



YOUNG WOMEN'S PREPARATORY NETWORK

1882 Governance Meeting

August 28th, 2019

1722 Routh Street, Ste. 720

Dallas, TX 75201

Board Members Present:

- Lynn McBee
- Berta Fogerson
- Sharonda Pruitt
- Tanuja Singh
- Kate Jeffrey Williamson
- Dave Joyner
- Koshi Dhiangra
- Jeanne Whitman Bobbitt
- Delia McClerran
- Jennifer Seybert

The 1882 Governance Meeting was called to order by Board Chairman, Dr. Sharonda Pruitt, at 11:34 am.

Board member and campus leaders introductions were initiated by Dr. Pruitt and each individual gave a brief overview of their careers and current professional roles as follows:

- Dr. Sharonda Pruitt- SB 1882 Governance Committee Chairman, Adjunct Professor at Johns Hopkins University Graduate School of Education & member of the Young Women's Preparatory Network Executive Board of Directors in Dallas.
- Lynn McBee- Chief Executive Officer of the Young Women's Preparatory Network in Dallas.
- Dave Joyner- Oil & Gas Consultant, Managing Member of Arya Resources & Clear Chem, Midland, Texas.
- Dr. Tanuja Singh- Dean and Professor of Marketing at the Greehey School of Business at St. Mary's University, San Antonio, Texas.
- Delia McClerran-Young Women's Leadership Academy Primary and Secondary Campuses Head of Schools in San Antonio.
- Berta Fogerson, Chief Academic & Accountability Officer at Young Women's Preparatory Network in Dallas & Executive Director of 1882 Partnerships.
- Dr. Koshi Dhiangra-Founding Director of talkSTEM, a non-profit organization in Dallas.
- Jeanne Whitman Bobbitt- Former Head of Schools at Hockaday and presently serving as a Management Consultant for Jeanne P. Whitman Consulting in Dallas.
- Jennifer Seybert- Principal of Young Women's Leadership Academy Midland, Texas.

- Kate Williamson-President, General Consultant and PAC Fundraiser at Basin Hill, LLC, a consulting business in Midland with a focus on Political Advocacy

Dr. Pruitt introduced Lynn McBee and Berta Fogerson to address the first item on the Discussion portion of the agenda: a YWPN History & SB 1882 Partnership Initiative. Lynn presented the YWPN Video and provided some background and history to set the stage for the work that YWPN and this board would be undertaking. She shared that the YWPN is a privately funded non-profit that formed in 2004 with the purpose of partnering with public school districts to promote the advancement of girls' education. She reported that YWPN currently has 9 schools throughout the state and that the decision to consider the SB 1882 work was attributed in great part to the outreach from San Antonio ISD, who has been a proven YWPN partner for many years. San Antonio Young Women's Leadership Academy Secondary was an existing YWPN school that entered into an 1882 partnership with YWPN as its Operator and expanded the Network's role into the elementary school arena with the opening of Young Women's Leadership Academy Primary in San Antonio. She noted that the school in Midland entered the Network as the 9th school and one of the SB 1882 Partnership Schools.

Lynn stated that SB 1882 has broadened the scope of YWPN's reach and will position the Network to reach more girls at a younger age. She affirmed that the 1882 work would strengthen the Network's connection with the districts and that becoming an Operator through the 1882 partnerships would allow the schools to avail themselves of additional state funding while allowing YWPN to provide a more active role in the oversight, management, and support of these schools.

She concluded by informing the Board that other districts have expressed interest in entering into 1882 Partnerships with YWPN including Fort Worth, Lubbock, and Beaumont. In addition, McBee noted that Berta Fogerson had been instrumental in making the strategic decision to embark in this work. McBee then turned the second part of the agenda item to Berta Fogerson to discuss the SB 1882 Initiative.

Fogerson thanked the members of the 1882 Governing Board for their willingness to serve. She presented the contents and resources included in the Governing Board Notebooks as follows:

- Meeting Agendas
- YWPN Bylaws-An addendum would be approved by the YWPN Board in late September to address SB 1882 Partnerships
- Board Membership Roster-Berta noted that she was still looking for one more representative from San Antonio and as new districts joined additional representatives would be added
- Meeting Schedules- reflected a list of meetings calendared through November 2020
- Partnership Agreements- which delineate the responsibilities of the district and the operating partner including accountability measures
- Performance Goals-provided for each of the schools and which will be reviewed in depth through presentations provided by the principals throughout the year
- Budgets- to be presented, reviewed, and approved later on in the meeting
- Meeting Minutes & Resources

Berta Fogerson also provided background on the SB 1882 legislation which was passed in 2017 explaining that the bill allowed for schools to partner with non-profits in an effort to receive additional funds and gain certain autonomies to run innovative school models in areas like professional development, curriculum, budget allocations, etc.

