



CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE

AGENDA REPORT

DATE: September 29, 2015

TO: Mayor Butt and Members of the City Council

FROM: Bill Lindsay, City Manager

SUBJECT: RICHMOND PROMISE STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN POLICY OPTIONS

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE:

On May 26, 2015, City staff presented the draft Richmond Promise Strategic Action Plan to the City Council. On September 22, 2015, City staff provided a report on the recommendations developed by the Richmond Promise Ad Hoc Committee. City staff is requesting direction regarding policy decisions for the Richmond Promise to assist in preparing a Strategic Action Plan that matches the Council's objectives to the greatest extent possible.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

DISCUSS specific policy options pertaining to the Richmond Promise and PROVIDE direction to staff – City Manager's Office (Bill Lindsay 620-6512).

FINANCIAL IMPACT OF RECOMMENDATION:

There is no financial impact related to this item at this time.

DISCUSSION:

Background

On September 22, 2015, City Council directed staff to prepare a comprehensive report on policy options for subsequent incorporation into the Richmond Promise Strategic Action Plan and to include for consideration guidelines of the "minority proposal" by Richmond Promise Ad Hoc Committee member Michael Parker.

On July 28, 2015, the City Council authorized the City Manager to enter into an agreement with Chevron to establish an administrative plan for the Richmond Promise consistent with the guidelines of the Environmental and Community Investment Agreement (ECIA), and enter into administrative service contracts as required to ensure the scholarship is available to seniors graduating in 2016. The City is currently facilitating the hiring process to retain an Executive Director that will be responsible for the implementation of the Richmond Promise. The Executive Director will play a leading role in fundraising to grow and support an endowment to support the Richmond Promise in perpetuity.

At its meeting of June 16, 2015, in an effort to encourage further community and expert input on the development of the Richmond Promise program, and to create a transparent process, the Richmond City Council directed that an ad hoc committee be formed. On June 23, 2015, the City Council approved committee appointments, and, consistent with Council-established parameters, the Richmond Promise Ad Hoc Committee met six times between July 2, 2015 and August 24, 2015 (Attachment 3).

The Richmond Promise Community Engagement Plan was presented to the Richmond City Council on May 26, 2015, in conjunction with the Richmond Promise Draft Strategic Action Plan. The Community Engagement Plan involved a series of interviews, community meetings, and a five-week visioning and community input project with Richmond middle and high school students. Staff also supplemented the plan by providing an online comment form available to the public at www.richmondpromise.org. The Community Engagement Plan intended to gather a broad range of data on current challenges in pursuing and succeeding in higher education for Richmond students.

This report transmits information and policy options to the City Council derived from all of these various community sources.

Community Workshops

As part of the Community Engagement Plan of the Draft Strategic Action Plan, the City of Richmond hosted two workshops, on June 8, 2015, at the Richmond Memorial Convention Center, and on June 18, 2015, at Lovonya Dejean Middle School. These workshops provided an overview of the Richmond Promise and current educational outcomes in Richmond, personal testimony from Richmond graduates, and an opportunity for community members to provide input in four breakout groups. A summary of the information gathered from these workshops is as follows:

A. College Readiness and “Future Centers”

- Provide a culturally competent and attentive staff working alongside community, caretakers, and higher education institutions, as supporters and promoters.
- Ensure consistency and continuity in counseling for college preparation.

- Begin early in elementary school with emphasis on underrepresented groups (foster youth, formerly or at risk of incarceration and homeless).
- Ensure the Future Centers: maintain accountability and career awareness resources.
- Clarify the difference between Future Centers and college centers.
- Need for leadership and accountability from the school district.
- Provide additional support for teachers.
- Develop a Youth Mentorship Program.
- Alignment of Future Centers with school based Health Centers.

