

# ***Los Angeles Unified School District***

---

## ***Program Improvement Local Education Agency Plan Year 3 Corrective Action***

School Improvement Grant (SIG)  
UPDATE  
November 1, 2010



## Executive Summary

The Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) had thirty-one Tier I & II Program Improvement schools eligible to apply for the School Improvement Grant (SIG). After a careful evaluation of the models, and an examination of the District's previous participation in large-scale, state reform efforts, LAUSD decided to take a dynamic approach to improving these schools. Instead of spreading support personnel and resources to serve all the eligible schools, this plan takes a razor sharp focus on integrating district and school reform measures to maximize improvement in 9 selected schools that serve a total of 14,943 students. These schools were selected not only for their needs, but for their capacity and determination to improve and participation in previous Board approved reform processes. The collaborative efforts of this cohort of PI schools will launch LAUSD into a new era of reform by creating prototypes for improving achievement and teacher/leader effectiveness in all of our schools.

LAUSD's Public School Choice Initiative and the District's focus on improving teacher and school leadership effectiveness define the core of this aggressive school reform proposal. The plan is agile and can be implemented in phases for future scale up; aligned to existing goals, resources and fiscal constraints; and, accountable for measurable results at both the school and district levels.

## District Overview

LAUSD educates 11% of California's students with a total K-12 enrollment of 617,796. This monumental task is accomplished at 891 K-12 school sites and 208 other centers including Early Education, Community Adult, Occupational and Skill Centers. 260 of our schools are underperforming and have been designated in Program Improvement 3+ years. The District employs 33,214 teachers with an average of less than ten years of experience, 2,308 Administrators, and other staff for a total of 71,851 employees.

Based on CalWorks and the Free/Reduced lunch program data, 75.9% of our district's families live below the poverty level, and 33% of our students are classified as English Learners. The California Dept. of Education reports that the LAUSD graduation rate is only 72.4%. Mirroring national trends, nearly half of our African American and Hispanic students will not graduate in four years (Harvard Civil Rights Project, 2004). The District's 2007-08 dropout rate was 26.4%. This tragic loss of human potential, coupled with the threat to our economic stability and community safety, drives the imperative to improve our schools and assure a better future for Los Angeles.

The Superintendent and the Board of Education, together with parents and community partners, are waging a war on failure. Superintendent Cortines has stated: "For too long we have protected the status quo even when it is not serving our children. We have a golden opportunity to accelerate the gains we have made by working together. We must take the passion and energy in the new ways of teaching and learning to make certain all of our students achieved their dreams." Many initiatives and strategic plans are already in motion demonstrating insight, forward thinking, and innovation, yet still grounded in the realities of our current fiscal crisis. The District's goal is that every student will receive a quality education. School reform and improvements in staff effectiveness are the means to that end.

Public School Choice Options is one of the District's reform initiatives that has created a mechanism for parents and members of the community to take control of schools and work together to improve learning for their students. On August 25, 2009 the Public School Choice (PSC) Resolution was approved by the Board of Education as a major initiative in the District's school transformation efforts. The Board recognized that while there were indications of growth in District schools, chronic academic under-performance still persisted within a significant number of schools. The aim of PSC was to ensure that students have more choices and access to high quality instructional programs.

Another major milestone for improving teaching and leadership was the establishment of the Teacher Effectiveness Task Force which began meeting in Fall 2009 in response to the April 2009 Board motion "Quality Leadership and Teaching to Ensure a World Class Education for All." Labor partners, parents and community representatives, private sector leaders, higher education partners, as well as district leaders, teachers and administrators, worked collectively to propose bold steps related to teacher, administrator, and support personnel effectiveness. On April 27, 2010 the Task Force presented its report to the Board of Education with recommendations for: redesigning the teacher and administrator evaluation process; differentiated compensation and career ladders; restructured tenure

process; augmentation of teacher support; intervention and professional growth; and legislative action steps needed to implement proposed changes

Superintendent Cortines worked with staff to develop a three-year implementation plan based on the Task Force's recommendation. Presented to the Board on May 18<sup>th</sup>, this plan will put LAUSD on a course to having an effective teacher in every classroom and an effective principal leading every school by Fall 2016. Several of the components of this strategic plan are embedded in the SIG schools' implementation plans. This cohort of enlisted schools will work collaboratively to prototype, initiate, develop, and test the actions proposed in the 3-year strategic plan. A description of how these strategies will be implemented appears in the individual Implementation Charts for each school.

