

BOARD MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

CULVER CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Regular Meeting of the Board of Education to “Conduct the District’s Business in Public” CLOSED SESSION – 6:00 p.m. OPEN SESSION – 7:00 p.m.

City Hall (Mike Balkman Chambers)
9770 Culver Boulevard, Culver City, CA 90232

March 22, 2011

Persons in the audience during the meeting of the Board of Education are asked not to talk during presentations or the meeting. If conversation with another person needs to take place, please do so outside the Board Room so as not to disrupt others or the meeting. *Please make sure your cell phone is turned off or silenced at this time.*

PRESENTATIONS AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

Persons wishing to address the Board on any item on the agenda will be granted three (3) minutes at the time the item appears on the agenda. In the case of a non-agenda item, persons are invited to comment under “Public Recognition.” In the interest of time and order, presentations from the public are limited to three (3) minutes per person. The total time for non-agenda items shall not exceed twenty (20) minutes. Prior to addressing the Board, please complete a card (located on the table at the rear entrance) and give the card to the Superintendent’s Executive Assistant. Persons addressing the Board are asked to do so from the podium. Please state your name, address, and organization before making your presentation.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by _____, at _____ p.m.

Roll Call – Board of Trustees

Scott Zeidman, Esq., President
Karlo Silbiger, Vice President
Katherine Paspalis, Esq., Clerk
Patricia Siever, Professor, Member
Steven Gourley, Member

2. PUBLIC COMMENT ON CLOSED SESSION ITEMS

3. RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION

- 3.1 Conference with Legal Counsel - Anticipated Litigation (Pursuant to subdivision (b) of GC §54956.9)
(3 Potential Cases)
- 3.2 Conference with Labor Negotiator (Pursuant to GC §54957.6)
Agency Designated Representatives: Leslie Lockhart, Director of Human Resources; Ali Delawalla, Assistant Superintendent Business Services
Employee Organizations: Culver City Federation of Teachers (CCFT) and Association of Classified Employees (ACE)

- 3.3 Public Employee Performance Evaluation (Pursuant to GC §54957)
(1 Teacher, 1 Principal, 1 Classified)
- 3.4 Public Employee Discipline/Dismissal/Release (Pursuant to GC §54957)
- 3.5 Public Appointment/Employment (Pursuant to GC §54947)
Certificated Personnel Services Report No. 16
Classified Personnel Services Report No. 16

4. **ADJOURNMENT OF CLOSED SESSION**

5. **REGULAR MEETING – 7:00 p.m.**

5.1 Roll Call – Board of Trustees
 Scott Zeidman, Esq., President
 Karlo Silbiger, Vice President
 Katherine Paspalis, Esq., Clerk
 Patricia Siever, Professor, Member
 Steven Gourley, Member

5.2 Flag Salute

6. **PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE BOARD IN CLOSED SESSION**

7. **PUBLIC HEARING - None**

8. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Recommendation is made that the agenda be adopted as submitted.

Motion by _____ Seconded by _____

Vote _____

9. **CONSENT AGENDA**

All matters listed under the Consent Agenda are those on which the Board has previously deliberated or that can be classified as routine items of business. An Administrative Recommendation on each item is contained in the agenda supplements. There will be no separate discussions of these items prior to the time the Board of Trustees votes on the motion unless members of the Board, staff, or public request specific items to be discussed or pulled from the Consent Items.

- 9.1 Approval is Recommended for the Minutes of Regular Meeting –
March 8, 2011
- 9.2 Approval is Recommended for Purchase Orders and Warrants
- 9.3 Approval is Recommended for Acceptance of Gifts - Donations
- 9.4 Approval is Recommended for the Certificated Personnel Reports No. 16
- 9.5 Approval is Recommended for the Classified Personnel Reports No. 16
- 9.6 Acceptance of Enrollment Report
- 9.7 Approval is Recommended for the Single Plan for Student Achievement –
Culver City Middle School

10. AWARDS, RECOGNITIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

10.1 AVPA Recognition/Music, Dance and Theater

11. PUBLIC RECOGNITION

Public recognition is the time when members of the audience may address the Board on matters not listed on the agenda. Those persons wishing to speak should complete a Speaker's Card and submit it to the Superintendent's Executive Assistant. In the interest of time and order, presentations from the public are limited to three (3) minutes per person. The total time for non-agenda items shall not exceed twenty (20) minutes. Board members will be allotted fifteen (15) minutes to comment during this portion of the agenda. The Board of Trustees may reduce the time limit(s) if there are a large number of individuals desiring to address the Board.

- 11.1 Superintendent's Report
- 11.2 Assistant Superintendents' Reports
- 11.3 Student Representatives' Report
- 11.4 Members of the Audience
- 11.5 Members of the Board of Education

12. INFORMATION ITEMS

Information items are generally included on the agenda for two reasons: to solicit reactions from the Board and the public on matters which may require Board action at a later date; and to provide information on a wide range of matters of interest to the Board and public. Comments by the public shall be limited to three (3) minutes per person and twenty (20) minutes per agenda item unless the Board, by majority vote, agrees to extend or reduce the time.

- 12.1 First Reading of Revised Board Policy 5117, Students – Interdistrict Attendance
- 12.2 Presentation of the Second Interim Report for 2010-2011

13. RECESS (10 Minutes)

14. ACTION ITEMS

This is the time of the meeting when members of the audience may address the Board on matters that are on the agenda. Those persons wishing to speak should complete a Speaker's Card and submit it to the Superintendent's Executive Assistant. Routine Board procedure on action items includes: receiving additional background information or analysis from staff; receiving comments from members of the audience; receiving additional information from the Superintendent or other resource personnel; introducing a motion on the item; taking action on the agenda item. Comments by the public will be limited to three (3) minutes per person and twenty (20) minutes per agenda item unless the Board, by majority vote, agrees to extend or reduce the time.

14.1 Superintendent's Items

- 14.1a Approval is Recommended for the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Beverly Hills Unified School District, Culver City Unified School District, The Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District and the Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health

Motion by _____ Seconded by _____ Vote _____

14.1b Adopt Findings of Staff Report Denying Building Bridges International, Inc. Charter School Petition

Motion by _____ Seconded by _____ Vote _____

14.2c Receipt of Petition from Innovate! Charter School Submitted by Kids Achieve! Foundation

Motion by _____ Seconded by _____ Vote _____

14.2 Education Services Items

14.2a Approval is Recommended for the Resolution Regarding Enrollment Capacity

Motion by _____ Seconded by _____ Vote _____

14.3 Business Items

14.3a Approval is Recommended for the Certification of the Second Interim Report for 2010-2011

Motion by _____ Seconded by _____ Vote _____

14.3b Approval is Recommended for the Rejection of Claim

Motion by _____ Seconded by _____ Vote _____

14.4 Personnel Items - None

15. BOARD BUSINESS

15.1 Discussion Regarding Board Goals and Objectives

16. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by _____ Seconded by _____ Vote _____

REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION FOR ANY INDIVIDUAL WITH A DISABILITY. Any individual with a disability who requires reasonable accommodation to participate in a board meeting, may request assistance by contacting the Superintendent's Office at 4034 Irving Place, Culver City, CA 90232. Phone Number: (310)842-4220 Fax Number: (310)842-4205

FUTURE MEETINGS

April 26 - 7:00 p.m. – Regular Public Meeting, (6:00 p.m. Closed Session), City Hall (Chambers), 9770 Culver Boulevard
May 10 – 7:00 p.m. – Regular Public Meeting, (6:00 p.m. Closed Session), District Office, 4034 Irving Place

NOTE: The CCUSD TIP Hotline is (310) 535-2590. Culver City Unified School District meetings are regularly scheduled for the second and fourth Tuesdays of every month. Public records related to the public session agenda, that are distributed to the Governing Board less than 72 hours before a regular meeting, may be inspected by the public at the District Office, 4034 Irving Place in Culver City during regular business hours (8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.) A complete agenda is available for review in each school office and also available for pickup at the District Office. Visit the Culver City Unified School District Website at www.ccusd.org. Each school office has a suggestion box. We look forward to receiving your comments and suggestions.

**CULVER CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD OF EDUCATION
UNADOPTED MINUTES**

Meeting:	<u>Regular Meeting</u>	Date:	<u>March 8, 2011</u>
Place:	<u>District Administration Office</u>	Time:	<u>6:00 p.m. – Public Meeting</u>
	<u>4034 Irving Place</u>		<u>6:01 p.m. – Closed Session</u>
	<u>Culver City 90232</u>		<u>7:00 p.m. – Public Meeting</u>

Board Members Present

Scott Zeidman, Esq., President
Karlo Silbiger, Vice President
Katherine Paspalis, Esq., Clerk
Patricia Siever, Professor, Member
Steven Gourley, Member

Staff Members Present

Patricia W. Jaffe, Interim Superintendent
Ali Delawalla
Gwenis Laura, Ed.S.

Call to Order

Board President Mr. Zeidman called the meeting of the Culver City Unified School District Board of Education to order at 6:00 p.m. The Board adjourned to Closed Session at 6:01 p.m. and reconvened the public meeting at 7:00 p.m. with all Board members in attendance. Hayley Yamamoto led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Report from Closed Session

Mr. Zeidman reported that the Governing Board met in Closed Session regarding issues listed on today's Closed Session agenda and announced that the following reportable actions were taken. In Closed Session, the Board took action to issue a notice releasing Principal (60%)/Coordinator of State and Federal Programs (40%), and reassigning as Principal, Adult School (100%), an administrative employee, identified by #NB3319588, pursuant to Education Code section 44951, effective at the end of the 2010-2011 school year, and directed the Superintendent or designee to send out appropriate legal notices. The roll call vote was unanimous with 5 – Ayes and 0 – Nays.

8. Adoption of Agenda

It was moved by Mr. Zeidman to adopt the agenda with the amendment to move item 10.1 and 10.4 to the top of the agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gourley. The motion was unanimously approved.

10. Awards, Recognitions and Presentations

10.1 American Citizenship Awards

Mrs. Jaffe and the Assistant Superintendents read the names and accomplishments of each school's recipients of the American Citizenship Award for the month of March. The recipients were Hayley Yamamoto from El Marino School; Anjali Prasad from El Rincon Elementary; Estafania Mendez from La Ballona School; Zoe Alamillo from Linwood E. Howe School; Katherine Garrido from Farragut School; Patrick Gardner from Culver City Middle School; Paul Kaoud from Culver Park High School; and Jordan Bentley from Culver City High School. Board members presented each recipient with a pin and certificate; and thanked the students and their families for attending the meeting.

10.3 Arts Education Month Proclamation

The Board of Education proclaims the month of March as Arts Education Month and encourages the celebration of the arts with meaningful student activities and programs that demonstrate learning and understanding in the visual and performing arts. Ms. Siever read the Proclamation.

10.4 AVPA Recognition/Art and Film

Ms. Laura announced some of the great achievements and recognitions of the AVPA Film students. She also spoke about the grants that the department has received. Ms. Laura extended congratulations to the students, crew, supporters, and the staff. She introduced each student that would receive a Certificate for Recognition in Film. Ms. Laura then introduced Ms. Kristine Hatanaka, Co-Director of the AVPA and art teacher. Ms. Laura read some of the awards and scholarships received by the students in the Art Department and introduced the

students. Ms. Hatanaka spoke about the community support and specially noted Emmanuel Saenz who received a wonderful scholarship. Ms. Seiver thanked Ms. Magee for being an exemplary leader at the high school.

9. Consent Agenda

Mr. Zeidman called the Consent Agenda and asked if any member of the audience or the Board wished to withdraw any item. Mr. Silbiger requested that item 9.2 be withdrawn.

It was moved by Mr. Gourley and seconded by Ms. Paspalis to approve Consent Agenda Items 9.1 (with revisions from Ms. Siever to be provided via e-mail to Ms. Williams), 9.3, 9.4, and 9.5 as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

9.1 Minutes of Special Meeting – February 15, 2011; Minutes of Special Meeting - February 18, 2011; and Minutes of Regular Meeting – February 22, 2011

9.3 Single Plan for Student Achievement – Culver City High School

9.4 Certificated Personnel Reports No. 15

9.5 Classified Personnel Reports No. 15

9.2 Approval is Recommended for Purchase Orders

Mr. Silbiger withdrew this item to inquire PO#56367 which Mr. Delawalla will follow-up on; PO#56371 which was charges on the credit card; and PO#56376 which was for the WASC visit. It was moved by Mr. Silbiger and seconded by Ms. Paspalis that the Board approve purchase orders from February 12, 2011 through February 25, 2011 as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

10. Awards, Recognitions and Presentations – (cont.)

10.2 Spotlight on Student Education – Culver City High School

Dr. Pam Magee, Principal of Culver City High School, shared some of the instructional practices that are showing significant results in achievement at the school. The administration team, Mr. Dylan Farris, Mr. Ian Drummond, Ms. Kim Indelicato, were also present. They presented information on the dramatic increase in student performance and announced that the high school was now eligible to be designated as a California Distinguished School. Students shared their experiences at the school. They spoke about the different programs including the AVID Program, AVPA, the ROP Program, the Athletic Program, and the Best Buddies Program. The shared with the Board how these programs have enhanced their high school experience and prepared them for their future endeavors. Board members thanked the staff and the students who presented. The Board was very impressed with the colleges and universities that the students have been accepted to thus far.

11. Public Recognition

11.1 Superintendent's Report

Mrs. Jaffe thanked all of the students who attended the meeting, and she stated that she was happy to have met with the California Distinguished School team. Mrs. Jaffe reported that she attended the meeting with the WASC team at Culver Park and they were very impressed with the school. She reported on some of the school-wide strengths at Culver Park and informed the Board what improvements the team suggested. Mrs. Jaffe reported on her attendance at the 29th Annual Bravo Awards at Disney Hall where middle school teacher Kari Fretham was honored with an award, and her attendance at the Chamber of Commerce Luncheon. She informed the Board that the second edition of Culver Currents in Print will be coming out the following day, and thanked Geoff Maleman and Nancy Burne for their hard work on the publication.

11.2 Assistant Superintendent's Report

Ms. Laura reported on the evening's student recognitions and how the students have specialized teachers. She spoke about generalist teachers and congratulated Kari Fretham on her Bravo Award. Ms. Laura reported that the CST writing tests were completed, and her attendance at the last session of the Immersion Strategic Planning Committee. She reported that the Committee's next discussion is an action plan to implement their goals.

Mr. Delawalla reported that the state legislature is at an impasse on the budget, and that the Governor has announced that he might not get support on his proposals for the upcoming election. He also stated deferrals are a challenge that the District is facing.

11.3 Student Representatives' Reports**Middle School Student Representative**

Mr. Rick Garcia, teacher at the middle school, reported for Sophia Greenberg. Mr. Garcia reported on activities at Culver City Middle School, including the completion of the Pennies for Patients Fundraiser. The school raised approximately \$1,400. He also reported on the 5th grade orientation taking place the following day, and the 5th grade orientation for parents taking place in the evening. Mr. Garcia announced that he will be joining Mr. Zeidman and Susan Herrera from the middle school on a trip to Boston with middle school students.

Culver Park Student Representative

Sandra Maldonado, Culver Park High School Student Representative, reported on activities at Culver Park High School, including the HeArt Project coming to a close. She stated that the teacher was amazing. She also reported on the ROP Program, the WASC team coming to the school for a visit and the students being presented with wigs to style for La Boehm.

Culver City High School Student Representative/Student Board Member

Jamie MacIntosh, Student Board Member, reported on activities at Culver City High School, including ASB holding interviews; the Multi-Cultural Assembly; AVPA's *Urinetown*; the yard sale taking place on April 23rd; the 10th graders taking the CAHSEE; the upcoming Sadie Hawkins Dance on March 16th and chaperones are needed; and students receiving their college acceptance or denial letters in March.

11.4 Members of the Audience

Members of the audience spoke about:

- David Mielke stated that it was gratifying to hear from the students, and there was no doubt that the high school would be designated as a California Distinguished School. He was happy to hear that the high school was narrowing the achievement gap. Mr. Mielke expressed to the Board that he thinks they need more flexibility and he is concerned that there were no notices given to administrators. He provided suggestions to the Board on positions that could possibly be eliminated or combined.
- Maria Nava, high school student, spoke in favor of getting solar panels in the District.
- Jerry Chabola commented on students who presented earlier, Rufus Humphries whom he stated also tutors at the middle school, and San Dixon whom he stated is also very involved with Youth and Government. He thanked all who attended Casino Night and stated it was a tremendous event. Mr. Chabola provided the Spring sports updated and announced that the Track Invitational would be on Saturday.
- Brad Hodge stated he was present on behalf of the Culver City Youth Health Center and announced the group's upcoming Mardi Gras event and spoke about how the group helps our students.

11.5 Members of the Board

Board Members spoke about:

- Mr. Silbiger spoke specifically about the honorees of the Culver City Youth Health Center, Mike Eskridge and Barbara Honig. He stated that his understanding was that in two weeks the Board meeting would be held at the City. He explained that there is a conflict with other committees at the City and our second Board Meeting of the month, so at this time the District would be unable to hold the second Board Meeting of the month in the Chambers. Mr. Silbiger thanked the DBA for giving CCEF some of the proceeds from the DBA's Night Out event. He stated that he spoke to Tony Spano and Mr. Spano had come up with a K-12 music program. Mrs. Jaffe said that it was being worked on.
- Ms. Paspalis stated that she also spoke to Mr. Spano. She reported on her attendance at the middle school's Open House, and the Culver Park visit by WASC. She said that the committee loved what was going on at the school. Ms. Paspalis also reported on her attendance at the Immersion Strategic Planning Committee meeting and she looks forward to bringing information from that meeting to the Board. Ms. Paspalis announced that it was currently the 100th Anniversary of International Women's Day.

- Ms. Siever would like to know when the WASC team comes out to the District. She stated that Dr. Spano did an excellent job at the Martin Luther King Day event. She reported that she attended the student art tour at the museum last year and it was great. Ms. Siever stated that she absolutely loved Casino Night and thought it was a great event.
- Mr. Gourley felt that Mr. Mielke was over exaggerating by saying that the security department could report to the principals. He does agree with Mr. Mielke that there should be more administrator layoff notices should go out, but also thinks that additional teachers and classified employees should get notices. Mr. Gourley thinks everyone should get tiered pay cuts along with furlough days. He also commended the Mock Trial Club students and thinks they are outstanding.
- Mr. Zeidman expressed that he is excited about the trip to Boston. He reported that he attended Open House, and the California Distinguished School visit. Mr. Zeidman thanked everyone who volunteered and contributed to Casino Night. He asked Jerry and Janet Chabola to stand in recognition for all of their tireless efforts for the event. Mr. Zeidman reported that the event probably grossed approximately \$25,000.

12. Information Items

12.1 Resolution Regarding Enrollment Capacity

Mr. Mielke stated that he was nervous about the Resolution and asked if it would be limiting student enrollment. Mr. Sotelo provided additional explanation about the Resolution and responded that it would in fact be limiting student enrollment.

13. Recess

The Board recessed at 8:35 p.m. and reconvened at 8:45 p.m.