B. College Going Culture

- Extensive parent/caretaker support: provide parent education on student needs for both K-12 and college readiness, support opportunities to improve relationships with children, develop incentives for parent engagement at school sites, provide resources for first generation college and immigrant families.
- Create a culture of high expectations across the board.
- Prioritizing/engaging caretakers and community members in college preparatory initiatives, financial counseling, early childhood education at home, and the importance of higher education.
- Account for historic trauma in the community and provide more mental health support for students.
- Expose students to college at a young age: introduce them to college students, bring them to college campuses, provide counseling and parent support early in their academic careers.
- Operate the community and school as one.
- Market the Promise program so students know what resources they will have social and traditional media, citywide college day, etc.
- Support and expand existing programs: Summer Out of School Time (OST) initiatives, neighborhood councils, community based organizations supporting education.
- Provide informational sessions about higher education and career pathways (Community College, Career Technical Education (CTE) programs).
- Charter schools are college ready; how do public schools get on even ground?
- Focus on supporting struggling schools in the district.

C. Award Amount

- Grade point Average (GPA) Scale – the workshops were divided over whether creating a GPA qualifier would incentive or exclude students.
- Means Testing – the workshops were divided over whether creating a financial means barrier would support equity or preserve the status quo.

- Awards should be allocated on a sliding scale to reward long time residency.
- Reconsider “full time student” qualification (ex. Single parent who may need to work)
- The award should be a flat amount no matter where a student chooses to attend.
- The award should be the same amount for all four year institutions (UC and CSU).
- Award should be “last dollar” as not to award families that do not need support.
- Awards should be allocated based on the gap amount a student has after a financial aid package.

D. Eligibility

- Include charter schools as eligibility.
- Prioritize traditional WCCUSD public schools (specifically Richmond High School and Kennedy High School) then charter schools if money is available.
- School attendance should be a part of the criteria.
- AB 540 students [undocumented students] must be included (they aren’t eligible for federal aid).
- Low-income students move a lot– how can program address this in eligibility?
- Unincorporated North Richmond should be included.
- Include private schools (mixed reactions).
- Concern that this will increase incentive for charter school enrollment and expansion.

Comment Forums

Staff provided attendees with the opportunity to submit written feedback on comment cards at both community workshops. In addition, staff created a publicly-accessible online form at <http://www.richmondpromise.org> through which feedback could be submitted. Staff compiled and coded the data to represent common community perspectives across all forums (Attachment 1).

There was a total of 94 comments from across comment forums (Figure 1). Once all the responses were collected and recorded, they were synthesized into different categories such as “college readiness” or “eligibility” twice by City Staff. Within these categories, similar comments were grouped together into two primary categories: College Readiness and Eligibility/Award. Staff cross analyzed how comments were sorted to determine similarities and differences and created a set of statements that represent these groupings.

Figure 1. Public Comment Submissions

Forum Type	Number of Comments
Online Public Comment	18
Comment Card - 06/08/15 Workshop	21
Comment Card - 06/18/15 Workshop	35
City Council Meetings	20
Total	94

Comments grouped under “College Readiness” identified three key themes:

- A. **Increase college going culture through parent engagement** – Public comment was centered around how to establish a supportive environment of attending higher education through parent engagement and reflection that many parents are unfamiliar with college and the college process.
- B. **Increase retention rate of existing college students** – Comments made were centered around the need to retain students who have made it to college by offering financial incentives as a means of support.
- C. **Students are not college ready and lack preparation** – Public comment was primarily focused on how students that wish to participate in the Promise program may not be ready to apply. Students fall behind starting in elementary and are not ready to graduate, let alone apply for college. The Richmond Promise should enable students to access resources such as study skill development programs.

Comments grouped under “Eligibility and Award” identified the following themes:

- A. **GPA Requirements** – Comments were divided. People in favor of a GPA requirement argued it will demonstrate a student’s ability to be competitive, encourage academic achievement, and regulate funding. Those that were not in favor indicated it would demotivate and exclude a number of students from applying.
- B. **Undocumented Students** – A comment expressed that undocumented students should receive support since they do not have access to the same resources as other students and need an avenue to help them succeed.
- C. **Sliding Award Scale** – Comments expressed supporting a scaled award amount to reward long term residency.
- D. **Charter School Inclusion** - The majority of the comments advocated for including charter school graduates as eligible, while a few were against the idea. Recurring support for charters indicated that a majority of their students are eligible for free/reduced lunch, charters are non-profit organizations, and noted

parents should not be penalized for choosing an alternative option for their children's education given the WCCUSD's underperformance.

