PSC School: <u>San Fernando High School</u>   **Planning Team Name: <u>Youth Policy Institute (YPI)</u>**

PSC 4.0 Evaluation Rubric
Superintendent's Review Panel

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
A. **Vision and Instructional Philosophy**	The vision statement communicates the school's fundamental beliefs about student learning and high expectations/rigorous standards for both students and adults. The vision statement and explanation of the vision provides a clear statement of values that will lead to the success of the school's future graduates. The key priorities of the school are meaningful, measurable, ambitious yet attainable, and appropriate for the target student population, as are the instructional strategies.	<u>Strengths</u>: • Clear & high expectations, personalized & supportive learning environment, family-school-community, state-school-private, meaningful, relevant, dynamic and motivated, problem-solve and collaborate, form meaningful relationships with teachers, administrators, peers and surrounding community, set goals, celebrate achievements • High expectations supported by a caring community • Focus on only two career areas: biotech health & digital-arts—chosen with community feedback and analysis of growing industries that afford students myriad future opportunities • SFHS has a media arts academy, which by their description is in name only and they are not proposing to continue it, therefore, a Digital Arts Academy would fill a need that is not being addressed. • Clear link to Career Pathways and rationale for their choice of academies through the Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Outlook Handbook 2012-2013. • Tools for delivering all of the vision: CPA, Linked Learning, Blended Learning, LA Promise Neighborhood/Full Service Community School model to support whole family from pre-natal to career • Clear philosophy. • SFMS currently has a YPI pilot school, the Institute for Applied Media, which will serve as a feeder school for the proposed Digital Arts Academy at SFHS. <u>Concerns</u>: • Sounded like a lot of other vision statements—it is generic and uses a lot of the "right" words. • Vision is very "pie in the sky," but is it realistic, attainable? • There are many educational terms without a specific connection to how these are inter-connected. There are so many "buzz" words, identifiers for what students will learn and be able to do but the reviewers wonder how all of this can be achieved. • There's a lot of coordinating required to get their programs implemented, such as the internships. Trying to get students into internships is very hard—how many students will receive this? Wish there were most specifics. Also, for Biotech Health Academy, plan listed the internship opportunities, but the Digital Arts one does not provide the same. • It seems the vision has a better chance of success with a small "select" student population.	• What is the focus of your vision? How can it be narrowed? • How many students will attend this school? • How will they attain the resources they need to accomplish all this? You have listed a multitude of expectations and services your school will provide. How will you achieve all of this? How will they get funds to implement these technology driven solutions? • What happens when students are not achieving? • How will students be selected for these academies? • Will students and parents sign a contract? What will hold students and parents accountable? • Plan states, "Young people will want to make a difference in their families and communities…" Why? What will motivate them? (pg. 2) • Where will the teachers come from…SFHS? • How will the presence of YPI and their two proposed academies impact SFHS overall?