### SIG School Selection Process

Under the direction of Dr. Sharon Robinson (Special Assistant to the Superintendent), staff from Superintendent's Leadership Team and the Local Districts, (all who work with the Tier I and II schools), evaluated potential SIG applicants. The intent of this process was to go beyond a needs analysis and also conduct a capacity analysis to measure each school's readiness for the SIG intervention models. Five questions were posed in the screening process:

**1. What was the school currently doing to enable students to make progress?**

We reviewed each school's Single School Plan and high school WASC accreditation reports for a description of interventions and other operating programs.

**2. What had been the school's previous experience with other reform programs including CSRD, II/USP, HPSG and QEIA?**

We ascertained their participation in each program and examined if the resources had generated any notable progress or changes in the school.

**3. What was the school's recent success or failure level in meeting measurable outcomes and goals established by the District's Accountability Matrix?**

Using School Accountability Report Cards (SARC) and other district data, we analyzed 3-year trends in: state testing results (CST, CELDT, CAHSEE), proficiency rates in core subjects for all students and subgroups, performance on local periodic assessments, course enrollments (A-G, AP/Honors), course pass-rates, EL reclassification rates, teacher and student attendance, graduation/dropout rates, and disciplinary actions.

**4. Why had the school's overall performance improved or remained the same?**

We took into consideration information about the staff composition, stability, leadership effectiveness, professional development, decision making/governance processes, alignment of fiscal resources, the use of data, information from staff, parent and student surveys, and input from Local District superintendents and school directors.

**5. What changes would best assure the likelihood of school improvement?**

We compared the strategies required for each SIG intervention model with the level of present interventions and reforms at each school and determined if a SIG model would best meet the existing needs and enhance the capacity of each site.

After completing the data screening process, nine Tier I & II schools were invited to participate in the SIG application process. All of the schools were selected based upon needs balanced with a high level of readiness and potential to move forward along with the following reform strategies:

- Three schools partnered with an Educational Management Organization (EMO) (Gompers MS, Markham MS, Stevenson MS) meet the eligibility requirements of the Restart model.
- Four of the six schools (Gardena SH, Hillcrest ES, Jefferson SH and Maywood SH) had already been identified in 2009 as PSC Schools (low performing) and participated with their teachers and their communities in a rigorous PSC process to develop comprehensive school reform plans that were approved by the Superintendent and the school Board. The remaining two schools (Carver MS and Griffith Joyner ES) joined iDesign external Network Partners.

Five of the SIG applicants are iDesign Network Partner schools. In these schools non-profit civic and academic institutions, called Network Partners, enter into a formal collaborative relationship with the schools to facilitate school reform and to manage the daily operational functions at the sites. They are held accountable to the Board of Education through a 5-year renewable Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). This agreement allows the Network Partners maximum freedom and autonomy to, in cooperation with the District, implement educational services in their partner schools. They have the flexibility to waive Board Rules and District policies except those that are necessary for compliance with state and federal laws and applicable collective bargaining agreements. Network Partners provide instructional leadership, technical assistance and support, as well as additional resources to improve school programs and instruction (See sample MOU as Appendix iv).

Three of the SIG applicant schools (Gompers MS, Markham MS, and Stevenson MS), based on their low academic performance and significant demand from their stakeholders for improvement, were identified by the Superintendent as potential iDesign schools. Each school underwent a series of teacher, parent and community meetings with iDesign staff and Network Partners' leadership prior to voting on the decision to become a Network Partner school for the 2008-2009 school year. As a result, Gompers MS, Markham MS, and Stevenson MS are now managed by the Partnership for Los Angeles Schools (the Partnership). Started by Los Angeles Mayor, Antonio Villaraigosa, the Partnership is a non-profit organization that contracts with LAUSD to reform some of the lowest performing schools in Los Angeles. They currently oversee 12 schools in East L.A. and South L.A., and through LAUSD's Public School Choice Initiative, the Partnership has been given the opportunity to manage three more schools.