The following 1882 information was provided via a presentation by Fogerson:

- **How do you become a partner school?** Fogerson stated that YWPN was sought out to be an 1882 partner both in San Antonio and Midland. The bill allows districts to create partnerships with mission aligned partners which must be vetted by the district and approved by the Texas Education Agency.

Board member Jeanne Whitman asked Berta Fogerson about the role of the governance board. Fogerson explained that the primary role was to protect the autonomies granted through the Partnership Agreement and to guide the work of the schools to ensure that decisions align with the goals and performance metrics delineated in the Partnership Agreements. Fogerson added that the YWPN Executive Board is ultimately responsible to the ISD Board of Trustees to insure that the goals are met. It was stressed that it was imperative that the district and the operating partner must work collaboratively to support the campus in providing special services, payroll management, transportation, food services, facilities, etc.

- **What are the benefits of becoming a SB 1882 partner?** It was explained by Fogerson that additional funds are provided through the 1882 funding formula to support the YWPN single-gender school model that focuses on advanced academic curriculum to promote college readiness for populations of girls from diverse backgrounds. The model also emphasizes the importance of health & wellness, community service, and leadership development. This opportunity would allow the YWPN to avail itself of \$100 per pupil in public school dollars to help support the work that has been funded strictly with private dollars for over 17 years.
- **How does the district hold the school and the partner accountable?** Fogerson noted that Senate Bill 1882 partnerships exist to improve student outcomes, so partnership agreements are written to define specific performance goals and ensure strong accountability on the part of the operating partner to the district. She explained that she would oversee the work at each of the campuses, and that the districts had been granted the flexibility to end the partnership if progress was not being made and goals were not being met. Fogerson stated that Mrs. McClerran, YWLA San Antonio Head of Schools, and Dr. Seybert, YWLA Midland Principal would present data at each future meeting informing the board about the progress of each school.

Dr. Pruitt addressed with the second Discussion Item dealing with 1882 Board Governance. She introduced Lynn McBee who noted that Berta Fogerson would provide a brief overview of the Governance expectations for the Board.

Fogerson explained that the YWPN 1882 Governing Board would consist of 3 YWPN representatives including the CEO, the Chief Academic Officer (who would act as Executive Director of the 1882 schools),

1 YWPN Executive Board Representative who would serve as Chairman of the SB 1882 Governing entity, 2 at-large members, and 2 community stakeholders from each ISD. It was also noted that the primary role of the governing board was to protect the autonomy that SB 1882 granted the schools—specifically in areas such as staff procurement, curriculum selection and implementation, professional development options, school calendar flexibility, and student assessments.

Fogerson also stated that based on guidelines from the Texas Education Agency and the Partnership Agreements established with each district, the main responsibilities of the board were to:

- Meet 3 times annually and report to YWPN Board
- Submit meeting schedules a week before a meeting
- Submit meeting minutes one week after a meeting was held
- Appoint an Executive Director to oversee the schools
- Serve as advisors and strategic thought partners
- Approve the annual budget for each school
- Monitor the progress toward meeting the goals and performance metrics at each campus
- Approve recommendations for refining curriculum, calendars, and programming based on the recommendations by school leaders and the 1882 Executive Director

In addition, Fogerson emphasized that Dr. Sharonda Pruitt would provide quarterly reports to the YWPN Executive Board. The floor was opened for questions from the Board.

Kate Williamson asked if schools without 1882 Partnerships had Governing Boards. McBee responded that they had Advisory Councils that raised private dollars to support the Enhancement Programs at each of the schools. In addition, the YWPN would continue to provide funding for Network-wide opportunities for all the campuses.

Williamson also asked if YWLA Midland would have an Advisory Council. Fogerson responded that it was the expectation so that in the future the Enhancement Programs at the campus could be sustained.

Jeanne Whitman Bobbit asked if the 1882 Governance Board would have fundraising responsibilities to the 1882 Partner Schools? Fogerson's response was "no" and explained that the only role of the 1882 Governing Board was to provide oversight in the areas described in the TEA Guidelines and the Partnership Agreements.

Lynn McBee added that the Network supported each campus with an initial investment to support Enhancement Programs until an Advisory Council was established; or, in situations like Houston where a council had not been created, YWPN assisted by hiring a grant writer to generate private dollars to pay for added programming at the campus. McBee noted that all of the YWPN schools have been established as a result of an MOU created with each of the districts and this new role as an operating partner was only in place with the campuses that have entered into an 1882 Partnership.

