterated when all partners share accountability for indicators, they all move together and identify their place in the Pipeline of Success for children, youth, and family. Ms. Masur read the Vision Statement for the Pipeline of Success: that every student will graduate from high school as a caring, critical thinking, life-long learner prepared for success in college, career, community, and life. Ms. Masur shared further about the process of creating the shared results and indicators:
  - When the process of fleshing out the vision began, the thinking was broad; the current Pipeline of Success plan represents a more succinct and direct way of thinking about how children move through the system.
  - With development of specific results and indicators, progress towards the vision can be seen and measured.
  - Five priority areas were developed (seen on the handout included in the agenda); all are aligned with the partners’ missions. Not every single one of the partners’ missions aligns with all five of the Pipeline results, but every organization can find a place in the Pipeline where it could be responsible for working towards at least one indicator within the five results. She emphasized the Pipeline to Success results are very much the goals of Redwood 2020, as well as the historical goals of Redwood City 2000.
  - Ms. Masur suggested that each partner could look at the indicators and identify where their organization naturally “holds” a component of the Pipeline work, and reiterated Ms. Paulson’s comment that the sample indicators (on the back of the handout) would be used to measure success. Ultimately the Stewardship Committee would develop final indicators with review and approval by the Executive Team and Leadership Council. The review would look at what is available from partners and their willingness to share accountability for the different pieces of the Pipeline.
  - Hillary Paulson thanked the Executive Team for providing digestible indicators from those that were included in the community schools Workgroup documents.
• Ms. Masur agreed the indicators are more manageable and a good starting point, and there will be additional pieces to think about when reviewed by the Stewardship Committee; she stated that Ms. Kiser informed her the indicators were recommended by the core partners, as they have the current available data that is ready to use.

• Jana Kiser offered a point of clarification: it is recommended that, instead of the Stewardship Committee, the Executive Team will set the indicators. The Executive Team already has real sense of the data, and the intention is to not develop any indicators from scratch. The collaborative would work with data that has been previously identified by partners as available, important to them, and what they would like support in amplifying. She noted that the indicators already went to Workgroup members, which included some Executive Team members, who came up with a broad list. The Executive Team then reviewed the list and began to narrow it down; this process would continue, as the Executive Team would propose indicators for the Stewardship Committee and Leadership Council to consider. It would be a model of shared leadership, where the Executive Team takes the lead in defining indicators with partners contributing ideas and participating in conversations; it leans on the expertise of the executives to choose the correct indicators.

  o Shelly Masur stated the Pipeline is timely as School Districts are now responsible to the State Board of Education for developing a Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP); the goals of the Pipeline are very much aligned with LCAP recommendations for accountability systems for districts and schools.

  o Ms. Kiser reiterated that the Pipeline honors 15 years of work by collaborative in its three areas: that students will be safe, academically successful, and healthy; newer work also includes mitigating the effects of poverty. The proposed Pipeline would be a revised version of that work which still supports academic success, acknowledges that transitions are still critical, and centers partnership with young people and their families (Pipeline goals 1-3). This has been the collaborative’s work over time and is still ongoing. The fourth Pipeline goal, health, is expanded to include social and emotional health. The fifth goal is related to the historical mission of improving safety by also acknowledging the financial reality of the impacts of poverty.

• Ms. Kiser noted there are also different segments of the Pipeline on the handout: birth to age three, kindergarten to grade 8, high school, and beyond. She asked Alan Sarver to present the high level highlights of Pipeline’s plan for Multi-level Collaboration, Guiding Principles, and Core Elements.

• Alan Sarver stated the work the collaborative has done in the past, coordinating partnerships to get the “big work done,” is where Redwood City 2020 is most visible and
strongly felt in the community. The Pipeline proposal refines and strengthens that model. Thus the model is that the community collaborative brings partners together to find individual strengths, common visions, and overlaps and gaps in services provided; the individual districts, organizations, and agencies are the core of the work, and the model strengthens their ability to do that work. For example, it strengthens the ability of schools to focus on academics by surrounding them with a complete range of services to support students and their families. The work is then implemented at sites of engagement, the third level, which includes schools, community schools, libraries, the health clinic, and more. The final piece of the Multi-level Collaboration is deep engagement by the public at all three levels. The model has cycles of feedback, input, and direction across all three levels of the Pipeline. Mr. Sarver noted that the collaborative was born from that deep level of public engagement, and highlighted the importance of ongoing feedback, engagement, and a sense of ownership. He stated:

- The collaborative works at all three levels of Multi-level Collaboration to ensure the change is at a community-wide level all the time, leverages all available resources, and that all stakeholders are convened to ensure all are expressing and meeting needs.
- The Guiding Principles behind all of the work are shared leadership, coordination and integration, strength-based approach, whole-person approach, partnership and family-centered approach, shared accountability, intentionality, and equity. These would be driven by the collaborative, ensuring that all partners are engaged, working together, expressing their special areas of expertise, and bringing what they do best to meet the needs of the youth and community.
- The Core Elements are the concrete actions that all sites are engaged in, including the high-quality work at community hubs, sites of engagement, and beyond. These are high quality core instructional programming and academic supports; after school support and opportunities; streamlined transitions and linkages; early learning opportunities; college, career, and community readiness; holistic support, including physical, cognitive, psychological, and social; family and community engagement opportunities; and youth development and leadership. Mr. Sarver emphasized the importance of supporting youth and families at every stage of the development spectrum, in close partnership with specific organizations and entities that could take responsibility for specific steps in the Pipeline. Mr. Sarver cited the example of high school graduation rates: the one single element that would have biggest impact on high school graduation rates is universal preschool, noting that as a trustee member for a high school district, schools cannot succeed without the Pipeline feeding and providing families all the way through. Likewise for the Core Element of college, career and community readiness: high school, middle and elementary schools prepare youth for life ahead with an entire umbrella of support services within the Community Schools environment. Mr.
Sarver emphasized again the importance of including family and community engagement as an integral part of the Pipeline.

- Jana Kiser highlighted the continuity of the Guiding Principles and Core Elements throughout the Pipeline, noting that in the visual, each flows all the way through. In theory, all partners would hold the Guiding Principles and Core Elements in the spirit of their work and actions. The individual segments of the Pipeline would be further linked through specific identified Linkages.

- Jim Lianides presented the Linkages of the Pipeline.
  - The first Linkage is continuity of holistic services, where partners work together to promote physical, psychological and social support so that families thrive and do not fall through the cracks as they pass through multiple systems on the development continuum. Continuity of holistic services aligns organizations and entities of the Pipeline and ensures transitions are smooth, and services are meeting needs.
  - The second Linkage is data linking. This helps all partners identify needs and measure quality and effective programs. In particular, linking through transition points ensures that families access needed supports as they move throughout the continuum. He noted that the Sequoia High School Union School District is currently working to link across transitions with two of its feeder districts, the Ravenswood City School District and the Redwood City School District, and that this data linking is very much aligned with that current work underfoot. He added that partners would amplify the work the districts are doing.
  - Support for families and students to ensure smooth transitions is the third Linkage; large pieces of this work are already being done together.
  - Streamlined referral systems is the fourth Linkage; this would address how the needs of the whole student and family are met by actively referring and linking students with services in the community, improving systemic equity and effectives of services and support. An example would be examining the services provided as students transition from Redwood City School District to Sequoia and Woodside High Schools, and how services in place are continued.
  - Academic alignment, the fifth Linkage, is an important aspect of work already being done as a tri-district collaborative; schools and partners work together to align their academic offerings to ensure consistent achievement of academic benchmarks. Mr. Lianides noted he is looking forward to how the collaborative and partners can contribute.
  - Staff and partner collaboration is the 6th and last Linkage and aligns very much with the direction the collaborative has been moving. Active and coordinated partners are most effective when their organizations’ norms and ethics include systemic community, collaborative professional development, and intentional alignment of services.
Jana Kiser asked if John Baker had anything to add.

Mr. Baker stated the Workgroup and Executive Team have come to an agreement on a streamlined referral system. He reiterated the need to have a system in place for high schools to have information about children as they transition into high school, which they have not had in the past; having this issue brought to the forefront has encouraged building a streamlined system. He noted that within the shared results was a discussion of 5150’s – the code for placement of persons in danger of doing harm to self or others on a 72-hour health hold by law enforcement. Currently, this information is brought to the attention of the authorities and parents, but the high school is not made aware of the situation as the child moves into high school. Mr. Baker emphasized the need to put in place better streamlined communication ensure any school a child is transitioning into would be aware of the issue and what services are currently in place for the child and family. The transition school could then replicate services, provide similar services, or even amplify the services available for that student and family. This idea was brought from the Workgroup to Executive Team, and Mr. Baker said he is pleased to see that students will continue to be served.