#### Public School Choice Schools – Five SIG applicants

Part of the Public School Choice Options provides for a process where low performing schools, who meet certain criteria, are designated as Public School Choice Schools. For these schools, PSC provides a competitive process for school planning teams, local communities, pilot school operators, labor partners, charter school operators, and any non-profit educational management organizations to submit operational and instructional plans for operating new LAUSD schools and/or existing schools that meet certain criteria.

Carver MS and Florence Griffith Joyner ES were two of the twelve 2009 PSC Schools that were identified using the following PSC criteria:

1. Program Improvement status for three or more years
2. Less than 21% proficiency in either Math or ELA for 2008-09
3. Zero or negative growth on the 2008-09 Academic Performance Index (API)
4. For high schools, greater than a 10% dropout rate based on 2007-08 data

Through the PSC process, the Partnership submitted proposals for partnerships with Carver MS and Florence Griffith Joyner ES. Both proposals were ultimately approved by the Board, and the partnerships will begin for the 2010-2011 school year.

Other schools in this SIG application include: Maywood SH, Gardena SH, Jefferson SH, and Hillcrest Drive ES. Through the PSC process, all four schools worked with teachers, administrators, parents and members of their communities to design their PSC school reform plans. The Superintendent's Office appointed two teams to review each PSC School application to ensure that they met all the PSC requirements. The teams consisted of internal and external representatives from institutions of higher education, parents, teachers, administrators, classified staff, instruction, Data and Accountability, Parent and Community Service, Special Education, Operations, Finance, Facilities and General Counsel.

After this initial screening, approved applications from potential external network partners, charter operators, universities, and teacher-community based groups were presented to the school communities at stakeholder engagement meetings. Subsequent to the meetings, community members cast their votes for the applications submitted for the management of their schools. The Superintendent considered the proposal ratings given by the two review teams and the community advisory votes before submitting his final PSC recommendations to the Board of Education for approval.

## Needs Analysis Tools and Process

On April 12<sup>th</sup> a meeting was held for the leadership teams of the nine potential SIG applicants. At this meeting the terms of the grant were presented along with a description of criteria for each intervention model. Based on the District's preliminary needs and capacity analysis, the District indicated its recommendation for each school's reform model. In order to be included in the SIG application the schools had to hold a Public Meeting for their stakeholders to discuss the grant implications and any potential modifications it might pose to their existing Single Plans. The schools then met with their Instructional Leadership teams and School Site Council members to decide if they wanted to pursue the grant. As a result of these meetings, on April 19<sup>th</sup> all nine schools submitted letters of intent indicating their willingness to participate in the SIG application process and to comply with all the conditions of the grant.

To better measure their needs and readiness for the SIG, each school's Instructional Leadership team completed a detailed, narrative survey describing their: instructional program, in-place interventions, professional development activities, instructional support, staff, governance/decision making process, fiscal resources, partnerships, and their use of data to improve student achievement. This narrative assessment survey was designed to provide more detail than the District could get from the APS or DAS tools. The schools candidly described their plans for the future, some recent successes, and the challenges that impede their ability to improve achievement. Staff effectiveness data for each school was gathered from the LAUSD Office of Human Resources. Instructional minutes and instructional materials information was also gathered from district resources.

The second qualifying/assessment process was for each school to complete a draft of an implementation proposal. In this pre-qualifying plan they had to submit descriptions of the required and permissible strategies that aligned with their respective model. Using their Single Plans for Student Achievement, each school's Instructional Leadership team had to determine which strategies they would employ to:

- Develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness
- Implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies
- Increase learning time and expand professional development
- Create community-oriented schools with support services
- Provide operational flexibility, decision making, and sustained support

On May 5<sup>th</sup> these implementation proposals were submitted to the District for review. Staff from the Los Angeles County Office of Education and the Superintendent's Leadership Team analyzed the proposed implementation plans for: alignment to the SIG models, feasibility, allocation of other school resources, cost estimates, staff and community buy-in, and the appropriateness to meet the needs of the school. Nine schools were recommended to participate in the final SIG application.