12.2 Capital Projects

Mr. Delawalla presented information to the Board on capital projects in the district that had previously been discussed by the Board. He reviewed the major components of the proposed Athletic Complex renovations with the addition of a solar carport. He also gave the Board points to consider regarding the solar project. Mr. Delawalla provided information on the funding resources and the amounts. The Board asked questions to Mr. Delawalla and Mr. Todd Johnson, Chair of the Environmental Sustainability Committee regarding the application and RFP process for the solar project. Mr. Delawalla and Mr. Gray seemed to have been receiving some conflicting information in a few areas of the project. Further discussion ensued. Mr. Silbiger expressed his frustration that the project has not been moved forward, and stated that if there is a disagreement Mr. Delawalla cannot just disregard the Board's direction. Mrs. Jaffe informed the Board of all the other projects/duties that Mr. Delawalla has to work on. She insisted that both she and Mr. Delawalla have been following up and working on the solar project and that there are also legalities that have to be looked at to make sure the project is done correctly. She informed them that savings from a solar project would not likely happen for another two years and the District needs to save money now. Mrs. Jaffe also informed the Board that the City is also working with Edison and suggested that both entities work together on their solar projects. Board members asked that Mr. Delawalla move forward with the RFP as soon as possible. Mr. Delawalla stated that he would have the RFP by the following Friday. Mr. Zeidman thanked Mr. Delawalla for all of his hard work and stated that he understands the difficulties of being short staffed. Mr. Zeidman also commented that Mr. Delawalla has a fiduciary duty to the District and needs to be as thorough as possible. Mr. Zeidman was in agreement to see what can get done by the following Friday.

14. Action Items

14.1 Superintendent's Items - None

14.2 Education Services Items

14.2a Third Reading and Adoption of Revised Administrative Regulation 6164.6, Instruction – Identification and Education Under Section 504

Ms. Siever had a suggested change in format. Mr. Sotelo explained the revision. Mr. Zeidman asked for clarification from Ms. Siever if her suggestion was in wording or in format only. Ms. Siever confirmed it was in format only. It was moved by Ms. Paspalis and seconded by Mr. Gourley that the Board approve Revised Administrative Regulation 6164.6, Instruction – Identification and Education Under Section 504 with the revised format. The motion was unanimously approved.

14.2b Third Reading and Adoption of New Board Policy/Administrative Regulation 5118, Students – Open Enrollment Act Transfers

It was moved by Ms. Siever and seconded by Mr. Gourley that the Board adopt New Board Policy/Administrative Regulation 5118, Students – Open Enrollment Act Transfers as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

14.3 Business Items - None

14.4 Personnel Items

14.4a Approval is Recommended for Resolution #21-2010/2011, Catastrophic Leave for Classified Employee (Elementary School Secretary)

It was moved by Ms. Paspalis and seconded by Mr. Gourley that the Board approve Resolution #21-2010/2011, Catastrophic Leave for Classified Employee (Elementary School Secretary) as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

14.4b Approval is Recommended for Resolution #22-2010/2011 (HR), Regarding the Reduction or Discontinuance of Particular Kinds of Service Now Being Performed by Certificated Employees

Ms. Siever commended Mrs. Lockhart and her staff for the extra work they put in on the Resolution. Ms. Paspalis clarified that if the FLAP grant was renewed the position at El Marino would not be cut. It was moved by Ms. Siever and seconded by Mr. Gourley that the Board approve Resolution #22-2010/2011 (HR), Regarding the Reduction or Discontinuance of Particular Kinds of Service Now Being Performed by Certificated Employees as presented. The motion was unanimously approved.

15. Board Business

15.1 Update on Budget Sub-Committee

Mr. Silbiger provided the Board with an update on how the committee meeting went and stated that the Board was sent copies of all the recommendations from the meeting. Janet Chabola stated that she was present at the meeting and there were people present that did not know much about the budget process. She feels that when people do not know about the process they are basing their suggestions more on personal interests and emotions. Ms. Siever stated that she was also present at the meeting as one of the Board appointees and she learned a lot. She stated that it was more of a session for ideas regarding the budget. Ms. Siever also appreciated the diversity of the group.

Adjournment

There being no further business, it was moved by Mr. Gourley, seconded by Ms. Siever and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting. Board President Mr. Zeidman adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m. in memory of Myrna Perks and Herbert Karnofsky, father of former Board member Marla Wolkowitz.

Approved: _____
Board President

Superintendent

On: _____
Date

Secretary

9.2 PURCHASE ORDERS AND WARRANTS

The attached purchase order list and warrants report are submitted to the Board of Education for ratification. No other purchase orders have been issued other than those previously approved or included in the attached list.

The intent of this report is to provide the Board of Education and the community with more definitive information relative to purchasing and disbursement of monies by fund and account.

Purchase order grand total from February 26, 2011 through March 11, 2011 is \$263,330.26. Warrants issued for the period February 10, 2010 through March 10, 2011 total \$7,407,680.11. This includes \$2,631,309.00 in commercial warrants, and \$4,776,371.11 in payroll warrants.

BUDGET NUMBER LEGEND FOR FUNDS

- 01.0 general fund
- 11.0 adult education fund
- 12.0 child development fund
- 13.0 cafeteria fund
- 14.0 deferred maintenance fund
- 21.0 building fund
- 25.0 capital facilities fund
- 40.0 redevelopment
- 76.0 warrant pass-through fund
- 96.0 general fixed asset account

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That purchase orders from February 26, 2011 through March 11, 2011 in the amount of \$263,330.26 and warrants for February 10, 2011 through March 10, 2011 in the amount of \$7,407,680.11 be ratified by the Board of Education.

Moved by:

Seconded by:

Vote:

Board List Purchase Order Report

CULVER CITY UNIFIED SD

Page No. 1

Run Date: 03/12/2011

Purchase Orders/Buyouts To The Board for Ratification From : 2/26/2011 To 3/11/2011

Purchase Orders/Buyouts in Excess of \$1.00 To Be Ratified

Run Time: 04:00:55AM
WEEKLY

Report ID: LAPO009C

District : 64444

Change

PO Date	PO #	Stat	Ord#	Date	Vendor Name	Description	Dept/Site	Fund	Res.Prj	Goal	Funct	Obj	Sch.Lo	Distrib Amount	PO Amt
03/11/11	110301A	A		03/11/2011	T-SHIRT WAREHOUSE	INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES	Culver City Middle School	01.0	90127.0	11100	10000	4310	3010000	108.65	108.65
						03/11/2011	110301A								
03/04/11	110312	A		03/04/2011	DELL COMPUTER CORP.	COMPUTER SUPP/EQUIP	Culver City High School	01.0	90127.0	11100	10000	4410	4010000	6,634.39	6,634.39
						03/04/2011	110312								
03/09/11	11SS03	A		03/09/2011	EAGLE SPORTS & AWARDS	OFFICE SUPPLIES	Culver City Middle School	01.0	90127.0	11100	10000	4350	3010000	81.22	81.22
						03/09/2011	11SS03								
03/09/11	55803	A		03/09/2011	THERAPY WEST, INC.	NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS SERVICE	Special Education	01.0	65000.0	57500	11800	5880	0004040	138,699.00	138,699.00
						03/09/2011	55803								
03/04/11	56293M	A		03/04/2011	EPRODUCTS TO GO, LLC	OFFICE SUPPLIES	Custodians	01.0	00000.0	00000	82000	4350	0005042	808.70	808.70
						03/04/2011	56293M								
03/02/11	56294M	A		03/02/2011	COX PAINT CENTER	MAINTENANCE SUPP/EQUIP	Maintenance	01.0	81500.0	00000	81100	4380	0005040	1,500.00	1,500.00
						03/02/2011	56294M								
03/10/11	56296M	A		03/10/2011	HAJOCA CORP	APPLIANCES	Office of Child Development	12.0	50250.0	85000	10000	4410	0000002	1,600.00	1,600.00
						03/10/2011	56296M								
03/11/11	56297M	A		03/11/2011	CLASSIC PARTY RENTALS	GRADUATION SUPPLIES	El Rincon	01.0	00000.0	11100	10000	4310	2040001	745.90	745.90
						03/11/2011	56297M								
03/08/11	56383A	A		03/08/2011	COLONIAL CHESTERFIELD AT	FIELD TRIPS	El Rincon Elementary	01.0	91400.0	11100	10000	5816	2040000	110.50	110.50
						03/08/2011	56383A								
03/01/11	56414	X	1	03/03/2011	SCHOOL SPECIALTY	OFFICE FURNITURE/EQUIP	Office of Child Development	12.0	50250.0	85000	10000	6490	0000002	20,695.40	20,695.40
						1	03/03/2011								

Stat : P = Pending, A=Active, C=Completed, X=Canceled

Board List Purchase Order Report
 CULVER CITY UNIFIED SD

PO Date	PO #	Stat	Ord#	Date	Vendor Name	Description	Dept/Site	Fund	Res.Prj	Goal	Funct	Obj	Sch.Lo	Distrib Amount	PO Amt
						03/01/2011	56414	SCHOOL SPECIALTY						25,895.81	
02/28/11	56417	A		02/28/2011	NEW MANAGEMENT	CONSULTANTS	Special Projects	01.0	40350.0	00000	00000	5850	0004030	716.00	
						02/28/2011	56417	NEW MANAGEMENT						716.00	
02/28/11	56419	A		02/28/2011	MONTEREY ABALONE CO.	INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES	High School	01.0	00000.0	11100	10000	4310	4010001	123.96	
						02/28/2011	56419	MONTEREY ABALONE CO.						123.96	
03/02/11	56420	A	1	03/07/2011	RIFTON PRODUCTS LLC	INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES	Undistributed	01.7	65000.0	50010	22000	4310	0000000	1,473.40	
						03/02/2011	56420	RIFTON PRODUCTS LLC						1,473.40	
03/02/11	56421	A		03/02/2011	CDW-G	OFFICE SUPPLIES	Technology	01.0	00000.0	00000	77000	4350	0005020	613.17	
						03/02/2011	56421	CDW-G						613.17	
03/02/11	56422	A		03/02/2011	THE APPLE STORE	COMPUTER SUPP/EQUIP	La Ballona Elementary	01.0	91400.0	11100	10000	4310	2060000	1,455.06	
						03/02/2011	56422	THE APPLE STORE						1,455.06	
03/02/11	56423	A		03/02/2011	ESPECIAL NEEDS, LLC	INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES	Undistributed	01.7	65000.0	50010	22000	4310	0000000	2,025.99	
						03/02/2011	56423	ESPECIAL NEEDS, LLC						2,025.99	
03/02/11	56424	C		03/02/2011	CABE	CONFERENCE AND TRAVEL	Special Projects	01.0	58200.0	00000	21000	5220	0004030	430.00	
						03/02/2011	56424	CABE						430.00	
03/03/11	56425	C		03/03/2011	S.T.A.R. INC.	CONTRACTED SERVICES	Special Projects	01.0	60100.0	00000	27000	5810	0004030	60,000.00	
						03/03/2011	56425	S.T.A.R. INC.						60,000.00	
03/01/11	56426	A		03/01/2011	LIGHTSPEED TECHNOLOGIES,	OFFICE MACHINES SUPP/SERVICES	Special Education	01.0	33100.0	57300	11100	4400	0004040	500.00	
						03/01/2011	56426	LIGHTSPEED TECHNOLOGIES, INC.						500.00	
03/01/11	56427	A		03/01/2011	PHONAK HEARING SYSTEMS	OFFICE MACHINES SUPP/SERVICES	Special Education	01.0	33100.0	57300	11100	4400	0004040	500.00	

Board List Purchase Order Report

CULVER CITY UNIFIED SD

Page No. **3**

Run Date: **03/12/2011**

Purchase Orders/Buyouts To The Board for Ratification From : **2/26/2011 To 3/11/2011**

Purchase Orders/Buyouts in Excess of \$1.00 To Be Ratified

Run Time: **04:00:55AM**
WEEKLY

PO Date	PO #	Stat	Ord#	Date	Vendor Name	Description	Dept/Site	Fund	Res.Prj	Goal	Funct	Obj	Sch.Lo	Distrib Amount	PO Amt	
							56427								500.00	
								PHONAK HEARING SYSTEMS								
03/02/11	56428	C		03/02/2011	MURRAY & ROBYN ZELMANOVITZ	CONTRACT SERVICES RENDERED	Special Education	01.0	33100.0	57500	39000	5890	0004040	3,120.79		
								MURRAY & ROBYN ZELMANOVITZ								3,120.79
03/02/11	56429	A		03/02/2011	DISCOUNT SCHOOL SUPPLY	INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES	Special Education	01.0	33850.0	57300	11100	4310	0004040	100.06		
								DISCOUNT SCHOOL SUPPLY								100.06
03/02/11	56430	C		03/02/2011	THERAPY IN ACTION	CONTRACT SERVICES RENDERED	Special Education	01.0	65000.0	57520	11360	5810	0004040	900.00		
								THERAPY IN ACTION								900.00
03/01/11	56431	A		03/01/2011	PURCHASE POWER	COMMUNICATION SUPP/EQUIP	Purchasing	01.0	00000.0	00000	73000	5910	0005030	1,959.76		
								PURCHASE POWER								1,959.76
03/02/11	56432	A		03/02/2011	CDW-G	CONTRACTED SERVICES	Technology	01.0	00000.0	00000	77000	5810	0005020	130.60		
								CDW-G								130.60
03/02/11	56433	A		03/02/2011	MALEMAN INK	CONSULTANTS	Superintendent's Office	01.0	00000.0	00000	71000	5850	0001000	2,736.00		
								MALEMAN INK								2,736.00
03/02/11	56434	A		03/02/2011	SURFAS INC.	INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES	Office of Child Development	12.0	61050.0	85000	10000	4310	0000002	734.31		
								SURFAS INC.								734.31
03/07/11	56435	A		03/07/2011	TYRONE C. HOWARD	CONSULTANTS	Culver City High School	01.0	07395.0	00000	27000	5850	4010000	3,000.00		
								TYRONE C. HOWARD								3,000.00
03/04/11	56436	A		03/04/2011	OFFICE DEPOT	OFFICE SUPPLIES	Pupil Services	01.0	00000.0	00000	31400	4350	0004020	264.80		
								OFFICE DEPOT								264.80
03/04/11	56437	C		03/04/2011	ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR	CONTRACT SERVICES RENDERED	Culver Park High School	01.0	07395.0	32000	27000	5810	5010000	601.36		

Stat : P = Pending, A=Active, C=Completed, X=Canceled

Board List Purchase Order Report
 CULVER CITY UNIFIED SD

Purchase Orders/Buyouts To The Board for Ratification From : 2/26/2011 To 3/11/2011
 Purchase Orders/Buyouts in Excess of \$1.00 To Be Ratified

PO Date	PO #	Stat	Ord#	Date	Vendor Name	Description	Dept/Site	Fund	Res.Prj	Goal	Funct	Obj	Sch.Lo	Distrib Amount	PO Amt
03/04/2011	56437					ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR SCHOOLS								601.36	
03/07/11	56438	C		03/07/2011	PUPPIES AND REPTILES FOR	FIELD TRIPS	El Rincon Elementary	01.0	00000.0	16003	10000	5816	2040000	110.00	
03/07/2011	56438					PUPPIES AND REPTILES FOR PARTIES								110.00	
03/10/11	56439	A		03/10/2011	PITNEY BOWES	OFFICE SUPPLIES	Purchasing	01.0	00000.0	00000	73000	4350	0005030	706.83	
03/10/2011	56439					PITNEY BOWES								706.83	
03/08/11	56440	A		03/08/2011	AUTRY MUSEUM OF WESTERN HERITAGE	FIELD TRIPS	El Rincon Elementary	01.0	00000.0	16003	10000	5816	2040000	56.00	
03/08/2011	56440					AUTRY MUSEUM OF WESTERN HERITAGE								56.00	
03/08/11	56441	A		03/08/2011	LASERCARE	OFFICE SUPPLIES	Culver City High School	01.0	91400.0	00000	27000	4350	4010000	218.41	
03/08/2011	56441					LASERCARE								218.41	
03/10/11	56442	A		03/10/2011	4IMPRINT	INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES	Office of Child Development	12.0	61050.0	85000	10000	4310	0000002	243.05	
03/10/2011	56442					4IMPRINT								243.05	
03/10/11	56443	A		03/10/2011	SURFAS INC.	INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES	Office of Child Development	12.0	61051.0	85000	10000	4310	0000002	164.63	
03/10/2011	56443					SURFAS INC.								164.63	
03/10/11	56444	A		03/10/2011	TROXELL COMMUNICATIONS	INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES	Culver City Middle School	01.0	00000.0	16002	10000	4310	3010000	2,063.30	
03/10/2011	56444					TROXELL COMMUNICATIONS								2,063.30	
03/10/11	56445	A		03/10/2011	AFTERSCHOOL CORNUCOPIA	CONTRACTED SERVICES	Linwood Howe Elementary	01.0	91400.0	00000	27000	5810	2020000	1,000.00	
03/10/2011	56445					AFTERSCHOOL CORNUCOPIA								1,000.00	
03/10/11	56446	A		03/10/2011	APPERSON EDUCATION	OFFICE SUPPLIES	Human Resources	01.0	00000.0	00000	74000	4350	0003000	151.58	
03/10/2011	56446					APPERSON EDUCATION PRODUCTS								151.58	
03/10/11	56447	A		03/10/2011	DEMCO, INC.	INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES	Special Projects	01.0	58100.0	11100	10000	4310	0004030	391.28	

Stat : P = Pending, A=Active, C=Completed, X=Canceled

Board List Purchase Order Report

CULVER CITY UNIFIED SD

Page No. **5**

Run Date: **03/12/2011**

Purchase Orders/Buyouts To The Board for Ratification From: **2/26/2011 To 3/11/2011**

Run Time: **04:00:55AM**
WEEKLY

Report ID: LAPO009C

District: 64444

Purchase Orders/Buyouts in Excess of \$1.00 To Be Ratified

PO Date	PO #	Stat	Ord#	Date	Change	Vendor Name	Description	Dept/Site	Fund	Res.Prj	Goal	Funct	Obj	Sch.Lo	Distrib Amount	PO Amt
03/10/2011					56447	DEMCO, INC.										391.28
03/10/2011	56448	A		03/10/2011		PROJECTOR SUPER STORE	OFFICE SUPPLIES	EI Marino Language	01.0	73950.0	11100	10000	4350	2030000	762.00	
					56448	PROJECTOR SUPER STORE										762.00
03/10/2011	56449	A		03/10/2011		CCUSD FOOD SERVICE	FOOD PRODUCTS	La Ballona Elementary	01.0	91400.0	11100	10000	4710	2060000	93.75	
					56449	CCUSD FOOD SERVICE										93.75
Total by District : 64444															263,330.26	263,330.26

End of Report LAPO009C

NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS:
CURRENT PERIOD: \$138,699.00
TOTAL YTD: \$2,759,442.97

**CULVER CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
DISTRICT WARRANT REPORT
2010 - 2011**

COMMERCIAL WARRANTS

FEB. 10, 2011 - MAR. 10, 2011	\$ 2,631,309.00
-------------------------------	-----------------

PAYROLL WARRANTS

FEB. 10, 2011 - MAR. 10, 2011	\$ 4,776,371.11
-------------------------------	-----------------

TOTAL:	<u>\$ 7,407,680.11</u>
---------------	-------------------------------

BOARD REPORT

9.4 Financial Implication for Certificated Services Report No. 16

Total Fiscal Impact per Funding Source:

Education Services Donations	\$ 4,410.00
General Fund – Athletics	\$ 1,155.01
School Improvement	\$ 2,918.00
Special Education	\$ 8,960.00
Testing	\$ 900.00
Title II	\$ 5,488.72

BOARD REPORT

9.4 Certificated Personnel Services Report No. 16

I. Authorization and Ratification of Employment

A. Administrator on Special Assignment – District Office, Mentor Two Farragut Teachers
Revision – Item previously approved on Board Report No. 8; 10/26/10
Effective October 1, 2010 through June 17, 2011 at \$59.66 per hour to work 4 hours
per week, not to exceed 92 hours
Funding Source: Title II – Teacher Quality
Total Cost: \$5,488.72

1. La Briola, Rosalind (Retired)

B. Substitute Teacher – District Office, One on One for Special Education Student
Effective March 15, 2011 through June 17, 2011 at \$160.00 per day
Funding Source: Special Education
Total Cost: \$8,960.00

1. Dickinson, Melinda

C. Substitute Teacher – Office of Child Development
Effective September 1, 2010 at \$18.40 per hour, on-call work as needed
Funding Source: Office of Child Development

1. Hearn, Yolanda

D. Extra Assignment – District Office, Physical Fitness Testing Coordinator
Effective March 23, 2011 through June 17, 2011 at \$900.00 stipend
Funding Source: Testing
Total Cost: \$900.00

1. Peacock, Brandy

E. Extra Assignment – Middle School, Open House Substitute Teacher
Effective March 3, 2011 at \$35.00 per hour, not to exceed 2 hours
Funding Source: School Improvement
Total Cost: \$140.00

1. Frank, Karen
2. Romero, Laura

BOARD REPORT

9.4 Certificated Personnel Services Report No 16 – Page 2

I. Authorization and Ratification of Employment – continued

F. Extra Assignment – Elementary Sites, Arts Integration Partnership Reconvening Sessions
Effective January 12, 2011 through June 17, 2011 at \$35.00 per hour, not to exceed
3 hours per teacher
Funding Source: Education Services Donations
Total Cost: \$3360.00

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Abascal, Atoosa | 17. Horiba, Alice |
| 2. Adachi, Naomi | 18. Kendrick, Marshanne |
| 3. Ames, Janet | 19. Manglilong, Stephanie |
| 4. Bearman, Alix | 20. McMillan, Wade |
| 5. Bell, Monica | 21. Mejia, Elizabeth |
| 6. Borcharding, Nan | 22. Miller, Samantha |
| 7. Burkenheim, Karen | 23. Mont, Allison |
| 8. Coelho, Isabel | 24. Padilla, Marisela |
| 9. Coleman, Margaret | 25. Redmon, Kimberly |
| 10. Connor, Jessica | 26. Roberts, Kelley |
| 11. Cruz-Hebert, Anna | 27. Rose, Jeffrey |
| 12. Egan, Johanna | 28. Sibert, Christine |
| 13. Fitts, Julie | 29. Sorbille, Selva |
| 14. Fredal, Ann | 30. Strom, Sukainatou |
| 15. Glusac, Jan | 31. Taslimi, Julia |
| 16. Gualtieri, Natalie | 32. Valdovinos, Patricia |

G. Extra Assignment – Middle School, Arts Integration Partnership Reconvening Sessions
Effective January 12, 2011 through June 17, 2011 at \$35.00 per hour,
not to exceed 5 hours per teacher
Funding Source: Education Services Donations
Total Cost: \$1,050.00

- | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Delaney, Sarah | 4. Green-Bratton, Cathi |
| 2. Fairfield, Kristin | 5. Grime, Daniel |
| 3. Fretham, Kari | 6. Morris, Ruth |

H. Extra Assignment – Middle School, 5th Grade Orientation During Prep Period
Effective March 9, 2011 at \$63.00 (pay for one block period)
Funding Source: School Improvement
Total Cost: \$63.00

1. Takahashi, Ai

BOARD REPORT

9.4 Certificated Personnel Services Report No 16 – Page 3

I. Authorization and Ratification of Employment – continued

I. Extra Assignment – Middle School, Saturday Success Academy Substitute
Item previously approved on Board Report #11; 1/11/11
Effective December 4, 2010 through June 11, 2011 at \$35.00 per hour,
not to exceed 2.5 hours per week
Funding Source: Title I

1. Takahashi, Ai

J. Extra Assignment – Middle School, Team Leader Replacement
Item previously approved on Board Report #6; 9/28/10
Effective April 1, 2011 through June 17, 2011 at \$300.00 stipend
Funding Source: School Improvement
Total Cost: \$300.00

1. Stowers, Katherine

K. Extra Assignment – Middle School, California STAR Writing Test Preparation
Effective March 1, 2011 at \$63.00 (pay for one block period)
Funding Source: School Improvement
Total Cost: \$315.00

1. Azad, Mark	4. James, Yakun
2. Bilbao, Phillip	5. McCorkle, Kyle
3. Collett, Robert	

L. Extra Assignment – Middle School, Math Counts
Effective October 12, 2010 through April 29, 2011 at \$35.00 per hour,
not to exceed 1 hour per week
Funding Source: School Improvement
Total Cost: \$840.00

1. Vandever, Emily

M. Extra Assignment – High School, Coaching CIF Playoffs
Effective February 11, 2011 through February 18, 2011 at stated stipend
Funding Source: General Fund – Athletics
Total Cost: \$1,155.01

1. Chapman, Jonathan	Basketball CIF Playoffs	\$424.07 Stipend
2. Kochevar, Jennifer	Girls' Soccer CIF Playoffs	\$449.19 Stipend
3. Sanchez, David	Boys' Soccer CIF Playoffs	\$270.75 Stipend

BOARD REPORT

9.4 Certificated Personnel Services Report No 16 – Page 4

I. Authorization and Ratification of Employment – continued

N. Extra Assignment – High School, After School Tutoring
Effective March 15, 2011 through June 17, 2011 at \$35.00 per hour,
not to exceed 3 hours per week
Funding Source: School Improvement
Total Cost: \$1,260.00

1. Tano, Aaron

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That approval be granted for Certificated Personnel
Services Report No. 16

Moved by:

Seconded by:

Vote:

BOARD REPORT

9.5 Financial Implication for Classified Personnel Services Report No. 16

Total Funding Fiscal Impact:

Child Development Total: \$9,300.00

General Fund Total: \$27,982.82
\$14.14 per hour, as needed
\$8.00 per hour, as needed

School Improvement Total: \$70.00

I. Authorization, Approval & Ratification of Employment

A. Clerical & Fiscal

1. Library Media Clerk I Funding Source: General Fund
Fiscal Impact: \$17,825/year
2. Health Technicians Funding Source: General Fund – Medi-Cal
Fiscal Impact: \$1,546.40/assignment

B. Instructional Assistants

1. Instructional Assistant –
Computer Lab Funding Source: School Improvement
Fiscal Impact: \$70.00/assignment

C. Maintenance, Operations & Transportation

1. Substitute School Custodians Funding Source: General Fund
Fiscal Impact: \$14.61/ hour, as needed

D. Coaches

1. Temporary Coaches Funding Source: General Fund – Athletic
Fiscal Impact: \$2,942.92/assignment

E. Noon Duty Supervisors

1. Noon Duty Supervisor Funding Source: General Fund
Fiscal Impact: \$3,052.50/assignment

F. Stipend Assignments

1. Temporary Choreographer Funding Source: General Fund – AVPA
Fiscal Impact: \$2,616.00/assignment

BOARD REPORT

9.5 Financial Implication for Classified Personnel Services Report No. 16 – Page 2

I. Authorization, Approval & Ratification of Employment – continued

G. Student Helpers

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| 1. Student Helper | Funding Source: General Fund – Special Ed.
Fiscal Impact: \$8.00/hour, as needed |
|-------------------|---|

II. Authorization, Approval & Ratification of Change of Assignment

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Instructional Assistant –
Child Development | Funding Source: Child Development
Fiscal Impact: \$9,300.00/year |
|---|---|

BOARD REPORT

9.5 Classified Personnel Services Report No. 16

I. Authorization, Approval & Ratification of Employment

A. Clerical & Fiscal

1. Ysaguirre, Ann Marie
Library Media Clerk I
Linwood Howe
5 hours per day, 10 months per year
Funding Source: General Fund
Effective April 11, 2011
Range 17 – \$1782.50 per month
2. Morales, Mayra
Health Technician I
Middle School Nurse's Office
Extra Assignment
Not to exceed 40 hours
Funding Source: General Fund – Medi-Cal
Effective March 28, 2011 through
April 1, 2011
Range 19 – \$19.07 per hour
3. Little, Tina
Health Technician II
High School Nurse's Office
Extra Assignment
Not to exceed 40 hours
Funding Source: General Fund – Medi-Cal
Effective March 28, 2011 through
April 1, 2011
Range 20 – \$19.59 per hour

B. Instructional Assistants

1. Augenstein, Patricia
Instructional Assistant – Computer Lab
Middle School – Extra Assignment
Open House – Not to exceed 2 hours
Funding Source: School Improvement
Effective March 3, 2011
Stipend of \$35.00 per hour

C. Maintenance, Operations & Transportation

1. Joya Lepe, Sigifredo
Substitute School Custodian
Maintenance, Operations & Transportation
Funding Source: General Fund
Effective March 23, 2011
Hourly, as needed – \$14.61 per hour

BOARD REPORT

9.5 Classified Personnel Services Report No. 16 – Page 2

I. Authorization, Approval & Ratification of Employment – continued

C. Maintenance, Operations & Transportation – continued

2. Acevedo, Uriel
Substitute School Custodian
Maintenance, Operations & Transportation
Funding Source: General Fund
Effective March 23, 2011
Hourly, as needed – \$14.61 per hour

D. Coaches

1. Eskridge, Adam
Temporary Boys' Assistant Basketball Coach
High School – CIF Playoffs
Funding Source: General Fund – Athletic
Effective February 11, 2011 through
February 18, 2011
Stipend of \$383.46
2. Goodwin, Gary
Temporary Boys' Assistant Basketball Coach
High School – CIF Playoffs
Funding Source: General Fund – Athletic
Effective February 11, 2011 through
February 18, 2011
Stipend of \$383.46
3. Huezco, Derek
Temporary Boys' Assistant Basketball Coach
High School – CIF Playoffs
Funding Source: General Fund – Athletic
Effective February 11, 2011 through
February 18, 2011
Stipend of \$383.46
4. Anderson, Julian
Temporary Girls' Basketball Coach
High School – CIF Playoffs
Funding Source: General Fund – Athletic
Effective February 11, 2011 through
February 17, 2011
Stipend of \$363.48
5. Batalla, Karlia
Temporary Girls' Basketball Coach
High School – CIF Playoffs
Funding Source: General Fund – Athletic
Effective February 11, 2011 through
February 17, 2011
Stipend of \$328.68

BOARD REPORT

9.5 Classified Personnel Services Report No. 16 – Page 3

I. Authorization, Approval & Ratification of Employment – continued

D. Coaches – continued

6. Nakayama, Tom Temporary Girls' Basketball Coach
High School – CIF Playoffs
Funding Source: General Fund – Athletic
Effective February 11, 2011 through
February 17, 2011
Stipend of \$363.48
7. Boisdeau, Rick Temporary Boys' Assistant Soccer Coach
High School – CIF Playoffs
Funding Source: General Fund – Athletic
Effective February 11, 2011 through
February 16, 2011
Stipend of \$249.55
8. Mair, Scott Temporary Girls' Soccer Coach
High School – CIF Playoffs
Funding Source: General Fund – Athletic
Effective February 11, 2011 through
February 22, 2011
Stipend of \$487.35

E. Noon Duty Supervisors

1. Goodrich, William Temporary Noon Duty Supervisor
Linwood Howe
Funding Source: General Fund
Effective March 23, 2011 through
June 17, 2011
Hourly, as needed – \$9.25 per hour

F. Stipend Assignments

1. McCleese, Mark Temporary Choreographer
High School – AVPA –
Spring Musical “Urinetown”
Funding Source: General Fund – AVPA
Effective January 3, 2011 through
March 14, 2011
Stipend of \$2,616.00

BOARD REPORT

9.5 Classified Personnel Services Report No. 16 – Page 4

I. Authorization, Approval & Ratification of Employment – continued

G. Student Helpers

1. Rodriguez, Cristobal Student Helper – Workability
Location outside of district
Funding Source: General – Special Education
Effective March 14, 2011
Hourly, as needed – \$8.00 per hour

II. Authorization, Approval & Ratification of Change of Assignment

1. Gomez, Yolanda Promotion via Classified Interview:
From: Substitute Instructional Assistant –
Child Development
Hourly, as needed
To: Instructional Assistant –
Child Development
16.5 hours per week, school year
Child Development
Funding Source: Child Development
Effective March 23, 2011
Range 11 – \$13.48 per hour

III. Authorization, Approval & Ratification of Resignations

1. Richards, Kari Temporary Spirit Squad Coach
Middle School
Funding Source: General Fund – Athletic
Pursue education
Effective March 6, 2011
Stipend of \$1,535.12 paid

BOARD REPORT

9.5 Classified Personnel Services Report No. 16 – Page 5

III. Authorization, Approval & Ratification of Resignations – continued

2. Goodrich, Denise

Instructional Assistant – Special Education
Linwood Howe
3.9 hours per day, school year
Funding Source: General Fund
& Instructional Assistant – Child Development
Child Development/Linwood Howe
3 hours per day, school year
Funding Source: Child Development
Retirement
Effective June 30, 2011
Range 14 – \$16.88 per hour &
Range 11 – \$15.64 per hour

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That approval be granted for Classified Personnel Services Report No. 16

Moved by:

Seconded by:

Vote:

9.6 Enrollment Report

The attached reports display enrollment information for the sixth month of the 2010-2011 school year. The reports are presented in two formats: a monthly detail and a summary comparison.

The first report shows total K-12 site enrollment by grade level on the last day of a specific four-week period. These reporting periods are categorized as 1st School Month through 12th School Month and rarely coincide with calendar months. This report also lists enrollment totals in the Adult School and State Preschool Program.

The second report is a comparative document that shows the current year's monthly enrollment and the previous year's enrollment for each K-12 site location.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Education for Culver City Unified School District accept the Enrollment Report for month six of the 2010-2011 school year as presented.

Moved by:

Seconded by:

Vote:

Culver City Unified School District
Enrollment for the 6th School Month (1/10/11 - 2/4/11)
2010 - 2011

ELEMENTARY	El Marino	El Rincon	Farragut	La Ballona	Linwood Howe	Ind. Study	Total
K	135	91	89	90	70	0	475
1	132	95	92	112	90	0	521
2	132	90	83	90	79	0	474
3	118	88	78	85	70	0	439
4	121	82	88	60	88	0	439
5	116	79	89	92	80	0	456
Spec Class	0	19	6	0	28	0	53
Elementary Total	754	544	525	529	505	0	2857

SECONDARY	Middle School	High School	Culver Park	Ind. Study	Total
6	498			0	498
7	516			0	516
8	502			0	502
9		548	0	3	551
10		578	3	4	585
11		568	29	4	601
12		506	43	19	568
Spec Class	24	45	0	0	69
Secondary Total	1540	2245	75	30	3890

Total K-12 Enrollment	6747
------------------------------	-------------

PRESCHOOL

Linwood Howe	El Marino	El Rincon	Farragut	La Ballona	CEE	Total
53	16	41	8	88	95	301

ADULT SCHOOL

Adult Basic Education	ESL	Citizenship	Adults with Disabilities	Older Adults Prog	High School Subjects	Total
106	400	11	16	242	216	991

Notes:

1. These enrollment figures represent the total number of sections. A single student may be enrolled in multiple sections.
2. Of the 216 students enrolled in high school subjects, 49 concurrently attend high school

Culver City Unified School District

Enrollment Comparison

09-10 vs 10-11

ELEMENTARY	1st		2nd		3rd		4th		5th	
	School Month		School Month		School Month		School Month		School Month	
	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
El Marino	734	747	733	748	735	748	736	750	734	750
El Rincon	500	529	501	538	501	542	499	538	496	541
Farragut	503	523	504	526	506	524	505	523	508	522
La Ballona	514	524	507	532	505	532	508	531	505	529
Linwood Howe	510	500	506	494	507	502	511	504	507	502
Ind. Study	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0
Special Ed	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl
Elementary Total	2763	2823	2753	2838	2756	2848	2761	2846	2752	2844

SECONDARY	1st		2nd		3rd		4th		5th	
	School Month		School Month		School Month		School Month		School Month	
	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
Middle School	1568	1560	1564	1565	1558	1559	1555	1549	1557	1542
High School	2322	2290	2318	2298	2296	2271	2277	2259	2280	2251
Culver Park	65	59	64	67	67	66	78	71	80	71
Ind. Study	48	8	51	0	59	28	59	29	58	30
Special Ed	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl
Secondary Total	4003	3917	3997	3930	3980	3924	3969	3908	3975	3894

K-12 Total	6766	6740	6750	6768	6736	6772	6730	6754	6727	6738
-------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Culver City Unified School District
Enrollment Comparison
09-10 vs 10-11

ELEMENTARY	6th		7th		8th		9th		10th		11th	
	School Month		School Month		School Month		School Month		School Month		School Month	
	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
El Marino	737	754	739		736		738		738		738	
El Rincon	501	544	501		501		502		501		494	
Farragut	510	525	501		499		501		501		490	
La Ballona	503	529	505		504		503		505		494	
Linwood Howe	507	505	507		508		505		505		491	
Ind. Study	2	0	2		2		3		2		2	
Special Ed	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl
Elementary Total	2760	2857	2755	0	2750	0	2752	0	2752	0	2709	0

SECONDARY	6th		7th		8th		9th		10th		11th	
	School Month		School Month		School Month		School Month		School Month		School Month	
	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11	09-10	10-11
Middle School	1554	1540	1547		1545		1541		1541		1525	
High School	2283	2245	2265		2258		2239		2235		2225	
Culver Park	77	75	80		78		79		76		61	
Ind. Study	40	30	41		44		38		41		36	
Special Ed	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl	Incl
Secondary Total	3954	3890	3933	0	3925	0	3897	0	3893	0	3847	0

K-12 Total	6714	6747	6688	0	6675	0	6649	0	6645	0	6556	0
------------	------	------	------	---	------	---	------	---	------	---	------	---

BOARD REPORT

3/22/11

9.7

9.7 Approval is Recommended for the Single Plan for Student Achievement for Culver City Middle School

Education Codes 52853 and 52855 require school plans to be annually reviewed, revised and submitted to the Board of Education for approval. Culver City Middle School is submitting its Single Plan for Student Achievement.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board approves the Single Plan for Student Achievement, as submitted, for Culver City Middle School.

