



**Public School Choice 3.0
Evaluation and Recommendations to the Superintendent**

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
PSC 3.0 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS			
42nd St. Elementary <i>LD 3/BD 1</i> <i>Focus</i>	42nd Street Elementary (Pittman)	<p>Strengths: None were noted during the discussion.</p> <p>Concerns: In 2006, the API was 647 and now in 2011, it is only 659. The plan did not convey a sense of urgency, nor did it address critical issues such as a student population that is 8% homeless and 30% or more in foster care. In fact, the plan was very generic and did not address diverse students' needs. The data show that the school has been cycling through the same fifty points for the last five years, and yet the data analysis was only peripheral with no specific targets identified. The school has a similar schools rank of 1 that indicates that lack of progress cannot be the sole result of the transient population.</p> <p>The staff and administrators at this school clearly have a number of challenges they face that extend beyond academic achievement. It was also unclear whether this school received the much needed support from the Local District or UTLA through the writing process.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
	Be the Change in Urban Education (BCUE)	<p>Strengths: The plan is strong in its proposal to develop a positive culture at the school—however, it is important to note that the demographics at 42nd Street EL are very different from the demographics (99% African American) at BCUE's currently operating school, CLAS. Philosophically, the school has some strong attributes, such as the focus on the how and why of instruction.</p> <p>Concerns: The plan is written like a middle school plan and the vast majority of the emphasis in the plan is on school culture instead of instruction. The plan states that the team will consult with LAUSD to determine how to work with their special education students; it was apparent that the team has little or no experience working with special education students. This plan also fails to address the large homeless and foster student population at 42nd Street EL. There was some question as to the stability with their existing charter school.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
107th St. Elementary <i>LD 7/BD 7</i> <i>Focus</i>	107th St. Elementary/ Magnet School (Rios)	<p>Strengths: The plan is well-developed, provides a thorough data analysis and is well-grounded in research.</p> <p>Concerns: There is an overload of research and not enough emphasis on exactly how the plan will be implemented. The plan relies heavily on local district support, which is a concern given the impending District reorganization. Parts of the plan seem over-ambitious, especially to implement all at once. It is suggested that the school take a phase-in approach, focusing initially on the priorities for the first year. For example, several different types of peer coaching are described in the plan, but the team may want to consider which element of peer coaching to implement first, before trying to implement the entire peer coaching framework.</p> <p>Questions to Address: Reviewers suggest the team provide an implementation timeline highlighting the priorities for the first year and the steps the school will take to reach its goals.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
<p>La Salle Elementary</p> <p><i>LD 8/ BD 1 Focus</i></p>	<p>La Salle Elementary/ LD 8 (Smith)</p>	<p>Strengths: The plan is well-written overall. Action research and a continuous improvement decision-making model permeates both teacher-team and administrator learning communities. Bilateral program evaluation and “reciprocal accountability” systems project genuine trust in and dependence on teacher professional judgment. The plan included a judicious and wisely conservative use of automatic LIS waivers. It is important to note that the plan is very similar to those written for two watch schools, Manhattan EL and West Athens EL. No specific concerns were noted in the discussion.</p> <p>Questions to Address: Reviewers suggest the team address the following questions: What is the nature of the partnership with Park Western EL and what aspects of Park Western does La Salle plan to emulate? How will the school address the fact that the demographic of students at Park Western is not the same as at La Salle?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Approved</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>
<p>Central Region Elementary School #21</p> <p><i>LD 5/ BD 7 New</i></p>	<p>SMArT Academy</p>	<p>Strengths: This is a thoughtful plan that proves the team is aware of the critical needs for the school. The instructional framework has four components: Response to Instruction & Intervention, 21st Century Skills as defined in Framework for 21st Framework Learning, 16 Habits of Mind, and Gradual Release of Responsibility Model. The program will follow California and Common Core State Standards, CA Treasures ELA program, DIBELS, enVision Math and CELDT assessments. Art is integrated throughout the instructional program.</p> <p>The proposal indicates that this school will participate in the Jefferson Pipeline in which all principals in this vertical structure of schools will meet monthly to discuss academic concerns. Professional development is based on the teaching-learning framework. The proposal has included <u>Second Step, Building Moral Intelligence</u> to work with students in creating a positive culture. <u>Echo Parenting</u> training will be available for parents. One key strength is that fourteen community organizations have been thoughtfully selected and are committed to supporting the school. The plan laid out ten clear first steps to impact student achievement immediately upon opening.</p> <p>Concerns: One possible concern was raised regarding the use of evaluations as a means for dismissal.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
<p>South Region Elementary School #5</p> <p><i>LD 6/BD 5 New</i></p>	<p>Academia de La Americas</p>	<p>Strengths: The plan was coherent and the strategies clearly aligned to the goals. The reviewers were impressed overall with this plan and appreciated the “ahead of the game” strategy. The plan included Common Core State Standards (CCSA) and references to greater use of non-fiction texts. The team highlighted plans for displaying student work, which also aligns to the Common Core, and there was a clear awareness of standards for mathematical practice. It was evident that the team truly respected and depended on the professional judgment of teachers.</p> <p>Concerns: Professional development (PD) plan was not clearly aligned to the instructional plan. For example, PD for CCSA was part of a five-day teacher orientation, but was just one component in a list of many other items to be covered. Performance goals were ambitious and realistic but they need more language about how the school would support English Learners.</p> <p>Questions to Address: Reviewers suggest the team provide further details showing how the professional development plan is aligned with the instructional plan and additional information about how the school will support English Learners.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>
	<p>Community Powered Public Schools (Sievers)</p>	<p>Strengths: None were noted during the discussion.</p> <p>Concerns: The applicant clearly does not have the experience or capacity to develop a strategic plan to support student achievement. A major concern is that the plan places an over-reliance on the creation of a Local Board of Directors that would exercise authorities over the principal—this is not a viable leadership plan for a school. Finally, there is a fundamental lack of knowledge and understanding of the basic requirements of an elementary school.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>
<p>South Region Elementary School #9</p> <p><i>LD 6/BD 5 New</i></p>	<p>School of Social Justice & Service Learning</p>	<p>Strengths: The writing team has conducted a comprehensive needs analysis and identified English Learners (ELL) as a top priority. They describe a wealth of instructional content that will be implemented to support the needs of ELL students. The plan incorporates a school-wide plan for using assessment data to inform instruction, as well as collaborative strategies to build trust and support for students. A dual-language program will be implemented. The applicant team also lays out a clear definition of rigor. Several community partnerships were identified.</p> <p>Concerns: The plan seems over-ambitious with limited resources—it addresses too many issues and plans to do more than seems feasible. Interestingly, despite being a Local District-led plan, it also did little to embed District initiatives into the plan. Unlike the Public Educators of South Gate plan, this plan did not provide a clear outline of professional development or Professional Learning Communities. Reviewers suggest that a detailed action plan/timeline to identify key priorities may be beneficial.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>
	<p>Public Educators of South Gate</p>	<p>Strengths: Professional development and its connection to assessments was thoroughly explained, as was the description of the Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)—this was noted as a major strength of the plan. Research was thoroughly cited and the school clearly planned to do a lot of assessment. English Learners and Standard English Learners are a top priority subgroup for this school, which the plan addressed. As in the Social Justice plan, this plan also is for a dual-language program.</p> <p>Concerns: It was somewhat unclear exactly how differentiated student support will be provided. Some aspects of the plan were not detailed and it was therefore difficult to determine how the various elements would come together to support student learning. Additionally, the response to parent/community engagement was extremely general, as was the description of how the dual-language program would be implemented.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