As one reads the school narratives, you may be taken back by the enormity and complexity of the challenges our schools face, particularly those sites located in very high crime, high poverty communities where dire circumstances can severely impact students' lives and their ability to attend school and learn. But at the same time, in the narratives you will hear the voice of schools that are not willing to give up on their students. They all speak with a determination to improve and make diligent efforts to remedy the causes of failure that plague their schools.

**Performance Goal 1: *All students will reach high standards, at a minimum, attaining proficiency or better in reading and mathematics, by 2013-14.***

**Planned Improvement in Student Performance**

(Summarize information from district-operated programs and approved school-level plans)

Description of Specific Actions	Persons Involved/ Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>1. Alignment of instruction with content standards:</p> <p>Implement a curriculum that is clearly aligned to the content standards and is focused on supporting and challenging all students to excel in learning using various strategies and programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>—Response to Instruction and Intervention</li> <li>—Differentiated Instruction</li> <li>—AVID</li> <li>—Voyager</li> <li>—Touch Math</li> <li>—Breaking the Code</li> <li>—Read Well</li> </ul>	<p>Teachers Administrators at the various school sites</p>	<p><b><u>Reading English/Language Arts</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Read 180 (Gardena SH, Stevenson MS, Hillcrest)</li> <li>• Accelerated Reader (Gardena SH, Griffith Joyner ES, Markham MS)</li> <li>• Literacy Systems for Primary Academies (Hillcrest)</li> <li>• Reference and instructional materials that support Academic English Mastery Program (Hillcrest)</li> <li>• Waterford Diagnostic and Early Learning Program for all K-2 (Hillcrest)</li> <li>• Read Well and Breaking the Code (Hillcrest)</li> <li>• Hire an English Learner Coach to train and support teachers in EL strategies and techniques (Stevenson)</li> <li>• Hire an instructional coach to support the standards-based ELA curriculum (Griffith Joyner)</li> <li>• Hire a part time literacy</li> </ul>	<p>\$285,833 Gardena SH (3 years) \$30,000 Stevenson (year 1 only) \$69,000 Hillcrest (year 1 only)</p> <p>\$5,000 Gardena SH (per year) \$8,000 Griffith Joyner ES (per year) \$30,000 Markham MS (per year)</p> <p>\$90,000 Hillcrest (year 2) \$80,000 Hillcrest (year 3)</p> <p>\$13,000 Hillcrest (year 1) \$13,000 Hillcrest (year 2) \$10,400 Hillcrest (year 3)</p> <p>\$ 50,000 Hillcrest (year 1 only)</p> <p>\$15,000 Hillcrest (per year)</p> <p>\$91,903 Stevenson (per year)</p> <p>\$87,134 Griffith Joyner (per year)</p> <p>\$49,550 Jefferson (per year)</p>	
<p><b>(Continued)</b></p> <p>1. Alignment of instruction with content standards:</p> <p>Implement a curriculum that is clearly aligned to the content standards and is focused on supporting and challenging all students to excel in learning using various strategies and programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>—Response to Instruction and Intervention</li> <li>—Differentiated Instruction</li> <li>—AVID</li> <li>—Voyager</li> <li>—Touch Math</li> <li>—Breaking the Code</li> <li>—Read Well</li> </ul>	<p>7</p>			



Description of Specific Actions	Persons Involved/ Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>4. Increased access to technology: Increase communication skills; expand and integrate knowledge as well as thinking and reasoning skills through the integration of technology at each school site.</p>	<p>Administrators Teachers Students Classified Staff</p> <p><b><u>Timeline:</u></b> June 2010—June 2013</p>	<p>Purchase:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Computers</li> <li>▪ Video Equipment</li> <li>▪ Smartboards</li> </ul> <p>Hire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information Systems Support Assistant (1 FTE) that support a variety of daily systems duties such as trouble shooting of operational needs. (Gardena SH)</li> <li>• Consultant to provide training to maximize impact that technology can have on standards-based instruction. (Griffith Joyner ES)</li> <li>• Computer-trained technician to assist students and staff on the proper use of equipment; make repairs as necessary; order required repairs. (Jefferson)</li> </ul> <p>Ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wiring of the learning center, computer lab and library media center to provide access to intervention programs, LAVA classes for</li> </ul>	<p>\$31,168 (per year)</p> <p>\$10,000 (per year)</p> <p>\$63,656 (per year)</p> <p>\$50,000 (year 1 only)</p>	

