

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

**Berkeley Global Campus at Richmond Bay
Community Working Group Meeting #11
December 10, 2015, 6:00-9:30**

Action Items and Summary Notes

Please note the presentations, original agenda, and all support materials are available at the [Chancellor's Partnership with Richmond webpage](#). This meeting was facilitated by MIG's Jamillah Jordan, with graphic recording and note taking by MIG's Noe Noyola.

Important Reminders and Action Items:

- The next scheduled CWG meeting is January 28 from 6 to 8:30 pm.
- The CWG voted the vast majority of recommendations the four sub committees put forth.
- The Local Hire/Workforce Training and Housing Sub Committee Recommendations were adopted, with only a few notations for minority opinions expressed about 1-3 aspects of the recommendations.
- Meanwhile, although CWG voted in support of the overall recommendations presented by the Education and Local Procurement Sub Committees, the CWG has asked the two committees to return with answers to questions raised about 1-2 elements of their recommendations.
- Finally, the CWG asked some sub committees to come back with more specific justifications for any specific financial investments that were proposed.
-
- **As agreed, some subcommittees will reconvene:**
 - **Procurement:** The CWG agreed that the procurement subcommittee should reconvene to address concerns about recommendations #1 and #5.
 - **Education:** The CWG agreed that the education subcommittee will reconvene to further discuss the issues of monetary amount and alignment with the Richmond Promise.

I. Welcome and Introductions

- Roll Call
- Meeting Objectives and Agenda Review
 - Present the **summary subcommittee recommendations to the CWG** for voting and approval
 - Review agenda
- Partner Updates
 - Diane reported attending an informational meeting to learn about community benefit agreement tools that she believes the CWG can benefit from. Presenters

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

are open to coming to a future meeting and she suggested putting it on the agenda for January. CWG members can benefit from a presentation on CBA tools and presenters can be put on agenda for January.

- Ruben offered thanks to the CWG and all the public sector partners (e.g., City, School District, Community College, etc.) and community partners (e.g., the Raise up Richmond Coalition, Healthy Richmond, etc.) that have invested countless hours in the CWG work. In response to emails and calls over the last week, Ruben took a few minutes to clarify that “Richmond Compact” is the noun the University has given to the legally binding agreement that the CWG and other community leaders have called for. Ruben reminded the CWG and the public that the term has been used in CWG’s process schedule the has been reviewed over the last few months; and that the parameters of the Richmond Compact were outlined in Chancellor Dirk’s open letter (May 2015)to the Richmond community. In response to some community member’s erroneous communication about the Richmond Compact Ruben clarified that commitments to support Richmond’s education priorities will be part of the agreement [Open Letter from the Chancellor to Richmond](#). Noting that he had spoken earlier that day to Juilan Gross, Raise Up Richmond Coalition’s lawyer, Ruben hoped that Gross conveyed all that was discussed on these points.
- CWG Member Edith Pastrano distributed Julian Gross’ memo to the CWG with his advise on the necessary elements of “a legally binding agreement.” The memo clarifies that “more important than the name of the documents are its content and attributes.”
- In response to questions about two of the elements in the Gross memo, referring to Chancellor Dirk’s letter, Ruben clarified that the Richmond Compact, and any subsequent implementation agreements that are signed, will include operational and financial commitments for UCB, LBNL, and any partners named in the agreements; as well as a commitment to track and report the results of activities undertaken in partnership with local entities.
- Finally, Ruben agreed to share the memo with Chancellor Dirks and campus leadership; and report back on the confirmation of the points he covered at the meeting.

II. Brief Recap of October 22nd CWG Meeting and November 30th Community Briefing & Open House

- 10/22 CWG meeting:
 - Subcommittees shared the status of the draft recommendations to collect input from the CWG and the community.
- 11/30 Community Briefing & Open House
 - Attended by over 200 community members who were asked to share their expertise and provide feedback on the draft recommendations.
 - Interactive, world-café breakout sessions for each subcommittee.
 - Engaged with subcommittee members to share their ideas and ask questions.