	Community Powered Public Schools (Sievers)	<p>Strengths: None were noted during the discussion.</p> <p>Concerns: The applicant clearly does not have the experience or capacity to develop a strategic plan to support student achievement. A major concern is that the plan places an over-reliance on the creation of a Local Board of Directors that would exercise authorities over the principal—this is not a viable leadership plan for a school. Finally, there is a fundamental lack of knowledge and understanding of the basic requirements of an elementary school.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
<p>South Region Elementary School #10</p> <p>LD 7/BD 1 New</p>	Local District 7/UTLA	<p>Strengths: The plan conveys a commitment to solid instruction and a recognition that students are entering local elementary schools significantly below accountability targets. Year one goals reflect plans to increase proficiency by 3-6% while decreasing students performing Below Basic/Far Below Basic 3-6% as well. Research is cited to support current LAUSD instructional materials, the use of RTI, and the formation of Professional Learning Communities for teachers and Small Learning Communities for students. Strategies for both English Learners and Standard English Learners are tiered according to the RTI framework. The needs of identified gifted/high ability students are also addressed. Professional development is driven by quantitative and qualitative data with PD on teacher-made tests. Parent engagement includes the formation of a School Family Action Team with activities such as student-led conferences, student work portfolios sent home, neighborhood walks and home visits. Plan also includes a seven-hour day once a week for enrichment activities and students, parents, and teachers have 20 hours per year volunteer time. A partnership with Pepperdine University will provide professional development for parents.</p> <p>Concerns: The plan would be improved by strengthening by the students with disabilities section by including Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction. The section on professional development could also be more detailed. There was some concern that the plan lacked a sense of urgency over the needs and struggles of the sending schools—although this is a new school, it should be viewed as a turnaround situation for the students who will be attending.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
	LA's Promise (Formerly MLA Partners)	<p>Strengths: The plan was clear, well-written, and thorough. The information in the plan indicated that LA's Promise has done much good work with existing schools. LA's Promise proposes to follow a Promise Neighborhood model in developing the school, which is a great idea for the community.</p> <p>Concerns: A closer look LA's Promise's data reveals that the schools they currently operate are not experiencing dramatic gains. While the plan clearly conveys a sense of high expectations for all students, across subgroups, setting the exact same graduation requirements and proficiency goals for all students, regardless of base-level data, is not at all realistic. AYP goals are also high, but again seem unrealistic. Furthermore, there was no apparent element of differentiation in the instructional program. The plan for articulation seems focused on other LA's Promise schools, but not with the other schools in the area. Additionally, the plan reads like a middle school proposal with just the grade levels changed; there was some lack of familiarity with elementary school policies. For example, the plan proposes a student council for all grade levels, but it was not clear how this would be implemented in the early grades, such as kindergarten. Overall, the readers liked what was written in the plan, but it was not at all clear that the organization had the capacity to successfully implement it.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
	Community Powered Public Schools (Sievers)	<p>Strengths: None were noted during the discussion.</p> <p>Concerns: The applicant clearly does not have the experience or capacity to develop a strategic plan to support student achievement. A major concern is that the plan places an over-reliance on the creation of a Local Board of Directors that would exercise authorities over the principal—this is not a viable leadership plan for a school. Finally, there is a fundamental lack of knowledge and understanding of the basic requirements of an elementary school.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Approved

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
South Region Elementary School #11 <i>LD 7/BD 1</i> <i>New</i>	Local District 7/UTLA	<p>Strengths: The plan was well-developed and proposed an engaging instructional program. The school would be divided into into a kindergarten through 3rd grade core program and 4th through 6th grade students will be organized into small learning communities to receive thematic units. This plan was very thorough in addressing the needs of special populations. Culture plan was also very strong. The school will provide various programs for behavioral, socio-emotional needs. The goals in the plan were very realistic. One major highlight was the attention paid to parents—the school will have a family center to provide parent workshops and parenting classes. The school would like to hire a parent resource liaison.</p> <p>Concerns: Reviewers noted some concerns regarding the available funds/resources to support the some of the work. For example, the detailed parent engagement plan would clearly require sufficient funds; the professional development plan also includes five days of substitute release time and conferences for teachers. The reality of limited resources needs to be kept in mind.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
	Community Powered Public Schools (Sievers)	<p>Strengths: None were noted during the discussion.</p> <p>Concerns: The applicant clearly does not have the experience or capacity to develop a strategic plan to support student achievement. A major concern is that the plan places an over-reliance on the creation of a Local Board of Directors that would exercise authorities over the principal—this is not a viable leadership plan for a school. Finally, there is a fundamental lack of knowledge and understanding of the basic requirements of an elementary school.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
South Region Elementary School #12 <i>LD 7/BD 7</i> <i>New</i>	Local District 7/UTLA	<p>Strengths: This is a well-developed plan in all areas. Instructional framework includes accelerated learning and an activity-based model; the learning will be multi-sensory, project-based, and will connect knowledge to real-world experiences, particularly in math, science, and technology. Service learning is a key component and English Learners will be provided good supports. One interesting idea is that students in grades 5 and 6 will have an active role in the development of their IEPs. Several good examples of differentiation for gifted/talented students are given. Training for teachers will specifically address the unique needs of the school community. The specific goals of the plan are supported throughout the document, through RTI, supports for social and emotional needs, Safe Harbor, TBLT and AEMP strategies. The school will be K-6, with small learning communities for students in grades 4 through 6 (emphasis on math, science and technology). The schedule includes a seven-hour day, two days a week. The plan is creative—for example, the plan describes the building of four gardens representing each of California's four ecosystems.</p> <p>Concerns: It is important to note that the primary sending school for SRES #12 is Miramonte EL. There will need to be sensitivity to these students included in the school culture. Otherwise, there are no major concerns with the plan although there were certainly areas that could be strengthened. For one, the plan could be strengthened with specific examples of what curriculum will look like in the classroom. Also, the plan notes that teachers would be responsible for investigating resources/funding for the school; there should obviously be some collaboration in this effort for coherence and consistency. The plan also requested many waivers—want to ensure these are well-reviewed.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
	Community Powered Public Schools (Sievers)	<p>Strengths: None were noted during the discussion.</p> <p>Concerns: The applicant clearly does not have the experience or capacity to develop a strategic plan to support student achievement. A major concern is that the plan places an over-reliance on the creation of a Local Board of Directors that would exercise authorities over the principal—this is not a viable leadership plan for a school. Finally, there is a fundamental lack of knowledge and understanding of the basic requirements of an elementary school.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Approved