		students during the school day and individualized support in the extended learning time. (Gardena SH)		
<p>5. Staff development and professional collaboration aligned with standards-based instructional materials:</p> <p>Provide professional development by contracting with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UCLA Center X to develop and strengthen the quality of standards-based instructional content for teachers and administrators at 4 Restart schools (Stevenson MS, Griffith Joyner ES, Gompers MS, Markham MS)</li> </ul>	<p>Teachers Administrator</p> <p><b>Timeline:</b> June 2010—June 2013</p>	<p>Hire 4 UCLA instructional experts per restart school to provide 2 days of training during the summer.</p> <p>Provide compensation for teachers and administrators to attend UCLA Center X training.</p>	<p>\$5,360.00 per school=\$21,440.00 (per year)</p> <p>\$264,00. for approximately 238 teachers (total number of teacher at the four sites) and administrators (per year)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guide and coordinate a coherent instructional program for students through Instructional Rounds. Through this process, educators develop a shared practice of observing, discussing, and analyzing learning and teaching. The focused observations, the analysis of data, collaborative dialogue and decisions lead to the continued development of common goals to accelerate student achievement. (Stevenson MS, Markham MS, Griffith Joyner)</li> </ul>		Provide substitute coverage for staff to attend training.	\$87,000 for approximate total for all three school sites	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UCLA Critical Friends Institute to provide teachers with 5 days of training to support the facilitation of professional learning community protocols. (Gardena SH)</li> <li>Engage teachers and administrators in other professional developments/training that support research-based strategies, AVID methodologies, Culturally Relevant and Responsive Education, data analysis and professional learning communities. (Gardena SH)</li> </ul>	<p>Department Chairperson Lead Teachers Administrators Teachers</p> <p><b>Timeline:</b> June 2010—June 2013</p>	<p>Provide substitute coverage for staff to attend training.</p> <p>Administrative X time to attend summer trainings</p> <p>AVID Conference Attendance</p>	<p>\$34, 608 (per year)</p> <p>\$9,245 (per year)</p> <p>\$10,000 (per year)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutions of higher learning and/or organization for on going professional development learning opportunities for teachers, school leaders, support staff and classified staff. (Maywood Academy)</li> </ul>	<p>Teachers Administrators Support staff Classified staff</p>	<p>Contacts for instructional services</p> <p>Conference Attendance</p>	<p>\$10,000 (per year)</p> <p>\$60,000 (per year)</p>	