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

III. Overview of CWG Process

- **Key Milestones to Date and Desired Outcomes for December 10 Meeting**
 - The [process schedule](#) was reviewed and Jamillah provided highlights of recent CWG work.
 - Tonight, CWG reviews drafts of the recommendations that have incorporated the feedback received on November 30th and some new items from subcommittees and mini groups.
- Approach to CWG Voting and Approval of Recommendations
 - **Voting, Decision Making and Conflict Resolution**
 - Jamillah reminded the public that the CWG voting and decision-making approach was agreed to at an previously held meeting that focused on the CWG Mission/Charter (See the <http://chancellor.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/BGC%20Working%20Group%20Draft%20Charter%20Feb%2018%202015.pdf> CWG Charter/Mission). Reading from the CWG Mission Charter:
 - “The WG will work toward consensus recommendations and proposals whenever possible. **If consensus is not possible, majority vote will prevail.**”
 - “**Where consensus cannot be reached, minority opinions will be transmitted to decision makers in writing.** WG recommendations and proposals will be directed to the appropriate leadership body at UCB and LBNL for final decision.”
 - “The voting mechanism shall be a quorum of at least two thirds of currently seated members, *and in no case fewer than eleven.*”
 - “For content conflicts, for example, in the case where the majority of the WG is in favor of making a recommendation to UCB/LBNL, dissenting members may submit a minority position recommendation to UCB/LBNL.”

Approach to CWG Voting and Approval of Recommendations

- **Step #1:** Subcommittees present summary recommendations
 - **Step #2:** CWG and the public ask clarifying questions and make comments
 - **Step#3:** Motion to pass the full set of set of subcommittee recommendations (e.g., recs #1-3) with a yes/no vote (i.e., green card, red card)
 - **Step #4:** If a majority (10 or more CWG members) votes in favor then the motion passes
 - **Step #5:** If there are opposing viewpoints, we will discuss and take a second vote
 - **Step #6:** If CWG members have alternative language or recommendations, then the alternative will be included in the **minority opinion**
 - **All minority opinions will be submitted with the approved CWG recommendations.**
- Following are highlights from a discussion about CWG voting and approval of recommendations.

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

- Jamillah reminded participants that the subcommittees have been working for months, and that the recommendations before the CWG tonight reflect that work, as well as the feedback of 200+ community members as well as other community engagement opportunities.
- Minor changes/nuances can be changed/documented tonight; those holding minority opinions can write that opinion to include in the same document as the majority opinion.
- In response to some concerned CWG members, Jamillah explained that the proposed process includes space for members to vote all or portions of the recommendations forward, and/or tweaking others.
- **Note on the authorship of the draft recommendations.**
 - The Richmond Community Working Group (CWG) is developing a set of draft recommendations for the Berkeley Global Campus to be submitted to UC Berkeley and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) in December 2015.
 - Inclusion of draft recommendations in this document does not imply an agreement by UC Berkeley or LBNL. Upon receipt of the CWG final recommendations, UC Berkeley and LBNL will develop a draft Richmond Compact (agreement) that specifies the commitments and benefits the University and the Lab are prepared to provide to the Richmond community.

IV. Summary Presentation of Local Hire/Workforce Training Subcommittee Recommendations

Please note, the following summary of recommendations can be found in the [Overview Presentation](#) slides. The [draft LH/WFT recommendations in spreadsheet form](#) that the CWG voted to approve are available [online](#).

Context and Approach

- The Local Hire/Workforce Training subcommittee's recommendations include policies, investments and partnerships with local organizations that are designed to increase the numbers of Richmond residents that are prepared for and secure construction and non-construction jobs at the Berkeley Global Campus. The recommendations call for the University and the LBNL to:
 - Set percentage goals for the numbers of local and disadvantaged residents that are employed
 - Expand workforce training programs and options
 - Establish fair chance policies and provide support for individuals with criminal convictions
 - Adopt labor standards that support union employment and provide family sustaining wages and benefits

Progress to date

- **Input from wide-ranging collaboration including:**

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

Community Working Group members, UCB/LBNL, For Richmond, Richmond Works, CCISCO, Contra Costa Labor Council, AFSCME 3299, ACCE, Haas Institute, Safe Return Project, Rubicon.