Moved by:

Seconded by:

Vote:

The Single Plan for Student Achievement

Culver City Middle School

School Name

19-6444-6057608

CDS Code

Date of this revision: March 17, 2011

The *Single Plan for Student Achievement* (SPSA) is a plan of actions to raise the academic performance of all students to the level of performance goals established under the California Academic Performance Index, California Education Code sections 41507, 41572, and 64001, and the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) require each school to consolidate all school plans for programs funded through the School and Library Improvement Block Grant, the Pupil Retention Block Grant, the Consolidated Application, and NCLB Program improvement into the *Single Plan for Student Achievement*.

For additional information on school programs and how you may become involved locally, please contact the following person:

Contact Person: Jon Pearson
Position: Principal
Telephone Number: 310-842-4200
Address: 4601 Elienda St.
Culver City, CA 90230
E-mail Address: jonpearson@ccusd.org

Culver City Unified School District

School District

Superintendent: Patricia Jaffe
Telephone Number: (310) 842-4220
Address: 4034 Irving Place
Culver City, CA 90232
E-mail Address: patriciajaffe@ccusd.org

The District Governing Board approved this revision of the School Plan on March 22, 2011.

The site has agreed to the centralization of Economic Impact Aid and Title I American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds to be utilized for site based services.

This plan will be considered valid upon the approval from the Culver City Unified School District's Board of Education. Upon approval, this plan will remain in place for the school year that it was approved, and it will act as an interim plan until a new plan is submitted and approved in the coming school year.

II. School Vision and Mission

The mission of the Culver City Unified School District, a diverse haven of excellence, is to ensure that each student possesses the academic and personal skills necessary to achieve his/her highest potential as a valued, responsible member of society by providing challenging, personalized educational experiences in a safe, nurturing environment and by fostering a passion for teaching and learning with committed parent and community involvement.

BELIEFS

We believe that:

- Each person deserves to be safe.
- Everyone deserves to be treated with respect.
- Honoring diversity makes us stronger
- Peace is worth pursuing
- The quality of life is determined by the harmony among emotional, physical, spiritual and intellectual pursuits.
- Everyone has a right to a belief system.
- Aesthetics is essential to life.
- We are responsible for ourselves and accountable to each other.
- Individuals have the right to express their views, opinions and thought.
- The sense of family and belonging is integral to our lives.
- Everyone has the right to preserve his/her dignity.
- Each person has the capacity for goodness.

CULVER CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of Culver City Middle School, a culturally diverse and collaborative learning community, is to ensure that all students are provided a rigorous, engaging educational program. We seek to foster a positive work ethic, integrity, respect, and a passion for learning while striving to integrate technology in the interest of promoting student achievement.

WE BELIEVE:

- All students can learn.
- Family and community partnerships are integral to student's learning
- School should meet the needs of every student to promote active learning.
- Students and staff will learn from each other and respect one another's contributions and diversity.
- The school's facilities must be safe, aesthetically pleasing, and conducive to learning.
- Character and academic expectations should be clearly defined.
- Environment encourages open communication and dialogue among staff, students, and families.

III. School Profile

Culver City Middle School, a 2003-2010 California School to Watch – Model Middle School, is one of nine schools in the Culver City Unified School district. There are five elementary schools, one middle school, one high school, an alternative high school and an independent study program. The district also has an adult school and the Office of Child Development. Culver City Middle School serves a diverse student body, ethnically, linguistically and economically, of 1554 sixth, seventh and eighth grade students. It is located in the small community of Culver City, which is five freeway miles west of downtown Los Angeles and is surrounded by the city of Los Angeles. Culver City encompasses 4.74 square miles and has a population of about 41,500. The school is situated in a neighborhood of tree-lined streets, manicured lawns and well kept homes, which were built in the 40s and 50s. It is buffered on the south side by the La Ballona Creek and a bike path which runs to the ocean. Originally, Culver City Middle School was built in the 1940s as a high school. When the new high school was built in the 1950s, the school became a junior high school, and then, in the early 1980s, in accordance with Caught in the Middle, it was transformed into a middle school.

According to the California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) report, dated October 2009, our student population is 42% Hispanic, 24% Caucasian, 19% African-American, 12% Asian, 2% Filipino, and 1% Pacific Islander. English language learners are 11% of our student population with 13% reclassified as fluent English Proficient. In excess of 25 languages are spoken on our campus. We became a targeted Title I school in 1998 with 39% low income students but currently we serve 42%, therefore CCMS is moving into a school-wide program to serve our students more effectively with a comprehensive academic program.

Culver City Middle School has a staff of dedicated, caring and well-trained personnel who provide programs which give students equal access to the core curriculum. The principal and the staff have worked together to form a collaborative endeavor for the common goal of making a learning/sharing environment which is good for all students, staff, parents and community. A collaborative effort through multiple media (i.e. webpage, parent access to grades and attendance through online portal, etc.) is in place in which understanding, listening, and constructive feedback are essential for success. Parents participate in PTSA, School Site Council, ELAC, and the Panther Partners Booster Club. Free mental health and medical services are available to students through a partnership with the Venice Family Health Clinic located on campus. Culver City Middle School has a sense of community with shared responsibility for all involved persons. All people and their opinions are valued and respected. This educational community is not afraid to take risks when it effects change and leads to achieving goals.

Culver City Middle School strives to attain the goals set by Caught in the Middle, Taking Center Stage and the State Department of Education's Standards. Culver City Middle School is student-centered and believes that students are our greatest resources and most promising leaders. Interdisciplinary teams have been established and interdisciplinary curriculum developed which encourages cooperative and collaborative learning and stresses higher level thinking skills. Teachers have high expectations for all students and provide students with opportunities to use the multiple intelligences throughout the curriculum. Academics, creativity and imagination are stressed. We address the needs of all students in our diverse population and have created lessons which accentuate cross-cultural understanding and interaction. Students participate in hands-on, high interest activities such as a multicultural festival and museum. Before and after school care is provided in collaboration with the YMCA and Culver City's Park and Recreation Department. Drama, Mock Trial, Math Counts, various student clubs, after school intervention classes, and athletics are just some of the offerings that are provided for students. Culver City Middle School has four computer labs and each teacher has at least one computer in the classroom with Internet access that enables teachers to access various web content to enhance instruction. A majority of our teachers have and use LCD projectors. We have a fully staffed library with computers. We foster a college-preparatory culture through our AVID program, college visitations, and the development of our College/Career Center that allows students to explore various careers and post secondary education opportunities.

The Culver City Middle School staff is committed to providing the best education for all students. We are striving to prepare our students for the challenges of the new millennium in our ever changing global environment.

IV. Comprehensive Needs Assessment Components

A. Data Analysis (See Appendix A)

The school site council has analyzed the available student performance data for all students, including English learners, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and students with special needs. The council has also obtained and considered the input of the school community.

Culver City Middle School's Academic Performance Index (API) continues to steadily rise. In 2009-2010, our API increased by 22 points to 829. Over the past three years, we have witnessed significant growth in API - 64 points school wide. We are very proud of what we are doing to close achievement gaps; however, our English Learner and Students with Disabilities subgroup did not make AYP in both math and English. In addition, our African American and Socioeconomic Disadvantaged students did not make AYP in math. This year, CCMS made its Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under the No Child Left Behind Law (NCLB) in 26 of our 33 Subgroups.

The following is a breakdown of our Subgroup API and the gains that they have made.

Subgroup API 2009-2010 Growth	
African American 792 +12	
Asian 917 +17	
Hispanic 783 +25	
White 890 +15	
Socio-Disadvantaged 766 +19	
English Learners 701 +4	
Students W/Disabilities 521 -43	
2010 Target in ELA: 56.8%	
2010 Target in math: 58%	
School-wide percentage of students who met AYP in ELA: 65.9%	
School-wide percentage of students who met AYP in math: 56.5%	

Student groups performing below performance standards:

EL: The EL students performed below the level of our school-wide population in ELA and math on the California Standards Test (CST).

Percentage of EL students meeting AYP in ELA: 36.8%

Percentage of EL students who met AYP in math: 34.1%

Special Education: The RSP students performed below the level of our school-wide population in ELA and math on the CST.

Percentage of Special Education students who met AYP in ELA: 22.7%

Percentage of Special Education students who met AYP in math: 18.2%

Title I: Title I students performed below the level of our school-wide population in math on the CST.

Percentage of Title I students who met AYP in math: 44.6%

African American: African American students performed below the level of our school-wide population in math on the CST.

Percentage of African American students who met AYP in math: 44.2%

However, every subgroup improved from our 2009 scores with the exception of Students with Disabilities.

B. Surveys

In order to better meet the needs of our English Learners, our teachers completed a self-study in 2009-10 that graded the "friendliness" of their instruction and classrooms. In addition, we had our Long-Term English Learners (L-TELEs) fill out a survey about their knowledge of the English Language Development (ELD) program, motivational issues, language acquisition difficulties, and college awareness. This information has helped train and guide faculty and administration to incorporate effective EL strategies into instruction and create realistic interventions that will improve achievement.

Also, as a "California School-to-Watch," we are required to perform a Self-Study every three years. The four

components of "Schools to Watch" are Academic Excellence, Developmental Responsiveness, Social Equity, and Organizational Structures and Processes. According to the data we gathered in 2008-09, our faculty believe we are doing an excellent job. A score of "4" on the rubric indicates that "the practice is highly and completely implemented, systemic, and coherent in every classroom and by every teacher across the school." A "3" indicated that "there is a high degree of maturing quality of implementation that is systemic. It may not be coherent or of the highest quality in every classroom and by every teacher, but certainly by most - 75% or better."

Our average score for the Academic Excellence component was 3.4 with the criteria describing their ability to provide instructional strategies that "include a variety of challenging and engaging activities that are clearly related to the grade-level standards, concepts, and skills being taught" receiving the highest score of 3.7. A common piece of evidence mentioned was that teachers intentionally plan for variation with standards in mind.

Data from our Self-Study indicates that our faculty believe we have room for improvement in the area of Developmental Responsiveness, scoring a total average of 3.35. The criteria describing our ability to provide students with "multiple opportunities to explore a rich variety of topics and interests in order to develop their identity, learn about their strengths, discover and demonstrate their own competence, and plan for their future" scored a 3.7, due to counselors providing ample guidance for future goals and teachers creating meaningful activities.

Data from our Self-Study in the Social Equity component indicates that our faculty believes we are a "socially equitable, democratic and fair" providing "every student with high-quality teachers, resources, learning opportunities, and supports" achieving a total average score of 3.7. They identified the criterion that describes our reward system "designed to value diversity, civility, service, and democratic citizenship" as our strongest with an average score of 3.9. A common piece of evidence described that students are recognized for their individuality and programs that award positive attributes and deeds.

Data from our Self-Study indicates that our faculty believes that Organizational Structures and Processes is our strongest component scoring an average total score of 3.9. The criterion describing how we "work with colleges and universities to recruit, prepare, and mentor novice and experienced teachers" received a perfect score. More importantly, we felt strongly about our performance in including "families and community members in setting and supporting the school's trajectory toward high performance," another criterion worth mentioning.

According to the Self-Study Rubric, our faculty believes that as a school, we need to do a better job using "an interdisciplinary approach to reinforce important concepts, skills, and addressing real-world problems," as stated in the Developmental Responsiveness component. One goal will be to plan a grade level, thematic, interdisciplinary, team project once per semester. In order to achieve this goal, CCMS Administration must provide opportunities "to enhance student achievement by working with colleagues to deepen their knowledge to improve their standards-based practice," as stated in the Academic Excellence component. We already have common, grade-level planning periods for each subject, in addition to Department and Team meeting time; however, a goal will be to find funding to support teachers during their collaboration time with specific trainings.

C. Classroom Observations

CCMS teachers adhere to and provide lessons based upon the California State Teaching Standards. When entering a CCMS classroom, you will see teachers and students engaged in the following: (1) Anticipatory Set-Teachers familiarize students with the Standard to be covered and provide a focus for the daily lesson. Students are given a "preview" into the material to be covered. (2) Input-Teachers provide their students with direct instruction to transfer information. (3) Checking for Understanding-Teachers pose questions to their classes on a whole group or individual basis. Utilizing this principle, teachers gain instant feedback and can restructure lessons as needed. (4) Guided Practice-Students are given an opportunity to practice using the information or concepts transmitted through the input phase. The teacher assigns a task and students work to demonstrate mastery under the observation of the teacher. (5) Closure-Before moving on to another concept or dismissing class, teachers include an exercise to solidify the day's lesson. Closure can take the shape of a brief question and answer session or a short reflection activity. (6) Independent Practice-When instruction is complete, teachers give the students an opportunity to individually engage in an assignment to show mastery of the concepts presented. Independent Practice can be ongoing.

CCMS values providing classroom environments in which students feel safe, nurtured, and confident in their abilities. Teachers work to build these values throughout the course of the year. As such, teachers are encouraged to post student work samples and relevant content area posters and displays. Classroom

instruction is bell to bell, with teachers maximizing the instructional minutes available. As CCMS works with in the block schedule model, students attend all six classes on Monday, including a 10 minute homeroom period. Classes on Monday are approximately 50 minutes in duration. On Tuesdays and Thursdays, students attend periods homeroom, one, three, and five. On Wednesdays and Fridays, students attend periods homeroom, two, four and six. Classes scheduled Tuesdays through Fridays are approximately 90 minutes in duration.

At CCMS, it is a school-wide ambition to instruct students with the latest research-based instructional practices. The staff is trained in Robert Marzano's "Classroom Instruction that Works," which includes, but is not limited to: Identifying Similarities and Differences, Summarizing and Note Taking, Reinforcing Effort and Providing Recognition, Homework and Practice, Non-linguistic Representations, Cooperative Learning, Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback, Generating and Testing Hypothesis, and Cues, Questions, and Advance Organizers.

In addition, teachers have been trained in strategies to improve EL achievement promoted by Dr. Kate Kinsella, a renowned expert in the field of academic language acquisition. Currently, our ELD department is participating in professional development workshops with Carole Ferraud which include classroom observations and feedback specific to the strategies presented. Moreover, our ELD department presents these strategies during monthly staff meetings. Lastly, how effectively teachers use these strategies are included in evaluation criteria.

We pride ourselves on offering students a meaningful, standards-based curriculum that will prepare them for real life. We are also making strides at closing the "achievement gaps" among our diverse body of students.

Our high level of commitment to focus on the area of technology is evident. Over 80% of our teachers utilize LCD projectors with streaming video resources regularly in their classrooms. We have multiple departments utilizing technology such as Smart Boards, response clickers and computer write pads. Our school was the recipient of a technology grant through LACOE where 6th grade language arts teachers were trained to incorporate technology into the curriculum using digital cameras, LCD projectors, etc. We also use our website to improve communication between school and parent. Not only is homework posted on teacher webpages on our website, but parents can access grades, attendance, and progress through our Parent Portal.

D. Student Work and School Documents

Students produce a variety of work, including labs, reports, research papers, projects, and portfolios. Students also are assessed in more traditional ways, such as quizzes, tests, and Benchmark Assessments.

E. Analysis of Current Instructional Program (See Appendix B)

The following statements characterize the status of student achievement and educational practice at this school. The conclusions reached in this section are used to determine improvements described in the following sections of the plan. To characterize the strength of our educational program, elements will be rated as "exceptional", "adequate", "limited", and "minimal."

PROGRAM ELEMENTS RATING

1. Alignment of curriculum to state standards: Exceptional
2. Curriculum and instructional strategies supported by scientifically based research: Exceptional
3. Regular use of assessments including diagnostic, benchmark, and department level common assessments: Exceptional
4. Use of assessment results to modify classroom instruction: Adequate
5. Timely intervention support provided as needed: Adequate
6. Evidence of high expectations for all students: Exceptional
7. Availability and use of instructional technology integrated into instruction: Adequate

8. Curriculum and instructional program evaluated on a regular basis: Exceptional
9. All teachers and instructional paraprofessionals are highly qualified: Exceptional
10. Professional development directly related to classroom instruction and embedded in daily activities: Exceptional
11. Professional development includes follow up monitoring and support: Adequate
12. Opportunities available for teacher collaboration and mentoring: Exceptional
13. Common planning time included in schedule and used effectively: Exceptional

CCMS top three program elements with the highest ratings:

1. Alignment of curriculum to state standards.
2. Curriculum and instructional program evaluated on a regular basis.
3. Common planning time included in schedule and used effectively.

CCMS target growth for three program elements with the lowest ratings:

1. Timely intervention support provided as needed.
2. Use of assessments results to modify classroom instruction.
3. Availability and use of instructional technology integrated into instruction.

V. Description of Barriers and Related School Goals

Possible underlying causes for low performance:

lack of funding and infrastructure for technology
 lack of intervention time during school day
 poor attendance during after/before intervention programs

Statement of Performance Improvement Targets/Goals, including actions steps or tasks to be accomplished to meet objectives for the School Plan:

Analyze test scores (CST and Galileo Benchmark Assessments) and work in teams and departments to create curriculum and lessons to address the standards and address the areas that need improvement.

Continue working on English Language Arts standards - word analysis and vocabulary development, reading comprehension, literacy response and analysis, and writing strategies to bring students to proficient/advanced levels.

Continue working on math standards - algebra and functions, statistics, data analysis, and probability, multistep problems, graphing, and functions to bring students to proficient/advanced levels.

Continue to provide intervention programs for all students including English Learners, Title I, and RSP students.

Bring English Learner program participants who have stagnated at the intermediate fluency level to proficient/advanced language levels according to AYP.

Revise curricular plans to address the needs of all students.

Utilize instructional aides for targeted instruction.

Provide technology to improve communication, including training.

Administer multiple assessments to improve teaching strategies.

Offer parent education and participation opportunities through ELAC.

Ongoing Staff Development, including summer staff development, conferences, supplemental reading materials, continued training on differentiated instruction, multiple intelligences, best practices, etc.

Continue to encourage writing across curriculum.

Provide regular communication between home and school.

Provide a safe learning environment, i.e. Safe School Plan.

Enhance and increase students' self esteem: character education, tangible and intangible rewards, opportunities for student leadership, opportunities for students to participate in co-curricular activities.

Enable students to attend educational, standards-based field trips.