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Valley Region Elementary School #13</p> <p><i>LD 1/BD 6</i> <i>New</i></p>	<p>Local District 1 (Del Cueto)</p>	<p>Strengths: Overall, the instructional plan follows current District initiatives. The plan addresses specific needs of the community including a projected 53% of students being English Learners, 7% identified gifted, high crime rates, parents' lack of high school degrees, and decreasing income.</p> <p>The team appears to have worked with both the middle and elementary school levels and, through VRES #13, aim to provide a full complex of services. Cal State University Northridge will be a key partner by providing a student writing project. Several other community partnerships will support programs such as afterschool. A good service learning program will be put in place, as well as an inner city arts program.</p> <p>Questions to Address: Reviewers suggest the team address the following issues. First, the sending schools range widely in scores, from 28% to 50% proficient in ELA and 39% to 67% proficient in math. Therefore, very specific Tier 2 intervention planning and organization would strengthen the plan as would further elaboration on how support personnel will be integrated into RTI both behaviorally and academically.</p> <p>Additionally, the plan proposes traditional intervention models, such as before/after school and Saturday School. However, these have not necessarily been proven effective, so what other strategies will be used to differentiate instruction and provide effective intervention/prevention? Finally, team should clarify how the Standard English Learner program is connected to the curriculum and how students with special needs are supported.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Approved</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
PSC 3.0 SPAN SCHOOLS			
Harry Bridges Span K-8 <i>LD 8/BD 7</i> <i>New</i>	Local District 8 (Mardesich)	<p>Strengths: The team focused on a family approach for students. A major aim of the school is to avoid the difficult elementary to middle school transition. The school plans to work closely with the Harry Bridges foundation at the nearby port, and use the port as a resource for project-based learning. Students will have access to a mental health Healthy Start Coordinator through USC, and additional support through programs such as Safe Passages and Peace Builders. There is a built-in, targeted Advisory Period as well as peer mentor support. The professional development (PD) plan describes a Buddy System for new teachers and peer observation. Professional Learning Communities will be engaged in action research. Teachers will develop formative assessments and use running records. The design team is comprised of strong educators with the capacity to greatly impact student learning. Overall, the plan conveys a sense of caring and a true collaborative spirit.</p> <p>Concerns: The major concern was the fact that the middle school portion of the plan seemed void. Furthermore, while the PD schedule for the beginning of the year was explained, the remainder of the year was less clear. The plan noted that arts and environmental education would be developed later, but it was not clear how.</p> <p>Questions to Address: Reviewers suggest the team provide an implementation/action plan and include details about the PD plan, describing the full year and how will it connect to the instructional program. Additionally, the middle school section of the plan must be strengthened.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
Valley Region Span K-8 #1 <i>LD 2/BD 6</i> <i>New</i>	Sylmar STEM Academy (DREAMS)	<p>Strengths: The emphasis in this plan on personification and collaboration along with project-based learning, interdisciplinary instruction, and a focus on Math, Science and Engineering will create critical thinking, collaborative and focused students. A key component of this school is partnerships with CSUN and Mission College as well as other community based organizations.</p> <p>Concerns: While STEM is the declared emphasis, the plan seemed to lack a clear STEM focus and no engineering component was apparent. Also troubling was the fact that no one on the design team seemed to have a STEM background. There was no evident plan laid out in the proposal for how to roll out STEM; ultimately, the plan read as if this could have been any kind of school without a focus. Also, much of the emphasis in the plan was on the middle school level. The plan also referenced an i3 grant but it is unclear how the grant would include VR Span.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
	Sylmar Leadership Academy (Local District 2)	<p>Strengths: Students would be organized into Personal Learning Environments or Houses with service learning as a main component of their instructional plan. The design team conducted a thorough analysis of relevant data and has duly taken note of the academic gaps. Common understandings and protocols such as word walls, display of student work and data chats will be universally applied. PD will include Lesson Study and weekly reverse minimum days to incorporate PD in the mornings. To improve school culture, students will have adult mentors; the school will implement Second Step, Caught Being Good and student uniforms. Partners include California State University Northridge (CSUN), LAEP, and Project Grad.</p> <p>Concerns: This read like a very adult-focused plan and overall, most of the plan seemed standard rather than innovative. PD plan did not address extra collaboration time and plan did not seem to leverage the LIS waivers effectively. It was also unclear exactly how partners such as CSUN and Project Grad support K-8?</p> <p>Questions to Address: Reviewers suggest the team provide further clarification regarding how leadership will be developed among these young students. How will the school identify students in leadership, especially since this should be the forte (as it is the namesake) of the school?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
PSC 3.0 MIDDLE SCHOOLS			
Sun Valley Middle School <i>LD 2/BD 6 Focus</i>	Sun Valley MS (Lee)	<p>Strengths: The plan has a well-defined program. One highlight was that the 6th and 7th grade teachers will teach a review for 8th graders to refresh them in their math skills. 6th graders will be separate from the other grades and organized into teams to complete co-projects. There will also be a pull-out from PE for 6th graders requiring intervention. There are many quality elements in the program, including AVID, service learning, and a summer Bridge program with Youth Policy Institute (YPI). YPI has been identified as a close partner in this plan and it appears their role is well-delineated. The plan outlines a genuine, whole-child approach and addresses the socio-emotional as well as the academic needs of the students. Furthermore, the needs of long-term English Learner students are also specifically addressed.</p> <p>Concerns: There was some concern regarding the daily “Plus One” period, which involves 20 minutes of sustained silent reading with YPI providing the classroom libraries—this does not seem to be the best use of the time. If this period is going to exist, it is a useful opportunity and should be very high-quality time. The plan indicates the intent to expand Sun Valley MS so that it eventually includes high school (span 6th-12th grade). It is unclear how this will take place, whether this is a viable option, and what this means for the feeder pattern in the area. Furthermore, the team self-identified as a “hybrid” model (traditional/Network Partner) but the school is in fact proposing a traditional governance model—all parties should be made aware of this distinction.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
South Region Middle School #3 <i>LD 6/BD 5 New</i>	Preparing for STEM Academy (Local District 6)	<p>Strengths: This plan proposes a high-quality instructional program. The team is very specific about what they will do in math and English; their proposal actually drills down to the very concrete parts of their math program, while English will be thematic and conceptual. Qualities of potential employees are described in great detail. They have a goal of becoming a model school, though it was not clear how this would happen.</p> <p>Concerns: While this plan clearly demonstrates instructional expertise, little information on school structure was provided. For example, while the importance of the social-emotional well-being of students is highlighted, no explanation is given for how students would be supported in this way. Additionally, this team did not seem to be as well-connected to the community as the other two plans clearly are. One particular concern was regarding the curriculum and what would be implemented year one. The plan acknowledged that the full STEM curriculum would take at least three years to write, but the current year’s plan was unclear. Finally, the plan is heavily dependent on outside sources of funding.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
	Teacher Leaders for Social Responsibility-Social Justice	<p>Strengths: This plan used research-based best practices and conducted a very thorough, thoughtful data analysis to address the needs of all students. The plan was easy to read and clearly written. There appeared to be an organic vertical articulation. Professional development was tied to the instructional goals and student needs, and the instruction will follow the constructivist approach, using real-world problem solving to explore the themes of social justice and service learning. Academic rigor and college readiness are clearly emphasized. The parent engagement plan is a significant strength. Note: this plan is very similar to the IES plan—the Social Justice and IES plans were written by the same team.</p> <p>Concerns: None specifically noted during the discussion.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
	Teacher Leaders for Social Responsibility-STEM (Institute for Environmental Science or IES)	<p>Strengths: This plan has a very strong connection to the community and the IES plan clearly explained in detail how students’ social-emotional needs would be supported. Professional development was tied to instructional goals. The instructional program focused on a pacing plan for the various grade levels. Like the Social Justice plan, this was easy to read and the curriculum was well-organized.</p> <p>Concerns: Several elements of this proposal need to be strengthened, particularly when compared to the other two plans at this site. For one, the instructional program seems less well-developed than the other plans. The English Language Learner program could also be strengthened. This plan also appears to be less clearly focused on its theme of environmental science. For example, it mentions the addition of service learning to their program, which seemed like an idea simply carried over from the Social Justice plan of the same team.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
