



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 (RTI²), 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)**

Students	Employees	Parents	Other Parents	Community Members	Uncategorized
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 (186th 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.