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
		• Re: the Biotech Health Academy – YPI is in competition with SFHS for the same students, staff, space and community partners if both plans are approved. SFHS already has a Math, Sci, Tech Magnet. • Plan did not address the need for bilingual graduates, especially in the biotech health field, despite their student demographics. • The 4 priorities are ambitious. Vision, connection to students and priorities for success are clear but broad. The priorities offer much but there are not many details on how to follow through on them • No mention of how they will work with the students and staff on the SFHS campus to ensure a positive experience for all stakeholders. • Vision continually states that students will graduate career ready, yet does not state anywhere that students will graduate certified in anything that a student could use to get a job out of high school, which is of vital importance to the students *and* their parents.	
B. School Data Profile/ Analysis	A wide range of data is used to conduct a thorough, in-depth analysis—at a minimum the review must discuss (a) areas of strengths and concerns; (b) areas of improvement over recent years; (c) both positive and negative trends over the past few years; and (d) underlying root causes of persistent trends. The data analysis conveys a highly complex and profound understanding of the school community and whole student, including physical, emotional, social, and academic needs. The application focuses in on three to five critical issues that are highly relevant to the school and will have far-reaching impacts when improved upon. The issues identified cover instructional, behavioral, and operational needs, rather than focusing solely on one area.	<u>Strengths</u>: • Plan demonstrates a strong understanding of the school's current achievements. Data also show that there is clearly a need for improvement. • The data analysis offers an honest reflection of areas of strength but most importantly areas that need improvement. • Listed numerous sources for the data, including student focus groups • Identified three urgent issues: (1) classes are not relevant and students are unmotivated, (2) insufficient teacher support & PD, (3) lack of student support at home. Plan provides ample justification for why these three were chosen based on research and data analysis • Identified very low pass rates for A-G classes and a need to focus on this also. • SFHS proposal actually corroborates YPI's assumption that students have high aspirations to attend college, but graduate unprepared to follow those dreams, as well as the statement from a student that "a lot of teachers don't know what to do for the whole two hours" and that the SLC (magnet) and magnet teacher's commitment to learning is a school strength. It also appears that YPI's analysis is accurate in noting that teachers are not fully implementing what they learn in PD or that the PD does not adequately address student needs. <u>Concerns</u>: • This section is very repetitive and not concise. Seemed to be a lot of cut and paste of the same things over and over again and lots of definitions. • The challenges noted reflect the analysis of their data and is supported by research, but the proposed solutions are not explicitly connected to stated or identified student, teacher, and/or community needs.	• Who were the participants in surveys (parent committees or reps? How was survey collected? Paper/ pencil, discussions, interviews? Were there follow up surveys? • How much input did students have in the focus groups? How many and how were students chosen? How many times? • Plan states that EL and Spec. Ed students will be targeted for academic support. What does this look like? • Plan identifies a need for math improvement. What will you do differently? • How will you prepare students for college and career? • Shouldn't truancy rates be an urgent issue? How do you plan to address this issue? • There is no mention of how the high teacher absenteeism will be addressed—why not? • What is the evidence of LA Promise Neighborhood Full Service Community

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
		- Assumptions are made based on data from the Internet with a reference (without supporting data) to their past experience with similar populations. - No evidence of surveys or meetings with the students, parents, etc. to determine whether their assumptions from the data downloaded were true. - Survey data are not strong. The only survey cited was the School Experience Survey which is a perception survey and does not address why this is the person's perception (positive or negative) or potential solutions to the identified negative perceptions. The School Experience Survey had a participation rate of only 15%. - Truancy rate stood out as extremely high at 84.71%, but where did they get this data? The concern is that attendance rates are easily misinterpreted/ manipulated. If the school doesn't have a PSA counselor following up on absence notes then all of those absences count as truants. - Analysis determines that the only reason for truancy is that classes are not relevant for students; therefore students are not motivated (pg. 8), however, they did not conduct any student or parent surveys to confirm this. - An important issue that was not addressed as a focus area was the A-G courses passed with a C or better because this is a key district initiative. - Emphasized what is lacking at the school, but did not address the combination of things such as the partnership with parents, etc. that is also important. Seems to simply blame the school. - Plan suggests that the team collaborated with faculty, staff, teachers, community members, etc. but there was no evidence to show this—all members of the planning team really seem to be YPI members. *"The rate of students meeting grade level standards (Advanced/Proficient levels) drops in mathematics over the course of their time at the school."* This is a <u>highly</u> debatable analysis. There are too many factors to consider before they make a statement like that. - Stated that one of the problems was that the guidance counselor rate was 270:1. They are implying that this is too high, yet this is a low ratio in many schools. They do not say what ratio they are proposing or what will be different in how students are "guided" by their counselor. - Plan states that students said "...there should be more opportunities for real-world learning...more experiential learning." Reviewers had questions about who participated in the focus groups	Schools' successes? - How many students do you propose to have in each class? - The only intervention mentioned is before and after-school tutoring--where is the data that supports this type of intervention over in-class? - With such a high truancy rate, how will you get students to come earlier or stay later? - How do you plan to provide more support to teachers, as you state in your plan?
C. School Turnaround	Overall, the strategies, practices, programs, and policies identified in this section are linked to the vision statement of the school and the results of the team's data analysis—it is clear that when the strategies are fully, effectively implemented, the priority area will be	<u>**Strengths**</u>: Cite three strategies, 1) California Partnership Academies and linked learning, 2) blended learning; and 3) integration into the LA Promise Neighborhood/Full-Service Community Schools model of whole family support to address their three identified issues.	Will there be students identified in each acad for the CPA model (max. students funded in this model is 90) or will all students in each acad have the same opportunities for CPA cohorts