PSC 3.0 HIGH SCHOOLS			
Carson High <i>LD 8/BD 7</i> <i>Focus</i>	Academy of Medical Arts (AMA)	<p>Strengths: This plan was submitted by a group of teachers from the highest performing existing SLC on the campus. It includes some good instructional programming such as interdisciplinary learning, Humanitas, linked learning, and project-based learning. Project Citizen is an intriguing program and actually seems to be working for some of their current students. First period will be designated as the “advisory” of sorts; overall, it appears the plan provides a good start to developing a positive culture and create the safety nets for students. In fact, culture development is well-addressed in the plan and it is a critical issue for the school, especially given the recent student conflict that occurred on campus. The small schools may help with some of the culture—attendance and drop out issues may be helped.</p> <p>Concerns: The plan itself is heavy on philosophy, and very light in terms of actual implementation/action planning. There was also some concern voiced amongst reviewers about whether the small school structure may create more segregation. There will need to be a shared agreement amongst the various schools on the campus about how the building is shared and other issues unique to a shared site. Finally, it was unclear to the reviewers whether AMA and AEE are planning to operate 9th-12th grade next year? This is a question related to WASC that will need to be addressed.</p> <p>Questions to Address: The reviewers suggest the team provide further details regarding their implementation plan.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
	Academies of Education and Empowerment (AEE)	<p>Strengths: Although some pieces of the plan may be overly ambitious, the team has included several good strategies that are well-grounded in data as well as a thorough analysis of the current school situation. Strategies include writing across curriculum, interdisciplinary learning, and a freshman success academy. The existing timeline for curriculum development also adequately acknowledges the challenging work it will be to implement their work.</p> <p>Concerns: The student intervention plan could be strengthened and their curriculum could have greater rigor at the upper grades. The plan also discusses offering all students two pathways by 10th grade, but it will be difficult to sustain two academies with only 500 students and a corresponding budget—may need to consider increasing the enrollment limit for this pilot. Having a peer review committee is a good idea but it will be hard to start in year one and may be hard overall with such a small staff and so many competing needs.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
	Carson High School/ Local District 8 (ESBMM)	<p>Strengths: This program includes research-based strategies planned for use in classrooms. The plan has built intervention into a new schedule, a schedule that also allows for more PD time (on a weekly basis). There is a focus on SDAIE, AVID, PBL and some school wide strategies.</p> <p>Concerns: The plan includes several different instructional initiatives and it seems the plan should be more focused. Also concerned that there is not nearly enough time for teachers to collaborate given all the different ways they are expected to create things in this plan. And governance model does not build in extra time. This plan is mediocre and is unlikely to yield substantive change. One thing to note is that the school needs to keep an eye on enrollment to keep all five SLCs viable.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Dorsey High <i>LD 3/BD 1</i> <i>Focus</i></p>	<p>A Stronger Dorsey (Sample)</p>	<p>Strengths: The writing team had goals and a plan that worked toward what the school hoped to achieve. The vision highlighted the team's plan for continuous improvement at the school. In order to address low performance in math, the plan noted that there would be weekly assessments in math and that WestEd would join Dorsey as a partner in an entry-to-algebra program. WestEd will also implement its reciprocal accountability system and provide objective monitoring and feedback of the data-review/response process at the school. In fact, several community partners would join with the school for various programs. A waiver was requested for an additional hour of service, likely in order to extend to a 7-block schedule. This would allow the school to include the programs it highlighted, such as linked-learning, project-based learning, a capstone project, etc.</p> <p>Concerns: It is unclear exactly what major reforms and changes will take place at the school in order to turn around the chronic under-achievement. It did not appear that the necessary sense of urgency was conveyed throughout the plan. The school has shown some progress over the past couple years, but it does not appear as though the plan takes full advantage of this opportunity to implement something innovative and impactful. The school has been making gradual, but not satisfactory progress. Math, in particular, is an area of serious concern. There does not appear to be a clear plan for how the school will turn around the achievement to reach their set goal of 12% proficiency, which is itself a low target. The plan notes improving staff support and professional development (PD), but there does not appear to be increased PD time. The plan states three days of PD a month, but does not indicate how this is a change from the current system, how long the PD would last, etc. The school has improved 90 API points over the past six years and has moved to 595 from 579 in the past year. However, there was a question of whether this is sufficient growth to expect from the school. Additionally, it was noted during the discussion that the proficiency rates among African American students at Dorsey is lower than the District average. Additionally, the plan noted that the students feel less safe now than they have in the past.</p> <p>Questions/Request for Rewrite: Will there be increased time in the schedule to support PD? Further explanation of the PD program is necessary. Also, what exactly will be WestEd's role at the school, specifically in supporting math instruction? WestEd also supports several other LAUSD schools; what is their capacity to provide high-quality services to all of them? Who will help the school identify and facilitate the changes needed to turn the school around? The reviewers were unclear about assessments, school-wide attendance and tardy policies, and the reading apprenticeship. It is clear the school needs consistency in leadership, a focused vision, and support in the turnaround effort.</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved </p> <p>A consensus decision was not reached. 5 reviewers voted Not Approved; 3 reviewers voted for Provisional Approval.</p>
<p>Los Angeles High <i>LD 3/BD 1</i> <i>Focus</i></p>	<p>LA HS Redesign</p>	<p>Strengths: This was a well-written, system-wide plan to monitor instruction. The instructional philosophy and strategies are comprehensive and grounded in evidence-based educational practices and teaching methods. The program includes project-based, interdisciplinary learning, differentiated instruction, and cognitive apprenticeships embedded within the academic program. It is evident that the data analysis led to the development of the instructional plan, as the needs of the school are identified and addressed in detail. The plan provides numerous examples of assessment tools that are intended to identify students needing intervention. The instructional program, which revolves around Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), is designed to support differentiated instruction and address the intervention and accelerated learning needs for students in all subgroups. The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) will be composed of Lead Teachers, Dept. Chairs, Administrators, Coordinators and coaches who will meet regularly to monitor and support the implementation of the school's instructional plan. It was also clear that the school has made some substantial progress over the past two years by gaining 73 API points.</p> <p>Questions to Address: Reviewers suggest the team clarify the 9th grade academy and how the students will be integrated in the 4 SLCs.</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved </p>

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Sylmar High</p> <p><i>LD 2/BD 6</i></p> <p><i>Focus</i></p>	<p>Sylmar HS</p>	<p>Strengths: No specific strengths were noted during the discussion.</p> <p>Concerns: There was concern among the reviewers that the plan seemed to lack a sense of urgency around improving student achievement. The plan did not introduce new ideas for instruction or an overall reform strategy that would yield better results than current performance data. SDAIE strategies and differentiation are mentioned, but the plan provides very few specifics for exactly how these strategies will be implemented and their usage monitored for continuous improvement.</p> <p>Furthermore, the performance goals were very low and unambitious—goals indicated the school would increase proficiency by only 2%. While some gains have been made over the years, proficiency rates continue to be low; the very low math scores were not adequately addressed in the plan. The recent API increase is promising, but the school did not go deep into determining what student’s urgent needs are, nor how the school will continue to improve. Professional development lacks detail and a real connection to students’ needs. The plan addressed the need for students to have higher expectations for themselves, but the same emphasis was not addressed for the adults.</p> <p>As a note, Sylmar High recently lost about 1500 students to the new Chavez HS last year, which has undoubtedly changed their student demographics, as students and teachers moved over to the new campus. Consequently, Sylmar HS has experienced chaos for the past two years. The reviewers believe Sylmar HS needs intensive support to create an action plan that will work for the school and improve student achievement.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Approved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>
