

**LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE 2.0
LA Pilot School Steering Committee**

Recommendations to Superintendent Ramon Cortines

On Thursday, February 3, 2010, the Los Angeles Pilot School Steering Committee gathered to collaboratively develop recommendations for the eighteen Pilot School applications submitted via the second round of the Public School Choice Initiative. Members of the committee that reviewed and provided feedback on the proposals include:

Ada Snethen Stevens	Principal Leader, Local District 4
Parker Hudnut	Executive Director, Innovation and Charter Schools Division
AJ Duffy	President, United Teachers Los Angeles
Greg Solkovits	Secondary Vice President, United Teachers Los Angeles
Judith Perez	President, Associated Administrators Los Angeles
Jarad Sanchez	Alliance for a Better Community

The following proposals have been recommended by the Los Angeles Pilot School Steering Committee to receive Pilot School status. Please note that some plans have been recommended without hesitation while other plans have been recommended with reservation or pending the team addresses concerns raised by the committee.

- Central Region Elementary School #14 – LD4 and Echo Park Community Partners
- Central Region Middle School #7 – School of Arts and Culture
- Central Region High School #13 – School of Business, Technology and Education
- Central Region High School #13 – The Los Angeles River School
- Central Region High School #13 – ARTLAB
- Central Region High School #13 – School of History and Dramatic Arts
- South Region High School #2 – Green Design Community School
- Valley Region High School #5 – Social Justice Humanitas Academy
- Valley Region High School #5 – Academy of Scientific Exploration

The following proposals were found to have some proficient features, but not enough across all indicators to merit approval:

- South Region High School #2 – Public Service Community School
- South Region High School #2 – Performing Arts Community School
- South Region High School #2 – Communications and Technology School

The following proposals are not approved:

- CLAY MS – Western Academy for the 21st Century
- Central Region Middle School #7 – Business and Technology School
- Valley Region High School #4 – Telesis Senior High
- Valley Region High School #4 – Arroyo Networked Global Studies Education and Leadership Studies
- Valley Region High School #5 – Telesis Senior High
- Valley Region High School #5 – ArTES Academy

Please see the chart below for more detail regarding the recommendations made by the Los Angeles Pilot School Steering Committee.

SCHOOL	APPLICANT TEAM
CLAY MS	<p>Western Academy for the 21st Century (<i>Not recommended</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of Concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Vagueness around certain subject areas – Concerns over the governance model – Funding is primarily based on outside grants. – Language regarding the voluntary excess of teachers is unclear, questionable and not in the spirit of the Pilot School Movement • Questions/Follow-up: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – How will they service all students, particularly ELL and SPED? – How will they fund the elements of their plan?
CRES#14	<p>Local District 4 and Echo Park Community Partners (<i>Recommended with conditions</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Lots of support from various members of the community – LD4, administrators, parents, teachers, etc. – SPAN school that specifically addresses the needs of the community – full integration of the arts, dual language approach and sciences – Distributed Leadership model is a plus – Multi-age groupings at the secondary level – IB Curriculum; multi-lingual = great appeal • Areas of Improvement/Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Working conditions are vague and need to be spelled out more clearly <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Workday = 7:15AM - 3:15PM (Point #1 under the Introduction Section) ○ # of hours asked to work ○ Point #18 of the Introduction section is too vague – Conditions that were agreed to post submission must be incorporated into the plan; submit back to the committee; add language related to collaboration • Questions/Follow-up: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – More thought needs to be given to what implementation looks like. This information should come back to the committee in a timely manner. – IB is expensive to implement. How will you fund the key elements of the plan? – All of the partnerships for this school are with organizations focused on the arts, but there is very little mention of partnerships with organizations focused on the sciences. How does science fit into this plan? Please be more specific about how science will come to life in this school.
VRHS #4	<p>Telesis High School – (<i>Not recommended</i>)</p> <p>Based on the comments of all of the previous reviewers, the committee does not recommend for approval.</p>
<p>CRHS#13 <i>How will all of the schools work together?</i></p> <p><i>Commend LD4 for beginning this work and continue to do this going forward.</i></p>	<p>ARTLAB Arts and Community Empowerment (<i>Recommended pending addressing the following items</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions/Follow-up: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Further clarify the staffing plan; Will teachers and health services professionals be hired from within LAUSD or from where will these teachers come? – Clarify the language in the EWA regarding hours worked without pay; specifically bullet points 4, 5 and 8 under Additional Commitments (page 159) <hr/> <p>The Los Angeles River School (<i>Recommended pending addressing the following items</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Strongly recommend; thoughtful way of looking at the site specific location and incorporating it into student learning – Well-articulated vision • Questions/Follow-up: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Clarify the language in the EWA regarding hours worked without pay