Jana Kiser cited these as beautiful examples from Superintendents of where work is already linked, where there is intention to link, and where the gaps are. The intention is to follow the lead of partner leaders to identify where more support is needed, and what is already covered so that support would be less necessary. The intention is to articulate that the linkages would support the seamlessness of a systemic and integrated Pipeline.

- Jana Kiser introduced the final section, Next Steps, and asked Alicia MacAvoy to begin the discussion.
- Ms. MacAvoy said she is excited about the work, that it is an opportunity to formalize Pipeline goals in writing and for people to determine how their organization fits within the collaborative in a more intentional, articulated way. The recommendation is to form a Pipeline Stewardship Committee, detailed on the yellow handout:
  - The areas of focus of the Stewardship Committee would be: Partnership Communication, Financial Sustainability, Shared Accountability and Evaluation, Pipeline Linkages, and Community School Implementation.
  - The Stewardship Committee would be composed of Redwood City 2020 core and other partners to help continue and expand the work.
  - The Stewardship Committee would develop a financial sustainability plan and seek new funding to help implement the work.
  - The Stewardship Committee would have shared accountability. Clearly the collaborative desires an accountability process to measure how the work is progressing and determine what more there is to do.
The Stewardship Committee would be responsible for creating linkages that support alignment.

The Stewardship Committee would support community school implementation at whatever point they may be on the community school continuum (some are offering more services than others), by creating a toolkit for all who serve students – schools, libraries, pre-schools, etc. – and seek to expand their services and link them with other resources.

Ms. MacAvoy added that she recently attended the California School Board delegate assembly and heard from a group of core districts; these districts are gathering data and looking at multiple measures of success, not just standardized test scores. Ms. MacAvoy stated that the intensity of concentrated poverty on an English Language Learner is a “triple whammy” on students and families. She believes the only way to address this challenge is through work like the Pipeline of Success. Schools cannot do it by themselves; success has happened where community partnerships were brought in. She reiterated former Mayor Jim Harnett’s comment in the video, “It is not about what the schools can do, or what the cities can do, but what each and every one of us can do.” Ms. MacAvoy believes that the collaborative is where this can happen.

Jana Kiser stated that she wanted to be thoughtful about ensuring the Stewardship Committee would be nested under Executive Committee and Leadership Council. She would consider it to be a “homework team;” if there is work to do, e.g., convene partners, logistics to figure out, invitations to be made, materials to produce, etc., this group would help sculpt the work with staff support. For example, after superintendents continue to weigh in about which Pipeline Linkages are important, the Stewardship Committee would benchmark other communities and avoid starting from scratch, e.g., examining other streamlined referral systems. The idea would be that the Stewardship Committee would be a working group and communicate up with feedback, but the vision would come from the leadership teams. Ms. Kiser asked the Executive Team for their thoughts.

Amy Gerstein stated that she is concerned about the Stewardship Committee; it is great to have structure and a strategy to engage, but she thinks understanding the charter for this group is critical and that alignment with the Executive Team is very important, as the topics are critical. Finding opportunities for the community writ large to keep learning about these issues, about principles and core elements is important for the work to continue to grow. Ms. Gerstein expressed concerns about people becoming attached to particular ideas related to how aspects of the work would roll out without having all the information or being in position to roll those pieces out; For example, a Stewardship Committee member may be a representative from an organization or agency, but not know the full budget, or be
in a position to say “Here is what we are going to do,” rather than, “Here is a conversation.”

- Hillary Paulson stated that Ms. Gerstein’s comments were a great start to the discussion and asked the attendees for feedback on the Pipeline of Success, the Stewardship Committee, the Guiding Principles, the Core Elements, and the recommendations.

- Shelly Masur stated appreciation to Ms. Gerstein for sharing her thoughts and explained that she also has some reservations about the Stewardship Committee. Ms. Masur said she likes the structure, shared goals, and that the correct indicators will be identified. In addition to sharing Ms. Gerstein’s concerns, Ms. Masur noted that the reason the people at this table are present is because, to a certain extent, those present have some ability to make decisions. She expressed concern that the Stewardship Committee would add another level of complexity. Ms. Masur said she is not convinced the Stewardship Committee is the right place to make the Pipeline work happen. The Leadership Council and the Executive Team already exist, and adding additional committees and subcommittees could make the process more complicated. She indicated that Pipeline work could be addressed as it needs to be addressed, perhaps by forming an ad hoc committee when something needs to be worked on, but adding a standing structure is adding complexity.