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
	addressed. The plan is clear, concise, and provides evidence that the school will accelerate student achievement fairly quickly, over the next few years. Evidence is provided to show that the strategies for turning around the school culture, into one that promotes the intellectual and social development of all students, are effective as well as realistic given the context of the school. Systems and structures will be established to support the transition to a culture/climate that supports the vision of the school and success of each future graduate. The plan demonstrates a thorough knowledge of the current school community and its stakeholders, including staff, students, parents and community members. This knowledge was used to develop thoughtful, tailored strategies to share, communicate and generate interest and create excitement for the school turnaround plan. The plan recognizes the need for a differentiated approach in order to fully engage each of the various stakeholder groups.	• Identified CPA/Linked Learning as a strategy to motivate students and provides ample research and studies to support this choice. • Specific example provided for how Blended Learning might work • 2 week summer institute and 5 days of in-service PD during the school year • Work based learning opportunities for PT or FT employment (pg. 11). This is important in high poverty areas for students to want to stay in school and parents to want to support and encourage their child to stay in school. • Good research justifying small schools and learning communities. • Realistic analysis of the school culture being characterized by parent and community involvement. • Starting with 9th grade only and adding a new grade each year makes it easier to build a program and to train and support teachers in implementing a program. It is not such a massive undertaking and allows for easy adjustments to the program based on stakeholder feedback. <u>Concerns</u>: • They provide the research to support their strategies, but there is no evidence that they have actually used these strategies. Excessive quoting of research without connection to school needs or vision. • Since they are starting with 9th grade, would have helped to explain how they will build the program over time until fully enrolling 9-12th. • No clear explanation or articulation of what they will do to provide for each particular subgroup of students. • No sense of how this will be so exciting and interesting in the classroom. • Multiple strategies with a lack of cohesiveness—Blended Learning (BL), CPA, Linked Learning, "hybrid elements," habits of mind, ALEKS, SFA, Khan, Voyager, SDAIE, etc. • Strategies within the three primary strategies seem very overwhelming, with lots of details. Too many parts per strategy to implement fully in their first year. • No detailed plan for implementing these strategies over the 4 years as they add successive grade levels. • With so many strategies within strategies, the teachers will have a hard time having a clear understanding of what they are learning and why. • Linked Learning and CPA are major strategies, but none of what they write is really a linked learning model. Also, becoming a CPA school would not be possible if they had their own CDS code—they can only be CPA if they are a school within a school, not an independent school. • <u>CTE</u>: Much discussion of CTE and there are very strong CTE guidelines for all the career pathways—but the plan did not include any of these things or describe	and classes? • How many students are projected to be in each Academy and each class? • Who will identify, coordinate and monitor internships, dual enrollment, partnerships, etc? • Who are the *"work force partners"*? • What will the *"targeted academic interventions to increase student achievement"* look like? • How will Blended Learning (BL) work with the interdisciplinary model? With EL students and Special Ed students? • With the 4 elements identified with blended learning, how do students do project based learning? How does this work with the 7 components of their Linked Learning model? • One full-time on-site Coordinator for FSCS will *"work with families to identify and address critical needs."* How will this work? CBOs seem overwhelmed with referrals. • How will college and career awareness be *"embedded in every school day..."*? • They identify their seven components of the linked learning instructional program and then state that their plan is a "hybrid." If they are using data and research to show that Linked Learning and CPA work, then how different is the "hybrid" model and does the research support this model? • Dual-enrollment: how will kids get there? Are the classes coming to them or will they have to travel to school? How will they combine these courses to enhance the curriculum? • How will you get all teachers to participate in 2 week summer institute?