SCHOOL	APPLICANT TEAM
	<p>School of Business, Technology and Education (<i>Recommended with reservations</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Has positive ideas; technology integration is a plus • Areas of Concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Plan lacks specificity, is written in general terms and needs some further development • Questions/Follow-up: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Clarify the language in the EWA regarding hours worked without pay – Supplemental writing to address the needs of ELL <hr/> <p>School of History and Dramatic Arts (<i>Recommended and address UTLA concerns</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Innovative approaches; linking the study of history and theater – Other exciting components include linked learning and student engagement • Questions/Follow-up: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify the language in the EWA regarding required hours worked without pay – Specifically address bullets #1 and #4 under Collaboration and Professionalism; bullet #1 under Distributed Leadership; and bullets #4 and #5 under Family and Community Support
<p>CRMS#7 <i>Commend LD5 for thinking about how all of these schools will work together; encourage them to continue to keep the lines of communications open.</i></p>	<p>Business and Technology School (<i>Maybe</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Community engagement – Articulation with other feeder schools – linking vertically to the surrounding middle schools • Areas of Concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance and leadership; minimal emphasis on the principal as instructional leader • Not much in the proposal about business; only technology aspect of the proposal is a Computer Science class • Instructional program lacks depth and specificity; • Curriculum lacks innovation <hr/> <p>School of Arts and Culture (<i>Recommend; address concerns identified below</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Strong partnerships; innovation • Areas of Concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Culturally Responsive Pedagogy – Clarify the governance structure – Concerns regarding compensation for teachers (bullet points #1 and #2 on pg 103) • Questions/Follow-up: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Can you require someone to participate in an online service if they disseminate your information to other companies and organizations? (page 103 bullet point #7) – Are teachers paid to conduct home visits? When do they take place? Please clarify (page 103 bullet point #5)
<p>SRHS #2</p>	<p>Green Design Community School – (<i>Recommend and address points below</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – No real concerns – Work with the Coalition of Essential Schools is applauded. We know and like their work. • Areas of Concern/Questions/Follow-up: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Distributed Leadership (page 31, line 4) – Additional Roles and Duties – Addressing non-extreme behavior issues within the classroom (or among teachers) – page 30; how is this addressed in the larger plan? How do you deal with behaviors that are out of control? Please clarify.

SCHOOL	APPLICANT TEAM
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Additional Roles and Duties – Home Visits (page 30). How many home visits are teachers expected to conduct per year? When will they take place? Liability? Safety? Is there compensation? Please clarify. – Who and how will the oversight of the breakdown of the student population occur? <p>Public Service Community School (<i>Address areas of the plan that need to be re-visited</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of Concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Three-week retreat for staff to develop all curriculum and assessments is not realistic. Please clarify the funding for this retreat; whether or not participants will be compensated; the plan for on-going professional development to make sure that what is touched on in the three-week retreat is re-visited throughout the year? • Next Steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Pilot School Steering Committee spells out what team needs to do, as there are elements of the plan that are not well-developed – Conversation with the LD and the individual school regarding the concerns raised by the committee <p>Performing Arts Community School (<i>Severe concerns; re-visit</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Good elements of plan, but there are lots of elements that are underdeveloped and vague • Areas of Concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Three-week retreat for staff to develop all curriculum and assessments is not realistic. Please clarify the funding for this retreat; whether or not participants will be compensated; the plan for on-going professional development to make sure that what is touched on in the three-week retreat is re-visited throughout the year? – Distributed Leadership → weak/low-level definitions; go deeper – Curriculum and Instruction needs to be spelled out more concretely – Organizational, operational and financial areas need further development <p>Communications and Technology School (<i>Severe concerns; re-visit</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of Concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Vague; a lot of missing pieces – Three-week retreat for staff to develop all curriculum and assessments is not realistic. Please clarify the funding for this retreat; whether or not participants will be compensated; the plan for on-going professional development to make sure that what is touched on in the three-week retreat is re-visited throughout the year? – Organizational, operational and financial areas need further development – Under-developed curriculum, assessments, staffing, professional development and budget
VRHS#5	<p>ANGELS (<i>Not recommended</i>)</p> <p>Artes Academy (<i>Not recommended; needs more development</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Humanitas model = wonderful • Areas of Concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Lots of emphasis on arts, but not enough on the core subject areas – The plan lacks significant detail and is vague – Issues around resources and core curriculum – The plan has good elements, but needs more development <p>Telesis Senior HS (<i>Not recommended</i>)</p> <p>In conjunction with the comments provided by the Initial Review Team and the Superintendent’s Review Panel, this proposal was deemed underdeveloped in many areas.</p> <p>The Academy of Scientific Exploration (<i>Recommended</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commendations:

SCHOOL	APPLICANT TEAM
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Advisory and The Strategic Lab built into the structure of the school • Areas of Concern: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Finances <hr/> <p>Social Justice Humanitas Academy (<i>Recommended</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Humanitas model is great – Plan clearly focuses on curriculum and instruction – Interdisciplinary thematic units