- Hillary Paulson asked whether the Stewardship Committee would be seen as a subcommittee of the collaborative.

- Amy Gerstein stated that she would love to think about people who have not yet been engaged in the conversation or who are learning about Guiding Principles and Core Elements at site levels, because they are the ones who need to do the work. Based on their intimate understanding of the community schools implementation work, she believes that without engaging people at the site level the work will not happen.

- Hillary Paulson said this matched the feedback from the work group in small conversations and that Redwood City 2020 is the right group to bring people together to receive information.

- Ms. Gerstein agreed that having the focus on learning, rather than implementation, is a very strong strategy for implementation, because the work is not “plug and play” and the collaborative is already doing convening work. The collaborative does not have resources to completely revise its mission. She offered a concrete example of an article in the San Francisco Chronicle today, which referred to student transitions. The article stated that high school graduation rates in San Francisco have gone up; the district is crediting the use of indicators which were used to identify 8th grade students in need of support whom they then worked with in high school. The John W. Gardner Center played a major role in
this program with exciting results. Ms. Gerstein offered this as an example of something one could do without a major program; it is in an area that has been identified in the Pipeline and everyone can learn from it.

- Jana Kiser said she was thrilled to have this feedback, because the Stewardship Committee concept was discussed at the end of the last Executive Team meeting and the thinking at that point was to ensure the Stewardship Committee would not have too many ad hoc committees. She said that it is clear there is a need for ongoing thinking about the Stewardship Committee structure, noting that no one was overly attached the structure as proposed. She reiterated the intent was to provide a structure for partners to come together and work together to push forward the next steps of the Pipeline. With regards to Ms. Gerstein’s concern about education of the public and of the Pipeline partners writ large, Ms. Kiser noted that some education was intended to occur within the Guiding Principle of Staff and Other Partner Collaboration, as well as partner communication. She offered that continued education or more specific work could be done with core partners and offered to other partners as opportunities for education and engagement.

- Ms. Kiser emphasized that there seemed to be consensus on the high-level concepts of the Pipeline of Success and the collaborative could continue to work on the details over the summer; there will be opportunities at the June Executive Team meeting plus the joint Leadership Council and Executive Team meeting in August to flesh out the implementation structure, then launch the Pipeline work in September. She noted that there could be many methods to figure out the structure of implementation, offering that it could task-oriented, rather than committee-based.

- Ms. Kiser asked if people had further reflections regarding the high-level Pipeline of Success concepts.

- Alisa MacAvoy stated that she appreciated what Amy Gerstein and Shelly Masur said. She said her concern is that if the Stewardship Committee responsibilities were left to those around the table, progress may continue the way it has in the past; Ms. MacAvoy rhetorically asked if there was need for another level, or a more focused group. She offered that perhaps the responsibilities could be articulated regularly on the agenda for each Executive Team and Leadership Council meeting. Ms. MacAvoy mentioned that there are Safe Routes to School and Alcohol and Other Drugs Prevention Partnership meetings which some Executive Team and Leadership members attend, but there are additional partners doing work. She would like to figure out a way integrate those who are doing the work with those who are making the decisions.
Amy Gerstein suggested that an ad hoc committee should have a responsibility to convene and learn but not be a concrete implementation and a decision-making group that could get stalled because it is without authority or field of vision.

Alisa MacAvoy agreed that the decision-making group is around the table; it has a more complete understanding of the collaborative’s budget, organization, and priorities and how each entity fits.

Shelly Masur stated that it is important to understand how to think about what ad hoc committees represent, as they would receive direction from Leadership Council around, for example, producing a community schools toolkit. She said that the Leadership Council would not be the right group to write a toolkit, but if the direction comes from Leadership Council then an ad hoc group could learn and start to develop something together and bring it back to the Leadership Council. Furthermore, ad hoc committees should not be standing committees, but be responsive to whatever is identified as a need or project by the leadership teams.

Hillary Paulson stated that the Pipeline of Success requires direction and a vote.

Ms. Paulson asked attendees to look at the Core Elements on visual and advise if they were comfortable with them as the focus for this work; Ms. Paulson added that all along the process, agreement had been reached on the Linkages and asked if anything was missing. She stated that a formal vote was not necessary, but wished for a physical indication of agreement, e.g., nodding of heads in consensus, that it is the right direction for the Core Elements. All nodded in agreement.

Ms. Paulson asked attendees to look at the Guiding Principles, particularly at shared accountability. She stated this would be more of a commitment for the partners, and asked if the partners agreed with these as Guiding Principles and whether their organization could support them.