- E. **Inclusion for All Students** – Comments also noted all Richmond residents should be included. They argued no child should be excluded because they are all deserving of this opportunity as part of the community
- F. **Unincorporated Areas** – There were comments regarding the eligibility of unincorporated areas surrounding the community.

Student Recommendations & Perspective

As part of the Community Engagement Plan of the Draft Strategic Action Plan, the City of Richmond sought to gather student perspectives and develop student recommendations that will increase the relevance and efficacy of the Richmond Promise for its intended primary benefactors, Richmond youth. The inclusion of their perspective is essential to ensuring that the plan addresses the needs of students and remains relevant to these changing needs.

Between June 11, 2015 and July 23, 2015, City staff conducted four interviews, one focus group, and one in-depth visioning project with 34 young people in Richmond. Participating students attended Alameda College, DeJean Middle School, El Cerrito High School, Helms Middle School, Kennedy High School, Leadership Academy, Portola Junior High School, Pinole Valley High School, Richmond High School, St. Mary's High School, and Salesian High School.

All Richmond residents who participated were students of color. Two students who participated are not Richmond residents and do not attend Richmond schools. Students from the East Bay Center for the Performing Arts who participated in the Visioning Process made the following recommendations:

- Propose to have a survey to evaluate counselors and teachers in order to have student voices heard.
- Counselors have a hard time providing quality service due to the ratio three counselors to 1,000 students; hire more counselors and station additional support outside schools such as Community Centers, the RYSE Center or the East Bay Center for the Performing Arts.
- Open the scholarship to all students living in Richmond.
- Improve college readiness as it is necessary for students to successfully pursue a higher education.
- Improve teachers' education and available resources.
- Create an application process for the Promise that would start at the end of the student's junior year, thereby paying more attention to students struggling to have certain classes or meet career goals (students recognize starting a tracking process earlier than junior year would be ideal if possible).

- Create an award amount with a GPA incentive. All students would receive a set award, and students with a certain GPA would get an extra monetary “bump” to act as an incentive to work harder and increase their chances of getting into a four year university.
- Create a recent college graduate advisory board for the Richmond Promise with the following criteria:
 - Graduated high school within the past four years; or
 - Completed their undergrad degree; and
 - Must be at least 19 years old and will maintain a two year term.

City staff worked with a Health in All Policies (HiAP) fellow from UC Berkeley to conduct further youth engagement. This included engagement with students at local youth centers and informational interviews (Attachment 2). Staff noted the following recommendations from youth:

- The impact of race, income, and systems are part of the daily perspectives of kids, and historical discrimination should help inform the development of the Richmond Promise.
- Trauma and violence come up frequently when discussing readiness and academic success and needs to be addressed.
- Money is both a real and perceived barrier, and better education is needed on what financial resources are available to help students pursue a postsecondary education.
- There needs to create a culture of expectation not exception. This should include developing a curriculum relevant to Richmond students and their experience, and hiring teachers who can relate to this experience.
- Students should be allowed to rate teachers similar to the university system, and hold them accountable.
- There should be a deep focus on literacy and making sure students are academically prepared.
- Students should also receive support by increasing the number of counselors, and having options to address trauma and violence.
- Deep parent engagement is necessary to allow parents to understand how to support their child and the importance of college.
- In terms of eligibility and award, the award should be available for all Richmond residents but with an equity element, so those in need can be assured access.
- GPA incentives should give students a financial boost to encourage academic success.
- Students should be more supported with a college advisory board (of recent college graduates) and an application process beginning in the junior year.

Ad Hoc Committee

Over a period of two months, the fifteen member committee developed policy recommendations for the implementation of the Richmond Promise. The final

recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee were provided in a report at the September 15, 2015 City Council meeting (Attachment 3).