- Recommendations and strategies modeled on existing agreements with other similar projects throughout the Bay Area,

Local Hire / Workforce Training Recommendations

#1. Ensure a minimum number of local and disadvantaged workers are able to work on the CONSTRUCTION of the BGC

- **Local Definition:** Richmond and North Richmond, unincorporated areas of North Richmond. Second priority: San Pablo.
- **Local hire goal:** 30% of total hours worked on a craft-by-craft basis.
- **Apprentice hours:** 30% of hours on a craft –by-craft basis, from local disadvantaged workers.
- **Definition of disadvantaged:** local residents who are unemployed veterans, previously incarcerated, emancipated foster youth, homeless, those on extended unemployment, chronically unemployed.

#2. Strengthen pathways between local CONSTRUCTION TRAINING programs and pathways and CONSTRUCTION JOBS at the BGC

- Designate a project manager to coordinate and ensure construction career pathways.
- Fund \$1 million annually – at minimum – for workforce training needs related to the BGC.
- Fund \$1 million annually – at minimum – for supportive services for low income and disadvantaged local workers.
- Enter into a Project Stabilization Agreement with the Contra Costa Building Trades Council.

#3. Ensure operations and maintenance employment opportunities to local and disadvantaged workers, and labor standards that support families.

- **Goal for new hires in operations:** 50% will be local residents
- **Goal for new hires in operations jobs:** 30% will be disadvantaged workers
- **Commit to ensuring workers at BGC are covered** under same collective bargaining agreements (same wages/benefits) as workers doing comparable work at the main campus.
- **Commit to not contract or subcontract:** any service that is customarily performed by University employees at the main campus
- **Commit direct employment by UCB/LBNL** for workers doing comparable work at buildings owned by private entities
- **Wages:** Ensure minimum pay at BGC is higher than Richmond Living Wage and UC minimum wage
- **Provide Funding:** for workforce training needs and supportive services for low-income and disadvantaged local workers for BGC Operations & Maintenance

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

jobs

#4. Strengthen pathways between local NON CONSTRUCTION training programs and pathways and NON construction jobs at the BGC

- Designate a project manager to coordinate and ensure NON CONSTRUCTION career pathways
- Fund \$1 million annually – at minimum – for workforce training needs with related to the BGC
- Fund \$1 million annually – at minimum – for supportive services for low-income and disadvantaged local workers
- Identify non-construction job-related needs at the BGC and partner to develop curriculum and hands-on experience that supports training programs and pathways to employment.

#5. Ensure Fair Chance Employment policies for individuals with prior criminal convictions

- **Interview/Application:** remove questions about prior criminal convictions
- **Third Party Inquiry:** no inquiry into applicant's conviction history; if required, only after applicant deemed otherwise qualified and offered a job
- **Employer must consider:** time elapsed since offense, evidence of rehabilitation activities or mitigating circumstances, if job-related conviction
- **If rejected for employment:** written notice including how the conviction may related to job, opportunity to correct inaccuracies and offer evidence of rehabilitation or mitigating circumstances
- **No consideration of:** arrest without convictions, dismissed or expunged convictions, juvenile convictions, convictions more than 7 years old, misdemeanors, infractions.

#6. Establish a committee to ensure the success of the benefits that are agreed upon. The committee will have community representation and will represent the community members intended to benefit from the community benefits agreement.

- **Discussion and comments**

A few explanations:

Most of what is presented here was available to the CWG and the community on November 30th

- While the subcommittee didn't get a chance to discuss #5, the ban the box component, it is a fair chance hiring policy and regular monitoring; it is based on the city's policy, developed by the National Employment Office.
- #6 Establish a committee... is also new.

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

Facilitated group discussion

Following are highlights from the CWG discussion about these draft recommendations.

- Concerns were voiced about the following: making a recommendation to “Commit direct employment by UCB/LBNL for workers doing comparable work at buildings owned by private entities;” #5 Fair chance/ban the box which appears to go beyond the city’s policy, and might not match the law; a concern that the recommendations do not reflect the 40 year timeline and the fact that Richmond’s environment might be very different, e.g. might have “full employment.” –
- Flexibility to change over time is needed; while resources to support suggested programs are needed arbitrary numbers are not helpful and make the recommendation(s) too easy to reject.
- In response to concerns, various points were made: refer to the [Chancellor’s Open Letter](#) where he states that operations and maintenance in privately owned buildings will be union; The Lab has to use E-verify and comply with federal regulations; UC Merced has agreed to hire UC employees in privately owned businesses.

