



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.