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
		in detail what they could get from each of the universities near them. No course of study included. Also, they do not state that their graduates will be certified in anything upon graduation, nor do they address the importance of their graduates being bilingual in technical terms in their respective fields of study. They only mention that they will take a course in technical language. • <u>Blended Learning (BL):</u> explanation seems pretty generic. The section is a long description without a connection to school needs or student interest. 　- Habits of mind are included in the blended learning section without a connection to student ownership of learning. 　- Seems that a great deal of personalization is reliant on L. 　- No significant data was used to support the work of BL other than in a charter school • <u>Dual-enrollment:</u> not much detail is provided for HOW this will happen, only the rationale for why it is a good thing. • <u>Success For All, Habits of Mind:</u> these programs depend on students' intrinsic motivation. Might not work for these students if truancy is an issue. Students with high truancy rates need external motivators. • Within strategies there are definitions of proposed solutions that seem very basic and not focused. • Core assessment methods include textbook assignments and assessments. But this would not be a good way to motivate their students because they are not really outside-the-box or exciting. • All assessments are teacher created—no student voice, innovation, etc. The assessment list is very teacher-centered. Did not explain well how they are going to use the things that they listed. • There is a huge EL population yet, other than SDAIE and CRRE, it's very unclear how they will work with the EL students. • Lack of close connection to parents, teachers, staff, or students at all. Instead, the plan discusses a lot about what YPI has done (page 24). • Pg. 16 -- First and only time technical teachers are mentioned. There is no mention of what their role is, i.e., advisory, provide P.D, support, teach students, used in both academies…? • Marzano is mentioned for PD but who has the expertise to provide it? LASSC is mentioned to give help for Linked Learning as well as ConnectEd but they work mostly with schools that have been identified by the district as Linked Learning. Educational Elements will provide PD for BL. • Pg. 17 – First and only time Advisories are mentioned. Did not state how these will be implemented, when, or the purpose of the advisories. • Pg. 19 – "Community engagement activities" not specified. Did not see a plan for	Will they be paid? • What would the focus of PD? Is there a timeline? Is there a priority list since it seems like so much of it would be multi-year work? Who will be in charge? • Who will monitor and support teachers during implementation? • The classroom model (Att-8) shows seating for 49. Many classrooms are not large enough to accommodate this model. Have they determined if this model is possible? How many students will be in each classroom? Do they propose to have three groups of students rotating at all times? If so, will the teacher be trained and supported? • Do courses build upon previous courses or can students start in 10th, 11th, or 12th grades as those grades are added that did not start there as a 9th grader? • What program will they use to assess student's achievement level in ELA and math? • Pg. 16 – SF Biotech Health Academy teachers will utilize free teacher training opportunities. The school will also apply to Amgen-Bruce Wallace, a free educational outreach program. Are these virtual training programs or will trainers come on site? How are teachers supported as they implement their training? • How will technical teachers be utilized? • How will advisories be utilized? What is the intended outcome of advisories? Is there a set curriculum? How will they be monitored? What accountability measures are in place for students to

PSC School: <u>San Fernando High School</u>   **Planning Team Name: <u>Youth Policy Institute (YPI)</u>**

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
		motivating family to attend these events. • Web-based strategies like ALEKS depend on student access to technology at home. Do not see a plan in place to address students and/or parents who have no access to technology at home. • Plan to invite SFHS teachers, staff and students to orientations on the school turnaround plans for both Academies, *after* they have been approved, to elicit feedback and buy-in. • Pg. 20 – Plan relies on an active Parent Advisory Board to design activities that increase effective parent involvement. SFHS has had a hard time getting enough members on this board. What will YPI do differently? Also states a goal of a minimum of 30 parent volunteer hours each school year, but does not say how this will be attained. • No mention of how P.E. or languages are addressed in these academies or their plan to share facilities with SFHS. No mention of food or custodial services to address student and staff needs. • Plan will take teachers and students from SFHS. There is no mention of how this will impact SFHS. • Plan does not include staffing needs, i.e., ratio of teachers and/or counselors to students, administrative and teacher support staff (SAA/clerical, additional admin, coordinators, PSA, Parent Outreach Coordinator, instructional specialists, translators). • Wish plan included more info about the Full Service Community Schools approach. Parent involvement is so difficult in this community. Unclear whether it will actually be effective in their particular community and whether it is what parents asked for.	fully participate and produce what is expected? Will advisories be graded/course credit? Where fit into the Master Schedule? How many minutes? • Pg. 17 – How will students' and parents' "dreams" for them be established and known among teachers? • When/where/ how often do they expect teachers to meet with families face-to-face? Are materials for home instruction determined by the teacher? Do they need approval before being sent home? Who will translate materials? What guarantees that parents will receive these communications that are sent home? (p.18) • Pg. 18 Section 3.a. Who will be responsible for ensuring materials are "linguistically appropriate, culturally competent and inclusive"? Who is responsible for ensuring that the school community is informed and engaged in implementing the plan? • Pg. 20 - When do you plan to hold the Grand Opening Celebration? How will opening your Academies after students have selected Magnet Schools and/or Charter Schools affect your ability to attract students to your Academies?
D. Implementation	The benchmarks for determining progress are clearly articulated and will provide an accurate measure of whether or not the strategies, practices, programs, policies are having the intended impact. The timeline and process for measuring progress will be frequent and regular, enough to ensure that the team can spot trouble areas immediately and make mid-	<u>Strengths</u>: • Noted specific ways they will engage parents/families in looking at students' progress • Learning outcomes are identified with deliverables and measurable indicators for parent involvement • Funding was identified as a barrier but they are working on securing funding. Appears to have good funding track record. • Good analysis of barriers related to sharing facilities.	• If starting with 9th grade only, how will the Senior Year quarterly be implemented in Grade 9-11? • Listed under the Assessment Column in Table 5, what does "Every 3-6 weeks" mean? • What type of intervention programs do they plan? Details are vague.