Community comments included:

- Emphasis on support for UC direct hires with benefits, etc. (3)
- Support for having ex-convicted in a community member’s home.
- **CWG Approval and Next Steps**
 - The CWG voted to pass the recommendations with the following notes (with 3 yellows):
 - Point of clarification: #3f: the intent is that wages should be at least the highest of the two: Richmond Living Wage and UC minimum wage
 - Josh’s concerns will be included as a minority opinion (Commit direct employment by UCB/LBNL; and Fair Chance/Ban the Box.)
 - Bill’s comments about amendments over time/flexibility and monitoring.

v. Summary Presentation of Housing/Displacement Subcommittee Recommendations

Please note, the following summary of recommendations can be found in the [Overview Presentation](#) slides. The [draft Housing/Displacement recommendations in spreadsheet form](#) that the CWG voted to approve are available [online](#).

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

Housing/ Displacement Subcommittee members include:

- Community Working Group members, City of Richmond staff, community based organizations like CCISCO, Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment and Raise Up Richmond Coalition, UCB Real Estate Division, residents and other community representatives

Priorities to Frame Approach & Analysis

- **Define what is affordable** (for very low and low income households) using the City's Housing Element
- **For the benefit of:** Current residents vulnerable to displacement and **"special needs populations"** (e.g., low-income and very low income residents, seniors, disabled, homeless, and re-entry populations)
- **Consider the timeline:** identify policies and strategies that can be implemented now and throughout the life of the project
- Identify **synergies with existing city programs** and policies (General Plan and Housing Element update)

Community Briefing & Open House Input

- Community feedback integrated into the recommendations; generally very supportive

Housing/Displacement Recommendations

#1: Housing Linkage Fee

- **Pay impact fees** to the City of Richmond to build and preserve affordable housing and to prevent displacement
 - Impact fees are based on the construction of residential and non-residential space in the City
 - Impact fees will be invested in an Anti-Displacement Fund to support a wide range of priority programs (e.g., first-time homebuyer programs, rental assistance)
- City of Richmond is preparing a **Nexus Study** to support establishment of an affordable housing linkage fee
- **Minority opinion:**
Until Richmond passes a housing linkage fee for non-residential development, UC will pay the **Bay Area median** of \$15 per square foot for the linkage fee.

#2: Build Housing on BGC Site

- **Build housing on BGC site** for unique needs of workforce (including faculty) and students to **avoid negative impact on existing and future residents** and neighborhoods.

#3: Provide Research and Data Support to Richmond Community

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

- Provide **research and data** support related to affordable housing and **displacement mitigation** by offering expertise of UCB departments, institutes, faculty and student engagement.
 - This support can begin before and independent of any BGC development.
- Collaborate with the City to **study the feasibility of non-traditional forms** of affordable housing (e.g., Community Land Trusts) and identify preferred **models to implement in Richmond**.
- **Identify promising practices** to preserve/develop affordable housing, and anti-displacement initiatives that have been successful in the past 10 years in cities similar to Richmond

- **Discussion and comments:**

- Facilitated Discussion

- The Following are highlights from the CWG discussion about these draft recommendations.

- There was some discussion about the minority opinion including: support for the \$15, but dispute on if that is the median; support for the nexus study and a relevant fee established by the City.

- Community comments

- There were comments in support of the minority opinion (4) and concern voiced about: property taxes; concern that the university can't house everyone; that the university shouldn't house anyone/that the BGC will be gated); about people with vouchers.
 - Jamillah clarified that the BGC will not be gated and the UC has rich town-gown relations across the state.

- **CWG Approval and Next Steps**

- The CWG voted to pass the recommendations with the following notes (with 3 yellows):
 - (Yellow) Joel suggested new language for #3: the university supporting a best practice around implementation.
 - (Yellow) Margaret and Diane support the minority opinion even though the concept is a good one; regardless he is glad the minority opinion is going forward.
 - (Green) Bill again voiced concern about the \$15 because it is not a well-researched number (the research sample size is small) and therefore feels arbitrary.
 - Josh pointed out that SF will throw off the Bay Area media and the nexus study and following analysis will likely show that Richmond can support a much lower number.

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

VI. Summary Presentation of Housing/Displacement Subcommittee Recommendations

Please note, the following summary of recommendations can be found in the [Overview Presentation](#) slides. The [draft Procurement recommendations in spreadsheet form](#) that the CWG voted to approve are available [online](#).

