

School District No. 1J, Multnomah County, Oregon
Board Work Session of September 24, 2018

INFORMAL MINUTES

A Work Session of the Board of Directors came to order at 6:30pm at the call of Chair Rita Moore in the Mazama Conference Room at the Blanchard Education Service Center, 501 N. Dixon Street, Portland, Oregon, 97227.

There were present:

Board of Directors:

Rita Moore, Chair
Julie Esparza Brown, Vice-Chair
Julia Brim-Edwards
Amy Kohnstamm - *absent*
Paul Anthony
Scott Bailey
Mike Rosen
Nick Paesler, Student Representative - *absent*

Facilitators:

Fiona Hovenden
Sonya Lopes

Staff:

Guadalupe Guerrero, Superintendent
Jonathan Garcia, Senior Director Strategic Partnerships
Liz Large, Interim General Counsel
Yvonne Curtis Deputy Superintendent, Instruction and School Communities
Luis Valentino, Chief Academic Officer
Stephanie Soden, Chief of Staff
Stephanie Cameron, Senior Director of Communications
Courtney Westling, Director of Government Relations
Loretta Benjamin-Samuels, Senior Director Talent Management
Camille Idedevbo, Associate Corporate and Foundation Relations
Kregg Cuellar, Chief of Schools
Rosanne Powell, Board Office Manager
Caren Huson-Quiniones, Board Clerk

2018-19 VISIONING

Chair Moore stated that she hoped by the end of the Work Session that there would be a direction and what we want to get out of the visioning process, how we want it organized, how the Board will be involved the process, etc. The facilitators will provide information on how they think this will all work.

The facilitators provided a PowerPoint presentation and stated the following outcomes from the Work Session: develop a deeper understanding of their approach and some of their tools; develop a deeper understanding of the proposed phases of the process; have a clear direction on the preferred project stakeholder engagement scenarios with direction to analyze potential implications to timeline and resources; and, agreement on method of working with and communicating with the Board going forward.

The facilitators provided an agenda for the evening: five exercises which the Board will participate in; phases of the visioning process; session design and prep; stakeholder engagement; and, vision artifacts development. Ms. Hovenden stated that *Vision* was an organization's guiding idea. It expresses the desired future the organization wants to bring about in the world. The Vision works as a "north star". *Mission* describes what an organization does and serves as a guide for decisions and activities for an organization. Some Key Practices: strategic foresight, futures thinking (imagining, tracking weak signals), Emphatic Design (listening, noticing, appreciating), and prototyping (tinkering, making your way into an idea, playing, trying.)

The Board and staff participated in the following five exercises: Third Horizon, Persona, Scenario, Graduate Portrait, and System Shifts. Director Bailey commented that the visioning process doesn't seem as rich as to what is going on in the world today and asked if it was too utopian. Ms. Hovenden responded that we want to give space for people to tell us what they think is wrong. Vice-Chair Esparza Brown stated that there was not a disengaged student in the Persona samples and that is going to be one of our biggest issues. Director Brim-Edwards asked when the facilitators have done this process before, how do they culturally align with communities of color. Ms. Hovenden responded that they have translators in the room.

At 9:10pm, the Board took a five minute break.

Ms. Hovenden offered three scenarios for the stakeholder process:

Scenario 1:

- Guiding Coalition Convening 1 (panels of speakers, strategic foresight, portraits)
- Community Engagement Session – 1st round
- Learning Journeys (2+ virtual)
- Guiding Coalition Convening 2
- Community Engagement Session – 2nd round
- Board and Senior Leadership Team Work Session
- Guiding Coalition Convening 3
- Community Installation

Scenario 2:

- Community Engagement Sessions – 1st round. Integrate futures/empathetic design, embeds virtual learning journey.
- Guiding Coalition Convening 1 – distillation of Community Engagement Session
- Community Engagement Sessions – 2nd round. Systems Shifts
- Guiding Coalition Convening 2 – distillation of Community Engagement Session
- Board/Senior Leadership Team and Core Team Work Session

Scenario 3:

- Community Engagement Sessions – 1st round. Integrate future/empathetic design and embed learning journey (virtual).
- Guiding Coalition Convening 1
- Community Engagement Session – 2nd round
- Board/Senior Leadership Team/Core Team Work Session

Director Bailey asked what the Board wanted in terms of a broader outreach. He would like to see a broad outreach that touches a lot of people and touches the diversity of our community. It would help build trust and connection in where we are going. Director Brim-Edwards stated that she thought all three scenarios would do that; however, she likes Scenario 1. She would add a Board/Senior Leadership Team reconciliation and calibration after each community session. She thought it was a well-defined process and the community input would inform the work. Ms. Soden commented that a list of stakeholders needs to be compiled and then determine the best way to reach out to each of them.

Chair Moore stated her concern about giving too much to the Guiding Coalition. Her suspicion is that members of the Coalition will not have contact with real people. She does not want to give them the authority to craft the vision for everybody else. Director Brim-Edwards stated that the Board will have the ability to pick the members of the Coalition. Director Anthony mentioned that we are going to need repetition with the same people; the process is too abstract and too much jargon. People will need to meet multiple times. Superintendent Guerrero stated that he wants to hear from parents and what they want for their children. Vice-Chair Esparza Brown commented that right now, it is targeted to a certain group of parents, and she wants a larger group to be heard.

Director Bailey asked what was the purpose of the Guiding Coalition. Will they continue after the visioning process is complete? Chair Moore responded that the purpose will define what level of person we want sitting on the Guiding Coalition. Do we want the Mayor or his assistant? The Chair of the County Commission or one of the Commissioners? Director Brim-Edwards responded that she thought we would want a mix of levels: leaders, followers, contributors.

The Board generally preferred Scenario 1. The Board will review the Coalition list. Staff will present one option of the Coalition and the Board could say yes or no. The purpose of the Coalition needs to be determined and a job description created for the Coalition. The Board will decide the right level and mix of the members, and they will determine the size of the Coalition. Director Brim-Edwards suggested that some contrarians should be on the Coalition.

Director Brim-Edwards indicated that she would like to receive copies of the agenda for Core Team meetings. Whatever the report out is, it should be the same for the Board and the leadership team so that all receive the same message. Notes and any new documents should be sent out to all. Board comments and questions will be sent to the facilitators and they will share the information in the Core Team meetings with the issue going into the minutes of the meeting.

Director Bailey commented that people will be named to the Coalition but there is no way they will be representative of the general public. Director Rosen stated that they will have to be, they have to be representative of the constituency the Board serves.

ADJOURN

Chair Moore adjourned the Work Session at 10:39pm.

Submitted by:

Caren Huson-Quiniones, Board Clerk
PPS Board of Education