Policy Recommendations

Staff is requesting direction on the specific policy items below to provide the final iteration of the Richmond Promise Strategic Action Plan for adoption by the City Council in October. Within the tables below, **Option A** provides policy recommendations from City Manager’s Office staff. Richmond Promise Ad Hoc Committee recommendations and additional alternatives to each are also include in the tables. City staff options were developed based on extensive interviews with other promise programs, academics, and foundations as well as significant stakeholder and community input, best practices, and research in an attempt to develop a program that will benefit the majority of Richmond students. All outlier scenarios were not recommended to encourage the development of a program that can be implemented with limited personnel and overhead expenses.

Policy recommendations for school eligibility and award amount may be determined by the City Council in late October. Without specific student enrollment data and projections, City staff is unable to finalize eligibility and award amount policy recommendations. Staff is requesting that the City Council authorize the City Manager to convene charter and private school representatives to obtain the necessary data to support modeling by an established deadline in early October, or else forfeit their potential eligibility from the Promise in 2016.

1. Residency

Eligible students must have confirmed residency in the City of Richmond or unincorporated North Richmond. The following options will dictate how residency within the City of Richmond will be noted for award purposes.

Policy	Option	Source
Residency	A) Residency must be established and the student enrolled and attending class within the first week of the school year.	Staff Recommendation
	B) Residency must be established and the student enrolled at the beginning of the school year.	Ad Hoc Committee
	C) Residency must be established and the student enrolled by October 1 of the school year.	Additional Option

A) Residency must be established and the student enrolled and attending class within the first week of the school year.

Staff agrees with the reasoning of the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee (Option B), but includes the caveat of the first week to allow for students and families who may be moving into the community.

B) Residency must be established and the student enrolled at the beginning of the school year.

This option emphasizes the importance of positive attendance, and supports efforts of the WCCUSD and local community based organizations to develop positive attendance habits for students. Research indicates it is pivotal for students to be at school beginning on day one. Residency will reflect a child’s enrollment at an eligible school.

C) Residency must be established and the student enrolled by October 1 of the school year.

All schools must report their demographic data to the State of California by the first Wednesday of October.

2. Residency/School Enrollment Length

Policy	Option	Source
Residency/School Enrollment Length	A) Residency as measured by a cumulative school attendance scale in grades K-12, minimum grades 9-12.	Staff Recommendation
	B) Residency as measured by a cumulative school attendance scale in grades 3-12.	Ad Hoc
	C) Residency as measured by high school enrollment and completion.	Additional Option

A) Residency as measured by a cumulative school attendance scale in grades K-12, minimum 9-12.

This model proposes an award proportional to a student’s cumulative enrollment, starting in kindergarten (K) and compounding each year through grade nine (9). A student must be enrolled for a minimum of high school to qualify for an award (Figure 2).

This model utilizes the cumulative rationale developed by the Ad Hoc Committee to emphasize inclusivity, but uses different grade levels for two distinct reasons. First, while Option B begins at third grade, research indicates it is essential to start positive enrollment in kindergarten to ensure children gain a strong foundation for subsequent

learning. Going to school regularly in the early years is especially critical for children from families living in poverty, who are less likely to have the resources to help children make up for lost time in the classroom. Among poor children, chronic absence in kindergarten predicts the lowest levels of educational achievement at the end of fifth grade. Further research indicates that disparities in school attendance rates starting as early as preschool and kindergarten are contributing to achievement gaps and high school dropout rates across the country.

Second, retaining students throughout high school is essential to developing continuity and a college going culture essential to student development and college readiness. Requiring residency for at least four years of high school speaks to the initial intent of the program to reward residency in the community over the long term.

Figure 2. Residency Option A - Residency as measured by a cumulative school attendance scale in grades K-12, minimum grades 9-12.

Grade Level	Percentage of Award Amount
K	10%
1	10%
2	10%
3	10%
4	10%
5	10%
6	10%
7	10%
8	10%
9-12	10%

B) Residency as measured by a cumulative school attendance scale in grades 3-12

This model proposes an award proportional to a student’s cumulative enrollment, starting in grade three (3) and adding equally by ten (10) percentage points each year through grade twelve (12) (Figure 3).