VI. Planned Improvements in Student Performance

The school site council has analyzed the academic performance of all student groups and has considered the effectiveness of key elements of the instructional program for students failing to meet API and AYP growth targets. As a result, it has adopted the following school goals, related actions, and expenditures to raise the academic performance of student groups not meeting state standards:

<p>SCHOOL GOAL #1 (Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages) Assisting English Learners to improve performance in the classroom and on the California Standards Test (CST) in English/Language Arts and math. By the end of the year, 67.6% of our English Learners will score "Proficient" or "Advanced" on the California Standards Test in English/Language Arts and 68.5% will score "Proficient" or "Advanced" in math.</p>	<p>Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: Improved performance on CST as defined by NCLB requirements</p>
<p>Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: English Learners grades 6,7, and 8</p>	<p>Group data to be collected to measure academic gains: Benchmark Assessments CST Scores</p>

SCHOOL GOAL #1	Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal (1) Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date(s) Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures (39)	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>Staff, including counselors, teachers, coordinators, administration, and parents will determine how to best meet the needs of our English Learners by analyzing CST scores, grades and other relevant assessments.</p>	<p>Administrators, counselors, faculty, ELD coordinators, parents</p>	<p>September, 2010-June, 2011</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>ELD Coordinators will use teacher observation and tests, CELDT test, District writing prompts, and the State of California English Language Development Standards to establish a baseline for assessing student growth. Also, Coordinator, Assistant Principal, and EL Counselor will organize Parent Meetings (ELAC) to distribute program information, including Home School Compact and collaborate about satisfying the needs of EL students and families.</p>	<p>ELD coordinators, administrators, counselor</p>	<p>September, 2010-June, 2011</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Instructional Aides will be used for support in EL classrooms and to translate during Parent Meetings. All correspondence between school and home will also be translated.</p>	<p>Classified staff</p>	<p>September, 2010-June, 2011</p>	<p>\$13,000.00</p>	<p>\$13,000.00</p>	<p>ELAP</p>
<p>Teachers and ELD Coordinators will select and purchase supplemental ELD material which support the standards and support student learning in relationship with the ELD standards.</p>	<p>ELD Coordinators, teachers</p>	<p>September, 2010-June, 2011</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>\$3000.00</p>	<p>ELAP</p>
<p>Intuse technology into all subject areas to improve student engagement, specifically for EL students. Specifically, purchase Success Maker to support achievement in Math Builders and Skill Builders classes.</p>	<p>Administration, technology committee</p>	<p>September, 2010-June, 2011</p>	<p>\$25,000.00</p>	<p>\$25,000.00</p>	<p>Title 1</p>
<p>Attend professional development specific to strategies to assist English Learners that will be shared with faculty during staff meetings.</p>	<p>Teachers, administrators, counselors, ELD coordinator</p>	<p>September, 2010-June, 2011</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>\$14,200.00</p>	<p>Title 1</p>
<p>Increase parent involvement through holding monthly ELAC meetings as well as DELAC meetings aimed at providing knowledge and tools for parents to support their children.</p>	<p>Administration, classified staff</p>	<p>October, 2010</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>English Language Development Coordinator, counselors, and administration will continuously monitor student progress and make appropriate placement adjustments and determine additional support services.</p>	<p>ELD coordinator, administration, counselors</p>	<p>November, 2010-June, 2011</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Administration will evaluate and report data from the Intervention/Enrichment programs to CCMS Site Council, Title 1, and ELAC at the end of the 2010-11 school year. Evaluation will be based on data acquired from Galileo Benchmark Assessments, 2011 CST data, and academic grades and by surveying students, teachers, and parents.</p>	<p>Administration</p>	<p>June, 2010-August, 2010</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>n/a</p>

(37) See the "Chart of Required Contents for the SPSA" for content required by each program or funding source supporting this goal.
 (38) List the date an action will be taken or will begin, and the date it will be completed.
 (39) List the date an action will be taken or will begin, and the date it will be completed. Appropriate to this goal are allocated to the school through the Consolidated Application or other sources. List each proposed expenditure, such as "middle manager" and the quantity to be acquired. Schools participating in programs for which the school receives no allocation may omit proposed expenditures.

VI. Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

SCHOOL GOAL #2	Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal (1) Staffing and Professional Development	Start Dates(39) Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures (39)	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>SCHOOL GOAL #2 (Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages) Assist Students with Disabilities to improve performance in the classroom and on the California Standards Test (CST) in English/Language Arts and math. By the end of the year, 67.6% of our Students with Disabilities will score "Proficient" or "Advanced" on the California Standards Test in English/Language Arts and 68.5% will score "Proficient" or "Advanced" in math.</p> <p>Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: Special Education students Grade 6, 7, 8</p> <p>Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: School Records CST scores</p> <p>Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: Improved performance on CST as defined by NCLB requirements</p> <p>Group data to be collected to measure academic gains: Benchmark Assessments CST scores</p>	Staff, including counselors, teachers, coordinators, administration, and parents will determine how to best meet the needs of Special Education students utilizing data analysis of CST, academic grades, and other relevant assessments.	September, 2010-June, 2011	Special education department meetings, IEP meetings	0	n/a
	Staff will assess each student and provide student with an appropriate educational program.	September, 2010-June, 2011	Administration, counselors, special education department, parents	0	n/a
All aides will work under the supervision of certificated personnel. They will work directly with students for a minimum of 60% of the time. An instructional aide may spend no more than 20% of the time on clerical tasks.	September, 2010-June, 2011	Special education teachers, administration	0	n/a	
An Individualized Education Plan (IEP) is developed for each Special Education participant by parent/guardian and appropriate personnel. Continuous monitoring and provisions are made as student progresses.	September, 2010-June, 2011	Administrator, counselor, psychologist, special education teacher, general education teacher	0	n/a	
Staff will ensure that students in special programs are mainstreamed into regular classes as appropriate.	September, 2010-June, 2011	Administrator, counselor	0	n/a	
Special education students will be clustered, as defined by their IEP, and supported with inclusion teachers and instructional aides.	September, 2010-June, 2011	Administration, teachers, aides	0	n/a	
Teachers trained in differentiated instruction will accommodate and modify curriculum to address unique needs of students.	September, 2010-June, 2011	Teachers	0	n/a	
Teachers will use consumable packets to assist in math instruction.	September, 2010-June, 2011	Teachers	\$400.00	Title 1	

(37) See the "Chart of Required Contents for the SPSA" for content required by each program or funding source supporting this goal.

(38) List the date an action will be taken and the date it will be completed.

(39) If funds appropriate to this goal are allocated to the school through the Consolidated Application or other source, list each proposed expenditure, such as "middle grades reading tutor" or "laptop computer" and the quantity to be acquired. Schools participating in programs for which the school receives no allocation may omit proposed expenditures.

VI Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

SCHOOL GOAL #3	Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal (1) Staffing and Professional Development	Start Dates(39) Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures (39)	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
<p>SCHOOL GOAL #3 (Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages) Assist students who scored "Far Below Basic" or "Below Basic" in English Language Arts and/or math on the CST. By the end of the year, each of those students will improve their score, 1 level on the CST.</p> <p>Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: Students who scored "Far Below Basic" or "Below Basic" Grade 6, 7, 8</p> <p>Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: School Records CST Scores</p> <p>Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: Improved performance on CST as defined by NCLB requirements</p> <p>Group data to be collected to measure academic gains: Benchmark Assessments CST Scores</p>	Determine which students are eligible for supplemental reading and math classes by analyzing CST scores.	June, 2010-September, 2011	Administrator Title 1 teacher Counselor	0	n/a
	Place eligible 6th and 7th graders into supplemental reading and math class.	June, 2010-September, 2011	Administrator Title 1 teacher Counselor	0	n/a
Technology to support instruction.	September, 2010-June, 2011	Administrator	Administrator	\$500.00	Title 1
Provide supplementary instruction for 6th and 7th grade students in English.	September, 2010-June, 2011	September, 2010-June, 2011	Title 1 teacher	\$32,497.92	Title 1
Provide supplementary instruction for 6th and 7th grade students not proficient in math.	September, 2010-June, 2011	September, 2010-June, 2011	Title 1 teacher	\$57,506.74	Title 1
Meet with at-risk students on a regular basis to monitor progress and provide support, including parent meetings, distribution of information, including Home-School Compact.	September, 2010-June, 2011	September, 2010-June, 2011	Counselor	0	n/a
Offer Supplementary Educational Services to students scoring "Below Basic" and "Far Below Basic."	September, 2010-June, 2011	September, 2010-June, 2011	Administrators, Director of Special Projects	\$100.00	Title 1
Allow administrators, faculty, and counselors to attend trainings/conferences that will positively impact the instructional process (i.e. Professional Learning Communities, AVID, English Learner strategies, etc.).	September, 2010-June, 2011	September, 2010-June, 2011	Administrators, faculty, counselors	\$600.00	Title 1
Administration will submit personnel requisitions to the district business office for each teacher who is paid to direct an Intervention/Enrichment program.	October, 2010	October, 2010	Administration, classified staff	0	n/a
Administration will evaluate and report data from the Intervention/Enrichment programs to CCMS Site Council, Title 1, and ELAC at the end of the 2010-11 school year. Evaluation will be based on data acquired from Galileo Benchmark Assessments, 2010 CST data, and academic grades and by surveying students, teachers, and parents.	June, 2010 - August, 2011	June, 2010 - August, 2011	Administration	0	n/a

(37) See the "Chart of Required Contents for the SPSA" for content required by each program or funding source supporting this goal.

(38) List the date an action will be taken and the date it will be completed.

(39) If funds appropriate to this goal are allocated to the school through the Consolidated Application or other source, list each proposed expenditure, such as "middle grades reading tutor" or "laptop computer" and the quantity to be acquired. Schools participating in programs for which the school receives no allocation may omit proposed expenditures.

VI Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

<p>SCHOOL GOAL #4 (Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages) Assisting students who are receiving "D" or "F" grades on quarter/semester report cards in order to adequately prepare them to be successful in high school and beyond.</p>	
<p>Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: Students who receive a "D" or "F" on a quarter/semester report card.</p>	<p>Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: Overall, better grade-point averages and 100% of our 8th graders eligible to participate in promotion activities. Improved performance on CST as defined by NCLB requirements.</p>
<p>Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: Student Records Student Records Benchmark Assessment CST scores</p>	

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal (1) Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date(s) Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures (39)	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
After-school tutoring programs will be available to students who need to raise academic grades.	November, 2010-June, 2011	Certificated faculty	\$10,800.00	SI
Offer three hours per week of intervention to 8th graders who have received a failing grade in one or more of their subjects on their quarter/semester report card. Students will receive extra help on classwork/homework. They will remain in the class until the end of the year or receive a passing grade. By attending the class and improving their grades (no F's), they will also earn the right to participate in 8th grade promotion ceremonies.	November, 2010-June, 2011	Administration, faculty, counselors	\$14,000.00	Title 1
Administration and certificated faculty will survey teachers regarding which Intervention Programs they would be interested in teaching.	September, 2010	Administration	0	n/a
Administration will write and publish intervention School Program Directory for each session offered. It will contain information for students, staff, and parents detailing description of classes offered, schedule, and enrollment instructions and deadlines.	September, 2010	Administration, Classified staff	0	n/a
Administration will submit personnel requisitions to the district business office for each teacher who is paid to direct an Intervention/Enrichment Program.	October, 2010	Administration, Classified staff	0	n/a
Teachers will develop lists of students who enroll as well as attendance sheets for each class and keep on file.	November, 2010-June, 2011	Faculty	0	n/a
Student referrals will come from teachers, counselors, and Administrators based on CST scores, Benchmark Assessments, and classroom assessments.	October, 2010-June, 2011	Administration, Counselors, Certificated faculty	0	n/a
Administration will do an evaluation of the Intervention/Enrichment Programs by surveying students and teachers.	June, 2011	Administration	0	n/a
Administration will report Intervention/Enrichment Program process, budget, and evaluation to CCMS Site Council, Title 1, and ELAC after each session the program is offered.	June, 2011	Administration	0	n/a

(37) See the "Chart of Required Contents for the SPSSA" for content required by each program or funding source supporting this goal.

(38) List the date an action will be taken or will begin, and the date it will be completed.

(39) If funds appropriate to this goal are allocated to the school through the Consolidated Application or other source, list each proposed expenditure, such as "middle grades reading tutor" or "laptop computers" and the quantity to be acquired. Schools participating in programs for which the school receives no allocation may omit proposed expenditures.

VI Planned Improvements in Student Performance (continued)

<p>SCHOOL GOAL #5 (Based on conclusions from Analysis of Program Components and Student Data pages) Ensure that students are assessed with formative assessments and that the data is used to build a culture of continuous improvement. Teachers will then be given opportunities to analyze data and collaborate to discuss intervention strategies for subjects, classes, and teachers. By the end of the year, 67.6% of our students will score "Proficient" or "Advanced" on the California Standards Test in English/Language Arts and 68.5% will score "Proficient" or "Advanced" in math.</p>	
<p>Student groups and grade levels to participate in this goal: Grade 6, 7, 8 students</p>	<p>Anticipated annual performance growth for each group: Improved performance on CST as defined by NCLB requirements</p>
<p>Means of evaluating progress toward this goal: School Records CST Scores Benchmark Assessments CST scores</p>	

Actions to be Taken to Reach This Goal (1) Consider all appropriate dimensions (e.g., Teaching and Learning, Staffing and Professional Development)	Start Date(s) Completion Date	Proposed Expenditures (39)	Estimated Cost	Funding Source
Teachers working in Teams will be given time through Staff Development days before the school year begins, during common, grade-level prep periods, and monthly trainings to learn about the technology component of West Ed/Galileo, to collaborate to identify "essential standards," analyze data, and discuss "best practices" to be used in the classroom.	August, 2010-June, 2011	Team Leaders	\$9,000.00	SI
Administration will evaluate and report data from the Intervention/Enrichment programs to CCMS Site Council, Title 1, and ELAC at the end of the 2010-11 school year. Evaluation will be based on data acquired from Galileo Benchmark Assessments, 2010 CST data, and academic grades and by surveying students, teachers, and parents.	June, 2010-August, 2011	Administration	0	n/a
A team of administrators and teachers will attend the California League of Middle Schools Annual Conference to learn strategies to improve student achievement.	December, 2010	Administration, Faculty	\$2,800.00	Title 1

(37) See the "Chart of Required Contents for the SPSSA" for content required by each program or funding source supporting this goal.

(38) List the date an action will be taken or will begin, and the date it will be completed.

(39) If funds appropriate to this goal are allocated to the school through the Consolidated Application or other source, list each proposed expenditure, such as "middle grades reading tutor" or "laptop computers" and the quantity to be acquired. Schools participating in programs for which the school receives no allocation may omit proposed expenditures.

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data

Table 1.- Academic Performance Index by Student Group

PROFICIENCY LEVEL	PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP													
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian				
	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010		
Number Included	1519	1488	1514	332	319	362	320	300	292	161	169	179		
Growth API	800	809	829	863	875	890	778	783	793	905	902	917		
Base API	770	787	807	833	859	875	736	774	781	876	903	900		
Target	5	3	A	A	A	A	5	5	5	A	A	A		
Growth	30	12	22	30	16	15	42	9	12	29	-1	17		
Met Target	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		

PROFICIENCY LEVEL	PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP													
	Hispanic			English Learners			Economically Disadvantaged			Students with Disabilities				
	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010		
Number Included	649	627	641	337	338	302	614	522	655	128	121	110		
Growth API	747	756	763	705	698	701	731	750	768	564	576	518		
Base API	719	745	758	678	702	697	699	729	749	510	522	561		
Target	5	5	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	15	14	12		
Growth	28	11	25	27	-4	4	32	21	19	54	54	-43		
Met Target	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 2 – Title III Accountability (District Data)

AMAO 1	Annual Growth			
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2009-10
Number of Annual Testers	791	851	782	782
Percent with Prior Year Data	99.9	94.8	100	100
Number in Cohort	790	807	792	792
Number Met	511	489	503	503
Percent Met	64.7	60.6	64	64
NCLB Target	50.1	51.6	56	56
Met Target	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

AMAO 2	Attaining English Proficiency			
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	
	All Students	All Students	Less Than 5	More Than 5
Number in Cohort	471	424	593	374
Number Met	221	182	163	213
Percent Met	46.9	42.9	27.5	57
NCLB Target	28.9	30.6	17.4	41.3
Met Target	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

AMAO 3	Adequate Yearly Progress for English Learner Subgroup at the LEA Level	
	2007-08	2008-09
English-Language Arts		
Met Participation Rate	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient or Above	Yes	No
Met Participation Rate	Yes	Yes
Met Percent Proficient or Above	Yes	Yes
Met Target for AMAO 3	Yes	No

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 3: English-Language Arts Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP													
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian				
	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010		
Participation Rate	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		
Number At or Above Proficient	923	898	997	249	286	183	169	172	130	134	145			
Percent At or Above Proficient	60.8	60.4	65.9	75.0	79.0	57.2	56.3	56.9	80.7	79.3	81.0			
AYP Target	35.2*	46.0*	56.8*	35.2*	46.0*	56.8*	35.2*	46.0*	56.8*	46.0*	56.8*			
Met AYP Criteria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			

* = AYP Target for Elementary/Middle Schools (2007=24.4%), (2008=35.2%), (2009=46.0%), (2010=56.8%)
 ** = AYP Target for High Schools (2007=22.3%), (2008=33.4%), (2009=44.5%), (2010=55.6%)

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 4: Mathematics Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP													
	All Students			White			African-American			Asian				
	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010		
Participation Rate	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		
Number At or Above Proficient	747	812	856	208	224	241	131	140	129	117	129	143		
Percent At or Above Proficient	49.2	54.6	56.5	62.7	70.2	66.6	40.9	46.8	44.2	72.7	76.3	79.9		
AYP Target	37.0*	47.5*	58.0*	37.0*	47.5*	58.0*	37.0*	47.5*	58.0*	37.0*	47.5*	58.0*		
Met AYP Criteria	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes		

* = AYP Target for Elementary/Middle Schools (2007=26.5%), (2008=37.0%), (2009=47.5%), (2010=58.0%)
 ** = AYP Target for High Schools (2007=20.9%), (2008=32.2%), (2009=43.5%), (2010=54.8%)

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	ENGLISH-LANGUAGE ARTS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP													
	Hispanic			English Learners			Socioeconomic Disadvantage			Students w/Disabilities				
	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010		
Participation Rate	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		
Number At or Above Proficient	320	303	362	127	112	111	275	246	353	31	34	25		
Percent At or Above Proficient	49.3	48.4	56.5	37.7	33.2	36.8	44.8	47.1	53.9	24.2	28.3	22.7		
AYP Target	35.2*	46.0*	56.8*	35.2*	46.0*	56.8*	35.2*	46.0*	56.8*	35.2*	46.0*	56.8*		
Met AYP Criteria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		

* = AYP Target for Elementary/Middle Schools (2007=24.4%), (2008=35.2%), (2009=46.0%), (2010=56.8%)
 ** = AYP Target for High Schools (2007=22.3%), (2008=33.4%), (2009=44.5%), (2010=55.6%)

AYP PROFICIENCY LEVEL	MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE DATA BY STUDENT GROUP													
	Hispanic			English Learners			Socioeconomic Disadvantage			Students w/Disabilities				
	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010	2008	2009	2010		
Participation Rate	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100		
Number At or Above Proficient	257	272	315	117	115	103	234	223	292	31	35	20		
Percent At or Above Proficient	39.6	43.5	49.1	34.7	34.1	34.1	38.1	42.7	44.6	24.2	29.2	18.2		
AYP Target	37.0*	47.5*	58.0*	37.0*	47.5*	58.0*	37.0*	47.5*	58.0*	37.0*	47.5*	58.0*		
Met AYP Criteria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No		

* = AYP Target for Elementary/Middle Schools (2007=26.5%), (2008=37.0%), (2009=47.5%), (2010=58.0%)
 ** = AYP Target for High Schools (2007=20.9%), (2008=32.2%), (2009=43.5%), (2010=54.8%)

Appendix A - School and Student Performance Data (continued)

Table 5: California English Language Development (CELD) Data

Grade	California English Language Development Test (CELD) Results for 2009-10											
	Advanced		Early Advanced		Intermediate		Early Intermediate		Beginning		Number Tested	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
K												
1												
2												
3												
4												
5												
6	10	23	14	33	15	35	1	2	3	7	43	
7	9	17	23	43	17	31	4	7	1	2	54	
8	9	17	25	47	14	26	4	8	1	2	53	
9												
10												
11												
12												
Total	28	19	62	41	46	31	9	6	5	3	150	

Appendix B - Analysis of Current Instructional Program

The following statements are adapted from No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Title I, Part A and the California Essential Program Components (EPC). These statements were used to discuss and develop findings that characterize the instructional program at this school for students:

- Not meeting performance goals
- Meeting performance goals
- Exceeding performance goals

Special consideration was given to any practices, policies, or procedures found to be noncompliant through ongoing monitoring of categorical programs. A synopsis of the discussion is provided:

Standards, Assessment, and Accountability

1. Use of state and local assessments to modify instruction and improve student achievement (NCLB)
Analysis of the following will be used to modify instruction and improve student achievement:

- CST Scores
- Benchmark Assessments
- Department Assessments
- CELDT

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

2. Use of data to monitor student progress on curriculum-embedded assessments and modify instruction (EPC)

We are using data to monitor student progress on curriculum-embedded assessments to modify instruction. Mainly through our West Ed/Galileo Benchmark Assessments which is given three times throughout the year, teachers analyze data to determine which grade-level standards their students performed poorly on. Collaboration about effective practices with peers assist in improving instruction. Grade-level departments have common planning periods in order to meet, analyze data, and discuss best-practices. In addition, teachers have the opportunity to perform "learning walks" which allows them to observe their peers and provide critical feedback. Lastly, teachers are trained in differentiated instruction in order to meet the needs of all students during class and in strategies to improve performance of English Learners. After class, there is extra-support available as well in math and English/Language Arts. 8th grade students looking to earn "make up" credit have the opportunity to meet on Saturday as well.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

Staffing and Professional Development

3. Status of meeting requirements for highly qualified staff (NCLB)
All of our teachers are considered highly qualified as defined by NCLB.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

4. Principals' Assembly Bill (AB) 75 training on State Board of Education (SBE) adopted instructional materials (EPC)
Our Culver City Middle School Principal and Assistant Principal have already obtained their Tier 2, full administrative credential, while our second Assistant Principal is currently enrolled in AB430 certification program through the Los Angeles County Office of Education.