		Provide professional learning libraries to support improved teaching	\$25,000 (per year)	
	<b><u>Timeline:</u></b> June 2010—June 2013			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Capturing Kids' Hearts Training Program to provide a 3 day off-site training experience at 4 Restart (Stevenson MS, Griffith Joyner ES, Gompers MS, Markham MS) schools that provides tools for staff to build positive productive trusting relationships among themselves and with students.</li> </ul>	<p>Teachers Administrators</p> <p><b><u>Timeline:</u></b> September 2011 September 2012 September 2013</p>	Provide substitute coverage for staff to attend training.	\$69,680 for approximately 268 substitutes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Balanced Literacy Training Consultants to provide teachers including PCEC trainer summer training, ongoing unit planning and collaborative coaching to assist in implementing a balanced literacy curriculum. (Gompers MS)</li> </ul>	<p>Teachers Administrators</p> <p><b><u>Timeline:</u></b> September 2011 September 2012 September 2013</p>	Provide compensation for RSP/SDC aides.	\$38,400 per year \$1,800 per year	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hire substitutes to provide teachers and administrators with the time to hold strategic planning off-site to review achievement data and refine school wide instructional strategies. (Stevenson MS)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>STEVENSON MS</u></b> Teachers Administrators</p> <p><b><u>Timeline:</u></b> Four times a year beginning September 2010-2013</p>	<p>Provide substitute coverage for staff.</p> <p>Hire consultant to facilitate off-site planning.</p> <p>Facility rental and food</p>	<p>\$52,026 per year</p> <p>\$20,000 (1 year only)</p> <p>\$7,000 (per year)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Observe best practices by visiting other schools that have successfully implemented the RTI model (Griffith Joyner)</li> </ul>	<p>Teachers Administrators</p> <p><b><u>Timeline:</u></b> June 2010—June 2013</p>	<p>Provide substitute coverage for staff.</p>	<p>\$5,203 per year</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide the school staff skills to handle the severe social emotional issues our students face as a result of growing up in a challenging community.(Stevenson MS)</li> </ul>	<p>Teachers Administrators Classified Staff</p> <p><b><u>Timeline:</u></b> June 2010—June 2013</p>	<p>Hire an outside expert to conduct training</p> <p>Hire an Intervention Counselor as additional support to help students cope with the social-emotional issues students face.</p> <p>Hire a Pupil Services Attendant to focus on tracking student attendance.</p>	<p>\$10,000 (per year)</p> <p>\$89,000 (one year only)</p> <p>\$21,294 (one year only)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hire a consultant to provide professional development to implement various online curriculum and train teachers to maximize program benefits. (Stevenson MS)</li> </ul>	<p>Teachers Administrators</p> <p><b><u>Timeline:</u></b> June 2010—June 2013</p>	<p>Hire a outside consultant</p> <p>Purchase and utilize-research based curriculum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Springboard Learning</li> <li>APEX</li> <li>Scholastic Guided Reading</li> </ul>	<p>\$15,000 (per year)</p> <p>\$20,000 (one year only)</p> <p>\$10,000 (per year)</p> <p>\$55,000 (per year)</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purchase an outside training services for professional development in 5 focused learning strategies to be implemented across curriculum, SLCs, grade-levels and content areas; Project Based Learning (PBL); WICR; Thinking Maps, SDAIE; and Interactive Notebook. These services will provide initial training and follow-up for faculty and will create in-house professional development experts to provide future training. (Jefferson SH)</li> </ul>	<p>Teachers Administrators</p> <p><b><u>Timeline:</u></b> June 2010—June 2013</p>	<p>Continue consultation with Buck Institute for PBL</p> <p>Identify trainers in SDAIE, Thinking Maps, Interactive Notebooks as needed</p>	<p>\$74,400 (3 years)</p> <p>\$10,000 (per year)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to use the Learning Team Model, the training of on-site facilitators and administrators, and the enforcement of Learning Teams protocols and activities that ensure successful PD and lessons for content area groups. (Jefferson SH)</li> </ul>	<p>Teachers Administrators</p> <p><b><u>Timeline:</u></b> June 2010—June 2013</p>	<p>Continue consultation with Pearson Learning</p>	<p>\$49,000</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engage teachers and staff to provide opportunities for planning, classroom observation, development of common assessments, curriculum and project development and student data analysis.</li> </ul>	<p>(JEFFERSON) Teachers Administrators</p> <p><b><u>Timeline:</u></b> June 2010—June 2013</p>	<p>Provide substitute coverage</p> <p>Provide staff training rate to provide compensation outside of the regular school day</p> <p>Provide after school or Saturday training time for ELA and ESL teachers to collaborate around student data assessment, portfolios, and curriculum-embedded assessments to provide coordinated transition from ESL classes to core English classes.</p> <p>Allocate 10 hours for 10 teachers to help guide and lead other teachers on the implementation of specific pedagogical technique to</p>	<p>\$26,014 (per year)</p> <p>\$89,248 (per year)</p> <p>\$72,828 (per year)</p> <p>\$6,070 (per year)</p>	

		<p>best meet their specific SLC's curriculum and content emphasis.</p> <p>Provide SLC counselors additional time to check that each students Individual Graduation Plan is up to date. (One week of X time per counselor)</p> <p>Provide professional development books and instructional materials for staff to be used in planning and employing appropriate instructional strategies.</p>	<p>\$24,945 (per year)</p> <p>\$29,250 (3 years)</p>	
	<p>(STEVENSON) Teachers Administrators</p> <p><b><u>Timeline:</u></b> June 2010—June 2013</p>	<p>Provide staff an additional hour of planning time each week for teachers to collaborate</p>	<p>\$98,405 (per year)</p>	
	<p>(HILLCREST ES)</p> <p><b><u>Timeline:</u></b> June 2010—June 2013</p>	<p>Provide substitute coverage</p> <p>X time is needed to provide time for 10 member data team to meet for 2 hours monthly to monitor the data and make adjustments to the instructional program as needed.</p> <p>X time is need to provide a 10 member Leadership Team to meet during the summer months and weekly throughout the year to plan/coordinate/facilitate the</p>	<p>\$39,020 (per year)</p> <p>\$12,000 (per year)</p> <p>\$50,000 (per year)</p>	

