

From: Roseann Torres roseann.torres@ousd.org 

Subject: Great info from voter- fBoard Policy discussion

Date: June 4, 2018 at 2:12 PM

To: Aimee Eng aimee.eng@ousd.org, Jody London jody.london@ousd.org, Shanthi Gonzales shanthigonzaes@gmail.com

RT

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Jan Malvin <janmalvin@gmail.com>

Date: Sun, Jun 3, 2018 at 9:05 PM

Subject: Board Policy discussion

To: <roseann.torres@ousd.org>

Dear Rosie,

I went to the System of Schools board study session with Derek Mitchell and appreciated all of your comments. I've been reading the education reform literature supporting charter schools and have run into "system of schools" ideas in various articles. I have concerns about implementation of the proposed Board Policy 6006.

"System of Schools" is a term of art which has a specialized meaning in the charter sector. It was popularized in a book by [Andy Smarick](#) (2012) which assumes the urban school system is irreparably broken and must be replaced by a set of charter schools.

The "system of schools" frame provides the charter sector the rationale to build "compacts" across sectors to break down barriers to district facilities and assets. The pro-charter [Center for Reinventing Public Education](#) promotes this strategy to jump-start the slowdown of charter school growth in [cities such as Oakland](#).

By using "system of schools" terminology as well as "portfolio" language the Board is buying into the [vision of the future](#) urban school district conceived by pro-charter/corporate education reformers.

I've looked at all versions of BP6006 and don't believe the Board can wordsmith its way to a meaningful policy with practical implications that benefit OUSD. The district and charter sectors are competitors and they play by different sets of rules. Does the Board really want to divert staff resources to implement this proposed policy?

GO, with their 1Oakland campaign, is positioned to become central to the configuration of this new "system." They will use the opportunity to leverage their demands for common enrollment, specific facilities, and local tax funds.

GO is primarily concerned with the health and growth of the charter sector. Last time I checked in 2016, GO's political action committee received 94% of its funding from school privatizers outside of Oakland such as CCSA, Michael Bloomberg, and Arthur Rock.

I realize it may be hard for you to criticize GO publicly because they are local and have resources for community organizing, social media, and political campaigns. But they are part of the problem, not part of the solution.

Thank you for your consideration of these ideas.

Sincerely,

Jan Malvin

--

Sent from Gmail Mobile