Alicia MacAvoy said that as a Kindergarten-through-8th grade District trustee, her goal is for students to be successful in school and life and her District desires success for students along the whole continuum. Even though the Redwood City School District’s focus is for a certain number of years, the District wants to be a part of the whole system.

Jim Lianides stated that the Guiding Principles are all important aspects that the collaborative is doing, and asked for further clarification of the roles for the High School District, the Tri-District Collaborative, and Redwood City 2020. He added that another step in the process is high quality core instruction programming.

John Baker agreed on wanting specificity, e.g. what do the Guiding Principles and Core Elements, for example, shared accountability look like, and how specifically are they implemented.
- Jim Lianides reiterated the ask for clarity on what Redwood City 2020’s role in the Pipeline was, to avoid duplication of efforts; one partner may have more of a role in expanded day work, e.g., and that needs to be sorted out later. Mr. Lianides emphasized that he and the Sequoia Union High School District very much support the values and priorities of the Pipeline.

- John Baker seconded the support of the values and priorities, but reaffirmed the need for clarity on the “what” and the “how for the work.

- Hillary Paulson acknowledged the feedback that the Stewardship Committee idea needs refinement and further discussion.

- Jana Kiser stated the staff is due to convene the Workgroup again to share final thoughts and wrap-up, many members of which were present in this meeting. She summarized that there seemed to be consensus in the room on the concept of the cradle to career Pipeline, and agreement on the need to articulate in greater detail to ensure the collaborative would not be overstepping in any way as well as best supporting the partners. She reiterated the idea that appropriate partners would take responsibility for different aspects of the work, honoring the strength of current work. For example, Ms. Kiser noted that high quality instruction was an aspect that the school districts already do every day, and this piece was historically listed first in literature to honor the current strength and historical focus of the school-based partners. She added that the descriptions for each high-level piece discussed was reflected in the handout, but that further details were in the recommendations paper sent by email. She stated the collaborative was at a crossroads and asked the members present if the Leadership Council would have the collaborative continue down the path of exploration and building Pipeline work, or if the Leadership Council would like the collaborative to change paths away from the proposed Pipeline of Success. Ms. Kiser noted that the input from the Executive Team was that they were in consensus with the vision and the high-level concepts; and she asked if that was echoed by the Leadership Council, whether the visual represented a priority of collaborative work or not.

- Alan Sarver stated the Guiding Principles and Core Elements are a statement of why the two districts are present in the room; the visual is a very clear statement of the commitment and a pathway to achieve the goals; he strongly supported that this is the direction the Leadership Council would like to go and the work it would like to do.

- Shelly Masur added that from the City of Redwood City’s perspective, the Core Elements are right, but questioned how it would be ordered. For example, she asked the attendees to consider how far down the list a city staff person would have to look before finding what they might be responsible for. She noted that it was very clear to her that the Pipeline would be a whole set of approaches to make the community one that all want to live in, and that each entity has a piece in the work.
Alan Sarver offered that looking at the principles and elements, certain ones such as college, career, and community readiness, family engagement, youth development and leadership, etc., drive outcomes and results that the whole initiative needs to have and should be highlighted at the top of the list; core steps might follow under those, i.e., high quality core instructional programming, streamlined transition, etc., which are building blocks to make the outcomes and results happen. At the end are the support activities needed to assist with all the above.

Shelly Masur stated Mr. Sarver is correct: some elements aim towards outcomes and some refer more to activities, and the list itself may need more work, but that the concept is very good.

- Jana Kiser asked if there was anyone not in agreement with the concepts of the Pipeline of Success. There was no dissent.
- Jana Kiser stated that the next steps would be to continue to develop the details of the implementation stage, including learning and convening, and to continue to think about the order of Core Elements and categories; the collaborative will revisit these at its August joint meeting.
  - Gerald Shefren asked Ms. Kiser what her responsibility will be in making sure the Pipeline is successful and how she sees her role fitting in.
  - Ms. Kiser said she has been thinking through concretely what implementation looks like; she stated she would like to articulate, or have articulated for her, what the staff role would be for Redwood City 2020; e.g., given the Redwood City 2020 staff convenes partners well, perhaps that could be an explicit part of the staff’s role. She stated she would like to develop and present a work plan of tangible actions for the next year based on the Pipeline vision and the ideas from Executive Team conversations and the Workgroup. She suggested that she present an outline in August after having conversations with appropriate people. Mr. Shefren agrees.