		distributive model leadership model.  X time is needed in year 2 and 3 to provide compensation to 45 teachers to participate in five 6 hour PD in the summer.	\$190,000 (per year)	
	(GRIFFITH JOYNER)  <b><u>Timeline:</u></b> June 2010—June 2013	Provide staff an additional hour of planning time each week for teachers to collaborate	\$45,186 (per year)	
	(MAYWOOD)  <b><u>Timeline:</u></b> June 2010—June 2013	Provide staff additional time (2 hours twice monthly beyond the school day.)	\$199,440 (per year)	
	(MARKHAM)  <b><u>Timeline:</u></b> June 2010—June 2013	Provide time for school staff to collaborate with each other on a weekly basis to develop coherent rituals and routines	\$44,100 (per year)	
	(CARVER)  <b><u>Timeline:</u></b> June 2010—June 2013	Release teachers to meet with prior grade level teachers and post level colleagues, do observations of each others' classrooms, and plan instruction based upon students' needs.	\$24,192 (year 1)  \$16,387 (years 2 and 3)	

<p>6. Involvement of staff, parents, and community (including notification procedures, parent outreach, and interpretation of student assessment results to parents):</p>				
<p>7. Auxiliary services for students and parents (including transition from preschool, elementary, and middle school):</p>				
<p>8. Monitoring program effectiveness: Use LAUSD's <i>MyData system</i> to monitor implementation of SIG. Benchmark dates will be set and data will be collected and reviewed at the District, Local District, and school site levels. Using on-line and other various methods of evaluation the monitoring model will respond to four target areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the implementation of the school plans increased student achievement and the number students who achieved proficiency in ELA and Math? (Evidence – annual state testing results; District Periodic Assessments)</li> <li>• To what extent have the schools carried out the strategies cited in their grant applications with fidelity? (Evidence - Turnaround Support Center observation reports, surveys, site visits, student response to interventions, parent satisfaction surveys, teacher responses to leadership support)</li> <li>• To what extent has the District placed highly qualified teachers into these low performing schools and proper assignments? (Evidence - reports from Human Resources Division)</li> <li>• To what extent has the District provided training and support for leadership development of teachers, administrators and parents, and other support services for the schools? (Evidence - agendas, surveys, interviews, participation rates in professional development offerings online and real time)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Turnaround Support Center Director</li> <li>▪ Principal Leader</li> <li>▪ Teacher Lead</li> <li>▪ Program Evaluation and Research Coordinator</li> <li>▪ Data Admin Analyst</li> <li>▪ School Site Administrators</li> <li>▪ Education Management Organization (if applicable)</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Timeline:</u></b> September 30, 2010- June 30, 2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data Admin. Analyst (1.0 FTE) Responsible for completing the required SIG track evaluation and the continuous monitoring of data</li> <li>▪ Program Evaluation and Research Coordinator (1.0 FTE) Manages evaluation and research projects related to program implementation including research design and instrument development.</li> </ul>	<p>\$60,464 (per year)</p> <p>\$86,352 (per year)</p>	

<p>Collect quantitative student-level data using 2009-2010 as the baseline against which to measure the schools' progress. For the purposes of local monitoring and continuous improvement, the District will utilize annual student achievement goals and student achievement data to evaluate the effectiveness of improvement strategies identified in each school's grant application.</p> <p>The District will provide information on the nine leading indicators identified by the California Department of Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of instructional minutes within the school year</li> <li>• Student participation rate on state assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, and by student subgroup</li> <li>• Dropout rate where applicable</li> <li>• Student attendance rate</li> <li>• Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g.AP/IB), early-college high schools, and dual enrollment classes</li> <li>• Discipline incidents</li> <li>• Truants</li> <li>• Distribution of teachers by performance level on the District's teacher evaluation system</li> <li>• Teacher attendance rates</li> </ul>				
<p>Identify the strengths and limitations of the school's instructional and organizational effectiveness through the analysis of data.</p>	<p>Teachers Administrators Data Coach</p> <p><b>Timeline:</b> September 30, 2010- June 30, 2013</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Problem Solving Data Coaches will work directly with teachers and administrators to continuously analyze schoolwide and classroom data identify process. (Hillcrest ES)</li> </ul>	<p>\$91,568 (per year)</p>	