CCMS is meeting performance goal.

5. Sufficiency of credentialed teachers and teacher professional development (e.g., access to AB 486 training on SBE-adopted instructional materials) (EPC)
100% of Culver City Middle School faculty is fully credentialed as defined by NCLB. Our beginning teachers are enrolled in a BTSA for two years, and all are encouraged to continue to develop

professionally by attending workshops and conferences. Many are currently attending graduate school to earn additional degrees. All teachers have been trained on differentiated instruction and read Robert Marzano's "Classroom Instruction that Works." In addition, teachers are currently being trained during monthly Staff Meetings on strategies promoted by Dr. Kate Kinsella, a renowned expert on academic language acquisition to support our EL students. Lastly, teams will present effective strategies they are currently using to motivate and challenge their students.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

- Alignment of staff development to content standards, assessed student performance, and professional needs (NCLB)
CCMS has aligned our staff development with the premise of "building a culture of continuous improvement." We have dedicated time and energy to identifying "essential standards" and assessing students through our technology-based West Ed/Galileo program. For the past four years, teachers met to prepare in August for the upcoming school year and continue to meet and discuss during monthly Staff Meetings and grade-level Department meetings. At those meetings, data is analyzed, best-practices discussed, and interventions assigned. Monthly in-service workshops are held for teachers to learn how to best access and organize the information from the Galileo data base. Those teachers are then given the opportunity to share with their peers. Last year, our focus was on supporting faculty with instructional strategies presented during monthly Staff Meetings that will improve the achievement of our English Learners. This year, our focus is on collaboration through "learning walks" and peer-to-peer conferences about their observations.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

- Ongoing instructional assistance and support for teachers (e.g., use of content experts and instructional coaches) (EPC)
CCMS teachers participate in two in-service workshops twice per year led by peers. These workshops have included but are not limited to training to learn how to best access and organize the information from the Galileo data base, effective EL teaching strategies, and how to integrate arts and technology into their core curriculum. One Assistant Principal and teacher have taken on the duties previously done by a "Teacher On Special Assignment" (TOSA) to implement the Galileo program and guide and support our faculty through this process. They are working more closely with the ELA and math department chairpersons to ensure the assessments are completed and data organized for teachers.

In addition, our English Language Development Coordinators are working closely with administration and faculty to provide resource support in order to improve the academic achievement of our EL students.

We also have a BTSA Coordinator to help advise our beginning teachers and a GATE Coordinator to teach strategies to teachers who have Gifted and Talented students in their classes.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

- Teacher collaboration by grade level (EPC)

CCMS teachers appreciate the opportunity to collaborate during grade-level department, common prep-periods. At these meetings, data is analyzed and best-practices and interventions discussed. In addition, teachers are given the opportunity to perform "learning walks" to observe their peers and provide critical feedback.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

Teaching and Learning

- Alignment of curriculum, instruction, and materials to content and performance standards (NCLB)
CCMS teachers have spent a considerable amount of collaborative time aligning our curriculum to the California State Standards. Through our WestEd Galileo technology program, "essential standards" were identified by analyzing past CST's and noting which standards had the most questions. Grade-level departments then constructed pacing guides and created common assessments so their curriculum would be consistent. Common prep-periods allow teachers to analyze data from classroom assessments and Galileo Benchmark Assessments to identify standards that need to be re-taught, students who need extra support, and lessons/practices that need reflection.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

- Adherence to recommended instructional minutes for reading/language arts and mathematics (EPC)
CCMS adheres to recommended instructional minutes for reading/language arts and mathematics. For at least 230 minutes per week, each CCMS student participates in reading/language arts and math classes, respectively. In addition, for 80 minutes per week, students engage in "Sustained Silent Reading."

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

- Lesson pacing schedule (EPC)
CCMS teachers collaborate each year to determine the lesson pacing guide for their grade-level subject. The initial planning takes place at Staff Development in August and continues throughout the year during common grade-level prep periods. At these meetings, teachers discuss student progress and opportunity for interventions, which may take place during the class period through differentiated instruction or after-school tutoring.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

- Availability of standards-based instructional materials appropriate to all student groups (NCLB)
CCMS provides instructional materials appropriate to all student groups. Each student has access to textbooks while in class, and is given a textbook to take home for the year for homework and to use as a resource. We currently have four computer labs and each teacher has at least one computer in the classroom with Internet access. We have a fully staffed library with computers.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

- Use of SBE-adopted and standards-aligned instructional materials, including intervention materials (EPC)
CCMS uses, as per California Department of Education, "instructional materials that are designed for use by pupils and their teachers as a learning resource and help pupils acquire facts, skills, or opinions or develop cognitive processes. Instructional materials may be printed or nonprinted, and may include textbooks, technology-based materials, other educational materials, and tests. This includes Web-based and electronic textbooks."

Currently, our English/Language Arts uses textbooks published by Holt, Social Studies, Geometry, and math uses McDougal Littell, and Algebra and science use Prentice Hall. Our intervention program uses a combination of interactive web-based programs, drill review, and teacher-guided assignments and assessments.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

Opportunity and Equal Educational Access

- Services provided by the regular program that enable underperforming students to meet standards (NCLB)
CCMS students are both supported and challenged through heterogeneous class groupings school-wide. All teachers have received ongoing training in implementing differentiated instruction techniques to best meet the needs of all learners. Furthermore, we have established and are continually refining a hierarchical Response to Intervention (RTI)-based system of interventions at our school. Examples of our interventions include Sustained Silent Reading (SSR), Time Tracker student organizer, before/after school programs, proficiency courses as students' elective (Math Builders, Skill Builders), small-group tutoring, mentoring, Saturday programs, targeted parent nights, etc. We have implemented a Mandatory Intervention Program for 8th Graders, where students who receive failing grades must complete 3.0 hours a week of interventions in order to "earn back" end-of-the-year activities. All CCMS special education and English Learner students are placed in the least-restrictive environment whenever possible to ensure a challenging curriculum for all. Counselors are armed with the data to place/remove students from interventions and intervention teachers are armed with the data (AT) and Galileo/West.Ed benchmark data) to remediate students in their areas of need.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

- Research-based educational practices to raise student achievement at this school (NCLB)

At CCMS, it is a school-wide ambition to instruct students with the latest research-based instructional practices. Three years ago, the staff read Robert Marzano's Classroom Instruction that Works and last year, teachers were being trained on specific strategies to improve academic achievement by our English Learners through Dr. Kate Kinsella conferences and online workshops. Part of their evaluation this year will be to include goals that incorporate EL strategies. We pride ourselves on offering students a meaningful, standards-based curriculum that will prepare them for real life. Obviously, what we are doing is working – CCMS achieved the desired 829 score on the 2010 API and all significant subgroup scores showed tremendous gains. We are also making strides at closing the "achievement gaps" among our diverse student body.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

16. Opportunities for increased learning time (Title I SWP and PI requirement)
- One of the major benefits of our West Ed/Galileo program is 1) Students are targeted for intervention quickly rather than having to wait for the STAR results in August; 2) Students receive practice in taking assessments similar to the STAR and receive a uniform curriculum; 3) Teachers are provided immediate feedback regarding whether their teaching strategies are reaching students. After the third benchmark, there is a one month period set aside before the STAR for teachers to re-teach the concepts that the data showed necessary. This year, afterschool intervention programs are offered in math and English/Language Arts. Students identified by teachers, through CST scores, and Galileo Benchmark Assessments will be strongly encouraged to attend. In addition, we hope to motivate students to improve on the CST's or maintain their "advanced" status by offering our gift card raffle again this year.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

17. Transition from preschool to kindergarten (Title I SWP)
- n/a

Involvement

18. Resources available from family, school, district, and community to assist under-achieving students (NCLB)

CCMS provides access to comprehensive services to foster healthy physical, social, emotional and intellectual development. The school also continues to provide access to the Culver City Youth Health Center, which offers individual counseling and group counseling in areas relating to grief, divorce, substance abuse, etc. We have a health clinic on campus where students can be referred for medical care and family life information. We have close relationships with the Didi Hirsh Mental Health Center as well as our police department, which provides a Juvenile Diversion Program for middle school students and their parents and School Resource Officers on campus.

Students at CCMS are actively involved in the decision-making process. The main office has a friendly open door policy and a "students/parents as customers" attitude exists at the school. Suggestion boxes are located at various locations on campus. Teachers are encouraged to implement and analyze feedback surveys from students/parents to assist them in program modification. We have an active Student Council with representation from all homeroom classes. There are also student representatives to PTSA and the School Board.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

19. Strategies to increase parental involvement (Title I SWP)

We are always looking to enhance parent involvement at CCMS. We have launched a new web site designed to enhance effective and efficient communication with the middle school. This site includes teacher web pages that describe homework assignments and a portal through which parents can get updates on grades, attendance, and completion of assignments. We recently created a Parent Involvement Policy which was presented at a CCMS Volunteer Orientation. Parents are welcome in the classroom during the day to assist teachers in organizing their classrooms, tutoring, and copying. We have an active Site Council, PTSA, ELAC, and Booster Club (Panther Partners). We keep our web page updated and send home regular bulletins, through mail and over the phone with our Notification message system. Multiple opportunities for parents to visit campus exist, such as Back to School Night, Open House, 8th Grade Portfolio Night, 5th Grade Orientation, parent nights, coffee and chats with the principal, music concerts, etc.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

20. Involvement of parents, community representatives, classroom teachers, and other school personnel in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of consolidated application programs (5 CCR 3932)
- The learning community at CCMS shares a vision of high expectations of academic excellence. The mission and vision statement are posted in every classroom and in the offices in an effort to further communicate our vision. Our collaborative environment drives ongoing improvement. The District strategic planning process is a part of the school culture that includes all stakeholders in the development of goals that enhance the learning opportunities for all students. The Principal acts as a facilitator in the collaborative process, which results in shared decision making. The coordination of the school involves the Principal, as the educational leader, in bringing together the Site Council, and other advisory committees: English Language Advisory Council (ELAC), Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA), Panther Partners, and the Leadership Team. The twenty member leadership team consists of grade level team leaders, department chairpersons, AVID coordinator, GATE coordinator, and administrators. Working together, CST and Benchmark Data is analyzed and strategies for interventions are discussed. Effectiveness of teaching practices and programs are consistently critiqued. A culture of continuous improvement is sustained.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

Funding

21. Services provided by categorical funds that enable underperforming students to meet standards (NCLB)
- Categorical funds that enable underperforming students to meet standards are currently funding personnel, books, trainings, tutors, supplies, and West Ed/Galileo program. Specifically, our ELAP monies are spent on extra hours for a bilingual aide to spend in classrooms supporting our English Learners. EL support materials, and translation during parent meetings. Our School Improvement monies are used for staffing of our computer lab, in addition to Team Leaders, Saturday School personnel, after school tutoring, and Orientation support. Our Title I monies are used to staff supplemental math and literacy classes, our Saturday Success Academy to support our underperforming 8th graders, and professional development.

CCMS is exceeding performance goals.

Appendix C - Programs Included in this Plan

Check the box for each state and federal categorical program in which the school participates and, if applicable, enter amounts allocated. (The plan must describe the activities to be conducted at the school for each of the state and federal categorical program in which the school participates. If the school receives funding, then the plan must include the proposed expenditures.)

State Programs	Allocation
<input type="checkbox"/> California School Age Families Education Purpose: Assist expectant and parenting students succeed in school.	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Economic Impact Aid/ State Compensatory Education Purpose: Help educationally disadvantaged students succeed in the regular program.	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Economic Impact Aid/ English Learner Program Purpose: Develop fluency in English and academic proficiency of English learners	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> High Priority Schools Grant Program Purpose: Assist schools in meeting academic growth targets.	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional Time and Staff Development Reform Purpose: Train classroom personnel to improve student performance in core curriculum areas.	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Peer Assistance and Review Purpose: Assist teachers through coaching and mentoring.	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Pupil Retention Block Grant Purpose: Prevent students from dropping out of school.	\$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> School and Library Improvement Program Block Grant Purpose: Improve library and other school programs.	\$105,234.00
<input type="checkbox"/> School Safety and Violence Prevention Act Purpose: Increase school safety.	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Tobacco-Use Prevention Education Purpose: Eliminate tobacco use among students.	\$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> List and Describe Other State or Local funds (e.g., Gifted and Talented Education); English Language Acquisition Program Empower Our Schools Donation GATE	\$16,002.78
Total amount of state categorical funds allocated to this school	\$121,236.78

Federal Programs under No Child Left Behind (NCLB)	Allocation
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I, Neglected Purpose: Supplement instruction for children abandoned, abused, or neglected who have been placed in an institution	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I, Part D: Delinquent Purpose: Supplement instruction for delinquent youth	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I, Part A: Schoolwide Program Purpose: Upgrade the entire educational program of eligible schools in high poverty areas	\$
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I, Part A: Targeted Assistance Program Purpose: Help educationally disadvantaged students in eligible schools achieve grade level proficiency	\$176,063.60
<input type="checkbox"/> Title I, Part A: Program Improvement Purpose: Assist Title I schools that have failed to meet NCLB adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets for one or more identified student groups	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Purpose: Improve and increase the number of highly qualified teachers and principals	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology Purpose: Support professional development and the use of technology	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for Limited-English-Proficient (LEP) Students Purpose: Supplement language instruction to help limited-English-proficient (LEP) students attain English proficiency and meet academic performance standards	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title IV, Part A: Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Purpose: Support learning environments that promote academic achievement	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title V: Innovative Programs Purpose: Support educational improvement, library, media, and at-risk students	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Title VI, Part B: Rural Education Achievement Purpose: Provide flexibility in the use of NCLB funds to eligible LEAs	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Federal Funds (list and describe)(42)	\$
Total amount of federal categorical funds allocated to this school	\$176,063.60
Total amount of state and federal categorical funds allocated to this school	\$297,300.38

(3) For example, special education funds used in a School-Based Coordinated Program to serve students not identified as individuals with exceptional needs.

Appendix E - Home/School Compact

It is important that families and schools work together to help students achieve high academic standards. Through a process that included teachers, families, and students, the following are agreed upon roles and responsibilities that we, as partners, will carry out to support student success in school and life.

Student Pledge: I understand that education is important to me, and I am responsible for my own success.

AS A STUDENT, I WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE FOLLOWING:

- Arriving to school on time and being prepared to do my best.
• Being responsible for my own behavior by following all school and classroom rules.
• Returning all homework completed and on time.
• Spending time at home reading and studying.
• Respecting other people and the community.

Parents Pledge: I understand the importance of my participation in my child's educational progress.

AS A PARENT, I WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE FOLLOWING:

- Being involved in my child's education through participation in school events.
• Listening to or reading with my child everyday.
• Providing a quiet place and materials needed for my child to study.
• Encouraging my child to complete his/her homework.
• Making sure my child gets an adequate night's sleep, and a healthy diet.
• Having my child attend school regularly and on time.

Staff Pledge: I understand that education is important to every student's life.

AS A TEACHER, I WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE FOLLOWING:

- Providing a challenging instructional program to teach all students.
• Teaching grade level skills and addressing the individual needs and strengths of all students.
• Assigning appropriate homework with clear instructions.
• Correcting and returning appropriate work in a timely manner.
• Helping students follow the school and classroom rules.
• Assisting parents with how to help students at home.

Appendix D - Recommendations and Assurances (Culver City Middle School)

The school site council recommends this school plan and proposed expenditures to the district governing board for approval, and assures the board of the following:

- 1. The school site council is correctly constituted, and was formed in accordance with district governing board policy and state law.
2. The school site council reviewed its responsibilities under state law and district governing board policies, including those board policies relating to material changes in the school plan requiring board approval.
3. The school site council sought and considered all recommendations from the following groups or committees before adopting this plan (Check those that apply):
[] School Advisory Committee for State Compensatory Education Programs
[X] English Learner Advisory Committee
[] Community Advisory Committee for Special Education Programs
[] Gifted and Talented Education Program Advisory Committee
Other (list)
4. The school site council reviewed the content requirements for school plans of programs included in this Single Plan for Student Achievement and believes all such content requirements have been met, including those found in district governing board policies and in the Local Improvement Plan.
5. This school plan is based on a thorough analysis of student academic performance. The actions proposed herein form a sound, comprehensive, coordinated plan to reach stated school goals to improve student academic performance.
6. This school plan was adopted by the school site council on March 17, 2010

Attested: Jon Pearson 3/17/11
Typed name of school principal Date
Patti Augenstein 3/17/11
Typed name of SSC chairperson Date

BOARD REPORT

3/22/11

10.1

10.1 AVPA Recognition/Music, Dance and Theatre

As a part of Arts Education Month we will celebrate our students' achievements in the visual and performing arts. This evening we will recognize the Music, Dance and Theatre departments.

BOARD REPORT

3/22/11
12.1

12.1 First Reading of Revised Board Policy 5117, Students – Interdistrict Attendance

It is recommended practice that the Board of Education regularly review Board Policies/Administrative Regulations that are significant to the operation of the district. A new Board Policy on Interdistrict Attendance is being presented for a first reading.

