



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

Report Number:	258-10/11
Date:	April 12, 2011
Subject:	Public School Choice 2.5 Applicant Team Recommendations
Responsible Staff:	
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 recommendation for Public School Choice 2.5:

<u>PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE SITE</u>	<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>
HUNTINGTON PARK HS	No applicant team recommended; Participate in the third round of Public School Choice.

Please see **Attachment A**, which provides the detailed rationale for the Public School Choice site recommendation summarized above.

Background: In May 2010, Huntington Park HS was identified as a focus school for the second round of the Public School Choice process having met all of the following criteria:

1. Program Improvement (PI) status of 5 or more years;
2. Academic Performance Index (API) Growth Score of 600 or less;
3. Did not meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) targets in 2009;
4. Less than 20% of students scoring proficient or advanced on the California Standards Test (CST) in English Language Arts or Math;
5. Less than 100 points net API Gain over 5 years; and
6. Greater than 10% dropout 4-year rate (for High Schools only).

In August 2010 after 2010 CST data was released, Huntington Park HS was removed from the list of schools participating in the second round of Public School Choice because the school’s API score exceeded 600. After further review, it was found that the increase in the school’s API score was due to the performance of a small academy on the campus, LIBRA Academy. As a result, it was decided that the school would participate in a special process – Public School Choice 2.5.

In December 2010, approximately six Letters of Intent/School Plan Outlines were received expressing an interest to submit a comprehensive proposal to operate Huntington Park HS.



LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

On March 7, 2011 three 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: Reviewers read proposals submitted by the applicant teams and generated corresponding application rubrics and site summary recommendations.
2. Superintendent's Panel: An additional team of reviewers read the proposals and developed individual site summary recommendations as well as a consensus recommendation from the team.
3. Advisory Vote: After convening Advisory Vote Recommendation Orientation, Proposal Summary Review and Applicant Team Presentation meetings in March 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.

The recommendation outlined in Attachment A includes an explicit rationale (based on the guiding principles) for corresponding recommendation along with suggested next steps. For additional reference, the Attachment also includes the corresponding Initial Review Team, Superintendent's Panel and Advisory Vote outcomes for each applicant team that submitted a proposal.

**Expected
Outcomes:**

Approval of the recommendation will enable the students in the Huntington Park HS community to benefit from the strongest instructional programs identified through the Public School Choice process.

**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 Huntington Park HS.



LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

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.

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:

To the extent that the new configuration does not require additional positions, the Superintendent's recommendation is cost neutral.

**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

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: HUNTINGTON PARK HIGH SCHOOL

LOCAL DISTRICT 6 (Lagrosa)

BOARD DISTRICT 5 (Flores)

SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION: Participate in the third round of the Public School Choice Process.

Huntington Park High School Network of 21st Century Schools

- I. The plan is well-written and includes references to research-based instructional strategies and practices such as Project-Based Learning (PBL), Specifically Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) and Response to Intervention² (RTI²); however, it lacks specificity and depth in many areas and neglects to discuss how the many programs and strategies will coalesce to form a comprehensive instructional program that meets the needs of all of the students. Additionally the plan focuses heavily on students in grades 9 and 10 and almost completely ignores students in grades 11 and 12. It is unclear how the instructional needs of those students will be met as the school transitions. Further, the assessment plan lacks rigor and does not clearly spell out how current or incoming students will be assessed. Finally, the professional development plan, while thoughtful and reflective, is not directly aligned to student assessment and achievement (i.e., PBL is a major part of the instructional program; however, only one day is allocated to it in the professional development calendar.
- II. Huntington Park High School does not have a track record of success and there is a lack of evidence that there is a sense of urgency to improve the educational outcomes of the students in this community. While the Academic Performance Index (API) score has increased 60 points over the last five years, the proficiency rates remain low. In 2010, only 24% of the student population scored proficient or advanced in English Language Arts and only 5% scored proficient or advanced in math.
- III. There is some evidence that the applicant team engaged parents, community members and students in the development of the plan. Unfortunately, the team's engagement efforts did not lead to support during the Advisory Vote Recommendation process, as only 53 parents out of 10,724 eligible parents (approximately .49%) cast a vote. The team has, however, developed solid community partnerships with organizations such as Mental Health America and Latino Behavioral Health Institute as well as with several universities to support the social and academic needs of the student population.
- IV. There is little to no clear evidence that the plan will be successfully implemented.

Huntington Park High School Reform Coalition (Huntington Park Community High School)

- I. The plan includes references to research-based elements such as PBL, proactive counseling and guidance for all 9th grade students, RTI², Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) and



LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

integrated school-career pathways; however, many of the elements are not well-defined, nor is it clear how well the team really understands some of the elements they proposed.