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
	course corrections as necessary. There is a clear understanding of the realistic challenges that the school may face in turning around the school. The ideas for for counteracting these challenges are thoughtful, applicable, creative, and within reason.	<u>Concerns</u>: • Assessments and methods of assessments are very standardized, traditional and not new—wish they had gone into more detail about what the benchmarks were, and hadn't included every single type. • There are a great deal of assessment methods, on the same timeline, same assessments, for all subjects—this a lot for students. Will all be important? • Only one that is not listed throughout is the Senior Year Quarterly—unclear how they will prepare students for this one? • May make sense for students from the YPI media program at SFIAM to go to the SFHS one, concern there could be conflict with the Sylmar HS biotech program. • Question of the team's expertise with linked learning—it seems that they have only been implementing elements of linked learning. • Only barrier noted is blended learning, funding, added PD. • Writing is contradictory because funding barrier comment is followed with the fact that they have an excellent fundraising track record. • Project based learning not reflected as an authentic assessment that includes student voice and choice. • Proficiency is 75% for all content areas, should be reflective of school data and achievable in increments. • Only form of intervention mentioned is before or after school tutoring with no details of how this will be implemented so that students needing the most help will attend the tutoring sessions. • Pg. 23 Table 6: 100% of teachers complete PD trainings. No mention of 100% implementation, teacher support or means of ensuring that teachers implement their training with fidelity.	• (Pg. 23 Table 6) How will teachers be supported after training? • How will new hire teachers be trained and supported each successive year as new grades are added and/or teachers are hired during the school year after training has been started or completed? • What happens if YPI is not funded through the grants they've submitted? • Where will students create the "road map?"
E. Alternative Governance Models & Autonomies	The plan presents a clear rationale for the chosen alternative governance model as well as any requested autonomies and how these elements fully support the school's vision and instructional philosophy. A thorough explanation is provided for how the selected model will allow for high levels of academic achievement among the target population of students. Plan provides a thoughtful, comprehensive rationale for why each requested autonomy is necessary to support student achievement at the school. The plan explains what steps the school will take to ensure that a culture of shared leadership and	<u>Strengths</u>: • Provides a feeder school for the middle school students who have studied media • Pilot model will embrace autonomy and accountability • Teachers will develop a clear, agreed upon Elect to Work Agreement • Healthy-medical and media arts field terminology is included in their proposed curriculum. <u>Concerns</u>: • Two small schools under the Network Partner model. • Digital Arts Academy will become Pilot in the second year; SF Biotech will remain in the Network Partner model—they do not explain why one will go pilot while the other will not. • It does not seem they discussed this plan much with teachers and parents. • They don't seem to really understand the governance model—they note that the	• What is the advantage of having the Digital Arts Academy become a Pilot School and having the Biotech Health Academy remain as a Network Partner? • Only Media Governance discussed. Why not a plan for the Biotech Health Academy? • Why start with California state standards instead of Common Core Standards?

