ATTACHMENT J

PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE SITE: South Region High School #2

LOCAL DISTRICT 7 (McKenna)   **BOARD DISTRICT 7 (Vladovic)**

SUPERINTENDENT'S RECOMMENDATION:
- Public Service Community School with reservations
- The Communication and Technology School with reservations
- The Green Design Community School with reservations
- Performing Arts Community School with reservations

RATIONALE:

Public Service Community School
 I. The instructional program is progressive, research-based and includes several sound educational practices at its core – project-based learning, use of habits of mind and other Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) principles. Additionally, the instructional program is student-centered and empowers teachers to work closely with students both academically and on a social-emotional level. Further, they propose additional graduation requirements with a focus on authentic assessments. Unfortunately, none of the curriculum is developed and much of the proposal is vague, unclear and requires more specificity.

 II. The Public Service Community School applicant team includes community members, current and former students as well as teachers from Fremont HS and other schools in South Los Angeles. The team reflects a broad range of stakeholders and clearly articulates why they are serving this community. The team also has a solid partnership with Local District 7 and organizations such as Los Angeles Education Partners to help support student success.

 III. The Public Service Community School applicant teams has done an admirable job reaching out to the community to find out what their needs are and incorporate those into the proposal. The team has a strong understanding of the student population and the community they will serve; their analysis goes beyond the obvious and unearths deeper causes for students' academic deficiencies. Additionally, there are some emerging partnerships in place (One LA) and there has been thought given to the structures into which these partnerships will fall across the complex of schools; however, specific roles are not defined. Emphasis rests mainly on the school complex as opposed to the individual school.

 IV. Although the proposal heavily relies on the three week summer retreat to develop critical elements of the instructional program, which is not feasible, there is some evidence that the plan will be successfully implemented if properly coached and supported. The team will need to achieve the benchmarks established in "Next Steps" in order to move forward with implementation.

The Communications and Technology School

I. The proposal sets out an instructional program that has solid foundational elements and research-based practices - project-based learning, relevant education, personalization, integration of technology, SDAIE, Understanding by Design, etc. – and proposes that all students will take AP classes. Unfortunately, the plan fails to communicate how all of the foundational elements and instructional strategies will come together as a comprehensive and coherent instructional program that is personalized for each student.

II. The Communications and Technology School applicant team includes community members as well as current and former teachers from Fremont HS. The team has a solid partnership with Local District 7 and organizations such as Los Angeles Education Partners to help them focus on student success.

III. The Communications and Technology School applicant team has done an admirable job reaching out to the community to find out what their needs are and incorporate those into the proposal. The team has a strong understanding of the student population and the community they will serve; their analysis goes beyond the obvious and unearths deeper causes for students' academic deficiencies. Additionally, there are some emerging partnerships in place (One LA) and there has been thought given to the structures into which these partnerships will fall across the complex of schools; however, specific roles are not defined. Emphasis rests mainly on the school complex as opposed to the individual school.

IV. Although the proposal heavily relies on the three week summer retreat to develop critical elements of the instructional program, which is not feasible, there is some evidence that the plan will be successfully implemented if properly coached and supported. The team will need to achieve the benchmarks established in "Next Steps" in order to move forward with implementation.

The Green Design Community School

I. The proposal spells out an instructional program that has sound foundational elements and research-based strategies (e.g., the Coalition of Essential Schools philosophy, project-based learning, AVID and backwards planning) with solid evidence that support the theories that underpin them, but these elements are not fully developed in the plan nor is it clear how these elements connect to the core instructional program.

II. The development team for the Green Design Community School includes members of the community as well as former teachers and administrators from schools within this community. Additionally, the person identified to lead the school has experience in environmental education. The team has partnered with a number of organizations that serve the community. In particular, they have partnered with Los Angeles Education Partnership who will support their professional development program.

