



**LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
Board of Education Report**

<b>Report Number:</b>	245-10/11
<b>Date:</b>	March 15, 2011
<b>Subject:</b>	Fall 2011 Public School Choice Applicant Team Recommendations
<b>Responsible Staff:</b>	
Name	Ramon C. Cortines, Superintendent of Schools
Office/Division	Office of the Superintendent
Telephone No.	(213) 241-7000

**BOARD REPORT**

**Action Proposed:** Approve the following recommended applicant teams for the corresponding Fall 2011 Public School Choice sites:

<u>PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE SITE</u>	<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>
CLAY MS	Clay MS Green Dot Public Schools (new school on the campus)
MANN MS	The PREP at HMMS with reservations
MUIR MS	Do not accept plans. Restructure John Muir MS
Central Region ES #14	Local District 4/Echo Park Community Partners with reservations
South Region ES #6	Aspire Public Schools
Central Region MS #7	Synergy Academies School of Arts and Culture with reservations Business and Technology School with reservations
Central Region HS #13	Alliance for College-Ready Public School
	The following plans must be resubmitted for further review



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

	The Los Angeles River School Partnerships to Uplift Communities The School of History and Dramatic Arts ArtLAB Art and Community Empowerment
Central Region HS #16	Synergy Academies Fine Arts Academy with reservations Global Issues Academy with reservations
East LA Star Academy	Do not accept the plan submitted by Local District 5
South Region HS #2	Public Service Community School with reservations The Communication and Technology School with reservations The Green Design School with reservations The Performing Arts Community School with reservations
South Region HS #4	Local District 8
Valley Region HS #4	Local District 1
Valley Region HS #5	Academy of Scientific Exploration Social Justice Humanitas Academy Local District 2 – Teacher Prep Academy ARTes with reservations

Please see Attachments A-M, which provides the detailed rationale for the Public School Choice site recommendations summarized above.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

### **Background:**

In accordance with the Board of Education's passage of the Public School Choice Resolution, 10 new campuses and 3 focus schools (existing District schools that met the following criteria: Program Improvement status of 5 years or more; an Academic Performance Index (API) of 600 or less; did not meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets in 2009; less than 20% of students scoring proficient or advanced on the California Standards Tests (CST) in English Language Arts or Math; less than 100 points net API Gain over 5 years; and greater than 10% dropout 4-year rate (for High Schools only) were designated as Public School Choice sites. In June 2010, approximately 200 Letters of Intent were received expressing an interest to submit a comprehensive proposal to operate a Public School Choice site.

On December 1, 2010 approximately 48 proposals were submitted. As prescribed in the Public School Choice Resolution, all proposals were vetted through the following rigorous evaluation process:

1. Initial Review Team: Consisted of more than 30 reviewers who read individual proposals for each designated Public School Choice site and generated corresponding application rubrics and site summary recommendations.
2. Superintendent's Panel: An additional team of 11 reviewers who read proposals and the site summaries produced by the Initial Review Team.
3. Advisory Vote: After convening Advisory Vote Recommendation Orientation, Proposal Summary Review and Applicant Team Presentation meetings in January 2011, students, parents, staff and community members submitted their recommendations via an Advisory Vote managed by the League of Women Voters Los Angeles.

The above-mentioned evaluation processes and applicant academic data were utilized as data points in the formation of the official recommendations provided in the Attachments. The overall guidelines for developing the official recommendations presented in this report consisted of the following principles:

1. Proposals primarily included a strong, research-based, data-driven instructional plan with a clear assessment methodology;
2. Proposals demonstrated a proven track record of success with students of similar demographics;
3. Proposals clearly exhibit strong outreach and a collaborative approach with all stakeholders; and
4. Proposals reflect effective structures to support implementation of the instructional plan.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

The recommendations outlined in the Attachments include an explicit rationale (based on the guiding principles) for the selection of the applicant team(s) designated to operate the corresponding Public School Choice site

with recommended next steps. For additional reference, the Attachments also include the corresponding Initial Review Team, Superintendent's Panel and Advisory Vote outcomes for each recommended applicant team.

**Expected Outcomes:** Approval of the recommended applicant teams will enable more than 20,000 students within 13 Public School Choice sites to benefit from the strongest instructional programs identified through the Public School Choice process. The operation of the Public School Choice sites commencing in the 2011-12 school year will provide students with the highest quality education possible. All partners, whether internal or external, must sign any applicable agreements or Memoranda of Understanding, including but not limited to Special Education MOU adhering to Modified Consent Decree requirements and LAUSD SELPA policies, operational agreements and facilities use agreements.

**Board Options and Consequences:** The Board of Education may approve, amend or deny the Superintendent's recommendation. The Board of Education's action is necessary to establish the 2011-12 school year instructional plans for each Public School Choice site.

Higher student achievement, greater public school choice and the replication of high-quality instructional models are the intended consequences of approving the Superintendent's recommendation.

The unintentional consequences of approving the recommendations may result in litigation from entities disputing the Public School Choice Resolution, process and/or authority of the Board of Education to authorize the external operations of District schools. Additionally, approval of external applicant teams may result in a decrease in ADA funding to the District.

**Policy Implications:** This action does not entail any policy implications and is in accordance with the Board of Education's August 2009 passage of the Public School Choice Resolution.

**Budget Impact:** Assuming, as required under the Public School Choice process guidelines, that independent charter schools draw students from neighboring District schools, their enrollment in the charter schools represents a reduction in District ADA of approximately 2,155 and ADA driven revenue to the District of approximately \$11.5 million. This loss in revenue will in part be



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

addressed through a reduction in enrollment driven school site expenditures, including teachers, administrators, support staff, and instructional materials. Currently this reduction in expenditures, excluding facilities costs and costs related to services for special education students, is estimated at approximately \$8.5 million resulting in a net impact of \$3.0 million.

Expenditure reductions will increase should facilities operating expenditures be reduced and special education costs be equalized across charter and District schools. Those District-wide costs that cannot be easily reduced will have to be covered by remaining District revenues or other expenditure reductions will have to be found.

Under Education Code section 47604(c), a school district that grants a charter to or operates a charter school that is formed as a non-profit public benefit corporation is not held liable for the charter school's debts or obligations as long as the school district complies with all oversight responsibilities. The District will continue to have monitoring and supervisory responsibility for charter school finances, as specified in the Charter Schools Act. Any modifications to the charter school's petition or operations with significant financial implications would require District approval prior to implementation. Petition approval is also contingent upon adequate liability insurance coverage.

### **Issues and Analysis:**

#### **Attachments:**

**Informative**

**Desegregation  
Impact Statement**



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

Respectfully submitted,

APPROVED BY:

RAMON C. CORTINES  
Superintendent of Schools

MICHELLE KING  
Deputy Superintendent of School Operations

APPROVED & PRESENTED BY:

REVIEWED BY:

RAMON C. CORTINES  
Superintendent of Schools  
Office of the Superintendent

DAVID HOLMQUIST  
General Counsel

Approved as to form.

YUMI TAKAHASHI  
Budget Director

Approved as to budget impact statement.



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

### ATTACHMENT A

**PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE SITE: CLAY MS**

**LOCAL DISTRICT 8 (Romero)**

**BOARD DISTRICT 1 (LaMotte)**

### **SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION:**

- Clay MS
- Green Dot Public Schools – Animo Clay (start a new school on the Clay campus)

### **RATIONALE:**

#### **Clay MS**

- I. The application outlines a research-based instructional plan that emphasizes education of the whole child through integrated technology, Culturally Relevant and Responsive Education (CRRE) and personalization, which is a significant departure from the instructional program that is currently in place. The applicant team proposes to capitalize on the autonomies granted under the Expanded School-Based Management Model (ESBMM) governance structure to: 1) expand Project-based learning (PBL) through the development additional interdisciplinary projects that connect to subject-area standards; 2) implement weekly common planning time for Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to meet as well as weekly professional development; and 3) implement an Advisory period to name a few. Additionally, all students will be engaged in projects, reciprocal teaching and writing across the curriculum. Unfortunately, the proposal does not clearly define improved student outcomes, which will be important to hold the school accountable.
- II. Although Clay MS has posted negative API growth over the last five years, there is evidence that the work of the last two years has laid the groundwork for accelerating achievement, especially if Green Dot will share its instructional strategies with the Clay team.
- III. The proposal has evidence of partnerships with established community resources and articulates strategies for engaging some families. The plan, however, offers very few opportunities for parent involvement in decision-making. Additionally, the turnout for the advisory vote was low with only on 31 parents out of 10,553 eligible parents (approximately 0.34%) participating in the process.
- IV. The proposal contains a clear instructional plan that should lead to a successful implementation.

#### **Green Dot Public Schools – Animo Clay**

- I. The application sets out an instructional plan that establishes a clear vision, mission and set of six core principles for operating a successful school. The proposal also clearly demonstrates a strong, research-based, data-driven instructional plan with a clear assessment strategy that is keenly focused on preparing all students for college. Additionally, the plan includes an emphasis on performance tasks as a means of engaging and assessing student learning, early inclusion of foreign language and built-in teacher planning and collaboration time.



**LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
Board of Education Report**

- II. While Green Dot Public Schools does not yet have a track record at the middle school level, they present strong documentation of past success in the operation and management of other existing schools serving a similar student population.
- III. The proposal outlines strong partnerships with established community resources to engage and outreach to parents, community members and students; however, Green Dot will need to continue to strengthen their parent engagement efforts based on the results of the advisory vote process where only 31 parents out of 10,553 eligible parents (approximately 0.34%) participating in the process.
- IV. The proposal demonstrates a strong relationship with other Green Dot schools, in particular, the other middle school; and is validated by a solid track record of success in the implementation of its other educational programs.