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
	decision-making focused on high student performance is in place to effectively implement the governance model and requested autonomies. Where applicable, evidence of staff input from UTLA members (e.g., petition, vote tally) is attached to the plan. *Governing School Council (pilot schools only):* Composition of the Governing School Council is in compliance with state regulations. Membership selection process is fair, equitable and also in compliance with state regulations. Roles and responsibilities of governing council is clearly articulated and broader than School Leadership Council. A draft of the Elect to Work agreement is attached. *NOTE: All pilot school applications will also be reviewed by the Pilot School Steering Committee.*	Governing Board has to meet the School Site Council percentages. • This section has definitions of governance autonomies but not directly connected to student achievement or school vision. • The list of Governing School Council members needs to be revisited. Need to check compliance of teachers, parents/community members, students. • The proposed Council (of 12) includes 4 YPI staff, 1 principal, 4 teachers, 2 parents and 1 student. Normal composition includes 3 parents, 3 students and 1 other, which could be a community rep. • Pg. 26 at top, states there will be 1 student on the Governing School Council, then refers to the Council as the board. At the end of that section, plan states the 2 Student Representatives will be Governing Board members. • Graduating students who are bilingual in Healthy-medical and media arts field terminology is not addressed. • Planning team included staff, parents, students, and community members but it is unclear how many and how often they participated • Unless the two academies will be considered one school they will not be able to apply to be a CPA. CPA pathways must be a school within a school.	
F. School Planning Team	Members of the school planning team were identified by a fair, equitable, transparent process; the team is diverse and representative of the entire school community, including faculty, staff, students, parents, and community members. All members, including the leader, fully participated and actively contributed to the plan development/writing process. Member contribution is noticeable and extended beyond those typically attributed to them (e.g., parents contributed in more ways than in discussions solely related to parent engagement). Parents and students were specifically engaged as plan writing/developing members and as leaders in the process. The process of developing the plan included equitable delegation of work and responsibilities, a comprehensive communication strategy to ensure all members are fully informed of decisions, and a conscious effort to regularly update the	<u>Strengths</u>: • Planning team included parents, staff, students <u>Concerns</u>: • Plan says they have been engaging parents for two years, and that they engaged the school, but did not name anyone other than YPI people. Entire planning team seems to be the YPI staff. Do not see the evidence of their actual engagement of parents. • Question is how connected they are with the actual school community. • Not enough evidence of a diverse team participating in plan development. • Engagement of parents in plan development was not strong. Parent data collected seems minimal. They also did not include neighborhood people or community agencies. Only received back 16.2% of their surveys back (out of 108 surveys distributed). • Plan to implement two suggestions made by parents: (1) To require uniforms, which is difficult to enforce at the HS level unless all area high schools do the same; and (2) To require teachers to switch classrooms instead of students, which is a strategy that will not build community or ownership and was not based on any research to validate implementing this instructional strategy.	• Where there any consistent parent/teacher participants in this plan? • The planning team included staff, parents, students, and community members—how many and how often did they participate with The YPI staff? • Why were so few (108) surveys completed by entire SFHS parent population? • What is the rationale for having teachers switch classrooms instead of students other than parents suggested the idea? Is there any research or data that shows that students perform better academically, are more connected to the school or any other benefit to the students?

Section of Proposal	Characteristics of an Exemplary Response	Comments *What were the strengths of the plan? Concerns or areas of weakness?*	Follow Up Questions
	school's community-at-large (beyond the members of the school planning team).		

School Visits

Did your Review Team conduct a School Visit? (circle one) YES / **NO**

Planning Team Interviews

Did your Review Team conduct a Planning Team Interview? (circle one)   YES / **NO**

Final Recommendation to the Superintendent

Overall Rating: (circle one)   Beginning   **Developing***   Well-Developed   Exemplary

Overall Comments: While there are areas that are well-developed, overall we feel that the plan is in the Developing Stage for the following reasons:

Vision & Instructional Philosophy: Plan highlighted four priorities and outcomes for students; it lays out YPIs fundamental values and core beliefs about powerful teaching and learning. Unfortunately, there is no clear evidence that stakeholders share these same core beliefs and the focus of the vision is difficult to identify. It is unclear how many students the school will start with and how many will eventually be enrolled in each academy. Key priorities and instructional strategies are meaningful and measurable, but the plan is highly ambitious for a large population, possibly for a small population, and in either case, very costly to implement with fidelity. It is unclear how students may change academies or what happens if a student fails to earn sufficient credits to advance to the next grade level. The plan also did not include the need for students to be bilingual upon graduation or address International Language or P.E. There appears to have been no collaboration with San Fernando HS, yet the two schools will be direct competition for students/teachers. There is a concern about how this will impact SFHS. The reviewers' main concerns were regarding ability to implement all strategies with fidelity, cost to implement, and stakeholder buy-in and willingness to make the changes.