	<p>Youth Policy Institute (YPI)</p>	<p>Strengths: The plan overall was well-written with specific strategic detail its instructional plan. The plan focuses on implementing a linked learning approach as a comprehensive high school reform strategy. The school will prepare students for two industry sectors: 1) health-medical and 2) media arts. A clear research base is described in the plan that provides their justification for utilizing such an approach. The plan includes innovative approaches to integrating technology such as the Khan Academy, a free online-learning community that provides free micro-lectures. YPI also has the benefit of a good track record for afterschool programming and parent involvement.</p> <p>Concerns: There were some elements in the plan that were unclear and the team’s ability to implement their plan fully was somewhat in question. For example, the plan noted that the school would seek WASC accreditation so it appears they plan to operate under a new CDS code. The plan also describes managing two 500-seat small learning communities, but Sylmar has more than 1000 students; therefore, YPI will manage only a portion of the school. Having multiple operators on one campus may create some confusion on the campus. YPI currently manages charter schools, but their track record in instructional programs is not clear to the reviewers. Their plan also does not include any teachers/representatives from Sylmar HS.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Approved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Wilson High School</p> <p><i>LD 5/BD 2</i> <i>Focus</i></p>	<p>Wilson HS (Rosin)</p>	<p>Strengths: The entire school plan is well-integrated and coherent. It sets goals substantiated by evidence from school data and the aspirations of faculty, administration and community members. The curricular thematic umbrella and approach of the International Baccalaureate (IB) program permeates professional development (PD) and the continual improvement of curriculum, assessments, and other school programs. All programs are implemented differentially by permanent subject-alike and interdisciplinary teams as well as individual teachers who have creative ownership of their products. Individual and group accountability mechanisms are aligned in support of this common work. It is notable that the IB program will actually extend down to middle school and elementary feeder schools that are currently running IB programs. The school has also shown slow but steady API growth since 2008.</p> <p>Concerns: Developing an IB program is demanding work. Fortunately, it appears that the faculty took the time to understand IB fully before committing to support the plan. It also appears that the school is currently undergoing the IB review and the reviewers believed Wilson High would be approved. One thing for the school to keep in mind is that the IB program must ensure differentiation for all student groups, including English Learners, students with disabilities, etc.</p> <p>Question to Address: The reviewers suggest that the team set more aggressive goals for student achievement.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>
<p>Hilda Solis High School Academy (Formerly East LA Star)</p> <p><i>LD 5/BD 5</i> <i>New</i></p>	<p>Hilda Solis Medical & Health Science Academy (Velazquez/UTLA)</p>	<p>Strengths: The community engagement plan was very thorough and genuine. It seems that the writing team understands the community well.</p> <p>Concerns: The instructional plan was not concise or coherent. Overall, the entire plan seemed disjointed. For example, the plan mentions the International Baccalaureate (IB) program, but does not explain how it will be rolled-out or implemented. It was not clear that the team fully understands the IB program. Linked learning is also noted in the plan, but not in connection to or to be integrated with the IB program. This raises serious concerns about how they will manage both programs. The instructional program and framework were not discussed in great detail, and despite the naming of the school and emphasis on medical/health programs, there was not much explanation of how the theme would be integrated across the curriculum. The reviewers also noted that this plan is actually in many ways very similar, if not identical, to the Hilda Solis Learning Academy plan, and it seems odd that the two teams did not work together.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>
	<p>Hilda Solis Learning Academy (LD 5)</p>	<p>Strengths: One innovative aspect of the plan is the discussion of using mobile devices as instructional tools—for example, replacing hardback textbooks with digital devices.</p> <p>Concerns: Overall, this plan lacked a clear, coherent instructional program and explanation of the instructional approach—instead, the team simply cites that they will use the District curriculum. The community engagement plan was also very weak. This team also did not thoroughly explain how the medical/health emphasis of their program would be integrated into the curriculum.</p> <p>The reviewers decided they could not support either plan submitted for Hilda Solis Academy. Instead, the reviewers believe it may be worth it to consider moving an existing small learning community from nearby Garfield High School onto the new Hilda Solis campus. In this way, a proven, effective instructional program will be provided the space to expand at Hilda Solis and this opportunity will likely already have the added benefit of the support of both the community and student body.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
<p>South Region High School #7</p> <p><i>LD 6/BD 5</i> <i>New</i></p>	<p>LIBRA Academy</p>	<p>Strengths: LIBRA Academy submitted an excellent, well-articulated plan. The plan clearly demonstrated a deep understanding of research-based strategies and the content curriculum integrated social-emotional learning as well. The team conducted a thorough analysis of several data sources, which led to the formation of the instructional plan. The program, which revolves around Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), is designed to support differentiated instruction and address the learning needs of all students. The plan references an Equity & Access training that staff participated in to work on strategies to providing learning for all students. The plan also lays out precisely how the school will maintain a positive school culture. The writing team is extremely experienced and highly-qualified—and the group is already a functioning pilot school. LIBRA has been in existence since Sept. 2009 at Huntington Park HS. In 2010, the API score for the Academy was 726 and in 2011, their score leapt to 821. Proficiency rates in math climbed 13% points and 84% of 10th grade students passed CAHSEE—these rates are impressive.</p> <p>Concerns: Community involvement seems somewhat limited. The plan needs more consistent methods of engaging parents in the educational experience as well as opportunities for authentic decision-making roles. One item to note is that this is an existing pilot school—therefore, the transfer to SRHS #7 may require some additional discussion with UTLA.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>
	<p>Huntington Park Institute of Applied Medicine (HPIAM)</p>	<p>Strengths: The instructional philosophy and strategies are comprehensive and grounded in evidence-based educational practices and teaching methods. Several key research-based practices are referenced. The mission of the school is to teach values that include high expectations for performance, collaboration, accountability, and a dedication to continuous improvement. This particular group has been functioning as a small learning community (SLC) of 500 students (grades 9-12) at Huntington Park HS since the fall of 2011. The team, led by the current small school coordinator, has demonstrated throughout the plan that the team has the experience and knowledge of working with their students. They understand the need for immediate impact and high student achievement; this is clear in the research-based instructional plan they are proposing.</p> <p>Concerns: The plan lacks evidence of a systematic approach to English Learners and detailed support structures for students with disabilities—the pieces are not presented as a coherent system. Additionally, the team plans to operate as a pilot school and included an Elect to Work agreement, but it must be clarified that they may not do so until a staff vote is conducted in their first year of operation. The parent engagement plan, though comprehensive, was identical to the version in the School of Social Justice Plan. Reviewers assumed the two teams are planning to work together, but while it makes sense to share a parent center, there was some concern that the plans did not have unique parent engagement plans.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>