III. The Green Design Community School applicant team has done an admirable job reaching out to the community to find out what their needs are and incorporate those into the proposal. The team has a strong understanding of the student population and the community they will serve; their analysis goes beyond the obvious and unearths deeper causes for students' academic deficiencies.

Additionally, there are some emerging partnerships in place (One LA) and there has been thought given to the structures into which these partnerships will fall across the complex of schools; however, specific roles are not defined. Emphasis rests mainly on the school complex as opposed to the individual school.

IV. Although the proposal heavily relies on the three week summer retreat to develop critical elements of the instructional program, which is not feasible, there is some evidence that the plan will be successfully implemented if properly coached and supported. The team will need to achieve the benchmarks established in "Next Steps" in order to move forward with implementation.

Performing Arts Community School

I. The proposal spells out an instructional program that has sound foundational elements and research-based strategies (e.g., the Coalition of Essential Schools (CES) philosophy, project-based learning, AVID and backwards planning) with solid evidence that supports the theories that underpin them. The instructional philosophy is clear and the pathway to get there is specifically outlined in the proposal. They also clearly articulate the benefits of an arts focused education. Additionally, the school has a solid plan for assessment that includes using the current district-wide periodic assessment while staff develop their own over the course of the year.

II. The development team for the Performing Arts Community School includes members of the community, current and former teachers from Fremont HS and administrators. The team is deeply passionate about arts education and possesses experience in and a commitment to the CES philosophy. The team has also partnered with organizations such as the Los Angeles Education Partnership and UCLA Center X to provide professional development and support the development of teachers.

III. The Performing Arts Community School applicant teams has done an admirable job reaching out to the community to find out what their needs are and incorporate those into the proposal. The team has a strong understanding of the student population and the community they will serve; their analysis goes beyond the obvious and unearths deeper causes for students' academic deficiencies. Additionally, there are some emerging partnerships in place (One LA) and there has been thought given to the structures into which these partnerships will fall across the complex of schools; however, specific roles are not defined. Emphasis rests mainly on the school complex as opposed to the individual school.

IV. With support from Local District 7, The Innovation and Charter Schools Division and The Pilot School Steering Committee, this plan should be successfully implemented.

EVALUATION PROCESS DATA POINTS:

Public Service Community 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
0/0*	9/37*	11/48*	25/112*	54/214*	0/0*

The Communication and Technology School
  I. **Initial Review Team Recommendation:** Yes
 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
0/0*	9/37*	13/48*	34/112*	55/214*	0/0*

The Green Design 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
0/0*	9/37*	11/48*	28/112*	52/214*	0/0*

Performing Arts Community 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
0/0*	9/37*	12/48*	25/112*	52/214*	0/0*

* *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 four (4) votes per ballot for this PSC site.*

NEXT STEPS:

1. Absent from the vision of the Gage and Central Community Schools complex are academic expectations for students. Additionally the teams must come together to clearly define the roles of the various partner organizations. Further, the philosophy of parent involvement is fine, but very traditional; it does little to empower parents or engage them beyond a cheerleading role. As a school with the vision of being at the center of the community, the vision of parent engagement should be much more expansive and include empowering and educating parents on navigating the current education system. By April 25, 2011, the complex must address the concerns outlined above and submit to the Innovation and Charter Schools Division a revised vision statement for the complex; a plan that defines the roles of the partner organizations; and a parent involvement and engagement plan.

2. By April 25, 2011, **The Public Service Community School** must revise and re-submit their plan to the Innovation and Charter Schools Division. The plan must include a comprehensive, coherent and detailed instructional plan that clearly articulates and connects to the mission and vision of the school. The team must also present a professional development program that supports the instructional program. In revising their instructional plan, the team should use the following guiding questions:
   a. On what habits of mind will the school focus? At what grade levels and why?
   b. What is meant by "relevant curriculum"? Since classes will be heterogeneous, how will you ensure that "honors" classes are available to all students using an embedded honors system? Where is the funding for this? When will staff receive PD for the learning labs? Who will manage the on going support for this type of computer based program?
   c. What does Project–Based Learning look like at the school? What is the connection to the instructional strategies?