Best practices from Promise communities indicate a majority of programs utilize a scale that awards allocation based on a student’s length of continuous enrollment in the school district. This tool is used to reward long term residency in the community and enrollment in the local school district.

The Ad Hoc Committee noted the importance of rewarding long term residency, but wanted to create a system that incorporated the transience of many low-income families within the district. As many students move between the boundaries of Richmond and its neighboring communities, the community proposed creating a system that measured cumulative enrollment as opposed to continuous.

Utilizing this cumulative enrollment framework will encourage long term enrollment in

the school system without penalizing families who may move for a period of years and return. The ten (10) percent scale creates an equitable distribution across grade levels, and extending the model through the high school grades emphasizes supporting all students who enter the community. This model does not incorporate kindergarten as it is not legally mandated for parents to enroll their children until the first grade.

Figure 3. Residency Option B - Residency as measured by a cumulative school attendance scale in grades 3-12.

Grade Level	Award Amount
1	-
2	-
3	10%
4	10%
5	10%
6	10%
7	10%
8	10%
9	10%
10	10%
11	10%
12	10%

C) Residency as measured by high school enrollment and completion.

This model will provide a full award to any student who is a Richmond resident and graduates or completes a high school equivalency test from an eligible school during their entire high school career.

This model emphasizes developing a strong college going culture in the school district, and rewards students based on their enrollment and graduation or completion of a high school equivalency test. This model accounts for students who frequently move throughout adolescence, and emphasizes inclusivity of student eligibility. This model will focus the award as an incentive to developing and attracting families with a focus on local high schools as platforms to reach a post-secondary education.

Collaborative efforts to support students will still be engaged at lower school levels, and this focuses solely on qualification for the financial allocation of the Promise. This model will be the most easy to administer in terms of providing proof of residency.

3. School Attendance

Policy	Option	Source
School Attendance	A) Eligible students must have positive attendance at an eligible school defined by missing no more than 10% of the school year, including excused and unexcused absences.	Staff Recommendation
	B) Eligible students must have positive attendance at an eligible school.	Ad Hoc
	C) No attendance mandate	Additional Option

A) Eligible students must have positive attendance at an eligible school defined by missing no more than 10% of the school year, including excused and unexcused absences.

Incentivizing students and parents to account for the importance of regular attendance is essential to the success and productivity of students and their peers. Research shows that children, regardless of gender, socioeconomic status or ethnicity, lose out when they are chronically absent (that is, they miss nearly a month of school or more over the course of a year). Children chronically absent in kindergarten show lower levels of achievement in math, reading and general knowledge during first grade, translating to educational achievement gaps and increased likelihood to drop out (as noted in 4-A). This standard is recommended by Attendance Works, a national and state initiative that promotes awareness of the important role that school attendance plays in achieving academic success starting with school entry.

B) Eligible students must have positive attendance at an eligible school.

The Ad Hoc Committee adopted a recommendation to support positive attendance but did not include the level of specificity identified in Option A. The committee recommended creating a definition based on definitions of the School Attendance Review Board (SARB) and/or Chronic Absenteeism standards following the Council's consideration.

C) No attendance mandate

No attendance mandate would provide inclusivity for eligible graduates, but may work as a counter to the Promise's goals to develop college readiness and a college going culture.

4. Graduation or High School Equivalency Documentation

Eligible students must provide graduation documentation from an eligible academic institution OR a certificate of high school equivalency (GED, HiSET, or TASC) issued by the California Department of Education. The committee supports all students who graduate from an eligible high school or complete an equivalency.

Policy	Option	Source
Graduation or High School Equivalency Documentation	A) Eligible students must provide graduation documentation from an eligible academic institution OR a certificate of high school equivalency (GED, HiSET, or TASC) issued by the California Department of Education.	Staff Recommendation /Ad Hoc
	B) Eligible students must provide high school graduation documentation from an eligible academic institution (excludes high school equivalency).	Additional Option

A) Eligible students must provide graduation documentation from an eligible academic institution OR a certificate of high school equivalency (GED, HiSET, or TASC) issued by the California Department of Education.