	<p>School of Social Justice (Toledo, Diaz, Valerio)</p>	<p>Strengths: This school proposes to use project-based learning and each grade level has a different thematic focus (e.g., 9th graders focus on human rights). This plans calls for a process that will ensure that a culture of teacher/staff accountability is established. After expectations and goals are in place, ongoing performance will be measured to check whether or not all identified goals and expectations have been met. Much like the other plans for this school, the School of Social Justice team developed out of an existing SLC at the Huntington Park HS campus. This group seems to be a 9th grade only SLC, and their API was 721 compared to the Huntington Park overall API of 605. The plan has addressed each area of focus and provided research-based strategies for accelerating student learning and sustaining academic achievement. The data presented in the plan proves that there is knowledge on how to achieve student success. By continuing what has proven successful, as a small school and adding the additional foci, the school has much potential to succeed.</p> <p>Concerns: It was less clear in this case than with the other plans what exactly the team would prioritize for their first year of implementation and their immediate strategies for the initial school year. Also, the parent/community engagement plan was identical to the one in the HPIAM plan.</p> <p>Questions/Request for Rewrite: The reviewers felt it would be beneficial for this team to develop an implementation plan/action steps detailing the priorities for the first year of operation.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
<p>South Region High School #9</p> <p>(Formerly SRHS #8)</p> <p>LD 6/BD 5 New</p>	<p>Movimiento Bellas Artes - VAPA</p>	<p>Strengths: VAPA HS offers a solid instructional plan for SRHS #8. The data analysis is in-depth, objective, and discusses both strengths and weaknesses, emphasizing opportunities for the school rather than deficits. Because this is a new campus, VAPA HS has taken recent data from the three schools it will relieve. The goals are directly aligned to the data and strategies that have been outlined are aligned to the needs of the students. The plan is rich in data analysis and provides the rationale for immediate impact and high student achievement in the first year of implementation. The plan also elaborates on the need to improve in other areas, such as: CELDT, CAHSEE, A-G course enrollment, matriculation, attendance, parental involvement, graduation, and drop-out rates.</p> <p>VAPA HS plans to operate as a small school and thereby create a personalized learning environment for the students. VAPA's foundation will be created through the collaborative efforts of all stakeholders. Expectations of all stakeholders will be explicitly discussed. It is important to note that VAPA HS is part of the SRHS #8 Collaborative, a Sister School Concept with the other two plans: STEAM and TAD High Schools.</p> <p>Concerns: Being a small school comes with some limitations, one being available funding for professional development (PD). The plan also states that VAPA staff will all be responsible for leading professional development, but there is the concern that not all staff are equipped to plan and lead a PD session. This needs to be examined further in order to plan the most effective PD.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>
	<p>Movimiento Bellas Artes – STEAM</p>	<p>Strengths: Much like the VAPA plan reviewed above, STEAM HS also offers a solid instructional program. The VAPA and STEAM plans are very similar and were written by the same team—therefore, the reviews were very similar as well. It is important to note that STEAM HS plans on being a part of SRHS #8 Collaborative, a Sister School Concept with two others: VAPA and TAD.</p> <p>Concerns: The same concerns for VAPA apply for STEAM, regarding the funding limitations and how PD will be supported.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>
	<p>Technology, Arts and Design (TAD)</p>	<p>Strengths: Data presented and analyzed are that of the three relief schools and the analysis is in-depth, objective, and focuses on both strengths and weaknesses, emphasizing opportunities for the school rather than deficits. Responses for most areas of the plan submitted by The TAD School are complete, concise, and relatively clear. Data from various assessments will be reviewed regularly and used to inform instruction. The TAD School's data and monitoring plan includes various facets of the school. The plan also provides a list of strategies for developing and maintaining a positive culture that promotes student learning and personalization. Students and staff members alike will be held to the same high expectations.</p> <p>Concerns: The team clearly has a solid grasp of key issues but the plan could use more detail in some places. For example, more research should be included to provide justification for the selection of the strategies. Also, like the STEAM and VAPA plans, the TAD plan proposes that teachers themselves will be responsible for leading PD sessions, but it is not clear how they will ensure everyone has the capacity to lead an effective session, or what support will be provided.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
<p>South Region High School #12</p> <p><i>LD 7/BD 1 New</i></p>	<p>Local District 7/UTLA</p> <p><i>Business Careers Technology Careers Health Careers Entertainment Careers</i></p>	<p>Strengths: There were clearly some conceptually strong ideas in the plan. Local District 7 highlighted four career areas intended to attract students to the school. The team appears knowledgeable of the community and has analyzed the unemployment rates, need for jobs, etc. Each school will have an instructional principal and all the schools will have an operational principal, for a total of five. Joint meetings will be held across the four schools for the leadership team. The plan includes numerous strategies for involving parents. An 8-period alternate bell schedule will allow teaching to go in-depth into each subject. Staff development time will be provided every Tuesday morning. The school has a high attendance goal and a plan for differentiated instruction/support. Students can choose the theme (i.e. Business, Tech, Health, Entertainment) they want and the themes will be addressed in elective classes.</p> <p>Concerns: While the electives classes seem like a realistic plan given budget constraints, there was serious concern over how the distinct themes will be authentically and fully embedded throughout the curriculum. The plan is written more like a proposal for a comprehensive high school, which begs the question of why the team chose to operate four small schools when the vision is clearly not in place? Small schools require that each have its own unique and clear identify, but this is not demonstrated in the plan. Furthermore, the value of small schools is in the closer, more personalized relationship to students, but the plan did not address how this would happen.</p> <p>It was evident that plenty of thought was given to how to structure the school, but equal planning was not given for the content of instruction. Given that the team seems to have an understanding of the community, this school site is a critical opportunity for the students, but the plan is inadequate. Four different themes were selected, but the plan only mentions five elective classes that address the themes. This plan feels like a missed opportunity to emphasize job-development, classes on career-ladders, or some other way of motivating students to gain the skills and knowledge necessary for each area of interest—this is a serious weakness.</p> <p>Further, the plan references a nearby school with a similar career focus; however, that plan was much more fully developed and offered a range of activities/opportunities to students that this LD 7 plan does not. The plan also discusses various community agencies that they plan on contacting, but they have not yet made contact. It is also unclear how the team will work with 9th graders to promote the programs at the school, nor how students will be able to move from one career focus to another.</p> <p>Finally, the four plans for SRHS #12 are identical to the four plans submitted for Augustus Hawkins HS (South LA Area New HS #3), another new campus opening in Local District 7. It was apparent in the plan that the Local District wrote it, but teachers were not included and the plan instead relies heavily on support from the Local District—however, the Local District structure will change dramatically once the District reorganization takes place this summer. The District has overbuilt schools in this community and this raises the question of how the school will ensure enrollment, especially if the school does not have enough of an appeal or provide a high-quality, impactful education to the local students.</p> <p>One suggestion the reviewers raised as a possible solution was to invite a leadership team to write a plan to open the school as a comprehensive high school, providing for personalization (perhaps through SLCs). The leadership team should be comprised of a principal that may ultimately lead SRHS #12 and teachers that may teach at the school.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Approved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Approved</p>

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
South LA Area New High School #3 (Augustus Hawkins) LD 7/BD 1 New	Local District 7 (All 4 plans)	These plans are identical to the plans written for South Region High School #12 and the reviewer comments were the same. Please see review comments for South Region High School #12 above.	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