Financial Update, Fundraising News, and FY2016-17 Budget

- Jana Kiser informed the Council that there will be a decrease in core membership for the 2016-2017 fiscal year:
  - San Mateo County will renew one membership for $25,000 for the FY2016-2017, with the Health System and the Human Services Agency each contributing $12,500. Ms. Kiser reminded the Council that San Mateo County offers the collaborative additional support through large grants to specific initiatives. Ms. Kiser advised she is happy to share further details offline.
  - Ms. Kiser read a letter she received from Kitty Lopez, Executive Director of First 5 San Mateo County, advising Ms. Kiser of First 5 San Mateo County’s decision
not to renew their Redwood City 2020 membership due to a decrease in their funding.

- Hillary Paulson asked if the names on the Leadership Council roster are still appropriate; Ms. Kiser replied that they are appropriate for the 2015-2016 fiscal year and that they would be edited for the following year to reflect any appropriate membership changes.

- Ms. Kiser acknowledged the diligent work of John Crowell, Redwood City 2020 Program Manager, in developing the budget presented for review. Ms. Kiser explained that the budget is reframed with the addition of a ‘net’ column, which was requested by the finance committee as they consider how to use the prudent reserve, and what should be a prudent reserve. She noted that a very conservative forecast for the upcoming fiscal year was provided on the handout; it did not include a number of pending grant applications. There has been an increase in core costs due to an increase in salaries and benefits; however the collaborative has a reserve. She noted the collaborative has a small projected deficit for the upcoming fiscal year due to core costs that would not be covered by current projections of grant revenue. Fiscal sustainability would require that core costs be covered by contributions and grants; in this sense, the collaborative is approximately $55,000 short of that goal. Ms. Kiser stated her confidence that by working with the Finance and Development ad hoc committee, the collaborative would be able to cover the deficit. She shared a few of the ad hoc committee’s ideas including:
  - Increasing membership, e.g. Cañada College and others in the community.
  - A fundraising event about which the committee is enthusiastic
  - Multi-year memberships, which some organizations have requested. While a multi-year membership does not increase revenue, it does ensure stability.

Ms. Kiser stated that these ideas would be discussed in August in greater detail when the ad hoc committee will distribute their report.

- Ms. Kiser reiterated that that the budget was a conservative forecast which included lost membership contribution and increases in grant revenue. Furthermore Ms. Kiser announced a successful grant application to The Big Lift, and that she would be meeting on May 26th regarding details of the grant award of $75,000. She noted the grant process was extremely competitive and was proud of the award. A portion of the funds will support staff and core costs as well as help fund initial work on the early childhood end of the Pipeline. Other grant proposals were not included in the budget as they are pending.

- Alisa MacAvoy shared that she was impressed with Ms. Kiser’s work on budget and staff management, and her comfort with the current staff. Ms. Kiser acknowledged switching from three full-time staff and consultants (a total of seven) to five full time and two part-time, still a total of seven staff. However, the current staff are all in-house which represented a significantly reduced cost; she noted that it would be possible to perceive the collaborative has brought on additional staff, but in truth the collaborative is no longer paying other organizations for the same amount of total staff.
• Hillary Paulson asked for a motion to approve the draft budget.
  o Shelly Masur moved to approve the budget as presented; Alisa MacAvoy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Member Announcements/Good News/Kudos

• Hillary Paulson reported the City of Redwood City’s Human Concerns Committee is hosting forums regarding the increased price of housing; she directed interested parties to visit the City’s website for details.
• Jana Kiser reported she has been working with County Manager Melissa Stevenson Diaz to ensure membership agreements for fiscal year FY2016-2017 will be processed in a timely manner.
• Alan Sarver reported the good news of increased graduation rates in California and Sequoia Union High School District:
  o Statewide graduation rate in 2015 was 82%, and Sequoia Union High School District reached 86%.
  o The dropout rate in California has dropped to 10.1%, and down to 5.7% at Sequoia Union High School District.

Next Steps and Meeting Closure

• Jana Kiser reminded the attendees of the following upcoming meetings:
  o The next meeting will be a combined Leadership Council/Executive Team meeting on August 17th from 9:00 A.M. – 10:30 A.M. in the Community Room of Redwood City Main Library.
  o The Community Schools Workgroup will meet again in June, date, time and location to be determined.
  o The Executive Team will meet on Wednesday, June 21st, 9:00 AM. – 10:30 A.M.
• Hillary Paulson adjourned the meeting at 10:30 A.M.