This option allows for students who complete a high school equivalency test to be eligible to receive the Promise.

B) Eligible students must provide high school graduation documentation from an eligible academic institution (excludes high school equivalency).

This option would provide the Promise only to students who graduate from an eligible school.

5. Grade Point Average (GPA)

Policy	Option	Source
GPA Requirement	A) No GPA requirement	Staff Recommendation /Ad Hoc
	B) Minimum 2.5 GPA	Additional Option
	C) Minimum 3.0 GPA	Additional Option

A) No GPA requirement

Staff and the Ad Hoc Committee recommend eligibility for the Promise award should not include a GPA requirement. The Richmond Promise should embrace inclusivity. While GPA benchmark requirements are utilized by some Promise programs to incentivize enhanced academic performance, it is recommended the Promise award should be available to any student whose academic achievement is accepted by a postsecondary institution. The good intention of incentivizing academic performance may work to counter to the intention of the Promise to support students who otherwise may not have considered attending college.

B) Minimum 2.5 GPA

Requiring a minimum 2.5 GPA (approximately a “C” average on the letter scale) could be a tool to incentivize students to achieve passing grades in all coursework.

C) Minimum 3.0 GPA

Requiring a minimum 3.0 GPA (approximately a “B” average on the letter scale) could be a tool to incentivize students to achieve grades that would make them competitive for admission into four year universities.

6. Partnerships with Postsecondary Institutions

Policy	Option	Source
Partnerships with Postsecondary Institutions	A) College students must participate for at least one academic year in an academic and social support program identified, sponsored, or administered by the Richmond Promise 501(c)(3) at their postsecondary institution.	Staff Recommendation
	B) Encourage the Richmond Promise 501(c)(3) to collaborate with postsecondary institutions to develop academic and social support and wrap around services to support Richmond Promise scholars on campus.	Ad Hoc
	C) No participation or collaborative effort.	Additional Option

A) Students must participate for at least one academic year in an academic and social support program identified, sponsored, or administered by the Richmond Promise 501(c)(3) at their postsecondary institution.

Staff agrees with the Ad Hoc Committee that financial barriers are just one obstacle many students, especially first generation college students, will face when attending a post-secondary institution. It is common for students, especially first generation college students and students of color, to feel isolated and/or struggle during their first year. This is when a majority of students drop out. Collaborating with institutions to create or include Richmond Promise scholars into academic, social, and emotional support services will be just as essential to them completing their degree as the financial award.

Making participation mandatory will help students assimilate to college and receive necessary support. It is a fair return for the financial award they are receiving, and will help ensure higher rates of retention and, in the case of community college, transfer. This could be an academic transfer program, an on-site program with other students, or off site communication with mentors. It will be the role of the 501(c)(3) to identify partner institutions and programs that can support students.

B) Encourage the Richmond Promise 501(c)(3) to collaborate with postsecondary institutions to develop academic and social support and wrap around services to support Richmond Promise scholars on campus.

The Ad Hoc Committee agreed with the importance of making support services available to students, but did not recommend making participation mandatory.

C) No participation or collaborative effort.

7. Extracurricular Activities & College Readiness

Policy	Option	Source
Extracurricular Activities	A) Students must participate in at least one extracurricular, volunteer, or work/internship activity and a college preparatory or advising program.	Staff Recommendation
	B) Students, where applicable, must work with an advisor/counselor to identify appropriate extracurricular activity or college preparatory program.	Ad Hoc
	C) No extracurricular activity requirement	Additional Option

A) Students must participate in at least one extracurricular, volunteer, or work/internship activity outside school and a college preparatory or advising program.

It is important for students to become well rounded and more competitive and prepared for college with participation in at least one extracurricular, volunteer, or work/internship activity outside school and a college preparatory or advising program. College preparatory or advising program will be provided by participating school sites to ensure students are enrolled in A-G coursework and are completing the necessary steps to apply for college. The University of California requires students to list participation in extracurricular, volunteer and educational/college preparation programs on their application.

This option would require a commitment from the WCCUSD and other participating schools to have equitable access to college preparatory services available to all students at their school sites.

B) Students, where applicable, must work with an advisor/counselor to identify appropriate extracurricular activity or college preparatory program.

The Ad Hoc Committee recognizes that students should be working with college partners and services where they are available to receive the support and meet with fellow students, thereby increasing their opportunity to graduate and succeed. However, they do not believe that it should be a requirement for student's to participate in anything outside traditional school time.

C) No extracurricular activity requirement

8. Time Limit

Students will be eligible for the Promise beginning with the class of 2016. Any time limits would begin for students following the graduating class of 2016.

Policy	Option	Source
Time Limit	A) Eligible students may apply for the Promise up to one year after the completion of their high school degree or equivalency and up to the age of 19.	Staff Recommendation
	B) Eligible high school graduates and equivalency completion students may apply for the Promise up to the age of 21, and older students may petition to the administrator.	Ad Hoc

	C) Eligible high school graduates and equivalency completion students may apply for the Promise up to the age of 20.	Additional Option
--	--	-------------------

A) Eligible students may apply for the Promise up to one year after the completion of their high school degree or equivalency and up to the age of 19.

Research indicates that after controlling for academic (e.g. poor standardized test performance, GED completion instead of graduating) and socioeconomic characteristics (e.g. low-income family), students who delay postsecondary enrollment after high school have lower odds of bachelor degree completion. Additionally, research shows that delayers are more likely than on-time enrollees to attend less than four-year institutions and to transition to other roles such as spouses or parents before entering college.

This option accounts for the fact that some students may need to take time off before beginning college, but incentivizes beginning coursework sooner to encourage continuity in educational pathways and increase students' likelihood of completing a postsecondary degree. This option may also help reduce the burden of additional remedial coursework students may need to take after extensive time away from the classroom. Staff does not support a petition process to account for older students, and recommends the intent of the program remain to serve high school youth. This option also supports the most accurate budgetary preparation in administration.

B) Eligible high school graduates and equivalency completion students may apply for the Promise up to the age of 21, and older students may petition to the administrator.

The option intends to create a more inclusive program that allows students who take several years off time the opportunity to attend college. This model recognizes some people may complete a high school equivalency later in life, but retains the intention of the Promise to serve the community's youth. This option is intended to provide inclusivity to those students who may have faced extenuating circumstances following high school.

C) Eligible high school graduates and equivalency completion students may apply for the Promise up to the age of 20.

Utilizing the age of 20 as an age limit may provide a compromise between encouraging students to attend college right away to increase their chances for success and accounting for extenuating circumstances following high school.

9. Petitions to the Advisory Board

Policy	Option	Source
Petitions	A) No petitions	Staff Recommendation
	B) Petition to the Administrator, and may petition to the Advisory Committee if rejected by the Administrator.	Ad Hoc
	C) Advisory Board Only	Additional Options

A) No petitions

The policy options set forth create an inclusive program that serves a strong majority of students in the community and includes time for those who may not choose to attend school directly after high school. The Richmond Promise should serve as a tool to serve our youth and provide options for young people in high school. A petitioning process would create an unnecessary administrative burden that would allow for excessive loopholes and potential inconsistencies in administration.

B) Petition to the Administrator, and may petition to the Advisory Committee if rejected by the Administrator.

The Ad Hoc committee recommended this option to allow for additional levels of review and accountability.

C) Advisory Board Only

If a petitioning process is implemented, it should be reserved for the discretion of the Advisory Board. It should not be the initial role of a single administrator.