Dr. Pruitt moved to the next discussion item pertaining to an Overview of the 1882 Partnership Agreements. Berta Fogerson was asked to present the information.

Fogerson asked the members of the Board to reference the copies of the Partnership Agreements provided under the orange tab in the Governing Board Notebooks. She explained that the Partnership Agreements delineated the roles and responsibilities of the District and the Partner. These were written to meet the requirements of the individual districts, but for the most part aligned in context. Each addressed common items such as operations, employees, supervision of schools, governance, finance, management fees, performance goals, audit and compliance, facilities, services, terms & termination, etc.

Jeanne Whitman Bobbitt asked how the audit expectations would be reported. Fogerson explained that a copy of the YWPN Annual Audit Report had to be provided upon completion to each district as long as the Partnership Agreement was in place. She also stated that within the YWPN budget ledger, specific 1882 Accounts for the Midland and San Antonio Campuses had been created to log expenses and facilitate the reporting of 1882 funds and expenditures.

Jeanne Whitman Bobbit asked if Fogerson also served as the CFO. It was noted that Claire Manigold was the Chief Financial Officer for the Network, and she had already engaged in conversations with the Network's contracted auditors in preparation for the 1882 audit reporting expectations.

Dr. Pruitt asked if San Antonio and Midland had both adopted district policies to address the 1882 Partnerships. Fogerson confirmed that such was the case and Midland ISD had included their policies in the addendums attached to the Partnership Agreement.

Lynn McBee added that YWPN would also include an addendum to the YWPN bylaws once Thompson and Knight, legal firm for the Network, vetted the policy and the Executive Board adopted it at the September meeting.

Fogerson directed the Board to the Performance Goals created for each school and included in the Governing Board Notebook. She emphasized that the goals would be addressed in depth at each meeting through data reports presented by each principal. She also noted that in the next few weeks these would be posted for public access to the YWPN website under the Performance Goals tab located under the 1882 Partnership Schools link. The following points pertaining to Performance Goals were made by Fogerson:

- TEA provides a two-year accountability rating waiver for new schools
- San Antonio would use MAP testing to monitor progress at the primary level. Mrs. McClerran added that they wanted to have a process for data collection with their Kindergarten through 2nd grade students to make sure that they were foundationally on target when they got to 3rd grade at which time they would be STAAR testing for the first time.
- San Antonio's YWLA Secondary campus had the option to avail themselves of the two-year waiver but opted not to do so. It was noted that this was already a very high performing school on track to maintain an A rating. Student achievement has been sustained in the upper 90's and these students have demonstrated continuous growth and exceeded the bar with high levels of achievement at the masters level.

- Midland has ventured into this work for the first time with 6th and 7th grade girls from all over Midland ISD. Dr. Seybert set conservative goals with the expectation that performance would surpass the projections delineated in the performance metrics.

Fogerson expressed confidence that all the goals would be met but assured the board that oversight at the campuses would be conducted with diligence in order to make sure that the expectations guaranteed to the districts would be honored.

Lynn McBee asked Fogerson to share the 2019 State Accountability data including the list of TEA Distinctions for all the YWPN Schools with the Governing Board.

The final discussion item was presented by Dr. Pruitt who asked Berta Fogerson to provide an overview of the Budget Development Process.

Fogerson explained that the budget process typically took place between February and June and was handled differently in each district. Even though YWPN was still in the 1882 Partnership approval and Board development process during this time, both campuses kept Fogerson in the loop about budget decisions throughout the budget development phase allowing for input that aligned budget expenditures with program goals for the 2019-20 school year. It was noted that in the future, the 1882 Governing Board would exercise a more proactive role in the development and approval of the campus budgets.

Fogerson provided an explanation of the most common sources of revenue that were included in each campus budget. These were presented as follows:

- **District Funding**-Texas guarantees every school district a certain amount of funding for each student. State lawmakers determine the base number per student, which is currently \$5,140. School districts generate funds from two main sources: their local property taxes and the state.
- **Title I Funds**-Federal funds which provide financial assistance to local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools with high numbers or high percentages of children from low-income families to help ensure that all children meet challenging state academic standards.
- **State Compensatory Education**-Funding for programs and/or services designed to supplement the regular education program for students identified as at risk of dropping out of school. The purpose is to increase academic achievement and reduce the dropout rate of these students.
- **Grants**-Non-repayable funds disbursed or given by grant makers (often a government department, corporation, foundation or trust) to a recipient, often (but not always) a nonprofit entity, educational institution, business or an individual.
- **SB 1882 Funds**- Additional state funding allocated for the purpose of improving schools and/or establishing innovative educational school models in new or existing schools.