School Data Profile/Analysis: Relevant data were used and the data analysis was connected to their vision for students. The instructional programs selected have solid supporting research. Furthermore, the Digital Arts Academy has a ready-made feeder population from San Fernando MS. The primary parent input seems to come from parents of students who are currently attending SFMS and will be matriculating to SFHS. However, the plan did not truly use anecdotal data, or go beyond stating just facts to convey a clear understanding of the data. Trends were not observed over a period of several years. The plan utilized collected data but not personal experience. Research did not include stakeholder surveys and conclusions seemed to depend entirely on data obtained from the internet. In developing the plan, the team did not draw from interviews with students/teachers participating in the instructional programs they are proposing or from visits to schools to observe these strategies—instead, they seemed to rely solely on their research of these programs. There was no community-based research to justify a Biotech Health Academy other than the fact that YPI has already had some success with a Biotech Academy at Verdugo Hills, a relatively local school which could be in direct competition for students and teachers. In sum, the reviewers questioned how much stakeholder input was taken into consideration. (Continued on following page.)

<u>School Turnaround:</u> The plan offers a clear response to this section with a strong rationale for the strategies identified & selected and a plan for turning around the existing school culture. The Planning Team clearly states how they will share/communicate to the entire school community and how the community will be engaged so that they are excited and invested in the plan's success. However, a multitude of strategies were listed to address the high priority issues, so it will be difficult to implement them all with fidelity. The reviewers were concerned that the plan includes everything that seems "good," but with little evidence to show they understood these practices deeply enough to implement thoroughly (examples include CPA and the pilot school model). The rationale for the plan included little or no input from potential stakeholders and, relatedly, the plan for turning around the existing school culture did not include surveys or interviews of how the school community predicts it will feel for staff, students and parents. It appeared that, to date, YPI has had little to no contact with the community.

<u>Implementation:</u> The plan clearly identified leading indicators that are connected to the key priority areas. The plan anticipates challenges within their control (based on prior experience implementing both of these academies on two other campuses), noting the challenges, weaknesses and idiosyncrasies of their school. The plan outlines possible strategies to minimize the impact of these barriers or avoid them altogether. Requiring teachers to sign a contract will ensure that they enlist motivated and committed teachers. They also have a good track record for securing funding. However, they do not have a plan in place in case their anticipated funding is not granted. Furthermore, the YPI team is changing their instructional strategies from what they have used at other sites and states that they have no experience implementing the instructional programs they are proposing for these new academies. They did not provide a rationale for why they are changing their instructional strategies with this plan. While teachers are required to sign a contract, there is no mention of students or parents being required to do the same in order to ensure the same level of motivation and commitment.

<u>Governance</u>/<u>Autonomies</u>: The plan provided a strong rationale for the autonomies requested based on their interpretation of data and experience, explaining how the school will foster a culture of collective responsibility and shared decision-making. It is unclear, however, why YPI is proposing that both academies begin as a Network Partner, with the Digital Arts Academy applying for Pilot School status in their 2nd year while the Biotech Academy remains a Network Partner school. No rationale was presented for this strategy. Neither the governance nor the autonomies selected seem based on stakeholder input, and YPI staff will represent a large proportion of the Governance Board. Their plan does not allow for membership by a community member or of any other school staff member other than the principal and 4 teachers. The reviewers are concerned that there is not a true feeling that parents/students or any other stakeholders had a real voice in developing this plan.

<u>Planning Team:</u> It is apparent that YPI's planning team is highly qualified to draft the plan. However, YPI staff are the only members listed on the team and dominate the creation of the plan. Allusions to a parent representative and input from a tech teacher are vague and no parents, community members or students were listed as team members. The plan included only a brief paragraph of how they plan to engage parents and the specific role they played in the development of the proposal.

*Please note that the rating and comments above reflect the review of the Superintendent's Review Panel members. While the Superintendent agreed with many of the areas of strength and weaknesses noted by the reviewers, given the numerous and serious concerns he identified, his final decision was to rate the plan **<u>Beginning</u>**.*