	Schools for Community Action: 1. <i>Critical Design and Gaming</i> 2. <i>Community Health Advocates</i> 3. <i>Responsible Indigenous Social Entrepreneurship</i> 4. <i>Urban Sustainability and Environmental Science</i>	<p>Strengths: All four plans were very creative, innovative, focused on the community and students, ambitious, well-written, and overall well-done. It was evident that the teams worked collaboratively in all regards, even when considering availability of funds. Collectively, they understood the bigger picture in terms of the entire school, instead of focusing solely on just their respective schools. All four are teacher-led teams, which bodes well for actual implementation. The teams were very thoughtful about professional and teacher development in general. Teachers are encouraged to have a certain level of ownership over own professional learning. The plans have a collaborative, teacher-centered approach. While there are clearly some gaps in each of the plans, but nonetheless, the teams did a very thorough job of thinking through the many issues of operating a school. Although the team members do not have much experience as administrators, they demonstrated the capacity to develop the necessary skills. All four plans were well-written; in particular, the Critical Design and Gaming team seemed very strong across the board. The plans also have a lot in common, although Responsible Indigenous Social Entrepreneurship (RISE) & Urban Sustainability and Environmental Science (USES) seem to have the most in common.</p> <p>Concerns: The plans identified both complex-wide strategies/goals and school-specific strategies/goals, which may make it confusing to teachers and students, not to mention difficult to prioritize. The schools propose to develop their own curriculum and assessments but planning everything between April and August seems overly ambitious—they may do better to have a backup plan for at least the first year. While the reviewers agreed that all four plans merited approval and they would like to give all four teams the opportunity to work collaboratively, the RISE and USES plans seemed to be somewhat less developed than the other two plans.</p> <p>There was some concern that the USES school had a humanities approach to science, rather than a hard science approach and that despite the science focus, no science teachers were represented on the team. More detail should be provided on how the theme would be integrated into the curriculum. USES also requested autonomy over staffing aides, but this is not an autonomy that is granted via the LIS agreement.</p> <p>The RISE team was creative in modeling the program after the Mills MBA, but some of the plan was difficult to understand. The theme was not fully developed throughout the plan. The Circle of Learning described in the RISE plan includes elements such as linked learning; while an interesting concept, it seemed a bit unrealistic to accomplish everything in the Circle, and it was overall confusing.</p> <p>Questions to Address: The reviewers suggested that the teams provide a backup plan for their curriculum development for the first year of operation, and to clarify or consolidate the campus-wide vs. school-wide strategies and goals. Furthermore, RISE should develop an action plan that specifically addresses the curriculum and the Circle of Learning</p> <p>Note: The reviewers also presented a couple of suggestions based on their review. One was to move two of the School for Community Action schools to the South Region High School #12 campus. It appears the teachers who wrote these plans have a good rapport with the students, so many students may be motivated to follow their teachers to the other school site. A second suggestion was to approve only 3 plans at Augustus Hawkins HS or combining two of the schools in order to ensure adequate enrollment for each school.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
WATCH SCHOOLS (Alphabetical by school level)			
Manhattan Elementary <i>LD 8/BD 1</i>	<i>Watch School</i>	<p>Strengths: Overall, the plan is fairly well-written. The design team includes several key stakeholders—the intervention coordinator, teachers, parents, UTLA chapter chair, principal.</p> <p>Concerns: There are some minor issues with inconsistencies in the plan. It is also difficult to discern whether they plan to purchase a generic AP. Another concern is that, for students with disabilities, the plan solely discusses Tier 3 interventions; however, many students with disabilities do not necessarily need Tier 3 and the team should explore Tier 1 and 2 strategies as well. It appears that the West Athens EL and Manhattan EL plans are essentially the same. As such, the same concerns noted for West Athens EL exist for this plan. It is important that the plan be specifically tailored to the school site and its needs, and the specific data of the school should have been reviewed extensively, instead of developing the same plan for multiple sites. Furthermore, if the plans have been written somewhat “cookie-cutter” across these Watch schools, there is the potential concern that faculty buy-in was not taken into consideration. Faculty support is critical in ensuring the effectiveness of the plan and the turnaround work, especially in a Watch school situation.</p> <p>Questions to Address: As was noted in the review for West Athens EL, how will Manhattan EL partner with the chosen model school, Park Western EL? Further, no UTLA vote was actually conducted at Manhattan EL—how will they ensure staff support for the plan?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
West Athens Elementary School <i>LD 8/BD 1</i>	<i>Watch School</i>	<p>Strengths: This plan incorporates LAUSD’s existing programs. A prominent feature of the plan is that the school plans to work with Park Western Place EL (a successful school in San Pedro) and use it as a model, although it is unclear exactly how West Athens EL will work with them. The school will open a family resource center, although it is unclear whether the center is already open or will be opened. The strength of the plan is in PD—they know they will have to analyze data to collectively determine any change. The school also made a big leap in their scores, so they seem to be headed in the right direction.</p> <p>It is likely that the LD principal leader, Christine Cassidy, has supported the plan writing for all the EL schools in this area (West Athens, Manhattan, La Salle EL)—all of these plans are very similar and all plan to model themselves after Park Western EL.</p> <p>Concerns: It appears this plan proposes to do business as usual at the school; there are no adjustments or changes to the current LAUSD plan. Furthermore, in the 4 years prior to the last, the API had remained relatively flat until there was a 70 point jump in the last year. However, the plan did not analyze this data thoroughly, and presented no hypotheses as to what caused the jump in scores. The plan does recognize the need to determine what helped them make their gains, but it appears they’re not quite sure how to do this at this point. The behavior management plan seems underdeveloped—it simply states that points will be awarded to students in the yard and in the classroom. This type of system may be difficult to manage, and it is questionable whether such a system is sustainable. The plan seems to rely on the points system as a key component of school culture; however, points do not translate into a transformed and positive school culture. Also, teacher buy-in may be a concern: the UTLA staff advisory vote reflected that 10 voted in favor of the plan while 15 voted against it.</p> <p>Questions to Address: What is the nature of the partnership with Park Western, how will they assist each other, and what aspects of Park Western will they emulate? The impression was that the principal at Park Western would help at West Athens, too, which brings into question the feasibility of this plan. Furthermore, the demographics of Park Western and West Athens are very different but this matter was not discussed in the plan. Finally, how will they sustain this work given the current budget? How will the team ensure staff support and buy-in to the plan?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
Western EL <i>LD 3/BD 1</i>	<i>Watch school</i>	<p>Strengths: The school's API grew 644 to 740. The plan identifies many engagement strategies including constructivism and project-based learning. Highlights of the plan include multiple means of evaluating teachers and a commendable plan to reduce class size. The plan discusses integration of direct instruction and constructivism, a Visual Art Gallery, and collaborative and co-teaching RSP.</p> <p>Concerns: Although the school has good reasons for wanted to add a dual language program, it seems now may not be the best time to begin the program. Further, the Dual Language section did not cite must research. The proposal overall does not include very much research or innovation. EL and SEL programs were combined into one section and the EL program was not well-developed.</p> <p>Also, despite the school's recent success, there are many questions regarding the thoroughness of the PD plan. The school has no real plan for teacher orientation and instead relies on grade-level teams, mentors, and veteran teachers sharing their knowledge. It is not clear what the written evaluation of PD entails and how implementation is measured. There is a very limited role for parents and no innovations, plans or intentions mentioned to expand the parents' current role.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
Cochran Middle School <i>LD 3/BD 1</i>	<i>Watch school</i>	<p>Strengths: Cochran Middle School has seem some improvement in the past few years, across all student subgroups. Assessments were discussed extensively throughout the plan, although there was actually not much mention of the instructional program. The major emphasis was on teacher development/evaluation. For one, the STULL will be supplemented by a peer observation program. Student emotional and personal support was given equal weight to pedagogy and instruction.</p> <p>Concerns: The positive trend in data shows the school is doing something right, but the plan is not necessarily well-written. Additionally, much of the reform work appears to be centered on governance (a change to ESBMM), hiring practices (mutual consent), and implementation of a more robust teacher development process. It is not clear if there will be changes in the instructional program, the support structures, and the professional development of the school.</p> <p>Questions to Address: Reviewers suggest that the team provide further details regarding the instructional program. The team should also clearly identify the strategies that are currently working at the school to improve student achievement, and explain specifically how they will expand these strategies school-wide.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