**EVALUATION PROCESS DATA POINTS:**

**Clay Middle School**

- I. **Initial Review Team Recommendation: Yes**
- II. **Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: Yes**
- III. **Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

<b>Students</b>	<b>Employees</b>	<b>Parents</b>	<b>Other Parents</b>	<b>Community Members</b>	<b>Uncategorized</b>
N/A	87/92	19/31	8/33	65/91	4/4

**Green Dot Public Schools – Animo Clay**

- I. **Initial Review Team Recommendation: Yes**
- II. **Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: Yes with reservations**
- III. **Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

<b>Students</b>	<b>Employees</b>	<b>Parents</b>	<b>Other Parents</b>	<b>Community Members</b>	<b>Uncategorized</b>
N/A	2/92	11/31	22/33	24/91	0/0

**NEXT STEPS:**

- 1. Prior to the beginning of the 2011-12 school year, Clay MS and Green Dot Public Schools – Animo Clay must develop a comprehensive plan that discusses how they plan to engage families. This plan must be made available to families on or before the first day of school.
- 2. On or before July 1, 2011, Local District 8 and Green Dot must develop a memorandum of understanding to commit to learn from each other. At a minimum the agreement should include:
  - a. Formation of a campus council that meets monthly;
  - b. A plan to host joint/collaborative Professional Development in multiple areas as well as tentative schedule of dates;



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

- c. A commitment to partner with all of the high schools in the area; and
  - d. A strategy and plan to ensure that enrollment among the schools on the campus exhibit equity based on gender, ethnicity, language, special needs, socioeconomic status and language learner status.
2. By the end of May 2011, the applicant team will meet with the Superintendent to review and if necessary revise their Performance Management Matrix.
  3. By October 2011, the school will meet with the Superintendent to discuss revisions to the Performance Management Matrix based on current data.
  4. Bi-annually (or as needed) all Public School Choice sites will be reviewed by institutions of higher education, Local District Superintendents and the Superintendent's Office with an annual report submitted to the Board and Superintendent.
  5. If Public School Choice sites are not meeting their annual targets, the Superintendent will work with the school to intervene as necessary.
  6. Public School Choice site operators will be considered for renewal every five years.



**LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
Board of Education Report**

**ATTACHMENT B**

**PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE SITE: MANN MS**

**LOCAL DISTRICT 3 (Havard)**

**BOARD DISTRICT 1 (LaMotte)**

**SUPERINTENDENT’S RECOMMENDATION:** The PREP at HMMS with reservations

**RATIONALE:**

- I. The plan sets out an instructional program that has elements of research-based and data-driven instruction. The plan emphasizes non-fiction writing across all content areas, individualized learning portfolios for all students and school-wide rubrics; however, the plan lacks details and specificity. Additionally, it is not clear how the school-wide professional development plan will support the many facets of the instructional program in a strategic and focused way.
- II. Horace Mann Middle School does not have a track record of success for students. There has been minimal API growth over the last five years (36 points) and CST proficiency rates are low.
- III. The plan incorporates a robust parent involvement and engagement strategy that should build a strong school community among students, families, teachers and the extended community. It is very powerful that each teacher will contact five parents per month to share information about the school and his or her students. However, there is concern that only 25 parents participated in the advisory vote process.
- IV. A major concern is that there is limited evidence that the plan will be successfully implemented because it lacks specificity. It is important that additional details are provided and a clear plan is developed to meet the benchmarks outlined in “Next Steps”.

**EVALUATION PROCESS DATA POINTS:**

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation: Yes**
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: Yes**
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

<b>Students</b>	<b>Employees</b>	<b>Parents</b>	<b>Other Parents</b>	<b>Community Members</b>	<b>Uncategorized</b>
N/A	35/37	25/25	5/5	10/11	0/0

**NEXT STEPS:**

- 1. By April 25, 2011, The Prep at HMMS applicant team must revise and re-submit their plan to the Innovation and Charter Schools Division. The plan must include a more rigorous and deliberate focus on their instructional plan. The team needs to further develop the four common standards and provide concrete examples of how each of those will be developed and delivered as part of the instructional program. They must also address how all of the proposed instructional strategies support the instructional program, paying special attention to how they are going to support teachers to implement these strategies across grade level and content areas.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

Additionally, they must strengthen their professional development plan, linking it with their data as well as all of the elements of the instructional program and specifying what they are doing and when they are doing it. Finally, they must outline the plan for identifying and serving students for the Tier II and III intervention programs as well as the AVID and Extended Day programs. For the Tier II and III intervention programs, the team should also specify the exit strategy.

2. The Superintendent has assigned the following educators with a proven track record to assist the applicant team: Rafael Balderas (Fremont HS); Kenneth Pride (Wright MS); and Robin Benton (122<sup>nd</sup> ST).
3. All revisions will need to involve teachers, parents, administrators and the local district.
4. If the plan is not improved, the Superintendent will intervene using the provisions under No Child Left Behind.
5. By the end of May 2011, the applicant team will meet with the Superintendent to review and if necessary revise their Performance Management Matrix.
6. By October 2011, the school will meet with the Superintendent to discuss revisions to the Performance Management Matrix based on current data.
7. Bi- annually (or as needed) all Public School Choice sites will be reviewed by institutions of higher education, Local District Superintendents and the Superintendent's Office with an annual report submitted to the Board and Superintendent.
8. If Public School Choice sites are not meeting their annual targets, the Superintendent will work with the school to intervene as necessary.
9. While most Public School Choices site operators will be considered for renewal every five years, applicant teams recommended with reservations will be considered for renewal in three years.



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

### ATTACHMENT C

**PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE SITE: MUIR MS**

**LOCAL DISTRICT 7 (McKenna)**

**BOARD DISTRICT 1 (LaMotte)**

**SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION:** Restructure John Muir MS

#### **Local District 7/John Muir MS**

- I. The plan submitted by Local District 7/John Muir is neither comprehensive nor coherent and lacks significant changes to the existing instructional program. The plan does not sufficiently address the needs of the lowest achieving students. There is no clear delineation of how the team will create a high-performing school culture and there is no strong through-line that connects theory to practice. The instructional plan lacks specificity and rigor.
- II. John Muir MS does not have a track record of success. After receiving support from the Superintendent's Office over the last three years and the change of leadership, the school is more orderly, but the school has seen minimal API growth over the last five years (29 points), sliding 9 points to 567 between 2008-09 and 2009-10. There is a lack of evidence that there is a sense of urgency to support all students.
- III. There is little to no evidence that the team engaged and involved parents throughout this process. Only 67 parents out of 13,171 eligible parents (approximately 0.51%) participated in the Advisory Vote Recommendation process.
- IV. There is no clear evidence that the plan will be successfully implemented.

#### **MLA Partner Schools**

- I. The proposal submitted by MLA Partner Schools is research-based, comprehensive and includes some key elements necessary to advance the academic achievement of the student population. Access to the curriculum will be facilitated by the implementation of expanded interventions, instructional scaffolding, and a redesigned math program to help all students achieve proficiency in 8th grade algebra. They did not, however, give much attention to the English Language Development program or academic literacy, which are important for both the English Learners (EL) and Standard English Learner (SEL) populations the school serves.
- II. MLA Partner Schools has seen some success at West Adams High School (62 point growth since they entered their Network Partner relationship with the school in 2008-2009), but there still is a significant number of students who are Far Below Basic and Below Basic. MLA has made little to no progress at Manual Arts High School. Further, the organization has no track record at the middle school level.
- III. There is evidence that the applicant team involved and engaged parents in the development of their proposal; however, the engagement did not translate into support during the Advisory Vote



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

Recommendation Process. Only 67 parents out of 13,171 eligible parents (approximately 0.51%) participated in the Advisory Vote Recommendation process.

- IV. It is unclear whether MLA Partner Schools will be able to successfully implement the plan given that they have no track record at the middle school level and their mixed track record at the high school level.

### EVALUATION DATA POINTS:

#### Local District 7/John Muir MS

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation:** Mixed
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation:** Yes, with reservations
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
N/A	86/86	35/67	7/20	152/195	22/30

#### MLA Partner Schools

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation:** Yes
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation:** No
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
N/A	0/86	32/67	13/20	40/195	8/30

### NEXT STEPS:

1. John Muir MS will be restructured immediately. All staff (certificated and classified) must re-apply for positions.
2. An internal team, based out of the Superintendent’s Office, will work with Local District 7 to oversee the restructuring of the school.
3. The teams must develop a new plan that is due to the Superintendent on April 25<sup>th</sup>. The plan must adhere to the RFP template, but must also include:
  - a. a plan to accelerate the academic achievement EL and SEL students;
  - b. a plan to support reading beyond the classroom; and
  - c. a robust parent involvement and engagement plan;
4. By the end of May 2011, the collaborative team will meet with the Superintendent to review and if necessary revise their Performance Management Matrix.
5. By October 2011, the collaborative team will meet with the Superintendent to discuss revisions to the Performance Management Matrix based on current data.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

6. Bi- annually (or as needed) all Public School Choice sites will be reviewed by institutions of higher education, Local District Superintendents and the Superintendent's Office with an annual report submitted to the Board and Superintendent.
7. If Public School Choice sites are not meeting their annual targets, the Superintendent will work with the school to intervene as necessary.
8. While most Public School Choices site operators will be considered for renewal every five years, applicant teams recommended with reservations will be considered for renewal in three years.



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

## ATTACHMENT D

**PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE SITE:** Central Region Elementary School #14

**LOCAL DISTRICT 4 (Vigil)**

**BOARD DISTRICT 5 (Flores)**

**SUPERINTENDENT’S RECOMMENDATION:** Local District 4 and Echo Park Community Partners with reservations

### **RATIONALE:**

- I. The proposal spells out a visionary, research-based instructional program, which uses core concept themes designed to engage students and build conceptual knowledge. Additionally, the plan proposes multi-age groupings in kindergarten through grade 8, personalized education plans for all students and organizing teachers into student learning communities to support flexible groupings. Unfortunately, the plan lacks depth in many key areas. Implementation timelines are vague and key decisions around curriculum, professional development and assessment are unknown.
- II. The schools that will be relieved by Central Region Elementary School #14 – Union Avenue and Rosemont Elementary Schools have both shown solid progress over the last five years. The Academic Performance Index Growth score for Union Avenue has increased by 93 points and Rosemont by 71 points.
- III. The proposal articulates a clear understanding of the community that the schools will serve. Additionally, Local District 4 partnered with a diverse group of stakeholders – parents, community members, teachers, administrators, etc. – to develop the proposal for a school that serves the needs of the community.
- IV. The proposal offers a visionary instructional program that provides some evidence that it will be implemented successfully; however, it lacks many important details, especially for English Learner students. The team must address the concerns outlined in the “Next Steps” prior to implementation.

### **EVALUATION PROCESS DATA POINTS:**

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation:** Mixed
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation:** No consensus reached
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

<b>Students</b>	<b>Employees</b>	<b>Parents</b>	<b>Other Parents</b>	<b>Community Members</b>	<b>Uncategorized</b>
N/A	78/85	142/170	74/188	221/325	46/57



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

### NEXT STEPS:

1. By April 25, 2011, The Local District 4 and Echo Park Community Partners applicant team must revise and re-submit their plan to the Innovation and Charter Schools Division. The revised plan must address in detail or include:
  - a. How instruction will be differentiated by age, student and ELD levels;
  - b. What multi-age groupings will look like across the school and how the curriculum and instructional approaches will differ for primary, middle and advanced elementary grades;
  - c. How instruction will be individualized for English Learners (EL);
  - d. The plan and strategy for assessment as well as data collection and monitoring;
  - e. An aligned professional development plan and calendar;
2. All revisions will need to involve teachers, parents, administrators and the local district.
3. By the end of May 2011, the applicant team will meet with the Superintendent to review and if necessary revise their Performance Management Matrix
4. By October 2011, the school will meet with the Superintendent to discuss revisions to the Performance Management Matrix based on current data.
5. Bi-annually (or as needed) all Public School Choice sites will be reviewed by institutions of higher education, Local District Superintendents and the Superintendent's Office with an annual report submitted to the Board and Superintendent.
6. If Public School Choice sites are not meeting their annual targets, the Superintendent will work with the school to intervene as necessary.
7. While most Public School Choices site operators will be considered for renewal every five years, applicant teams recommended with reservations will be considered for renewal in three years.



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

### **ATTACHMENT E**

**PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE SITE:** South Region Elementary School #6

**LOCAL DISTRICT 7 (McKenna)**

**BOARD DISTRICT 1 (LaMotte)**

**SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION:** Aspire Public Schools

### **RATIONALE:**

- I. The Aspire proposal is extremely well-developed, and the instructional plan and corresponding curriculum are rooted in research and has proven effective here in Los Angeles. Central elements of Aspire's instructional program are the use of personalized learning plans and student-led report card conferences, designed to support the learning and ensure the success of each child in the school. They also use a cadre of research-based pedagogical structures such as project-based instruction, integrated curriculum and authentic experience to name a few to help students access the content and learn at high levels. The Aspire plan clearly articulates the role of data-driven instruction and decision-making; they use multiple forms of data to plan, manage, deliver and evaluate instruction and intervention. Additionally, all of their students "loop" with the same teacher for two years, which they believe accelerates the level of instruction and maximizes learning time. Finally, Aspire proposes to operate three small autonomous schools of approximately 310 students on the South Region Elementary School #6 (SRES #6) campuses to foster a personalized learning environment.
- II. The plan articulates the organization's past success serving similar communities. Aspire has a 12-year history of starting and running high performing schools in California, and is now the highest performing district in California that has 10 or more schools and serves at least 50% low income students. They operate five schools within a three mile radius of SRES#6, all of which have API scores at or above 800. The organization also has four Title I Academic Achievement Awards, four California Distinguished Schools and one Blue Ribbon Award for an Aspire school in Sacramento.
- III. Aspire partnered with Families that Can to train families at their schools in Huntington Park to reach out to and engage families in the SRES#6 community. These efforts do not go unnoticed, but it is clear from the advisory vote – only 32 of 98 parents supported their proposal - that they will need to continue to reach out to families in the community.
- IV. Based on Aspire's track record of starting and running schools in California, it is clear that they will be able to successfully implement the proposed plan.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

### EVALUATION PROCESS DATA POINTS:

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation:** Yes
- II. Superintendent's Panel Team Recommendation:** No
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

<b>Students</b>	<b>Employees</b>	<b>Parents</b>	<b>Other Parents</b>	<b>Community Members</b>	<b>Uncategorized</b>
N/A	0/105	32/98	31/56	100/183	2/15

### NEXT STEPS:

1. By the end of May 2011, the team will meet with the Superintendent to review and if necessary revise their Performance Management Matrix. Additionally, the team will need to present a plan for how they will engage the families in this community.
2. By October 2011, the collaborative team will meet with the Superintendent to discuss revisions to the Performance Management Matrix based on current data.
3. Bi- annually (or as needed) all Public School Choice sites will be reviewed by institutions of higher education, Local District Superintendents and the Superintendent's Office with an annual report submitted to the Board and Superintendent.
4. If Public School Choice sites are not meeting their annual targets, the Superintendent will work with the school to intervene as necessary.
5. Public School Choice site operators will be considered for renewal every five years.



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

### **ATTACHMENT F**

**PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE SITE:** Central Region Middle School #7

**LOCAL DISTRICT 5 (Martinez)**

**BOARD DISTRICT 2 (Garcia)**

#### **SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION:**

- Synergy Academies
- School of Arts and Culture with reservations
- Business and Technology School with reservations

#### **RATIONALE:**

##### **Synergy Academies**

- I. The proposal details a rigorous, research-based, data-driven college preparatory instructional program that emphasizes STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) and focuses on four key instructional strategies: fluency, academic language, schemas and time on task. Additionally, they have a well-developed plan for the use of data and assessments to drive instruction. They also employ both traditional and innovative instructional methods to ensure that all students have access to the content. Further, Synergy places a high value on high quality teaching and developing teachers as professional educators.
- II. Synergy Academies has an excellent track record of success at their existing middle school, Synergy Kinetic Academy. Serving a similar population of students, the school has a 2010 API score of 802 after only its second year in operation. Additionally, their elementary school – Synergy Charter Academy – is a 2010 National Blue Ribbon Award winner.
- III. The plan articulates a deep understanding of and commitment to this community. They outline proven strategies to continue to engage and involve families in the education of their children. Additionally, Synergy already has strong partnerships with community organizations, support providers and institutions of higher learning and has plans to seek more.
- IV. It is clear that Synergy will be able to implement their plan successfully.

##### **School of Arts and Culture**

- I. The proposal includes some promising elements such as AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination), teachers looping with students in grades 7 and 8, project-based learning and public performances and productions as part of the assessment; however, the proposal lacks depth, specificity and coherence. Additionally, student learning outcomes are not clear or measurable. The proposal also provides little research or evidence to support the overall instructional program.
- II. The partnership that the applicant team has forged with Local District 5 and Synergy to support students Pre-K through grade 12 is encouraging.



**LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
Board of Education Report**

- III. The applicant team has strong ties to the community and has developed partnerships with established community organizations and institutions of higher learning to support parent and community engagement as well student learning.
- IV. There is limited evidence that the plan will be successfully implemented because it lacks specificity. It is important that the applicant team addresses and meets the benchmarks outlined in “Next Steps”.

**Business and Technology School**

- I. The instructional plan lists some promising elements such as AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination), project-based learning and a school-wide emphasis on reading and writing, and includes a vertical link to the Academy of Business and Communications small learning community at Jefferson High School. Unfortunately, the instructional program lacks depth and specificity; provides a vague description of Response to Intervention and Instruction (RTI<sup>2</sup>), Culturally Relevant and Responsive Education (CRRE) and AVID; and fails to connect all of the strategies together in a coherent manner. There also appears to be no identifiable theoretical framework to guide the proposed actions spelled out in the proposal.
- II. The partnership that the applicant team has forged with Local District 5 and Synergy to support students Pre-K through grade 12 is encouraging.
- III. The applicant team has strong ties to the community and has developed partnerships with established community organizations and institutions of higher learning to support parent and community engagement as well as student learning.
- IV. There is limited evidence that the plan will be successfully implemented because it lacks specificity. It is important that the applicant team addresses and meets the benchmarks outlined in “Next Steps”.

**EVALUATION PROCESS DATA POINTS:**

**Synergy Academies**

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation:** Yes
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation:** Yes
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

<b>Students</b>	<b>Employees</b>	<b>Parents</b>	<b>Other Parents</b>	<b>Community Members</b>	<b>Uncategorized</b>
N/A	2/12*	34/115*	294/1829*	163/619*	2/15*



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

### School of Arts and Culture

- I. **Initial Review Team Recommendation:** Yes
- II. **Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation:** No
- III. **Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
N/A	5/12*	23/115*	162/1829*	104/619*	2/15*

### Business and Technology School

- I. **Initial Review Team Recommendation:** Yes
- II. **Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation:** No
- III. **Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
N/A	5/12*	18/115*	180/1829*	95/619*	1/15*

*\* As indicated above, the numerator represents the total number of votes received by an applicant team and the denominator represents the total number of votes cast. It is important to note that voters could cast up to three (3) votes per ballot for this PSC site.*

### NEXT STEPS:

1. By April 25, 2011, **The School of Arts and Culture** and the **School of Business and Technology** applicant teams must revise and re-submit their plans to the Innovation and Charter Schools Division. The plans must be data-driven, research-based, coherent and specific. The plans must also include a more rigorous and deliberate focus on the instructional program. Additionally, the teams must clearly indicate how they plan to implement their plans.
2. All revisions will need to involve teachers, parents, administrators and students.
3. The plans will be reviewed by: Rafael Baldarez (Fremont HS); Coleen Kaiwi (Edison MS); and Marcia Reed (186<sup>th</sup> St. ES).
4. On or before July 1, 2011, **Local District 5** and **Synergy** must develop a campus level agreement to commit to learn from each other. At a minimum the agreement should include:
  - a. Formation of a campus council that meets monthly;
  - b. A plan to host joint/collaborative Professional Development in multiple areas as well as tentative schedule;
  - c. A commitment to partner with all of the high schools in the area; and
  - d. A strategy and plan to ensure that enrollment among the schools on the campus exhibit equity based on gender, ethnicity, language, special needs, socioeconomic status and language learner status.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

5. By the end of May 2011, the applicant teams will meet with the Superintendent to review and if necessary revise their Performance Management Matrix.
6. By October 2011, the schools will meet with the Superintendent to discuss revisions to the Performance Management Matrix based on current data.
7. Bi-annually (or as needed) all schools on Public School Choice sites will be reviewed by institutions of higher education, Local District Superintendents and the Superintendent's Office with an annual report submitted to the Board and Superintendent.
8. If schools on Public School Choice sites are not meeting their annual targets, the Superintendent will work with the school to intervene as necessary.
9. While most Public School Choices site operators will be considered for renewal every five years, applicant teams recommended with reservations will be considered for renewal in three years.



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

### **ATTACHMENT G**

**PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE SITE:** Central Region High School #13

**LOCAL DISTRICT 4 (Vigil)**

**BOARD DISTRICT 5 (Flores)**

#### **SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION:**

- Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools – Technology, Math and Science School

The following plans must be resubmitted for further review

- The Los Angeles River School
- Partnerships to Uplift Communities
- School of History and Dramatic Arts
- ARTLAB Arts and Community Empowerment

#### **RATIONALE:**

##### **Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools – Technology, Math and Science School**

- I. The proposal details an engaging, student-centered, research-based instructional program that establishes a clear vision for a successful school and emphasizes integrated technology, math and science. There is also a keen focus on college readiness as evidenced by the California State University (CSU) Early Assessment program, quarterly writing assessments and emphasis on success on the SAT and ACT tests. Additionally, the objectives for student achievement are explicit and aligned with the course offerings identified in the proposal. The plan also includes personalized learning plans for all students and substantive descriptions of the services that will be available to English Learners (EL), students with special education needs and gifted students. Furthermore, the plan outlines a comprehensive student assessment process and a professional development plan that pays careful attention to the needs of newer teachers.
- II. The Alliance proposal provides solid evidence of successfully operating high schools and middle schools in communities with similar demographic populations and needs. They currently operate two high schools in the general neighborhood, one of which is seventh of the top ten highest performing high schools in LAUSD.
- III. The Technology, Math and Science School is committed to serving students and families in this neighborhood and already has strong existing partnerships with community organizations in this area. Additionally, the proposal includes a well-developed strategy to continue to engage, involve and support families.
- IV. It is clear that the Technology, Math and Science School will be able to successfully implement this plan based on their strong relationship with other schools operated by Alliance and the partnerships already established with other agencies and local universities.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

### **The Los Angeles River School**

- I. The proposal sets out an engaging, student-centered instructional program that emphasizes inquiry-based science, project-based learning and interdisciplinary units of study. The integral relationship of the school and the natural environment of the river provide great opportunities for students to research and work to solve real-life problems. The instructional proposal also pays close attention to student cultures and organizes the curriculum and instruction in a coherent, standards-based manner. The plan also includes a Career Technical Education (CTE) component to provide certification in the fields of energy and environmental technology. Additionally, student culminating projects focus on community and environmental problems. The plan, however, does not offer much by way of research to support some of their instructional choices, in particular the multi-age classes. Further, the plans for assessment and data analysis appear unconnected to the instructional program and must be clarified. Finally, the plan does not spell out a clear plan for addressing the needs of the English Learner (EL) population of students.
- II. While the applicant team itself does not have a track record, the partnership with service providers such as Los Angeles Educational Partnership to help with professional development, curriculum and assessments is encouraging.
- III. The plan places a great deal of emphasis on community partners and work-based learning opportunities and includes numerous letters revealing a commitment on the part of these agencies to foster learning at other venues beyond school. The plan also includes multiple ways for parents to participate in the school on many levels both inside and outside the classroom.
- IV. There is some evidence to conclude that this plan can be successfully implemented; however, the applicant team must address the concerns noted in "Next Steps."

### **Partnerships to Uplift Communities (PUC)**

- I. The instructional plan is visionary and focuses on building individual learning plans to bring all students into college-level courses before graduation regardless of language or special education designation. The key strengths of the instructional plan include: the link between data and instructional planning and practice both at the instructional and organizational levels; and a focus on teacher effectiveness. Instruction is guided by a process called the Learning Cycle and is based on how students learn - accessing prior knowledge, extending prior knowledge, applying new knowledge and reflecting on learning. The plan also included well-developed support structures through Community Circles/Tribes and clinical counseling partnerships. The plan, however, does not adequately address the needs of English Learners (EL); much of the section on EL is focused on compliance and pays very little attention to the specific needs of EL students in this community. It is also unclear how the instructional strategies they list come together to support the academic program.
- II. The applicant team has an encouraging track record at their nearby high school, CALS Early College HS, which serves a similar student population. CALS Early College High School has a 2010 API score of 769, which is up 37 points over the previous year.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

- III. The applicant team has a solid understanding of the community they serve and a deliberate plan for engaging the community.
- IV. While much of the instructional plan is solid, there is some concern that the organization may not have the operational capacity to implement the plan. The applicant must address the concerns outlined in “Next Steps.”

### **School of History and Dramatic Arts**

- I. The instructional program is built on the underlying philosophy that students learn best through experience and performance, and is translated into the work of Linked Learning - a bringing together of strong academics, demanding technical education, and real world experience. The plan indicates a set of knowledge, skills and attributes (habits of mind and heart) that is based on the school’s goals and core beliefs. Unfortunately, the plan lacks detail in several critical areas. First, there is little emphasis on the math and science programs. Second, the plan for English Learners (EL) is not well-developed or articulated in the proposal and does not include an assessment of students prior to the start of the year. Finally, the plan for professional development, while comprehensive, lacks rigor and is not always linked to the instructional program.
- II. The team reflects a broad range of stakeholders and includes parents, teachers and community members from one of the relieved high schools, Franklin. The team also has a solid relationship with organizations such as Los Angeles Education Partners to offer curriculum and professional development support.
- III. The applicant team has a solid understanding of the community they serve; however, there is very little detail on how the team will engage and involve families in the school.
- IV. There is some evidence to conclude that this plan can be successfully implemented; however, the applicant team must address the concerns noted in “Next Steps.”

### **ARTLAB Arts and Community Empowerment**

- I. The proposal sets out an instructional program that is student-centered, has solid foundational elements and research-based practices (e.g., linked learning, inter-disciplinary thematic units and project and problem-based learning) and is based on the National Common Core Standards as well as the California content standards. The instructional plan also outlines a strong art and media focus; however, it does not clearly address math and science. In addition, the plan does not specifically address the needs of English Learners (EL). Further, the plan includes “vocational” language, which may mean tracking. The plan does include well articulated learning competencies and discusses the use of multiple authentic assessments to measure student performance and achievement; however, it is unclear what the overall plan is for monitoring and analyzing student data and how it impacts changes in the instructional program.
- II. While the applicant team itself does not have a track record, they have partnered with Los Angeles Educational Partnership to help with professional development, curriculum and assessments, which is encouraging.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

- III. The applicant team has formed solid relationships with established community partners to support student safety, student success and teacher development. The plan also includes solid ideas for parent engagement, but the ideas have not come together in a comprehensive approach and need to be further developed.
- IV. There is some evidence to conclude that this plan can be successfully implemented; however, the applicant team must address the concerns noted in “Next Steps.”

### EVALUATION PROCESS DATA POINTS:

#### Alliance for College-Ready Public Schools

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation: Yes
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: Yes
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
27/171*	14/493*	55/316*	182/1269*	93/1053*	1/5*

#### The Los Angeles River School

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation: Yes
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: Yes
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
29/171*	116/493*	59/316*	102/1269*	156/1053*	1/5*

#### Partnerships to Uplift Communities

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation: Yes
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: No consensus reached
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
17/171*	12/493*	29/316*	692/1269*	303/1053*	0/5*

#### School of History and Dramatic Arts

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation: Yes
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: No consensus reached
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
36/171*	119/493*	54/316*	88/1269*	169/1053*	1/5*



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

### ARTLAB Arts and Community Empowerment with reservations

- I. **Initial Review Team Recommendation:** Yes
- II. **Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation:** No consensus reached
- III. **Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
26/171*	114/493*	52/316*	89/1269*	160/1053*	1/5*

*\* As indicated above, the numerator represents the total number of votes received by an applicant team and the denominator represents the total number of votes cast. It is important to note that voters could cast up to five (5) votes per ballot for this PSC site.*

### NEXT STEPS:

1. By April 25, 2011, **The Los Angeles River School** must revise and re-submit their plan to the Superintendent. In revising the plan, the applicant must cite research to support every element of the proposed plan. The revised plan should also include a clear plan for assessment and data analysis that is connected to the instructional program. Further, the plan must also include a detailed and specific plan for how the school will address the EL population of students. The applicant team must also provide a detailed implementation plan as well as a budget to support the implementation of the plan.
2. By April 25, 2011, **Partnerships to Uplift Communities** must revise and re-submit their plan to the Superintendent. The plan must include a comprehensive, coherent and detailed plan that clearly articulates how they will meet the needs of EL students beyond compliance. The plan should also more clearly discuss how all of the instructional strategies will come together to support the instructional program. Finally, the applicant team must submit a detailed implementation timeline focused on school start-up.
3. By April 25, 2011, **The School of History and Dramatic Arts** must revise and re-submit their plan to the Superintendent. The revised proposal should include:
  - a. a stronger focus on science and mathematics;
  - b. a detailed plan for serving the needs of students designated as English Learners (EL);
  - c. a professional development plan that is aligned to the instructional program; and
  - d. A budget that supports the implementation of this program.
4. By April 25, 2011, **ARTLAB Arts and Community Empowerment School** must revise and re-submit their plan to the Superintendent. The revised proposal should include:
  - a. A stronger focus on science and mathematics;
  - b. A detailed plan for serving the needs of students designated as English Learners (EL);
  - c. A data comprehensive data assessment and monitoring plan that at a minimum addresses the following questions:
    - i. What are the overall measurable program goals?
    - ii. What is the process for measuring progress toward the goals?
    - iii. What specific data indicators will be used? When? How?