Fogerson noted that the budgets as well as brief summaries had been shared with the board prior to the meeting to allow time for in depth review. She explained that before moving to the approval of the budgets, each principal would present the most relevant components of their campus budgets—specifically in the allocation of SB 1882 funds with which they were able to exercise the most discretion.

She also reminded the board that some budget categories were purposely established to be broad enough to give the campuses flexibility in spending as initiatives and needs to support the campus goals arose.

Dr. Tanuja Singh asked the following question: Were the campus performance measures aligned with the district's or were they different? And if the goals were aligned, was the intent of the 1882 funds to help the campuses reach these goals?

Fogerson responded that the goals were set based on what accountability data for each campus revealed and were directly aligned with the accountability expectations of the individual districts. She also affirmed that the 1882 funds were allocated to support the initiatives and programs that would ensure the goals would be met.

Dr. Pruitt initiated the presentation portion of the agenda by introducing Delia McClerran, YWLA San Antonio Head of Schools, who presented key components of the Primary and Secondary Campus Budgets.

Mrs. McClerran made the following points during her Primary Budget presentation.

- The campus allocation would be used to supplement the school beyond what the district would generally provide for other campuses.
- The primary campus had been assigned an organization reference number: 120; the secondary campus code was 023.
- State-Comp-Ed dollars have been ear-marked for supplies.
- The 1882 funding allocation included \$50,000 in discretionary funds for instruction in primary in addition to a \$43,000 salary allocation for a split funded position that would serve both the elementary and secondary campuses.
- The Transformation Grant and School Redesign Grant funds were used to update the building and for the purchase of campus start-up materials including furniture, playground equipment, computers, SMART Boards, curriculum supplies, etc. Both grants were secured by the district.
- The primary campus is populated with kindergarten and first grade girls with five sections of kinder and three sections of first grade. As the population grows the 1882 allocation should also increase.
- The budget coding system was explained to define budget sources, functions, and organizational and program designations. The broad budget categories or "functions" delineate expenses for instruction, leadership, etc.
- Specific breakdowns of expenses were noted under each function

During the presentation of the Secondary Campus Budget. Mrs. McClerran made the following points:

- The Secondary Campus did not have access to the Transformation and Redesign grants because it was not a new school like the Primary Campus. However, the 1882 allocation was significantly larger because of the number of students that were already enrolled in the 6th – 12th grade program.

- Local funds in various functions addressed secondary campus expenses including a variety of programs and salaries as specified in the budgeted line items.
- This campus had a higher population of at-risk students making them eligible to receive State Compensatory dollars in the amount of \$16,000 dedicated to teacher compensation for extended day support for struggling students.
- \$25,000 was dedicated out of 1882 funds to cover the costs for College Trips for every grade level in order to mirror the programming at other Network schools. Since many of the girls served at this campus are deemed first-generation college bound students, there would be a concerted effort to expose them to college experiences to promote the college-going culture. Most of the trips would be local or day trips; but, starting with the junior and senior year, overnight college road trips would be planned. This budget allocation was dedicated to cover expenses for transportation, hotel, meals, etc. for students and teachers.
- 1882 funds would also be used to provide professional development for teachers to attend AP Institutes, AVID training, Mindfulness training, and content specific workshops and conferences to help teachers stay current in their content areas.
- \$80,000 of the 1882 funds were dedicated to the purchase of 21st century furniture and the update of secondary classroom instructional resources.
- 1882 funding was also dedicated to providing resources for robotics and STEAM programming, including updates to the Maker Space Lab with the purchase of a 3-D printer, supporting software, and project supplies.
- \$2,000 was budgeted for marketing and promoting the school.

Dr. Tanuja Singh offered some possible university partnerships to support professional development opportunities for teachers over the summer and some free marketing consulting through her department at St. Mary's University.

Dr. Koshi Dhiangra asked if the campus was at capacity. Mrs. McClerran responded that they would be next year.

Dr. Singh asked Mrs. McClerran to explain the enrollment process. Mrs. McClerran shared that there was an application but no acceptance criteria for the primary campus, but there was a process for acceptance at the secondary level wherein students would apply, take a reading and math aptitude exam, and undergo an interview to assess level of interest and dedication to the program. A scoring rubric is used to tally the points and because of limited space the top 125 are offered enrollment.