<p>9. Targeting services and programs to lowest-performing student groups:</p> <p>To ensure successful implementation of SIG and the coordinated collaboration among the local districts, iDesign, the Office of Curriculum, Instruction, and School Support, and the Teacher Effectiveness Task Force—a director, a principal leader and teacher leader will be hired as part of the grant. The expectation will be that these individuals that lead the SIG reform work are task-oriented and unyielding in the ability to achieve results for student success.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Turnaround and Support Director (1 FTE) will support and monitor the 9 schools in addition to subsequent schools selected, the teacher effectiveness components that must be implemented as well as serve as liaison among all District partners and offices. The Director will be accountable for overall school performance such as the evaluation of the improvement grant.</li> <li>▪ Principal Leader (1 FTE) will serve as a coach to support the school principal.</li> <li>▪ Teacher Lead (1 FTE) serves as an expert to ensure implementation and integration of literacy and numeracy in all core classes. In addition, the teacher lead will work closely with out of classroom support staff to evaluate student performance data.</li> <li>▪ Clerical Administrative Aide</li> <li>▪ Fiscal Specialist to provide support in budget development and implementation, monitoring budget versus actual expenditures.</li> </ul>		
---	--	--	--	--

10. Any additional services tied to student academic needs:				
---	--	--	--	--

**Performance Goal 3: *By 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.***

**Summary of Needs and Strengths for Professional Development**

Based on a needs assessment of teacher data for your district, include a narrative that describes areas of needed professional development and areas where adequate professional development opportunities exist.

**[Description of activities under Title II, Part A, Subpart 1, Grants to LEA]**

STRENGTHS	NEEDS

**Performance Goal 3: *By 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.***

**Planned Improvements for Professional Development (Title II)**

(Summarize information from district-operated programs and approved school-level plans)

Please provide a description of:	Persons Involved/ Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
1. How the professional development activities are aligned with the State's challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, State assessments, and the curricula and programs tied to the standards:				
2. How the activities will be based on a review of scientifically based research and an explanation of why the activities are expected to improve student academic achievement:				

Please provide a description of:	Persons Involved/ Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
3. How the activities will have a substantial, measurable, and positive impact on student academic achievement and how the activities will be used as part of a broader strategy to eliminate the achievement gap that separates low-income and minority students from other students:				
4. How the LEA will coordinate professional development activities authorized under Title II, Part A, Subpart 2 with professional development activities provided through other Federal, State, and local programs:				
5. The professional development activities that will be made available to teachers and principals and how the LEA will ensure that professional development (which may include teacher mentoring) needs of teachers and principals will be met:				

Please provide a description of:	Persons Involved/ Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
6. How the LEA will integrate funds under this subpart with funds received under part D that are used for professional development to train teachers to integrate technology into curricula and instruction to improve teaching, learning, and technology literacy:				
7. How students and teachers will have increased access to technology; and how ongoing sustained professional development for teachers, administrators, and school library media personnel will be provided in the effective use of technology. (Note: A minimum of 25 percent of the Title II, Part D Enhancing Education through Technology funding must be spent on professional development.):				
8. How the LEA, teachers, paraprofessionals, principals, other relevant school personnel, and parents have collaborated in the planning of professional development activities and in the preparation of the LEA Plan:				

Please provide a description of:	Persons Involved/ Timeline	Related Expenditures	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>9. How the LEA will provide training to enable teachers to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Teach and address the needs of students with different learning styles, particularly students with disabilities, students with special learning needs (including students who are gifted and talented), and students with limited English proficiency;</li> <li>□ Improve student behavior in the classroom and identify early and appropriate interventions to help all students learn;</li> <li>□ Involve parents in their child's education; and</li> <li>□ Understand and use data and assessments to improve classroom practice and student learning.</li> </ul>				
<p>10. How the LEA will use funds under this subpart to meet the requirements of Section 1119:</p>				