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

- iv. What does the cycle of data analysis look like and how does it align with instructional planning and professional development?
  - d. A budget that supports the implementation of the program.
5. All Pilot School applicant teams must study current small Pilot School start-ups.
  6. All revisions will need to involve teachers, parents, administrators and the local district.
  7. By the end of May 2011, the applicant team will meet with the Superintendent to review and, if necessary, revise their Performance Management Matrix.
  8. By October 2011, the school will meet with the Superintendent to discuss revisions to the Performance Management Matrix based on current data.
  9. Bi-annually (or as needed) all Public School Choice sites will be reviewed by institutions of higher education, Local District Superintendents and the Superintendent's Office with an annual report submitted to the Board and Superintendent.
  10. If Public School Choice sites are not meeting their annual targets, the Superintendent will work with the school to intervene as necessary.
  11. While most Public School Choices site operators will be considered for renewal every five years, applicant teams recommended with reservations will be considered for renewal in three years.



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

### ATTACHMENT H

**PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE SITE:** Central Region High School #16

**LOCAL DISTRICT 5 (Martinez)**

**BOARD DISTRICT 7 (Vladovic)**

#### **SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION:**

- Synergy Academies
- The Social Justice Schools: Fine Arts Academy with reservations
- The Social Justice Schools: Global Issues Academy with reservations

#### **RATIONALE:**

##### **Synergy Academies**

- I. Modeled after their successful elementary and middle school programs, the Synergy Academies proposal details a rigorous, research-based, data-driven college preparatory instructional program that emphasizes STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) and focuses on four key instructional strategies: fluency, academic language, schemas and time on task. The attention to English Learners (EL) is thoughtful, consistent and reflects the fundamental needs of the incoming student population. Additionally, they have a well-developed plan for the use of data and assessments to drive instruction. They also employ both traditional and innovative instructional methods to ensure that all students have access to the content. Further, Synergy places a high value on high quality teaching and developing teachers as professional educators.
- II. Although Synergy Academies does not have a track record at the high school level, they have an excellent track record of success at their existing elementary and middle school. Serving a similar population of students, all of their schools boast API scores of greater than 800. Their middle school, Synergy Kinetic Academy, received a 2010 API score of 802 after only its second year in operation. Additionally, their elementary school – Synergy Charter Academy – is a 2010 National Blue Ribbon Award winner.
- III. The plan demonstrates a deep understanding of and commitment to this community. They outline proven strategies to continue to engage and involve families in the education of their children. Additionally, Synergy already has strong partnerships with community organizations, support providers and institutions of higher learning and has plans to seek more.
- IV. It is clear that Synergy will be to implement their plan successfully.

##### **The Social Justice Schools: Fine Arts Academy**

- I. The proposal sets out an instructional program that establishes a rigorous, research-based, arts-integrated, interdisciplinary curricular program for all students. The proposal clearly identifies the team's teaching philosophy of powerful literacy, the teacher/apprentice instructional model and Culturally Relevant and Responsive Education (CRRE), all which align very well with their core foundational beliefs: cognitive engagement and identity investment. Additionally, the applicant team spells out the research-based instructional strategies on which they will focus across the



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

school – SDAIE (Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English), interactive notebooks, The Reading Apprenticeship Framework and Socratic dialogue - all which have a proven track record of success with similar populations of students when implemented well. It is, however, not clear what curriculum the school will use or how the fine arts will connect to the interdisciplinary approach of their instructional program. Additionally, the core offerings to meet the fine arts are unrealistic and need to be revisited.

- II. While the applicant team itself does not have a track record, the partnerships with Synergy Academies, a high-performing and successful charter management organization, and WestEd, a nationally recognized non-profit education research agency, to ensure student success are very promising and encouraging.
- III. The proposal demonstrates very strong and realistic community partnerships that are appropriate to the student population and responsive to their needs. Additionally, there is a clear, well-defined and focused strategy for engaging families and community. The foundational tenets of the three-pronged approach include: participatory democracy in school governance that involves parents in running the school; wraparound services for students and adult education at the school site to connect the school to families and the community; and student and family participation in community betterment and advocacy.
- IV. With support from WestED and the continued collaboration with Synergy Academies, The Fine Arts Academy appears to have a good foundation for successful implementation. They will, however, need to address the concerns outlines in “Next Steps”.

### **The Social Justice Schools: Global Issues Academy**

- I. The proposal details a rigorous, research-based instructional program that emphasizes global issues and an inter-disciplinary curriculum. The proposal includes multiple strategies to make learning accessible to all students such as Response to Intervention (RTI), Socratic dialogue and Culturally Relevant and Responsive Education (CRRE) to name a few. Additionally, the team proposes a strong research-based plan to engage students with disabilities to emphasize inclusion as a student right and collaboration model between general education and special education teachers. The plan also outlines a professional development program that emphasizes: reflection, dialogue, peer observations, co-planning and guided practice. Unfortunately, global issues appear to be absent in the curricula of the school. Also, the proposal is missing critical details regarding funding and implementation that must be addressed.
- II. While the applicant team itself does not have a track record, the partnerships with Synergy Academies, a high-performing and successful charter management organization, and WestEd, a nationally recognized non-profit education research agency, to ensure student success are very promising and encouraging. Also encouraging is the partnership with Cal Poly Pomona for support in science and mathematics.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

- III. The proposal demonstrates very strong and realistic community partnerships that are appropriate to the student population and responsive to their needs. Additionally, there is a clear, well-defined and focused strategy for engaging families and community. The foundational tenets of the three-pronged approach include: participatory democracy in school governance that involves parents in running the school; wraparound services for students and adult education at the school site to connect the school to families and the community; and student and family participation in community betterment and advocacy.
  
- IV. With support from WestED and the continued collaboration with Synergy Academies, The Fine Arts Academy appears to have a good foundation for successful implementation. They will, however, need to address the concerns outlines in “Next Steps”.

### EVALUATION PROCESS DATA POINTS:

#### Synergy Academies

- I. **Initial Review Team Recommendation: Yes**
- II. **Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: Yes**
- III. **Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
1/1*	18/81*	90/144*	131/252*	101/209*	0/0*

#### The Social Justice Schools: Fine Arts Academy

- I. **Initial Review Team Recommendation: Yes**
- II. **Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: Yes**
- III. **Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
0/1*	21/81*	16/144*	45/252*	35/209*	0/0*

#### The Social Justice Schools: Global Issues Academy

- I. **Initial Review Team Recommendation: Yes**
- II. **Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: Yes**
- III. **Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
0/1*	22/81*	13/144*	31/252*	32/209*	0/0*

*\* As indicated above, the numerator represents the total number of votes received by an applicant team and the denominator represents the total number of votes cast. It is important to note that voters could cast up to four (4) votes per ballot for this PSC site.*



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

### NEXT STEPS:

1. Since CRHS#16 was built for four schools, but we only received three quality applicants, I am capping the enrollment at Synergy and allowing the Fine Arts Academy and Global Issues Academy to enroll the remaining number of students.
2. By April 25, 2011, **The Fine Arts Academy** applicant team must revise and re-submit its plan to the Innovation and Charter Schools Division. The plan should clearly spell out how the fine arts will connect to the interdisciplinary approach of the instructional program as well as what curricula the school will use. The revised plan should also provide a more realistic fine arts course offering as well as budget that supports the implementation of this program given the budget constraints.
3. By April 25, 2011, **The Global Issues Academy** applicant team must revise and re-submit its plan to the Innovation and Charter Schools Division. The plan should clearly spell out how the global issues theme will connect to the interdisciplinary approach of the instructional program. The revised plan should also detail the curricula that will be used. Additionally, the team should provide a detailed implementation timeline that identifies critical benchmarks in the start-up of the school. Finally, the team should provide a realistic budget that supports the implementation of this program given the budget constraints.
4. All revisions will need to involve teachers, parents, administrators and students.
5. On or before July 1, 2011, Local District 5 and Synergy must develop a campus level agreement to commit to learn from each other. At a minimum the agreement should include:
  - a. Formation of a campus council that meets monthly;
  - b. A plan to host joint/collaborative Professional Development in multiple areas as well as tentative schedule;
  - c. A commitment to partner with all of the high schools in the area; and
  - d. A strategy and plan to ensure that enrollment among the schools on the campus exhibit equity based on gender, ethnicity, language, special needs, socioeconomic status and language learner status.
6. By the end of May 2011, the applicant teams will meet with the Superintendent to review and if necessary revise their Performance Management Matrix.
7. By October 2011, the schools will meet with the Superintendent to discuss revisions to the Performance Management Matrix based on current data.
8. Bi-annually (or as needed) all schools on Public School Choice sites will be reviewed by institutions of higher education, Local District Superintendents and the Superintendent's Office with an annual report submitted to the Board and Superintendent.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

9. If schools on Public School Choice sites are not meeting their annual targets, the Superintendent will work with the school to intervene as necessary.
  
10. While most Public School Choices site operators will be considered for renewal every five years, applicant teams recommended with reservations will be considered for renewal in three years.



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

## ATTACHMENT I

**PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE SITE:** East LA Star Academy

**LOCAL DISTRICT 5 (McKenna)**

**BOARD DISTRICT 5 (Flores)**

**SUPERINTENDENT’S RECOMMENDATION:** No applicant team recommended.

### **RATIONALE:**

- I. The proposal puts forth an instructional plan that includes many of the right “buzz” words, but lacks depth and specificity. The applicant team asserts that the school will focus on medicine, health and technology; however, these themes are absent from the proposal. As written, the instructional program identifies several intervention models, but none that have the rigor to meet the range of the needs of the student population. The plan as written does not translate into accelerated outcomes for students.
- II. While the applicant team worked closely with the local district, the instructional components are not developed strong enough to demonstrate they are ready for implementation or success.
- III. The proposal identifies several strong community partners who support the school, but it is unclear the role that each of the community partners will play, especially as it relates to the themes of medicine, health and technology. Parent involvement and engagement strategies are minimal, and there is little to no indication that the team engaged and involved parents throughout this process, as evidenced by the low parent participation in the Advisory Vote Recommendation process; only 10 parents out 4,670 eligible parents (approximately 0.21%) cast a vote.
- IV. The proposal does not contain a clear instructional plan that demonstrates the capacity for successful implementation. The benchmarks outlined in the “Next Steps” must be followed.

### **EVALUATION PROCESS DATA POINTS:**

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation:** Mixed
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation:** No
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

<b>Students</b>	<b>Employees</b>	<b>Parents</b>	<b>Other Parents</b>	<b>Community Members</b>	<b>Uncategorized</b>
15/16	15/15	10/10	115/118	110/111	0/0

### **NEXT STEPS:**

1. Local District 5 has until April 25, 2011 to submit a revised plan that includes a rigorous and specific instructional program. The local district should clearly articulate the key components and strategies of the instructional program; strategies for English Learners will need to be specifically discussed in the revised plan. The local district should also outline a detailed plan for implementation of the instructional program.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

2. The Superintendent is assigning the following educators with a proven track record to work with the Local District to revise the plan: Coleen Kaiwi, Principal, Edison MS; Marcia Reed, Principal, 186<sup>th</sup> Street School; and Jaime Morales, Principal, Hollywood HS.
3. The local district must also include a thorough and comprehensive plan for engaging and involving parents and community partners in the school.
4. All revisions will need to involve teachers, parents, administrators and the local district.
5. By the end of May 2011, the applicant team will meet with the Superintendent to review and if necessary revise their Performance Management Matrix.
6. By October 2011, the school will meet with the Superintendent to discuss revisions to the Performance Management Matrix based on current data.
7. Bi-annually (or as needed) all Public School Choice sites will be reviewed by institutions of higher education, Local District Superintendents and the Superintendent's Office with an annual report submitted to the Board and Superintendent.
8. If Public School Choice sites are not meeting their annual targets, the Superintendent will work with the school to intervene as necessary.
9. While most Public School Choices site operators will be considered for renewal every five years, this site will be watched closely by the Superintendent and reviewed annually.



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

### **ATTACHMENT J**

**PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE SITE:** South Region High School #2

**LOCAL DISTRICT 7 (McKenna)**

**BOARD DISTRICT 7 (Vladovic)**

#### **SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION:**

- Public Service Community School with reservations
- The Communication and Technology School with reservations
- The Green Design Community School with reservations
- Performing Arts Community School with reservations

#### **RATIONALE:**

##### **Public Service Community School**

- I. The instructional program is progressive, research-based and includes several sound educational practices at its core – project-based learning, use of habits of mind and other Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) principles. Additionally, the instructional program is student-centered and empowers teachers to work closely with students both academically and on a social-emotional level. Further, they propose additional graduation requirements with a focus on authentic assessments. Unfortunately, none of the curriculum is developed and much of the proposal is vague, unclear and requires more specificity.
- II. The Public Service Community School applicant team includes community members, current and former students as well as teachers from Fremont HS and other schools in South Los Angeles. The team reflects a broad range of stakeholders and clearly articulates why they are serving this community. The team also has a solid partnership with Local District 7 and organizations such as Los Angeles Education Partners to help support student success.
- III. The Public Service Community School applicant teams has done an admirable job reaching out to the community to find out what their needs are and incorporate those into the proposal. The team has a strong understanding of the student population and the community they will serve; their analysis goes beyond the obvious and unearths deeper causes for students' academic deficiencies. Additionally, there are some emerging partnerships in place (One LA) and there has been thought given to the structures into which these partnerships will fall across the complex of schools; however, specific roles are not defined. Emphasis rests mainly on the school complex as opposed to the individual school.
- IV. Although the proposal heavily relies on the three week summer retreat to develop critical elements of the instructional program, which is not feasible, there is some evidence that the plan will be successfully implemented if properly coached and supported. The team will need to achieve the benchmarks established in “Next Steps” in order to move forward with implementation.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

### **The Communications and Technology School**

- I. The proposal sets out an instructional program that has solid foundational elements and research-based practices - project-based learning, relevant education, personalization, integration of technology, SDAIE, Understanding by Design, etc. – and proposes that all students will take AP classes. Unfortunately, the plan fails to communicate how all of the foundational elements and instructional strategies will come together as a comprehensive and coherent instructional program that is personalized for each student.
- II. The Communications and Technology School applicant team includes community members as well as current and former teachers from Fremont HS. The team has a solid partnership with Local District 7 and organizations such as Los Angeles Education Partners to help them focus on student success.
- III. The Communications and Technology School applicant team has done an admirable job reaching out to the community to find out what their needs are and incorporate those into the proposal. The team has a strong understanding of the student population and the community they will serve; their analysis goes beyond the obvious and unearths deeper causes for students' academic deficiencies. Additionally, there are some emerging partnerships in place (One LA) and there has been thought given to the structures into which these partnerships will fall across the complex of schools; however, specific roles are not defined. Emphasis rests mainly on the school complex as opposed to the individual school.
- IV. Although the proposal heavily relies on the three week summer retreat to develop critical elements of the instructional program, which is not feasible, there is some evidence that the plan will be successfully implemented if properly coached and supported. The team will need to achieve the benchmarks established in “Next Steps” in order to move forward with implementation.

### **The Green Design Community School**

- I. The proposal spells out an instructional program that has sound foundational elements and research-based strategies (e.g., the Coalition of Essential Schools philosophy, project-based learning, AVID and backwards planning) with solid evidence that support the theories that underpin them, but these elements are not fully developed in the plan nor is it clear how these elements connect to the core instructional program.
- II. The development team for the Green Design Community School includes members of the community as well as former teachers and administrators from schools within this community. Additionally, the person identified to lead the school has experience in environmental education. The team has partnered with a number of organizations that serve the community. In particular, they have partnered with Los Angeles Education Partnership who will support their professional development program.
- III. The Green Design Community School applicant team has done an admirable job reaching out to the community to find out what their needs are and incorporate those into the proposal. The team has a strong understanding of the student population and the community they will serve; their analysis goes beyond the obvious and unearths deeper causes for students' academic deficiencies.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

Additionally, there are some emerging partnerships in place (One LA) and there has been thought given to the structures into which these partnerships will fall across the complex of schools; however, specific roles are not defined. Emphasis rests mainly on the school complex as opposed to the individual school.

- IV. Although the proposal heavily relies on the three week summer retreat to develop critical elements of the instructional program, which is not feasible, there is some evidence that the plan will be successfully implemented if properly coached and supported. The team will need to achieve the benchmarks established in “Next Steps” in order to move forward with implementation.

### **Performing Arts Community School**

- I. The proposal spells out an instructional program that has sound foundational elements and research-based strategies (e.g., the Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) philosophy, project-based learning, AVID and backwards planning) with solid evidence that supports the theories that underpin them. The instructional philosophy is clear and the pathway to get there is specifically outlined in the proposal. They also clearly articulate the benefits of an arts focused education. Additionally, the school has a solid plan for assessment that includes using the current district-wide periodic assessment while staff develop their own over the course of the year.
- II. The development team for the Performing Arts Community School includes members of the community, current and former teachers from Fremont HS and administrators. The team is deeply passionate about arts education and possesses experience in and a commitment to the CES philosophy. The team has also partnered with organizations such as the Los Angeles Education Partnership and UCLA Center X to provide professional development and support the development of teachers.
- III. The Performing Arts Community School applicant teams has done an admirable job reaching out to the community to find out what their needs are and incorporate those into the proposal. The team has a strong understanding of the student population and the community they will serve; their analysis goes beyond the obvious and unearths deeper causes for students' academic deficiencies. Additionally, there are some emerging partnerships in place (One LA) and there has been thought given to the structures into which these partnerships will fall across the complex of schools; however, specific roles are not defined. Emphasis rests mainly on the school complex as opposed to the individual school.
- IV. With support from Local District 7, The Innovation and Charter Schools Division and The Pilot School Steering Committee, this plan should be successfully implemented.



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

### EVALUATION PROCESS DATA POINTS:

#### Public Service Community School

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation: Yes
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: Yes
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
0/0*	9/37*	11/48*	25/112*	54/214*	0/0*

#### The Communication and Technology School

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation: Yes
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: Mixed
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
0/0*	9/37*	13/48*	34/112*	55/214*	0/0*

#### The Green Design School

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation: Yes
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: Yes
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
0/0*	9/37*	11/48*	28/112*	52/214*	0/0*

#### Performing Arts Community School

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation: Yes
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: Yes
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
0/0*	9/37*	12/48*	25/112*	52/214*	0/0*

\* As indicated above, the numerator represents the total number of votes received by an applicant team and the denominator represents the total number of votes cast. It is important to note that voters could cast up to four (4) votes per ballot for this PSC site.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

### NEXT STEPS:

1. Absent from the vision of the Gage and Central Community Schools complex are academic expectations for students. Additionally the teams must come together to clearly define the roles of the various partner organizations. Further, the philosophy of parent involvement is fine, but very traditional; it does little to empower parents or engage them beyond a cheerleading role. As a school with the vision of being at the center of the community, the vision of parent engagement should be much more expansive and include empowering and educating parents on navigating the current education system. By April 25, 2011, the complex must address the concerns outlined above and submit to the Innovation and Charter Schools Division a revised vision statement for the complex; a plan that defines the roles of the partner organizations; and a parent involvement and engagement plan.
2. By April 25, 2011, **The Public Service Community School** must revise and re-submit their plan to the Innovation and Charter Schools Division. The plan must include a comprehensive, coherent and detailed instructional plan that clearly articulates and connects to the mission and vision of the school. The team must also present a professional development program that supports the instructional program. In revising their instructional plan, the team should use the following guiding questions:
  - a. On what habits of mind will the school focus? At what grade levels and why?
  - b. What is meant by "relevant curriculum"? Since classes will be heterogeneous, how will you ensure that "honors" classes are available to all students using an embedded honors system? Where is the funding for this? When will staff receive PD for the learning labs? Who will manage the on going support for this type of computer based program?
  - c. What does Project-Based Learning look like at the school? What is the connection to the instructional strategies?

As stated above, it is unrealistic and unfeasible to believe that key elements of the instructional program will be developed over the course of three-weeks or during the school year. That said, the team must present a realistic timeline for developing the curriculum, assessments, the advisory program, staff training, etc. Additionally, the team must identify what will be in place if these items are not developed by the beginning of the school year. Finally, the team must submit a budget that supports the implementation of this program. They should also submit a realistic plan for fundraising to cover the additional costs.

3. By April 25, 2011, **The Communications and Technology School** must revise and re-submit their plan to the Innovation and Charter Schools Division. The plan must include a comprehensive, coherent and detailed instructional plan that clearly articulates how all of the proposed instructional strategies support the instructional program, paying special attention to how they are going to support teachers to implement these strategies across grade level and content areas. The team must also present a professional development program that supports the instructional program. In revising the instructional program, the team should use the following guiding questions:
  - a. What is the strategy to ensure that all students have access to technology?
  - b. How will the instructional program be personalized for each student? How do the instructional strategies proposed come together to support an individualized instructional program for all students?



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

- c. How are Project-based learning and the multi-ways of demonstrating knowledge connected to the instructional strategies that will be implemented across the school? What does this look like across content areas?
- d. What is the plan for monitoring how students are getting back into and performing in core, mainstream classes after the 7<sup>th</sup> period class?

As stated above, it is unrealistic and unfeasible to believe that key elements of the instructional program will be developed over the course of three-weeks or during the school year. That said, the team must present a realistic timeline for developing curriculum, assessments, the advisory program, staff training, etc. Additionally, the team must identify what will be in place if these items are not developed by the beginning of the school year. Finally, the team must submit a realistic budget that supports the implementation of this program. They should also submit a realistic plan for fundraising to cover the additional costs.

4. By April 25, 2011, **The Green Design Community School** must revise and re-submit their plan to the Innovation and Charter Schools Division. The plan must include a comprehensive, coherent and detailed instructional plan that clearly connects the Coalition of Essential Schools principles to the core of the instructional program. Additionally, the team must address how all of the instructional strategies proposed integrated across content areas. The team must also present a professional development program that supports the instructional program. In revising their instructional program, the team should reflect on the following guiding questions:
  - a. On what habits of mind will the school focus? At what grade levels and why?
  - b. What do RTI and learning labs look like as part of the instructional program? How are learning labs monitored? How is the information that comes from them integrated into the instructional program?
  - c. What does project-based learning look like at the school? What is the connection to the core instructional strategies? How does project-based learning connect to the “green” theme?

As stated above, it is unrealistic and unfeasible to believe that key elements of the instructional program will be developed over the course of three-weeks or during the school year. That said, the team must present a realistic timeline for developing the curriculum, assessments, the advisory program, staff training, etc. Additionally, the team must identify what will be in place if these items are not developed by the beginning of the school year. Finally, the team must submit a realistic budget that supports the implementation of this program. They should also submit a realistic plan for fundraising to cover the additional costs.

5. The **Performing Arts Community School** indicates that assessments are not judgments, but they do not expound on how data will be monitored and analyzed or how it will inform instruction, interventions and professional development. By April 25, 2010, the team must present a comprehensive data monitoring plan that addresses the concerns above.
6. All applicant teams must study current small Pilot School start-ups.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

7. All revisions will need to involve teachers, parents, administrators and the local district.
8. The plan will be reviewed by a three-member team identified by the Superintendent's Office.
9. By the end of May 2011, the applicant team will meet with the Superintendent to review and if necessary revise their Performance Management Matrix
10. By October 2011, the school will meet with the Superintendent to discuss revisions to the Performance Management Matrix based on current data.
11. Bi- annually (or as needed) all Public School Choice sites will be reviewed by institutions of higher education, Local District Superintendents and the Superintendent's Office with an annual report submitted to the Board and Superintendent.
12. If Public School Choice sites are not meeting their annual targets, the Superintendent will work with the school to intervene as necessary.
13. While most Public School Choices site operators will be considered for renewal every five years, applicant teams recommended with reservations will be considered for renewal in three years.



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

### **ATTACHMENT K**

**PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE SITE:** South Region High School #4

**LOCAL DISTRICT 8 (Romero)**

**BOARD DISTRICT 7 (Vladovic)**

**SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION:** Local District 8

#### **RATIONALE:**

- I. The instruction plan is well-developed, student-centered and includes a number of research-based elements including, but not limited to project-based learning, linked-learning, advisory and student internships. The team clearly delineates the instructional practices that will be used across grade and content levels and paints a clear picture of what instruction will look like. Students will be housed in four academies – one for students in grades 6-8; one for students in grade 9 and two for students in grades 10-12 - that will each focus on a specific theme or pathway, which allows for personalization across the 6-12 Span School; the thematic pathways are thoughtful and realistic in terms of student interest. Additionally, teachers will work in inter-disciplinary teams, which not only further the idea of personalization for students, but allows for collaboration among teachers. The proposal did not, however, clearly define the assessment strategy and does not include a structured plan for data-driven accountability and continuous improvement. Also absent from the plan was a detailed plan for implementation of the school's common practices and the four academies. Moreover, it is unclear how the autonomies afforded in the Expanded School-Based Management Model (ESBMM) will be employed to accelerate student achievement. Finally, the plan for professional development does not discuss how teachers will be supported throughout the year to implement the many instructional strategies covered during the PD sessions.
- II. Local District 8 has an adequate track record improving student achievement in the surrounding secondary schools – Carnegie MS, Curtiss MS, Banning HS and Carson HS. Over the last five years, the aforementioned schools have seen 70-point, 71-point, 80-point and 36-point gains respectively. It is important to note that some of the years are marked by little to no growth or negative growth. The team for South Region High School #4 should consistently monitor the California Standards Test proficiency rates to ensure that they improve.
- III. Local District 8 identifies a strong list of organizations that will not only support the overall vision of the school, but will partner with individual academies at the school to support the learning and development of students. These organizations include: The City of Carson, Carson City Government, CSU Dominguez Hills, The Carson's Sheriff's Department, The Los Angeles County Bar Association and The Boys and Girls Club. Unfortunately, the plan for meaningful parent engagement is not outlined.
- IV. The proposal contains a clear instructional plan that evidences the capacity for successful implementation; however, some elements such as the assessment strategy, the implementation timeline of the school's common practices and the implementation of the four academies need further development.



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

### EVALUATION PROCESS DATA POINTS:

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation:** Yes
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation:** Yes
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

<b>Students</b>	<b>Employees</b>	<b>Parents</b>	<b>Other Parents</b>	<b>Community Members</b>	<b>Uncategorized</b>
15/16	45/47	58/77	14/18	47/87	29/36

### NEXT STEPS:

1. By April 25, 2011, Local District 8 must develop the following:
  - a. A structured plan for data-driven accountability and continuous improvement that will be implemented in Fall 2011;
  - b. A detailed implementation timeline that outlines the rollout of the school’s common practices and the four academies;
  - c. A plan that discusses how the autonomies afforded under the ESBMM model will be used to accelerate student achievement; and
  - d. A plan that outlines how teachers will be supported throughout the year to successfully implement the instructional strategies covered in the PD plan.
2. Prior to the beginning of the 2011-12 school year, Local District 8 must develop a comprehensive plan that discusses how the school will engage families and community organizations. This plan must be made available to families on or before the first day of school.
3. All revisions will need to involve teachers, parents, administrators, and students.
4. All required revisions will be due to the Superintendent by the end of April 25, 2011.
5. By the end of May 2011, the applicant team will meet with the Superintendent to review and if necessary revise their Performance Management Matrix.
6. By October 2011, the school will meet with the Superintendent to discuss revisions to the Performance Management Matrix based on current data.
7. Bi- annually (or as needed) all Public School Choice sites will be reviewed by institutions of higher education, Local District Superintendents and the Superintendent’s Office with an annual report submitted to the Board and Superintendent.
8. If Public School Choice sites are not meeting their annual targets, the Superintendent will work with the school to intervene as necessary.
9. Public School Choice site operators will be considered for renewal every five years.



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

### ATTACHMENT L

**PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE SITE:** Valley Region High School #4

**LOCAL DISTRICT 1 (Del Cueto)**

**BOARD DISTRICT 3 (Galatzan)**

**SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION:** Local District 1 with Monroe High School

*It is important to note that both plans submitted for Valley Region High School #4 – Granada Hills Charter High School and Local District 1 with Monroe High School were strong plans, and if implemented and executed well would be strong options for our students. The optimal decision would have been to recommend both proposals for this site, but it was clear that this was not a viable option because of the adult behaviors exhibited by both applicant teams throughout this process.*

### **RATIONALE:**

- I. The proposal outlines a data-driven, well-written, research-based instructional program that links science and technology with the arts to create a rigorous academic program designed to stimulate the hearts and minds of students. The instructional program rests on four cornerstones - personalized small learning communities; a college-prep, arts-infused curriculum; project-based learning; and performance based assessment & evaluation. In addition, this plan with its three arts-focused small learning communities, fills an arts high school void in the San Fernando Valley and provides an option for students interested in visual and performing arts, especially those students matriculating from the arts-focused elementary and middle schools in the community. Missing from the instructional plan is a defined plan for educating and supporting English Learners (EL) at various proficiency levels. It is unclear what strategies that will be used to differentiate instruction for this population of students. Additionally, the proposal does not establish a link between the final grade-level project (including the senior project) and a career/workforce pathway with relevance for each student. The proposal also outlines an assessment system that relies on both traditional assessment methods and performance-based assessments to demonstrate mastery of visual or performing arts skills. Furthermore, the proposal proposes the use of formative and summative assessments based on the focus and curriculum of each small learning community; however, the timeline for developing these assessments is vague and unclear. It is also unclear how data collected will be monitored and used to inform teaching and learning.
- II. The Local District 1 high schools that will participate in the Zone of Choice for Valley Region High School #4 (VRHS #4) have all shown growth in their API scores over the last two years – Cleveland High School is up 30 points to an API score of 756; Kennedy High School is up 31 points to an API score of 695; and Monroe High School is up 50 points to an API score of 667. Furthermore, the two persons identified to play significant roles in the start-up of VRHS #4 have excellent track records in launching successful small learning communities.
- III. The proposal articulates a deep understanding of the community the school serves and strategies for robust family and community engagement. At the heart of their approach to developing comprehensive partnerships that include the school, parents and the community is J. Epstein's framework outlining the six types of involvement. Additionally, the school is actively seeking to



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

strengthen existing partnerships with institutions of higher learning, arts facilities and museums. Of note is their partnership with California State University Northridge who collaborated in the development of their plan and will play an instrumental role in helping the team launch the arts program.