Process to Date

- **Wide Ranging Collaboration and Expertise**
 - Community Working Group members, UCB/LBNL procurement departments, City of Richmond, small business development centers, Healthy Richmond, Richmond Main Street, Richmond Chamber of Commerce, For Richmond, CCISCO, local small businesses
- **Local Business Involvement through Business Roundtables [Business Bites, etc.]**
 - Held in August 2015 and November 2015
 - 100 Richmond leaders, 80 local businesses represented
 - Survey completed to provide feedback on recommendations
 - Vetted at Community Briefing on November 30th 2015
 - Advised by facilitator group with business procurement expertise

Community Briefing Input

- Broad support

Draft Procurement Recommendations

#1. Set specific goals and adopt policies for INCREASING PROCUREMENT of local businesses in design and in construction and through regular procurement

- Formal preferences for 25% local spend integrated in CONSTRUCTION contracts
- Apply BGC procurement policies to other sectors beyond construction including design services and solar industry
- Specific percentage of Set-Aside contracts for local small businesses
- Bid Process Selection: a responsible bidder that offers the best value and that limits and/or minimizes any change orders
- Incentivize procurement officers to meet CONSTRUCTION goals
- Adopt Prompt Payment/Invoicing Policies (30 days max.)
- Set a goal for increasing NON CONSTRUCTION procurement over five years, including incentivizing procurement officers to meet goals
- Prioritize local food procurement by providing pathways for local farms

#2. Expand Outreach and Education on new construction and ongoing procurement

- Assign dedicated staff to manage outreach activities
- Promote, create, or attend vendor outreach events including Business roundtable

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

- Facilitate pre-construction Matching Workshops between prime contractors and subcontractors
- Develop a Supplier mentor/protégé program that includes incentives for prime contractor participation
- Create a one-stop-shop on the BGC Campus for access to information about procurement bids

#3. Increase Access to Capital

- Contribute to an established program that awards grants and funds loans for capital improvements, and additionally contribute funds to expand the City of Richmond's Revolving Loan Fund.
- Fund incentives that require coordination of the local small business support system
- Require prime to establish and/or contribute to a Collateral pool or guaranteed line of credit that serves as a \$5M set aside for small businesses

#4. Address Bonding Challenges

- Improve bonding availability or couple with prime-sub contracts. Bonding types include: Bid bonding, payment bonding, performance bonding
- Require primes to require wrap-around insurance policies as opposed to contractor default that covers prime only

#5. Build capacity of Richmond businesses to compete

- Increase the numbers of businesses that are certified through training sessions on certification application and by simplifying application process
- Provide, fund, and/or support a Blueprint room for contractors
- New fund for launching and building capacity of small, locally and worker-owned businesses
- Support and/or participate in capacity building workshops
- Establish a "Certifications" Reciprocity and common licensing agreements
- Extend partnerships, especially beyond construction including cleaning, HVAC maintenance, and building controls systems maintenance
- Create and/or support a program that provides back office administrative support, including for example accounting, bid support, payroll services

#6. Regularly assess and address policies and protocols that create barriers for local, small and micro enterprises to access procurement opportunities

- Structure contracts and bidding process to encourage inclusion of small, minority and worker-owned businesses by using a standard definition of MBE, WBE to include zip code
- Encourage partnerships between large and small vendors
- Review insurance and bonding requirements to consider and address policies that present barriers to small business
- Restructure contracts so smaller firms can compete by unbundling of larger contracts, done by function or by contract size or by product

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

- Adopt a governance committee to ensure accountability, report on a regular basis to the community

Facilitated Group Discussion

Following are highlights from the CWG discussion about these draft recommendations.

- Add “design” to top level recommendations regarding construction. For example all recommendations should read “design and construction”. Socially responsible contracting policies have yet to be defined; other qualifying language may be needed.
- Joel suggested that should and will be changed to “shall” here and in all recommendations.
- Josh suggested a minor edit to clarify 1E: While the university seeks to pay in net 30, the contractor might then need 30 days, rather than assuming both the university and the contractor can process payment within the same 30 days.
- Roxanne Carillo asked the CWG to consider including a specific percentage goal for local procurement on UCB and LBNL’s regular procurement. The current set of recommendations sets 25% goal on design and construction. Roesia Gerstein clarified that state, federal and UC policy that ensure competitive bidding prohibit the use of “set asides” which is what this recommendation would amount to.
- Roxanne also suggested a dashboard of metrics that can be monitored (under 6e)
- Tammeil requested more information about the \$5million, #3: Increase Access to Capital.
- Noe clarified that rather than recreating what partners are already doing, the recommendations are to support existing efforts.
- It was clarified that on page 1, the partners listed in row 2 are suggested partners for following sub-recs.
- Page 1 The top level recommendation, should read, “set a goal that 25% of BGC construction be done by Richmond based businesses.
- (Amanda Elliot clarified that for construction the goal was to be set at %25 which is the same as the City of Richmond’s local procurement goal; this was changed on the slide in real time.
- Roesia reminded participants that university representatives have advised about this and discussed it with the subcommittee: UC cannot set a specific goal for a 25% spend in Richmond, but must comply with the state of California Public Contract Code., which prompted concern from the CWG that they are making a recommendation that is not legal at this time. Such restrictions will be listed in the notes section of the recommendation spreadsheet.
- Bill suggested the following addition: include in agreements with 3rd parties involved in developers on the site a 25% procurement and specific policies for increasing businesses, including construction and regular procurement; Ruben explained that the Sub Committee’s decision to recommend a specific goal for construction was per the Chancellor’s letter indicating the University would

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

consider requiring that third party developers set a goal for procurement with Richmond businesses on BGC construction. Roesia added that this will have to be discussed with Real Estate and construction.

- The CWG agreed that if they are not clear on some items, the subcommittee can clarify and bring back to the CWG.

Community Comments

Following is summary of comments from community members in attendance:

- Support for working together to protect Richmond residents
- Concern that tonight is not enough time for digest the information
- **CWG Approval and Next Steps [during this time** the CWG voted to extend the meeting to 9.
 - The CWG voted to pass the recommendations with the following notes (with 5 yellows):
 - Tameil raised a question about #1 and would like more information on the \$5million in #5: **Increase Access to Capital**
 - Diane, Kate and Jane expressed concern about the process about the process is to refine the items that we commented on.
 - Jim suggested that using the analogy of the consent folder, #1 is pulled for further study and a potential revote. This was essentially agreed to.
 - The CWG agreed that the procurement subcommittee should reconvene to address concerns about #1 and #5.

VII. Summary Presentation of Education Subcommittee Recommendations

Please note, the following summary of recommendations can be found in the [Overview Presentation](#) slides. The draft Education recommendations in [narrative](#) and [spreadsheet](#) that the CWG voted to approve are available [online](#).

Framework to Date

- Pipeline: Bolstering institutional and student success *at key transitions* from elementary school to middle school to high school; from high school into college; and from college admission to completion of a degree.
- Pathways: Providing *clear connections* from middle school to college and career opportunities for all students. Ensuring ongoing support throughout.
- Partnerships: *Leveraging and coordinating efforts* of educational providers across the community to address gaps, improve accessibility, and avoid duplication.

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

Priorities to Frame Approach & Analysis

- Equity
- Access
- Scalability
- Funding Opportunities

Proposed Draft Education Recommendations

#1 Commit to a Richmond Educational Partnership: long-term, codified educational partnership with high-level administrators and key education partners in Richmond to create sustained identification, assessment, and investment in mutually beneficial programs and initiatives which boldly address the critical educational and societal issues that impede the development of activities, curriculum, resources and, professional development to help prepare educated and engaged students.

Adopt a data-driven, strategic plan with key benchmarks, activities and assessments within six-months of convening addressing the following key areas:

Key Areas for Educational Partnership Strategic Plan

College Exposure & Preparation

- Support and expand college advising at Richmond middle and high schools.
- Support and expand experiential learning and academic preparation for students- pre-K to adult.
- Increase college knowledge & reinforce college-going culture and transfer opportunities for Richmond students.
- Increase financial aid availability by partnering with Richmond Promise.

Career Exposure & Readiness

- Support multi-partner coordination by investing in work-based learning partnerships and related curricular alignment across UCB, LBNL, and educational and community partners.
- Support success by investing in research and evaluation of work-based learning.
- Solicit partnerships with regional and local employers to provide systematic opportunities for work-based learning, internships, and field trips, including support for career pathways and STEM development.

Teacher and Staff Professional Development

- Facilitate partnerships that provide opportunities for K-14 and adult education teachers and staff to participate in externships in business, STEM, etc.
- Facilitate partnerships that support K-14 curriculum development and implementation.
- Provide professional development for K-14 and adult education teachers and staff, including content support, pedagogy and training in areas such as literacy and contextualized learning (e.g., literacy and STEM).

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

- Provide training for tutors and mentors to support students

Universal Preschool Education

- Recognizing the fact that many Richmond children grow up in poverty and are already behind by kindergarten, preschool education was identified as a priority for some community members. It is included in the recommended areas of focus as a placeholder for further discussion/consideration.

Proposed Recommendations continuedL

#2. Partner with the Richmond Community to develop and operate **an Education Center, Museum and/or Visitor Center at the Berkeley Global Campus**, with consideration for satellite and/or mobile centers within close proximity to transit hubs and schools.

#3. Commit to funding an ongoing and substantial **Richmond Youth and Adult Education Opportunity Fund** in partnership with the Richmond community, UC Berkeley, LBNL, and corporate partners to seed and scale new and existing best practice programs that model university/lab/school and community partnerships and to address barriers students face in taking full advantage of career and college exposure and preparation opportunities.

4. Partner with Richmond community-based organizations and regional transportation entities, as well as anchor institutions and funders, to provide **infrastructure improvements to increase accessibility of** educational programs, activities and resources. This includes specifically developing systematic and robust **communication and outreach** efforts to improve the distribution of program information and ensure accessible and inexpensive transportation options.

A few explanations:

- Since launching in Feb/March of 2015, subcommittee has heard from hundreds of community members and we have detailed matrixes to reflect the feedback that the current draft recommendations seek to reflect.
- Most related services, programs or initiatives currently at work in Richmond (which might or might not be associated with UCB or the Lab) are not listed in the recommendations, as one of the guiding ideas of the partnership are around equity, and finding what works the best/has the most impact, and scaling it up.

Facilitated Group Discussion

Following are highlights from the CWG discussion about these draft recommendations.

- Many subcommittee members do not feel comfortable with the monetary amounts that have been suggested because they have not been discussed. Some thought any number used at this point without research to back it up was arbitrary and not reflective of needs in future.
- Jesus Robert, the CWG student representative, strongly supports the recommendations and feels that they will be effective.

Berkeley Global Campus

AT RICHMOND BAY

- Some CWG members voiced concern that the memo from the a member of CCISCO, which seems to represent the Raise up Richmond coalition, but has no authorship listed was sent to subcommittee members on the afternoon of this meeting, which meant that most recipients did not have time to review it.
- Other CWG members suggest that \$3 million, \$15 million or \$18 million annually is too little.
- Kyra, Armando and Donnell highlighted the importance of early childhood education.

Community Comments

Below is a summary of community comments:

- Suggest that UC Berkeley acquire Contra Costa College as a college for people of color.
 - Support for \$3 million a year or more; support for an educated number; (14, 15, 18million) (3 people); want a number that is legally binding.
 - Education should not go last.
- **CWG Approval and Next Steps**
 - The CWG voted to pass the recommendations with the following notes (with some yellows):
 - Jim suggests that the subcommittee explore aligning the partnership proposal with the Richmond Promise. (Kyra agrees)
 - Tamisha emphasized the importance of asking for money; Bill added that he agrees, but suggested that the ask be effective.
 - Kyra suggests the education subcommittee should reconvene to discuss the issue of a monetary amount as well – but that the money should be tied to something.
 - The CWG agreed that the education subcommittee will reconvene to further discuss the issues of monetary amount and alignment with the Richmond Promise.
 - In a 2nd vote, CWG voted to pass the recommendations excluding the monetary amount.

VIII. Next Steps

- **As agreed, some subcommittees will reconvene:**
 - **Education:** The CWG agreed that the education subcommittee will reconvene to further discuss the issues of monetary amount and alignment with the Richmond Promise.
 - **Procurement:**
 - **Next CWG Meeting:** Thursday, January 28, 2015 6:00 – 8:30 pm