   As stated above, it is unrealistic and unfeasible to believe that key elements of the instructional program will be developed over the course of three-weeks or during the school year. That said, the team must present a realistic timeline for developing the curriculum, assessments, the advisory program, staff training, etc. Additionally, the team must identify what will be in place if these items are not developed by the beginning of the school year. Finally, the team must submit a budget that supports the implementation of this program. They should also submit a realistic plan for fundraising to cover the additional costs.

3. By April 25, 2011, **The Communications and Technology School** must revise and re-submit their plan to the Innovation and Charter Schools Division. The plan must include a comprehensive, coherent and detailed instructional plan that clearly articulates how all of the proposed instructional strategies support the instructional program, paying special attention to how they are going to support teachers to implement these strategies across grade level and content areas. The team must also present a professional development program that supports the instructional program. In revising the instructional program, the team should use the following guiding questions:
   a. What is the strategy to ensure that all students have access to technology?
   b. How will the instructional program be personalized for each student? How do the instructional strategies proposed come together to support an individualized instructional program for all students?

    c. How are Project-based learning and the multi-ways of demonstrating knowledge connected to the instructional strategies that will be implemented across the school? What does this look like across content areas?

    d. What is the plan for monitoring how students are getting back into and performing in core, mainstream classes after the 7th period class?

As stated above, it is unrealistic and unfeasible to believe that key elements of the instructional program will be developed over the course of three-weeks or during the school year. That said, the team must present a realistic timeline for developing curriculum, assessments, the advisory program, staff training, etc. Additionally, the team must identify what will be in place if these items are not developed by the beginning of the school year. Finally, the team must submit a realistic budget that supports the implementation of this program. They should also submit a realistic plan for fundraising to cover the additional costs.

4. By April 25, 2011, **The Green Design Community School** must revise and re-submit their plan to the Innovation and Charter Schools Division. The plan must include a comprehensive, coherent and detailed instructional plan that clearly connects the Coalition of Essential Schools principles to the core of the instructional program. Additionally, the team must address how all of the instructional strategies proposed integrated across content areas. The team must also present a professional development program that supports the instructional program. In revising their instructional program, the team should reflect on the following guiding questions:
   a. On what habits of mind will the school focus? At what grade levels and why?
   b. What do RTI and learning labs look like as part of the instructional program? How are learning labs monitored? How is the information that comes from them integrated into the instructional program?
   c. What does project–based learning look like at the school? What is the connection to the core instructional strategies? How does project-based learning connect to the "green" theme?

As stated above, it is unrealistic and unfeasible to believe that key elements of the instructional program will be developed over the course of three-weeks or during the school year. That said, the team must present a realistic timeline for developing the curriculum, assessments, the advisory program, staff training, etc. Additionally, the team must identify what will be in place if these items are not developed by the beginning of the school year. Finally, the team must submit a realistic budget that supports the implementation of this program. They should also submit a realistic plan for fundraising to cover the additional costs.

5. The **Performing Arts Community School** indicates that assessments are not judgments, but they do not expound on how data will be monitored and analyzed or how it will inform instruction, interventions and professional development. By April 25, 2010, the team must present a comprehensive data monitoring plan that addresses the concerns above.

6. All applicant teams must study current small Pilot School start-ups.

7. All revisions will need to involve teachers, parents, administrators and the local district.

8. The plan will be reviewed by a three-member team identified by the Superintendent's Office.

9. By the end of May 2011, the applicant team will meet with the Superintendent to review and if necessary revise their Performance Management Matrix

10. By October 2011, the school will meet with the Superintendent to discuss revisions to the Performance Management Matrix based on current data.

11. 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.

12. If Public School Choice sites are not meeting their annual targets, the Superintendent will work with the school to intervene as necessary.

13. 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.