- IV. The proposal contains a rigorous instructional program that provides evidence that it will be implemented successfully; however, it is unclear whether or not this program is feasible under our current budgetary constraints. The team must address the concerns outlined in the “Next Steps”.

### EVALUATION PROCESS DATA POINTS:

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation:** Yes
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation:** Consensus was not reached
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

<b>Students</b>	<b>Employees</b>	<b>Parents</b>	<b>Other Parents</b>	<b>Community Members</b>	<b>Uncategorized</b>
659/1183	373/638	162/610	305/540	435/979	2/2

### NEXT STEPS:

1. By April 25, 2011, the applicant team must develop and submit the following to the Innovation and Charter Schools Division:
  - a. A defined plan for EL students at various proficiency levels. The plan should, at a minimum identify how EL students who need primary language support will access both core and elective courses, and provide a unifying vision for how “thinking like DaVinci” will be applied both vertically and horizontally;
  - b. A detailed timeline and sequence for developing assessments;
  - c. A plan that further explains the link between the final grade-level project (including the senior project) and a career/workforce pathway;
  - d. A more clearly defined data collection and monitoring plan that spells out how data will be used to inform teaching and learning;
  - e. A master schedule that works for kids and supports student learning; and
  - f. A budget that supports the implementation of this program.
2. All revisions will need to involve teachers, parents, administrators, and students.
3. All required revisions will be due to the Superintendent by the end of April 25, 2011.
4. By the end of May 2011, the applicant team will meet with the Superintendent to review and if necessary revise their Performance Management Matrix.
5. By October 2011, the school will meet with the Superintendent to discuss revisions to the Performance Management Matrix based on current data.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

6. Bi-annually (or as needed) all Public School Choice sites will be reviewed by institutions of higher education, Local District Superintendents and the Superintendent's Office with an annual report submitted to the Board and Superintendent.
7. If Public School Choice sites are not meeting their annual targets, the Superintendent will work with the school to intervene as necessary.
8. Public School Choice site operators will be considered for renewal every five years.



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

### **ATTACHMENT M**

**PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE SITE:** Valley Region High School #5

**LOCAL DISTRICT 2 (Pena-Sanchez)**

**BOARD DISTRICT 3 (Galatzan)**

#### **SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION:**

- Local District 2 Teacher Prep Academy
- The Academy of Scientific Exploration
- Social Justice Humanitas Academy
- ArTES Academy with reservations

#### **RATIONALE:**

##### **Local District 2 – Teacher Prep Academy**

- I. The instructional program is research-based and designed to be personalized to each student. Instruction will be provided through project-based learning, the inquiry approach, and through the use of technology. In addition, students will receive individualized supports through programs such as mentoring and tutoring. The proposal outlines clear expectations for students, as well as parents in supporting student achievement. Formative assessments were thoroughly described in the plan. Overall, the program is well-developed and ambitious.
- II. Local District 2 has a solid track record working with high schools in the area.
- III. The Teacher Prep Academy applicant team clearly demonstrated an understanding of the needs of the local community, evidenced in the plans for a community resource center and hours of operation of the campus itself. The proposal highlighted the importance of parent engagement by noting that teachers will be expected to communicate regularly with parents and families to discuss the progress of their students and plan for intervention/improvement.
- IV. There is no reason to believe that the applicant team, in conjunction with Local District 2 does not have the capacity to successfully implement this plan.

##### **The Academy of Scientific Exploration**

- I. The instructional program for the Academy of Scientific Exploration emphasizes mathematics, science, and technology through a project-based learning approach. A unique feature of the plan is that the school will provide Advisory and Strategic Labs as additional resources for students during the school day. Strategic Labs in particular are an innovative method for connecting with each student to provide individualized intervention, enhancements to classroom learning, or test preparation activities.
- II. The members of the Academy of Scientific Exploration team are experienced teachers; however, they appear to lack administrative experience—there is some concern about the lack of a track record of successful school management.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

- III. The Academy of Scientific Exploration has well-articulated strategies for parent outreach and engagement. For one, part of a teacher's responsibility will be to connect with parents on a regular basis. The team also seems to be well-aware of the key local community members and institutions in the area.
- IV. There is no reason to believe that the applicant team, in conjunction with Local District 2 does not have the capacity to successfully implement this plan.

### **Social Justice Humanitas Academy**

- I. The Social Justice Humanitas Academy presents an instructional plan centered on research-based practices and the use of the Humanitas model as well as an emphasis on the philosophy of social justice. There is a clear vision of curriculum, instruction, and assessment that drives towards academic achievement and college-readiness. The program focuses on the development of the complete individual, and this theme runs throughout the instructional program as well as the envisioned school culture. While the program will be personalized and differentiated, it is less clear how interventions will be provided to students when needed.
- II. The members of the Social Justice Humanitas Academy are current teachers at the Sylmar High School Humanitas Academy; each is an experienced educator and the Humanitas model has proven effective in other LAUSD schools.
- III. The proposal emphasizes the importance of collaboration between the school and community, which the Social Justice Humanitas Academy reinforces with a well-informed analysis of the northeast valley community members and local institutions. The team has already garnered support for the school from local community partners. However, the team may be overly optimistic regarding future prospects for grants and other philanthropic support.
- IV. There is no reason to believe that the applicant team, in conjunction with Local District 2 does not have the capacity to successfully implement this plan.

### **ArTES Academy**

- I. The instructional program is designed with a Humanitas model of interdisciplinary study and focuses on art instruction as a way to engage students. Individual student capacity to learn and students' roles as learner, citizen, and artist are key tenants of the instructional model and the school will be committed to personalized and differentiated learning. However, the plan requires further development and details regarding how the core instructional program will be implemented—currently, it is unclear how the core program will interact with the arts program to create a comprehensive, well-rounded curriculum. It is also unclear how the arts instruction will be connected to the provision of intervention as necessary, support for A-G requirements, and measureable student outcomes.
- II. The ArTES Academy applicant team members are current teachers from Verdugo Hills High School, where an arts program similar to the one proposed is currently being implemented.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

- III. One of the priorities for the ArTES Academy team was to keep the school open to the community until 6:00 pm. The proposal also provided evidence of a variety of community partners based in the local community. Furthermore, the proposal included a tentative shared facilities agreement with two other pilot schools applying for VRHS#5: Academy of Scientific Exploration and the Humanitas School of Social Justice. While the ArTES Academy team has clearly already begun outreach efforts related to the school, its strategies for parent outreach and engagement were not clearly explained.
- IV. There is no reason to believe that the applicant team, in conjunction with Local District 2 does not have the capacity to successfully implement this plan.

### EVALUATION PROCESS DATA POINTS:

#### Local District 2 – Teacher Prep Academy

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation: Mixed
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: No consensus reached
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
24/609*	40/298*	23/287*	97/1414*	54/664*	0/8*

#### The Academy of Scientific Exploration

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation: Yes
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: No consensus reached
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
110/609*	60/298*	46/287*	119/1414*	79/664*	1/8*

#### Social Justice Humanitas Academy

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation: Yes
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation: Yes
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
161/609*	71/298*	66/287*	171/1414*	128/664*	4/8*



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

### ArTES Academy

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation:** Mixed
- II. Superintendent’s Panel Team Recommendation:** Yes with reservations
- III. Advisory Vote Tabulation for Applicant (# votes for applicant/# of votes)**

<b>Students</b>	<b>Employees</b>	<b>Parents</b>	<b>Other Parents</b>	<b>Community Members</b>	<b>Uncategorized</b>
85/609*	49/298*	37/287*	191/1414*	128/664*	0/8*

*\* As indicated above, the numerator represents the total number of votes received by an applicant team and the denominator represents the total number of votes cast. It is important to note that voters could cast up to nine (9) votes per ballot for this PSC site.*

### NEXT STEPS:

1. By April 25, 2011, the ArTES applicant team must submit a revised plan to the Innovation and Charter Schools Division that clearly spells out how the core instructional program will be implemented. Specifically, the team should address how the core program will interact with the arts program to create a comprehensive, well-rounded curriculum. The team must also delineate how arts instruction will be connected to the provision of intervention, support A-G requirements and measurable student outcomes. Further, the applicant team must submit a realistic budget that supports the implementation of this program. Finally, the applicant must submit a detailed implementation timeline.
2. All Pilot School applicant teams must study current small Pilot School start-ups.
3. By the end of May 2011, the team will meet with the Superintendent to review and if necessary revise their Performance Management Matrix. Additionally, the team will need to present a plan for how they will engage the families in this community.
4. By October 2011, the collaborative team will meet with the Superintendent to discuss revisions to the Performance Management Matrix based on current data.
5. Bi- annually (or as needed) all Public School Choice sites will be reviewed by institutions of higher education, Local District Superintendents and the Superintendent’s Office with an annual report submitted to the Board and Superintendent.
6. If Public School Choice sites are not meeting their annual targets, the Superintendent will work with the school to intervene as necessary.
7. While most Public School Choices site operators will be considered for renewal every five years, applicant teams recommended with reservations will be considered for renewal in three years.