Gage Middle School <i>LD 6/BD 5</i>	<i>Watch school</i>	<p>Strengths: The plan is thorough and the proposed changes to the school will likely increase the effectiveness of the initiatives the school has already begun to implement. There is a strong sense of teacher ownership in the continuous improvement model of the school plan. The plan cites relevant research and student data, and focuses on the needs of ELs and SPED students who have shown the least amount of growth. The academy structure proposes three academies with 600 students each and one MST magnet with 300 students; each academy has its own instructional focus, giving students choices. The plan states that parents will be expected to provide 10 hours of volunteer service. Parent trainings will also be offered. The school appears to be in the process of developing community partnerships to support to the school's programs.</p> <p>Concerns: It was not noted how the school plans to transition to the Common Core State Standards, so the school will need to address this soon. Also, there was some question regarding the after school program led by Woodcraft Rangers and Youth Services and how the school will continue to support this work with a limited budget.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
LA Academy Middle School <i>LD 3/BD 1</i>	<i>Watch school</i>	<p>Strengths: The plan was very well written. It addressed many of the concerns from the past and identified several research-based strategies. The plan clearly outlines how Professional Learning Communities will foster effective instruction. The team focused on identifying and implementing standards to improve instruction and have begun to show success already. The plan also reflects thorough analysis of data sources. The school showed a 44-point increase in API last year. In Algebra 1, performance increased from 18% to 27%. They also had a greater offering of geometry and higher proficiency (from 18 to 25 8th grade students participating). The scores show consistent gains across grade levels in Algebra 1 and geometry, as well as for special education students.</p> <p>The culturally responsive/relevant education portion of the plan was well-done. Identified at-risk students entering the school will receive additional supports while eighth grade students will receive exploratory classes to help them think about high school. A shared decision making council will ensure parents are involved with the school. Parents are also offered a well-developed volunteer program, as well as meetings with the principal and weekly workshops in the parent center.</p> <p>Concerns: The concept of “Superflex” that was noted in the plan sounded like it could be a good idea for intervention and enrichment, but the readers did not fully understand what it entailed. The team has a clear plan for differentiating and implementing Response to Intervention and the effective strategies to address diverse populations are there but there is lack of focus on targeting the specific subgroups. As noted above, the parent engagement plan is extensive; however, there was some concern about exactly how the parent engagement plan will be implemented.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
Maclay Middle School <i>LD 2/BD 6</i>	<i>Watch School</i>	<p>Strengths: The plan was very clear and all components of the plan were well-developed. The major strengths were in the areas of PD, partnerships with the community, and the fact that school had heavily surveyed their parents to address major concerns. The school is well-grounded in the community and is making progress.</p> <p>The instructional plan is based on their Five Core Values in which they will use the Gradual Release of Responsibility model. The plan also includes using Explicit Direct Instruction and strategies found in Teach Like a Champion. The curriculum will be based on CA State Standards and a 4 x 4 block schedule will be implemented. Each student will have an Individual Learning Plan and, in fact, there are specific plans for all student populations.</p> <p>Concerns: None were noted during the discussion.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
Vista Middle School <i>LD 1/BD 6</i>	<i>Watch School</i>	<p>Strengths: One of the major strengths cited was the fact that Vista MS is part of the Panorama City Community Partnership, which supports a K-12 continuum. The applicant team and the school leader are well-qualified to implement the plan and the support of Local District 1 will be instrumental.</p> <p>Concerns: Algebra I scores have dropped since 2009, although the API did jump. English Language Arts scores moved from 22 to 30% students proficient, although this is still below district average.</p> <p>Questions to Address: What is the school doing to support English Learners (EL), Students with Disabilities, and long term ELs? What kind of professional staff development will take place at the school? How will the school address the low Algebra I scores?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved

SCHOOL	APPLICANT	COMMENTS FROM SUPERINTENDENT'S REVIEW PANEL	RECOMMENDATION
Fulton College Prep (Span 6-12) <i>LD 2/BD 6</i>	<i>Watch School</i>	<p>Strengths: None were noted during the discussion.</p> <p>Concerns: Not much thought seemed to have been put into the plan writing. There were several different strategies written into the instructional plan, but no action plan as to how to effectively utilize them. There was no explanation of how PD and data on performance would guide the instructional strategies. Good first teaching is mentioned throughout, but it was not defined nor did the plan discuss how first teaching would be measured and evaluated. Overall, the plan is overly ambitious and unrealistic. There is no mention of a planned series of interventions, nor plans to use a database to compare the strengths and weaknesses of various programs. The team needs to engage in a serious inquiry and analysis of what programs have a positive impact on student achievement for all student subgroups at their school. While the instructional initiatives and strategies noted may seem appropriate, they are not connected to any data derived from current student achievement or identified student needs. Waivers are requested and a vote conducted, but the plan does not adequately explain exactly how the waivers would support the program.</p> <p>Fulton College Prep clearly needs much support in developing a viable plan that will accelerate student achievement, but it is unclear whether the team could complete such a plan in the next few weeks. The school needs to focus on the specific needs of their students, conduct an intensive review of their data, and create/follow a detailed action plan.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
South East High School <i>LD 6/BD 5</i>	<i>Watch school</i>	<p>Strengths: South East High School's plan is complete, clear and coherent. It reflects a thorough understanding of key issues, which have been identified through data analysis. The proposed goals for implementation and student achievement are ambitious, realistic, and appropriate. The goals are based on the school's current data; in addition, the strategies listed throughout the plan, address the needs of the students, and are evidence-based. Furthermore, the school is making some promising gains. Their API of 549 moved up to 644, which is still a low score but a gain nonetheless. 80% of their 10th graders passed the CAHSEE in English Language Arts.</p> <p>Concerns: It was unclear whether the school is proposing to function as small schools or a comprehensive high school with small learning communities (SLCs). It is also not clear how the teachers will meet in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) in content-alike groups, how they will fit into the master schedule, and how they will ensure collaboration across the SLCs. The plan stated they would be using formative assessments but it wasn't clear what they were. Perhaps most concerning is the fact that algebra and geometry scores on the CSTs are dismal, but the team did not address this need. Gains were clearly made in English Language Arts and CAHSEE scores in math, but not in CSTs.</p> <p>Questions to Address: The plan states that all students will be assessed using the CELDT—what is the rationale for testing regardless of English proficiency? What is their plan for the CST math scores, algebra/geometry? There was also inconsistencies regarding when Advisories will meet.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved
South Gate High School <i>LD 6/BD 5</i>	<i>Watch School</i>	<p>Strengths: Having considered current data, South Gate High School has outlined strategies they will implement in order to accelerate student learning. The strategies listed are research-based, relevant and will lead to academic achievement. This plan is complete, clear, coherent, and aligned. It reflects a thorough understanding of key issues; addresses the topics with specific and accurate information; and sets an example of the very highest performing schools in our system. The proposed goals for implementation and student achievement are ambitious, realistic, and appropriate. The goals are directly aligned with the data analysis, based on the baseline data. The plan also addresses the team's leadership, history, experiences and successes working with the community it will serve. Due to the leadership team's history with the community, there is a strong sense of ownership and pride evident in the plan.</p> <p>Concerns: Additional details and/or possible strategies (e.g., incentives) for improving school culture are recommended.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Re-Write <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved