



# 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.