Dr. Seybert continued with this portion of the budget agenda and presented her budget making the following points:

- YWLA Midland reported enrollment at 170 6th and 7th grade students housed in a temporary modular structure. Plans for future growth included the addition of a grade level every year and extensions to the modular structure being made until a permanent facility is secured for the school. Midland ISD developed a Bond Package to be voted on in the November election
- Due to the small size of the school, the Midland budget was not as comprehensive as San Antonio's. District funds were primarily dedicated to fund salaries for a staff of 10 teachers and a principal, assistant principal, counselor and an assistant teacher who serves in multiple roles at

the school. The total local budget allocation was \$818,061 which was dedicated to compensation and instructional program expenses as shown in the budget.

- \$160,000 in SB 1882 funds were secured to fund professional development, Advanced Academic Programming, College Visits, STEAM initiatives, co-curricular activity support, instructional travel, etc.
- Building capacity was established to house 200 students and additional students would be accepted up to a reasonable time as long as they met the entrance criteria. Efforts would continue to draw more students to YWLA Midland.
- 1882 funds have been dedicated to insure that YWLA students have access to equitable and comparable programming as would be found in a traditional middle school. In addition, the funding would be used to enhance programs and make sure students have the ability to travel and enter competitions of various kinds
- As a YWPN school, summer programming would be provided for students. 1882 funds were allocated to pay for summer camps, STEAM learning opportunities, teacher stipends, and academic summer projects.
- In addition to the 1882 funds, state and local grants to support the opening of a new campus were obtained by the district. A local company donated \$100,000 to equip the science lab. The \$1,000,000 grant from the state was dedicated to fund the purchase of the modular building, the furnishings, 21st century classroom technology, classroom equipment and resources, and furniture.

Dr. Pruitt asked about the modular building and how it was set-up to meet the campus needs. Dr. Seybert described the floor plan and explained that property had been secured and plans were in place for connecting the future additions.

Dave Joyner shared some pictures of the school with the board and spoke of the great learning environment that had been created for the girls in Midland.

Dr. Dhiangra asked for an explanation of expenses funded under instructional supplies. Dr. Seybert provided examples of items like one-to-one calculators in math classes as well as science classes, supplemental reading resources, and materials to enhance instruction to meet the advanced academic expectations.

Dr. Singh inquired about long-range, strategic planning efforts and what those processes entailed. Mrs. McClerran offered to respond and noted that each school is charged with conducting needs assessments and developing Campus Improvements Plans that align to campus needs and district goals. She noted these were developed with a 2 to 3 year and long-range strategic plan in mind. Budgets were developed to support the goals, strategies, and programs that must be implemented in order to meet the defined goals. In addition, long range strategic plans were shared with the Advisory Councils in order to plan for Enhancement Program support that would sustain and support the mission of the school. This process was described as fluid in an effort to meet immediate and long-range expectations.

Dr. Pruitt asked if there were any more questions before moving to the Action Items of the agenda. No additional questions were presented.

Dr. Pruitt made a motion to approve the budget as presented for the San Antonio Young Women's Leadership Academy Primary Campus in San Antonio. Dr. Tanuja Singh provided a second to the motion. Dr. Pruitt asked if there was any additional discussion needed, none was brought forward, and the motion passed unanimously with 8 in favor and 0 against.

Dr. Pruitt moved to the second item listed for approval on the agenda and presented the motion to approve the budget as presented for the San Antonio Young Women's Leadership Academy Secondary Campus in San Antonio. Jeanne Whitman Bobbit provided a second to the motion. Dr. Pruitt asked for additional questions or comments, none were brought forward, and the motion passed unanimously with 8 in favor and 0 against.

Dr. Pruitt made the third motion to approve the budget as presented for the Young Women's Leadership Academy of Midland. Dave Joyner provided a second to the motion. Dr. Pruitt asked if additional discussion was needed, none was brought forward, and the motion passed unanimously with 8 in favor and 0 against.

Lynn McBee thanked everyone for their participation and for taking part in leading this work. She stated she was very proud of how everything had come together and expressed a lot of gratitude to all.

Dr. Pruitt commented that she was a first-generation college graduate and wanted to applaud and thank the principals for their work.

Dr. Singh stated that it was not often that she attended a board meeting and left feeling inspired, but this meeting was undoubtedly one of those exceptions. She expressed appreciation for the Governance Notebook, the presentation of the material, and the organization leading up to the meeting. She thanked everyone for their work and expressed appreciation for the invitation to serve.

Dr. Pruitt officially adjourned the meeting at 1:14 pm.