10. Program Launch

Policy	Option	Source
Program Launch	A) All eligible seniors as defined by the Richmond City Council	Staff Recommendation / Ad Hoc
	B) Pilot at Kennedy High School (only high school with majority Richmond students)	Additional Option premised on Ad Hoc Minority Report
	C) Pilot at Kennedy High, Richmond High, and De Anza High School	Additional Option premised on Ad Hoc Minority Report

A) All eligible seniors as defined by the Richmond City Council

This option would make scholarship awards available to all eligible students (as defined by the Richmond City Council) beginning with the class of 2016. This is policy will serve a larger swath of the Richmond community from the beginning, and recognizes the

diverse situations students attend school in across the community. Staff believes accurate evaluation can happen at a community wide level and philanthropic donors will be more receptive of a plan that extends assistance to all eligible students.

B) Pilot at Kennedy High School (only high school with majority Richmond students)

Ad Hoc Committee Member Mike Parker submitted a Minority Report separate from the committee that encouraged the Council to “start with a pilot program with a limited number of public high schools and colleges and then work to expand”. Mr. Parker advocated for a pilot based on a variety of reasons, including better financial preparedness and the ability to more accurate evaluation (Attachment 4).

Mr. Parker did not provide explicit pilot recommendations, so Staff developed B and C as two potential choices. Option B selected Kennedy High School because it is the only high school in the WCCUSD with a strong majority of Richmond residents; 839 of Kennedy’s 870 students are identified as Richmond residents (96%). By comparison, slightly less than half of Richmond High’s total student population (1,484) are identified as Richmond residents (724). Kennedy High School is also the lowest performing school in the WCCUSD in term of academic performance and graduation rates, especially among students of color.

C) Pilot at Kennedy High, Richmond High, and De Anza High School

These are the three high schools in the WCCUSD that are physically located in Richmond. Piloting the Promise at these three sites could support the notion of the Promise as a tool for positive community development within the boundaries of the Richmond community.

11. 501(c)(3) Nonprofit/Foundation Board

Per the direction of the City Council on July 28, 2015, the City Manager’s Office is working with Chevron to establish an administrative plan for the Richmond Promise consistent with the guidelines of the ECIA. In accordance with the ECIA, the City and Chevron are working together to establish a 501(c)(3) nonprofit/foundation to manage the Richmond Promise. The Council must agree upon the necessary infrastructure for the bylaws of the 501(c)(3) and letter agreement with Chevron.

Proposed Board of Directors
City of Richmond
Chevron
Education Sector
Business Sector
Philanthropic Sector

The Board of Directors will be developed to include five members, not to exceed nine. The main priority of the Board will be to fundraise in support of Promise awards. The proposed Board will include representatives from the City and Chevron as well as representatives from the fields of education, business, and philanthropy. The Executive Director will not be on the Board of Directors.

12. Advisory Board

A) Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the nonprofit/foundation will be supported by an Advisory Board that will support and work in collaboration with the Executive Director. The proposed Advisory Board will be comprised of 9-12 non-voting members that include representatives from the Richmond community, local foundations, local nonprofits, community college system, University of California system, California State University system, WCCUSD, charter schools, and private schools.

Proposed Advisory Board
Richmond Community Member
Local Foundation
Local Nonprofit
Community College System
University of California System
California State University System
WCCUSD
Charter Schools
Private Schools

B) Ad Hoc Committee Recommendation

The Ad Hoc Committee recommends creating a Policy Advisory Committee that must include four Richmond residents in addition to any elected officials. They note any advisory board that makes recommendations for the Promise should be composed of more community members than elected officials; it is important to have the voices of the community reflected in the program, separate from politics and self-interests.

NEXT STEPS:

City staff will incorporate the policy directives of the City Council into the revised Richmond Promise Strategic Action Plan for consideration at the October 20, 2015 City Council meeting. Adopting the Draft Richmond Promise Strategic Action Plan will be the next critical step towards successful implementation of the Richmond Promise for the graduating class of 2016.

DOCUMENTS ATTACHED:

Attachment 1 – Richmond Promise Community Input Summary

Attachment 2 – Richmond Promise Student Recommendations & Perspectives

Attachment 3 – Richmond Promise Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations

Attachment 4 – Richmond Promise Ad Hoc Committee Minority Report Submissions