- II. Huntington Park High School does not have a track record of success and there is a lack of evidence that there is a sense of urgency to improve the educational outcomes of the students in this community. While the Academic Performance Index (API) score has increased 60 points over the last five years, the proficiency rates remain low. In 2010, only 24% of the student population scored proficient or advanced in English Language Arts and only 5% scored proficient or advanced in math.
- III. There is some evidence that the applicant team engaged parents, community members and students in the development of the plan. Unfortunately, the team's engagement efforts did not lead to support during the Advisory Vote Recommendation process, as only 53 parents out of 10,724 eligible parents (approximately .49%) cast a vote.
- IV. There is no clear evidence that the plan will be successfully implemented.

Huntington Park Community in Partnership

- I. The instructional plan presented by the applicant team lacks vision and depth; it is not compelling, comprehensive, cohesive or coherent and includes many of the existing practices and strategies already in place at the school, which are not working. The plan fails to clearly articulate a philosophy of education, instruction or assessment. The plan mentions the use of meta-cognitive strategies, but fails to identify what teaching will look like aside from those strategies. The plan also references the use of RTI² as a framework for intervention, but fails to articulate how the school will customize the framework to address the specific needs of the student population. Additionally, the plan cites academic research, but does not incorporate the current Huntington Park data in its analysis to justify the instructional approach proposed.
- II. The applicant team does not demonstrate a clear or strong track record of success. Huntington Park High School has a history of low achievement, and the plan submitted by this team will do little to interrupt that pattern.
- III. The applicant team outlines some viable strategies to involve and engage families in the school; however, there is no evidence that they engaged families in the design of the school. Further, the team has no formal partnerships with community organizations, universities, etc.
- IV. There is no evidence that the applicant team has the capacity to improve instruction at Huntington Park High School. The role of the principal is non-existent and there is an over reliance on an R&D team to make critical decisions pertaining to the instructional program. As outlined in the proposal, it is unlikely the instructional program will lead to improved academic outcomes for students.



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

EVALUATION DATA POINTS

Huntington Park High School Network of 21st Century Schools

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation: Mixed**
- 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
48/248	50/102	23/53	9/22	2/13	0/0

Huntington Park High School Reform Coalition (Huntington Park Community High School)

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation: No**
- 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
51/248	31/102	8/53	3/22	7/13	0/0

Huntington Park Community in Partnership

- I. Initial Review Team Recommendation: No**
- 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
126/248	17/102	20/53	9/22	4/13	0/0

NEXT STEPS

1. Huntington Park HS will be placed in the third round of Public School Choice. The process will be open to all stakeholders. Letters of Intent will be due by April 30th and final applications will be due on October 14th along with other schools participating in the third round.
2. Huntington Park HS will also be restructured in 2012-2013 and all employees certificated and classified must re-apply for their positions so that the team or teams ultimately approved by the Board can select the persons they believe best align with their school vision, mission and instructional philosophy. Additionally, the restructured Huntington Park HS will participate in a Zone of Choice with South Region High School #7 (SRHS#7), a new high school opening in fall of 2012 to relieve overcrowding at Huntington Park HS.
3. Beginning in the 2011-2012 school year, Huntington Park HS will establish an academy for all incoming 9th grade students across all tracks. The academy will be under the leadership of Mr. Jonathan Chaikittirattana and have autonomies in the following areas: governance, staffing, curriculum, schedule/calendar and budget. The academy must provide an intense learning experience for all students, include a counselor who works solely with 9th grade students and must utilize the intercession period to provide extended learning opportunities for all students.



LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

Mr. Chaikittirattana should study the models at Gardena HS and Reseda HS, and must engage Mr. Walter Flores in the development of the academy.

4. Natividad Rozsa, Principal Leader in Local District 6, will oversee the 10th through 12th grade program at Huntington Park HS. By June 1, 2011, Ms. Rozsa and Ms. Rowena Lagrosa (Local District Superintendent) must co-develop a plan that includes corrective action steps for the 2011-2012 school year. By that time they must also work with Cynthia Lim (Office of Data and Accountability) to develop a set of measurable leading and lagging benchmarks that the school must achieve throughout the school year and by the end of the school year.
5. By June 1, 2011, the team will meet with the Superintendent to review and if necessary revise the plan for the school.
6. On or before July 1, 2011, the administrative teams on campus 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 sessions in multiple areas as well as a tentative schedule of dates; and
 - c. A plan to share resources.