Students

INTERDISTRICT ATTENDANCE

The Governing Board recognizes that students who reside in one district may choose to attend school in another district and that such choices are made for a variety of reasons. It is the intent of the Governing Board to accept non-resident students and release resident students on interdistrict transfers under Education Code 46600-46611.

The Board desires to communicate with parents/guardians and students regarding the educational programs and services that are available.

(cf. 0520.3- Title I Program Improvement Districts)

(cf. 5116.1-Intradistrict Open Enrollment)

(cf. 5117.1-Interdistrict Attendance Agreements)

(cf. 5117.2-Alternative Interdistrict Attendance Program)

(cf. 5145.6-Parental Notifications)

(cf. 5118- Open Enrollment Act Transfers)

The primary responsibility of the District is to meet the academic needs of the students whose parents/legal guardians or court approved legal guardians reside within the District. The Board recognizes that in order to meet this responsibility that it may not be able to accommodate all families and student requests for interdistrict transfers and that consideration of transfers should be done in a manner that strives to be fair and equitable to all applicants.

Acceptance of non-resident students will be maintained at a level that assures enrollment of resident students will be given priority in their neighborhood schools, allows for adequate scheduling flexibility at the middle and high schools, and will not place the District at risk of violating local class size agreements set in ~~a negotiated teacher contract~~ **the District's collective bargaining agreement, the District's limits pursuant to the state Class Size Reduction Program, maximums established by the State of California, or exceeding the physical capacity of the site or classroom pursuant to the District's facilities master plan or other facility planning document.**

The Superintendent or designee is hereby directed to leave sufficient room in each class, grade level, program, and school building for new Culver City residents who may move into the District over the summer or enroll during the school year.

Upon request by students' parents/guardians, the Superintendent or designee may approve interdistrict ~~attendance~~ **transfer** permits ~~with other districts~~ on a case-by-case basis to meet individual student needs.

~~The interdistrict attendance permit shall not exceed a term of five years and shall stipulate the terms and conditions under which interdistrict attendance shall be permitted or~~

denied. (Education Code 46600)

The superintendent or designee shall ensure that interdistrict permits specify the terms and conditions for the granting, denial, or revocation of the permit. Once an interdistrict permit has been granted and a student has enrolled, a student is not required to reapply unless an interdistrict attendance agreement between the governing boards of the district of residence and the district of enrollment states otherwise.

The parent/guardian is responsible for providing transportation to and from school and making sure the student maintains satisfactory attendance/reports to class on time. Students can not be brought to school excessively early or left excessively late.

Students shall be allowed to continue in the District until they leave or graduate, assuming that they: comply with the terms and conditions of the interdistrict permit; uphold appropriate behavior standards, maintain satisfactory attendance, and make appropriate academic efforts. Students entering grades 11 and 12 shall not have their permits rescinded by either district. (Education Code 46600)

The Superintendent or designee may deny interdistrict attendance permits because of overcrowding within ~~d~~District schools or limited ~~d~~District resources.

The Board recognizes that the District may be capable of serving additional students. The Board may delegate to the Superintendent or designee the authority to issue or accept interdistrict permits in accordance with ~~interdistrict attendance agreements and the following~~ procedures, as referenced in AR 5117, on a cost or non-cost basis. It is the policy of the District that each permit request be evaluated on its own merits.

Therefore, ~~t~~The Superintendent or designee may approve interdistrict attendance agreements with other districts. **Interdistrict attendance agreements shall not exceed a term of five years and shall stipulate the terms and conditions under which interdistrict attendance shall be permitted, denied, revoked or rescinded. (Education Code 46600)**

Legal Reference:

EDUCATION CODE

46600-46611 Interdistrict attendance agreements

48204 Residency requirements for school attendance

48209-48209.16 Student attendance alternatives

48915 Expulsion; particular circumstances

48300-48315~~6~~ Student attendance alternatives

48350-48361 Open Enrollment Act

48915 Expulsion; particular circumstances

48915.1 Expelled individuals: enrollment in another district

48918 *Rules governing expulsion procedures* ~~48980 Notice at beginning of term~~
48980 *Notice at beginning of term*
52317 ~~Admission of persons including nonresidents to attendance area; workers'~~
~~compensation for pupils~~ **Regional Occupational Center/Program, enrollment of**
students, interdistrict attendance

Management Resources:

WEB SITES

CSBA: <http://www.csba.org>

California Department of Education: <http://www.cde.ca.gov>

Policy
adopted: January 20, 1998
Policy
Reviewed: July 8, 2008
Policy
Revised: July 22, 2008

CULVER CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Culver City, California

Policy
Reviewed: March 22, 2011

12.2 Presentation of the Second Interim Report for 2010-2011

In addition to other fiscal requirements, AB 1200 and AB 2756 legislation was enacted to insure full public disclosure of a public school district's financial position in the current and future years. The purpose of the interim reports, as required under AB 1200 and AB 2756, is to establish a procedure for the Board of Education, the public and other interested agencies to receive information regarding the financial condition of an entity during periodic intervals of the fiscal year.

The Second Interim Report for the 2010-2011 fiscal year is provided under separate cover.

14.1a Approval is Recommended for the Memorandum of Understanding Between Beverly Hills Unified, Culver City Unified School District, The Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District and Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health

In 1984 the California State Legislature passed AB 3632 mandating that county Departments of Mental Health (DMH) work with school districts to provide services to students with IEPs who require mental health services. Specifically AB 3632 provides for:

- Case management of students placed in residential treatment centers
- Payment of residential and therapeutic treatment cost of residentially placed students
- Provision of outpatient mental health services to students and their families
- Attendance at IEP meetings for students eligible for DMH services

In October outgoing governor Schwarzenegger eliminated both the mandate and the funding for AB3632. In November 2010, the California Department of Education approved the release to County Departments of Education of \$76 million of federal funds for the short-term continuation of AB 3632 services. These funds were exhausted in mid-January 2011. Los Angeles County DMH agreed to continue to provide and pay for services through January 2011. Since school districts are payers of last resort for educational services Culver City Unified will be required to begin paying for IEP-based mental health services effective February 1, 2011.

Because the districts did not have adequate time to develop alternate means of providing these services, and because the law does not allow for an interruption in IEP services, most districts are opting to contract directly with county Departments of Mental Health to provide these services.

Attached is a copy of the MOU.

RECOMMENDED MOTION

It is recommended that the Board of Education approve the Memorandum of Understanding with the Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health to continue services as presented.

Moved by:

Seconded by:

Vote:

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN
BEVERLY HILLS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CULVER CITY UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT ,THE SANTA MONICA-MALIBU UNIFIED SCHOOL
DISTRICT AND THE
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH
REGARDING FUNDING AND THE PROVISION OF EDUCATIONALLY-
RELATED AB 3632 MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

THIS MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (“MOU”), is made by and between the three member school districts of the Tri Cities SELPA (“Tri-Cities”), Beverly Hills Unified School District (“Beverly Hills”), Culver City Unified School District (“Culver City”) and the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District (“Santa Monica”) (hereinafter, Beverly Hills, Culver City and Santa Monica may be referred to as “Districts” or “LEAs”) and the Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health (hereinafter referred to as “COUNTY”) (collectively, the COUNTY and Districts/LEAs may be referred to as “Parties”) with respect to the provision of educationally-related mental health services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (“IDEA”), 20 U.S.C. 1400, et seq., and Section 26.5 of Division 7 of title 1 of the California Government Code, sections 7570-7590, commonly known as “AB 3632.”

RECITALS

WHEREAS, on October 8, 2010, California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger (“Governor”) vetoed a fiscal year 2010-11 appropriation for educationally-related mental health services mandated by AB 3632, and stated in doing so that “[t]his mandate is suspended.”

WHEREAS, Government Code Section 7570 et seq. (AB 3632) and its implementing regulations remain codified; which state that counties and their Mental Health Divisions are required to conduct mental health assessments and to provide necessary mental health-related services, including residential care-based treatment (placement including the provision of psychotherapy) to students with disabilities, as identified within the individualized education programs, pursuant to Government Code sections 7570, 7572, and 7572.5.

Chapter 26.5, Section 7570, established that the provision of related services as defined in paragraph (22) of Section 1401 of Title 20 of the United States Code, to children and youth with a disability shall be the joint responsibility of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Secretary of Health and Human Services and further provides that the Secretary of Health and Human Services appoint an agency in each county to assume the responsibility of providing these services;

WHEREAS, Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution requires the State to provide a subvention of funds to reimburse local governments for State mandated programs, such as AB 3632;

WHEREAS, LEAs and COUNTY disagree as to the impact of the Governor’s veto on AB 3632 requirements pertaining to the LEAs and County. While LEAs believe AB 3632 remains in full force and effect, notwithstanding the Governor’s veto, COUNTY contends its mandate under AB 3632 is suspended. The Parties nevertheless wish to

ensure that while such disagreement is being resolved, LEAs' students continue to receive an AB 3632 assessment and services they may require under the IDEA;

WHEREAS, LEAs and COUNTY intend to reserve all rights each may have at the time this MOU is executed, and agree that nothing in this MOU shall waive or limit the LEAs' rights including any right to seek reimbursement through an inter-agency dispute procedure and/or the courts for such matters as recovery from the COUNTY for all costs incurred in providing services to students under AB 3632. Nothing in this MOU is intended to establish or impose upon COUNTY any additional legal obligation under IDEA to provide these services except as provided in this MOU;

WHEREAS, prior to the Governor's appropriation veto, county mental health agencies and Special Education Local Plan Areas ("SELPA") had previously entered into an Interagency Agreement ("IA") for mental health services pursuant to Title 2 Division 9 Section 60030, which COUNTY contends is no longer operative. LEAs continue to believe the IA is in full force and effect and reserves the right to enforce that IA and COUNTY disputes such (this MOU does not create an agreement between LEAs and COUNTY which establishes that the IA is void);

WHEREAS, the State Legislature, in the Budget Act provides federal IDEA local assistance funding for the provision of mental health services by transmitting the funds to county offices of education through the California Department of Education (CDE);

WHEREAS, the Budget Act authorizes each county office of education ("COE") and county mental health agency ("CMHA") to enter into a memorandum of understanding ("MOU") for the purpose of transferring these federal grant funds, subject to the fulfillment of the grant's terms and conditions, to the CMHA for AB3632 mental health services that are provided for eligible students in the school districts and Los Angeles County Office of Education ("LACOE") has entered into such MOU with COUNTY;

WHEREAS, these federal IDEA funds are to be allocated by the CDE to LACOE for the purpose of funding mental health services identified within individualized education programs ("IEP") of resident students, and for which expenses have been and will continue to be incurred in Fiscal Year 2010-2011; and

WHEREAS, the intent of this MOU is that the Parties, despite their disagreement regarding their respective rights and obligations under the law, intend to preserve in all respects the COUNTY's service level status quo regarding the provision of AB 3632 services and that the LEAs will fully fund the COUNTY for the continuance of these programs and services as hereinafter provided for in this MOU, subject to LEA's reservation of rights including the right to claim reimbursement for the full amount of monies that would otherwise be deemed the County's responsibility but for the current funding crisis and the resulting dispute between the Parties, from February 1, 2011 through and including June 30, 2011, unless this MOU is terminated earlier by its own terms;

NOW, THEREFORE, based on such recitals, and other mutual considerations and promises herein, the Parties agree as follows:

1. Referrals and assessment reports: COUNTY and LEAs agree to abide by the policies and procedures for making student referrals and providing the necessary

assessment reports, as provided in Title 2, Division 9, of the California Code of Regulations Section 60040. LEAs will refer all students with suspected mental health needs to COUNTY for assessment, and COUNTY will process and complete that assessment as it had before the Governor's veto on October 8, 2010.

2. Array of services: COUNTY agrees to maintain the level of AB 3632 services currently being provided during the term of this MOU, which shall include mental health services consultation, assessment and re-assessment, reports, IEP team meeting attendance and participation, referrals and sending out referral packets, monitoring and placement, contracting with residential facilities and other mental health service providers, as needed and participation in the defense of any due process hearings and compliance complaints which may arise from the provision of AB 3632 services. The array of services will be provided for a child with a disability, as defined in paragraph (3) of Section 1401 of Title 20 of the United States Code, and shall include those related services as defined in paragraph (26) of Section 1401 of Title 20 of the United States Code, and designated instruction and services, as defined in Section 56363 of the Education Code, the California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Division 9, Section 60020(i).

3. Student Records: LEAs will provide data to COUNTY regarding LEAs' students eligible for AB 3632 services according to LEAs' records which COUNTY will verify based on its records. Thereafter, COUNTY will obtain and provide LEAs with student IEP and service data in order to verify that the LEAs are the respective applicable district of residence for each individual student for payment purposes by the 15th day of the month following the month of service for residentially placed students. County and LEAs will collaborate on an ongoing basis to verify students receiving outpatient AB 3632 services within specific LEA districts in order to reconcile the County's costs associated with the individual LEA students.

4. Individual Services Agreement Execution: This MOU shall include an Individual Services Agreement ("ISA") template which shall be used to develop an ISA for each eligible LEA student to whom COUNTY is to provide AB 3632 educationally-related mental health services. Within ten (10) days of COUNTY's receipt of an ISA for AB 3632 eligible students, COUNTY shall verify or provide the required information to LEAs to complete the ISA.

5. Individual Services Agreement Expenditures: COUNTY will provide LEAs with an itemized summary (i.e., room and board, therapy, etc.) of expenditures pursuant to the ISAs incurred under this MOU two times during the term of this MOU. The first itemized summary of expenditures will cover the period of February 1, 2011 through March 31, 2011, and will be provided by April 30, 2011. The second itemized summary of expenditures will cover the period of April 1, 2011 through June 30, 2011, and will be provided by July 31, 2011. Payment to the County is due within 60 days of receipt of the summary of expenditures.

6. COUNTY Mental Health Services and Case Management Cost Oversight: An oversight committee comprised of representative(s) of LEAs, Tri-Cities, and COUNTY will be formed to monitor and audit costs associated with this MOU and to assist in any dispute resolution as identified in paragraph 17. The oversight committee shall not exceed 13 representatives.

7. Funding and Reimbursement: The ISA shall serve as the itemized invoice for services provided to each LEA student under this MOU and is incorporated by reference herein. County represents that it will have expended all available AB 3632 funding as of January 31, 2011 and LEAs rely upon this representation. To the extent legally permissible, COUNTY will seek Medi-Cal reimbursement for all eligible students. LEAs shall fully reimburse COUNTY all of its ISA itemized costs incurred in providing all AB 3632 services which are not reimbursed by Medi-Cal or Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment ("EPSDT"). Fully reimbursable costs for continuing the AB 3632 program shall include both direct and indirect costs incurred but in no event shall it include items of cost not previously deemed allowable costs as part of COUNTY's prior SB 90 claims to the State of California. Indirect costs do not include attorney fees incurred by County Counsel associated with defending due process claims. COUNTY represents that the federal IDEA funds distributed November of 2010 have been exhausted and agrees to utilize all other available non-County funding sources to offset the direct and indirect costs. Final actual cost reimbursement rates will not be known until the State's final reconciliation and settlement of the County's cost report. Therefore, an initial reconciliation of payments from LEAs to County will be completed by March 1, 2012, after the submission of the County's initial Cost Report to the State. A final reconciliation will be completed when Medi-Cal approvals are finalized and the State has issued its Cost Report Reconciliation and Settlement to the County, which is anticipated to occur in approximately January 2013. Funds owed to LEAs will be paid by County and funds owed to County will be paid by LEAs at the time of the initial reconciliation and final reconciliation.

8. LEA Reimbursement: If a final and binding legal decision finds that the mandate was not suspended this Fiscal Year, COUNTY agrees to reimburse the LEAs for all monies paid by the LEA to COUNTY pursuant to this MOU and LEAs will reasonably cooperate with COUNTY to enable COUNTY to seek State of California reimbursement, e.g. an SB 90 claim. If COUNTY receives funding for this purpose from any non-County source to provide AB 3632 services during the term of this MOU, COUNTY agrees to reimburse LEAs its proportional share of these funds.

9. Reconciliation: COUNTY will use its Annual Cost Report to reconcile all services provided during the term of this MOU and will provide a final reconciliation to LEAs by September 30, 2011 or other date agreed mutually agreed upon. All parties to this MOU agree to pay any difference of costs as determined by the final reconciliation without waiver of its right to seek use of the oversight committee set forth in paragraph 6 and dispute resolution process set forth in paragraph 17 to dispute the final reconciliation, or other remedies provided by law, including inter-agency dispute procedures pursuant to Government Code Section 7585. County shall also provide to the LEAs an accounting regarding its expenditure of all available AB 3632 funding for fiscal year 2010-11. If requested this accounting will be available as part of the reconciliation process under paragraph 9 and if necessary, the Dispute Resolution process under paragraph 17.

10. Privacy: COUNTY and LEAs acknowledge the protections afforded to student health information under regulations adopted pursuant to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA), Pub. L. No. 14-109, students records under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), 20 USC Section 1232g; and under provisions of state law relating to privacy. COUNTY and LEAs shall ensure that all activities undertaken under this MOU will conform to the requirements of these laws.

11. Modification: This MOU shall not be modified or amended without the mutual written consent of the parties. If any actual or physical deletions or changes appear on the face of the MOU, such deletions or changes shall only be effective if the initials of both contracting parties, along with the date of initialization, appear beside such deletion or change.

12. Integration: This MOU represents the entire understanding of LEAs and COUNTY as to those matters contained herein, and supersedes and cancels any prior oral or written understanding, promises or representations with respect to those matters covered hereunder. This MOU may not be modified or altered except in writing signed by both parties hereto. This is an integrated MOU.

13. Laws and Venue: Subject to Paragraph 17, this MOU contains the complete and final understanding of the Parties' rights, duties and obligations with respect to the subject matter in this MOU and supersedes all prior MOUs, contracts, understandings and commitments whether oral or written with respect to the subject matter of this MOU. This MOU shall be interpreted in accordance with the laws of the State of California. If any action is brought to interpret or enforce any term of this MOU, the action shall be brought in a state or federal court with the jurisdiction for the Los Angeles County, State of California.

14. Third Party Rights: Nothing in this MOU shall be construed to give any rights or benefits to anyone other than LEAs and COUNTY.

15. Severability/Waiver: The unenforceability, invalidity or illegality of any provision(s) of this MOU shall not render the other provisions unenforceable, invalid, or illegal. No waiver of any provision of this MOU shall be deemed, or shall constitute, a waiver of any other provision, whether or not similar, nor shall any such waiver constitute a continuing or subsequent waiver of the same provision. No waiver shall be binding unless executed in writing by the party making the waiver.

16. Term: This MOU shall cover the period of February 1, 2011, through June 30, 2011. This MOU shall terminate as of the close of business on June 30, 2011, subject to the provisions of paragraph 21. However, this MOU may be extended by the Parties' mutual written consent.

17. Dispute Resolution: County and LEAs agree that for those disputes which are covered by Government Code Section 7585, the LEAs and County shall utilize the inter-agency dispute resolution procedures and processes of Government Code Section 7585.

For those disputes arising out of this MOU that are not covered by Government Code Section 7585, COUNTY and LEAs agree that the following process will be used to address disputes regarding the implementation of the MOU. It is understood that these dispute resolution procedures shall have no application to any right of the LEAs to seek recovery should there be a determination that the AB 3632 remains in full force and effect. This dispute resolution does not pertain to due process complaints.

COUNTY and LEAs shall name a mutually agreed upon neutral party (hereinafter "outside party") to assist to resolve disputes using a process of facilitated communication through non-binding mediation between COUNTY and LEAs. The Parties will use the following process:

- A written notice of the request for dispute resolution, including a description of the concerns to be addressed, shall be forwarded by the aggrieved agency initiating the dispute to the non-initiating party.
- If the issue is not resolved within 10 business days of the date of the written notice of the request for dispute resolution, the notice shall be submitted to the committee formed pursuant to paragraph 6 for possible resolution
- If the issue is not resolved within 10 business days of the date of the written notice of the request for dispute resolution, the aggrieved agency initiating the dispute shall request that the outside party be contacted to schedule a meeting between the agencies.
- No later than thirty (30) calendar days from the date outside party is contacted, a resolution plan between the three agencies will be developed with the assistance of the outside party. The signatories of this MOU or their designees shall be responsible for assuring the agreements included in the resolution plan are implemented.
- Each party shall bear its own costs related to the use of this dispute resolution service except for those costs for the outside party shall be shared equally between the affected LEA and COUNTY, respectively.

18. Force Majeure: No party shall be deemed to be in default of the terms of this MOU if the party is prevented from performing the terms of this Agreement by causes beyond its control, including without being limited to: acts of God; any laws and/or regulations of State or Federal government; or any catastrophe resulting from flood, fire, explosion, or other causes beyond the control of the defaulting party. If any of the stated contingencies occur, the party delayed by force majeure shall immediately give the other parties written notice of the cause for delay. The party delayed by force majeure shall use reasonable diligence to correct the cause of the delay, if correctable, and if the condition that caused the delay is corrected, the party delayed shall immediately give the other parties written notice thereof and shall resume performance of the terms of this MOU.

No party shall be liable for any excess costs if the failure to perform the MOU arises from any of the contingencies listed above.

19. Notices: All notices provided for by this MOU shall be in writing. Notices shall be mailed, electronically delivered or delivered by hand and shall be effective as of the date of receipt by addressee.

All notices related to this MOU shall be mailed to the respective LEAs (to the LEA Superintendent and separately, Director of Special Education) and shall be addressed to:

Beverly Hills Unified School District
 Office of Superintendent
 Director of Special Education
 Beverly Hills Unified School District
 255 S. Lasky Drive
 Beverly Hills, CA 90212

Culver City Unified School District

Office of Superintendent
Director of Special Education
4034 Irving Place
Culver City, CA 90232

Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District

Office of Superintendent
Director of Special Education
1651 16th Street
Santa Monica, CA 90404

All notices related to this MOU shall be mailed to COUNTY shall be addressed to:

Paul L. McIver, District Chief
Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health
600 S. Commonwealth Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90005
(213) 738-2334 Facsimile: (213) 738-6521

20. Representation on Authority of Parties/Signatories: Each person signing this MOU represents and warrants that he or she is duly authorized and has legal capacity to execute and deliver this MOU. The Parties represent and warrant to the other that the execution and delivery of the MOU and the performance of such obligations hereunder have been duly authorized and that the MOU is a valid, legal and binding agreement and enforceable in accordance with its terms.

21. Termination: This MOU may be terminated at anytime upon the mutual agreement of the Parties or by any party upon 30 days advanced written notice to the other parties.

If AB 3632 is found to remain in full force and effect by a court of competent jurisdiction, notwithstanding the Governor's veto, this MOU shall immediately terminate and COUNTY will resume providing AB 3632 services as it had before the veto.

22. Incorporation of Recitals: The Parties understand and agree that the recitals set forth above are terms of this MOU and are incorporated herein by this reference.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have executed this Agreement as of the dates of their signatures.

BEVERLY HILLS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

By Dick Douglas (Date)
Superintendent
Beverly Hills Unified School District

CULVER CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

By Patricia Jaffe (Date)
Superintendent
Culver City Unified School District

SANTA MONICA-MALIBU UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

By Tim Cuneo (Date)
Superintendent
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH

By Marvin J. Southard, DSW (Date)
Director
Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health

14.1b Adopt Findings of Staff Report Denying Building Bridges International, Inc. Charter School Petition

Education Code 47605(b) sets forth the process for consideration of a petition to establish a charter school and provides that within 30 days of the governing board's receipt of a charter petition, the board must hold a public hearing on the provisions of the charter proposal, at which time the governing board of the district shall consider the level of support for the petition by the teachers employed by the district, other employees of the district, and parents.

The statute further provides that the governing board must make a determination whether to grant or deny the charter petition within 60 days of its receipt of the petition.

The Board received the Building Bridges International Charter School Petition on January 25, 2011. The Board will render a decision to grant or deny the charter.

A copy of the full petition can be reviewed in the Superintendent's office upon request.

RECOMMENDED MOTION

That the Board deny Building Bridges International, Inc. Charter Petition as presented.

Moved by:

Seconded by:

Vote:

CULVER CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

STAFF REPORT REGARDING BUILDING BRIDGES INTERNATIONAL: An International Baccalaureate (IB) World School CHARTER PETITION

GOVERNING BOARD MEETING DATE: MARCH 22, 2010

I. INTRODUCTION

The Charter Schools Act of 1992 permits school districts to grant charter petitions, authorizing the operation of charter schools within their geographic boundaries. (Ed. Code § 47600, et seq.) Charter schools are established through submission of a petition by proponents of the charter school to the governing board of a public educational agency, usually a school district, and approval of the petition by the school district. The governing board must grant a charter "if it is satisfied that granting the charter is consistent with sound educational practice." (Ed. Code § 47605(b).)

Nevertheless, a governing board may deny a petition for the establishment of a charter school if it finds that the particular petition fails to meet enumerated statutory criteria and it adopts written findings in support of its decision to deny the charter. (*Ibid.*) Once authorized, charter schools "are part of the public school system," but "operate independently from the existing school district structure." (Ed. Code § 47615(a)(1) and 47601.)

II. PROCEDURAL STATUS

The Culver City Unified School District ("District") Board of Trustees ("Board") received the Building Bridges International: An International Baccalaureate (IB) World School ("Charter School" or "BBBI") Charter Petition ("Petition") on January 25, 2011. Within 30 days of receiving the petition, the Board must "hold a public hearing on the provisions of the charter, at which time the governing board of the school district shall consider the level of support for the petition by teachers employed by the district, other employees of the district, and parents." (Ed. Code, section 47605(b).) A public hearing was held on February 22, 2011. If the Board grants the Petition, the Charter School will become a legal entity.

Under Education Code section 47605, subdivision (j)(1), if the District denies a charter petition, the petitioners may appeal that denial to the Los Angeles County Board of Education ("County Board"). If the County Board grants the charter, it becomes the supervisory agency over the charter school. In that case, the District's obligations with respect to the charter school become limited to transfer of what would become the charter school's share of local property taxes based on its ADA, along with provision of facilities if a request were made and entitlement shown. If the County denies the petition, the petitioner may appeal to the State Board of Education ("SBE"). (Ed. Code, §47605, subd. (j)(1).)

III. REVIEW OF THE PETITION

A staff team conducted a full review of the Petition. Education Code section 47605(b) sets forth the following guidelines for governing boards to consider in reviewing charter

petitions:

- The chartering authority shall be guided by the intent of the Legislature that charter schools are, and should become an integral part of the California educational system and that establishment of charter schools should be encouraged.
- A school district governing board shall grant a charter for the operation of a school under this part if it is satisfied that granting the charter is consistent with sound educational practice.
- The governing board of the school district shall not deny a petition for the establishment of a charter school unless it makes written factual findings, specific to the particular petition, setting forth specific facts to support one or more of the following findings:
 - (1) *The charter school presents an unsound educational program for the pupils to be enrolled in the charter school.*
 - (2) *The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition.*
 - (3) *The petition does not contain the number of signatures required by statute.*
 - (4) *The petition does not contain an affirmation of each of the conditions required by statute.*
 - (5) *The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of the required elements of a charter petition.*

In addition to the above, Staff's review and analysis of the Petition was also guided by Regulations of the California State Board of Education which were promulgated for the SBE's evaluation of its own charter petition submissions (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, section 11967.5.1 "Regulations"). Although these Regulations do not apply by law to a school district's review of charter petitions, they are helpful guidance. Where relevant, the content of the Education Code and Regulations is stated or paraphrased with respect to each area in which staff has identified deficiencies.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based upon its comprehensive review and analysis of the Petition, Staff recommends that the Petition be **denied**. Factual findings with respect to each deficiency Staff identified appear in numbered paragraphs in Section V, below. This Staff Report also contains Staff's analysis of the Petition, and the written findings supporting Staff's recommendation of denial.

V. GROUNDS FOR DENIAL

Staff recommends that the Petition be denied for the following reasons:

- **The Petition fails to provide a reasonably comprehensive description of all required elements of a charter petition; and**
- **The Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program presented in the Petition.**

Staff's more specific findings with regard to each reason for denial are described in numbered paragraphs below relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

VI. FINDINGS IN SUPPORT OF DENIAL

Staff's review and analysis of the Petition resulted in the following factual findings in support of denial.

A. The Petition Fails To Set Forth Reasonably Comprehensive Descriptions Of Many Charter Elements As Required By Education Code Section 47605(b)(5)

Education Code section 47605, subdivision (b)(5)(A-P), requires a charter petition to include reasonably comprehensive descriptions of numerous elements of the proposed charter school. The Regulations require the "reasonably comprehensive" descriptions required by Education Code section 47605(b)(5) to include, but not be limited to, information that:

1. Is substantive and is not, for example, a listing of topics with little elaboration.
2. For elements that have multiple aspects, addresses essentially all aspects the elements, not just selected aspects.
3. Is specific to the charter petition being proposed, not to charter schools or charter petitions generally.
4. Describes, as applicable among the different elements, how the charter school will:
 - a. Improve pupil learning.
 - b. Increase learning opportunities for its pupils, particularly pupils who have been identified as academically low achieving.
 - c. Provide parents, guardians, and pupils with expanded educational opportunities.
 - d. Hold itself accountable for measurable, performance-based pupil outcomes.
 - e. Provide vigorous competition with other public school options available to parents, guardians, and students.

(Cal. Code Regs § 11967.5.1, subd. (g).) Staff finds that the Petitions fails to provide reasonably comprehensive descriptions of many of the required elements, particularly in light of the regulatory definition, as identified above and described below.

1. Element A – Educational Program

The Statute and Regulations provide various factors for considering whether a charter petition provides a reasonably comprehensive description of the educational program of the

school, including, but not limited to, a description of the following: the charter school's target student population, including, at a minimum, grade levels, approximate numbers of pupils, and specific educational interests, backgrounds, or challenges, the charter school's mission statement with which all elements and programs of the school are in alignment and which conveys the petitioners' definition of an educated person in the 21st century, belief of how learning best occurs, and goals consistent with enabling pupils to become or remain self-motivated, competent, and lifelong learners, the instructional approach of the charter school, the basic learning environment or environments, the curriculum and teaching methods that will enable the school's students to meet state standards, how the charter school will identify and respond to the needs of pupils who are not achieving at or above expected levels, how the charter school will meet the needs of student with disabilities, English learners, students achieving substantially above or below grade level expectations, and the charter school's special education plan, to include the means by which the charter school will comply with the provisions of Education Code section 47641, the process to be used to identify students who may qualify for special education programs and services, how the school will provide or access special education programs and services, the school's understanding of its responsibilities under law for special education pupils, and how the school intends to meet those responsibilities. (Ed. Code, § 47605, subd. (b)(5)(A); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11967.5.1, subd. (f)(1).)

Based on the following enumerated findings, Staff concludes the Petition does not contain a sufficient description of the Charter School's proposed educational program.

1. General Description. Generally, the educational program is only described in theoretical frameworks, and is really more a summary of research-based best practices, with little concrete information on how the Charter School would achieve all of the things promised in the Petition, with the identified target population. It describes many programs vaguely, but nothing in a reasonably comprehensive manner. As is discussed further, supra, the budget, assumptions, and cash flow documents do not support many of the promises in the Petition, including the referenced International Baccalaureate (IB) program, performing arts, language and immersion programs. To the extent any educational program identified in the Petition is not supported by the budget, it is not comprehensively described.
2. Target Population and Student Goals and Outcomes: The Petition unrealistically proposes a K-8 school of academic excellence, targeting students with low socioeconomic status, where 70% of the students qualify for free or reduced lunch. The petition proposes to serve these needy students through a vaguely and insufficiently described International Baccalaureate program in which all students will master a language other than English, while also learning career awareness (p.12-15.) The Petition fails to make any connection between the IB Academy striving for academic excellence and the more needy student population Petitioners propose to target, and also fails to budget for many of the promises in the Petition. (p. 12-34.)
3. How Learning Best Occurs:
 - a. The Petition indicates that learning best occurs with a school that employs educators who "understand the importance of socio-cognitive and socio-cultural frameworks of working with diverse student populations" . . . , "[a]re highly specialized in their fields" . . . , with [h]igh expectations for student achievement". . . , and "understand the importance of Curriculum

Triangulation, Measurable Goals/Ongoing Assessments, [and] Collaboration and Teamwork" (pp. 9-10, 270). The Petition never describes these "socio-cognitive and socio-cultural frameworks" with any more detail, nor does it indicate any well-defined or realistic recruiting plan or compensation structure which would attract and retain these sorts of educators with the pedagogical ideologies presented.

- b. The Petition indicates that "Technology enhancement" is also critical factor in how learning best occurs (p. 11). It then cites to socioeconomic disparities in access to technology by students, and promises a "huge component" of its program will involve providing the "academic opportunity to interact with the latest technological advances." (Id.) The Petition further promises "[t]echnology offers a unique opportunity to extend learning" and that BBI's "program will create structures to engage students in the use of technology to enhance learning, solve problems, and create new paradigms throughout all levels of learning." No further information or detail is provided as to what the "latest technological advances" are, how the school will use technology to "extend learning", or what "structures" the charter school will create. Additionally, the budget and assumptions provide for little in the way of technology and communication costs.

4. Instructional Approach

- a. The Petition provides general information on a variety of instructional strategies, educational programs, and desired accomplishments, but it lacks any meaningful, specific information regarding the instructional approach that will be employed at BBI. (pp. 35-41.) For example, the Petition defines "interdisciplinary learning" as instruction that "eliminate[s] fragmentation and the learning of isolated skills" and "allow[s] teachers to better differentiate instruction and create more interesting and rich methods of instruction and assessment [while] work[ing] to close the academic achievement gaps. . ." but does not describe how this will be concretely employed in the educational program at BBI. (p. 35.) Many of the instructional approaches are described in terms of best practices and methodologies, not how BBI will employ them.
- b. The Petition identifies block scheduling, team teaching, looping, service learning, but these are described mostly in philosophical and theoretic terms, and nearly the entire description is of the research in support of these techniques, rather than a reasonably comprehensive description of what BBI plans to do with the techniques. Most of the instructional approach description is dedicated to citing and describing research that supports Petitioner's promises, rather than concretely describing how these instructional methods will be employed at the charter school. (pp. 35-40, 226-238-243.)
- c. The Petition does not identify the written curriculum to be used by the school, but instead quotes California content standards for each grade level and subject, then vaguely describes the "scope and sequence" that these standards will be taught in. The Petition never indicates what BBI will actually do in terms of instructing students. For example, the Petition indicates an awareness of English learners and what they need to accomplish, but it does not in any way describe how BBI will serve EL students. (p.42.) Further, the Petition indicates its Kindergarten English Language arts courses "will strike

the appropriate balance of the skills and knowledge to be taught coupled with the capacity of these early learners," but nowhere does it describe what the appropriate balance is, what knowledge it is seeking to teach through what written curriculum, nor does it identify the "capacity of these early learners." (p.42.) In fact, the Petition spends nearly 200 pages quoting the content standards and describing their importance and what they mean when accomplished, without ever describing how the educational program at BBI will work towards them with what curriculum (p. 41-212). The Petition lacks any specific course of study description or curriculum listing, making review of these criteria impossible. Cutting and pasting pages and pages of content standards verbatim, then putting them in different orders and arrangements, and describing their value is not a sufficient description of the instructional design and curriculum.

- d. The Petition describes the importance of world languages and global awareness, shifting focus from the content standards to the earlier referenced IB Program. (pp. 213-221.) However, the Petition still does not describe any of the requirements of an IB program, or what BBI will do to accomplish that status or teach world languages to its needy students. Beyond highlighting the importance of these concepts, ideas, and areas, and the research that supports them, the Petition does not describe them or how they will be employed in the educational program at BBI. In essence, the Petition describes what a student should ideally accomplish in their education, but it never really or concretely describes what BBI will do to assist the student in meeting those goals.
- e. IB Program Description: The Petition touts IB programs, and how much better IB graduates fare in college and in their careers. (p. 215-224.) While the Charter commits to having a Primary Years IB program and Middle Years IB program, it does not describe what the organization has or will do to accomplish that designation, nor what these earlier IB programs will provide for students who are not able to feed into an IB Diploma Program for high school. The Petition indicates BBI is a "member of the IB community" but provides no more detail. (p. 217.) Even the sample lesson plan does not identify any curriculum, but still only focuses on the content standards. (p. 244-245.) The Petition's description of the IB Program, like the instructional design, is really theoretical, and does not provide a reasonably comprehensive concrete description of how and what IB Program will be offered. (See, e.g., pp. 226-234.) It also fails to specify or describe how it will be funded, and the budget and cash flow documents do not allocate any funding for this purpose.
- f. Immersion/language Program: The Petition promises to offer a language immersion program, but does not describe one. It also does not harmonize its immersion program with the IB Program the Petition primarily focuses on. The teacher and staffing plan do not account for the personnel necessary to provide an immersion or language program, and the Petitioners never recognize the difficulty in locating staff with language proficiency and credentialing in less prevalent languages, for example, Mandarin. It also does not recognize the student body that is necessary for an immersion program to function.

- g. The Petition attempts to summarize BBI's "Education Model Interface: Improving Achievement and Closing the Academic Achievement Gap," but this is similarly rhetorical. (p. 225.) It uses the analogy of a vehicle, with the written curriculum (California content standards, IB Program, and Career Awareness) as the vehicle body, the operational curriculum (interdisciplinary instructional units, team teacher, block scheduling, looping, and service learning) as the wheels, and the destination as core subject mastery/academic achievement gap closure, global awareness and understanding of 21st century themes, second language proficiency, life and career awareness education. However, the Petition fails to identify any written curriculum, has not concretely or specifically described the operational curriculum, has not comprehensively described its plan for accomplishing global awareness and second language proficiency nor life and career awareness. As such, the summary does no more than describe in few words what the Petition had just vaguely described over many pages.
 - h. The Petition promises to employ "Single Subject content teachers and Multiple Subject teachers with advanced degrees within core content subject matter areas." (p. 235.) It also promises interdisciplinary team teaching, with teachers being "required to plan lessons that cross-disciplines" and also "team teach and create interdisciplinary units." (p. 235-236.) The graphic depiction in the Petition is inconsistent with the team teaching model described, and seems instead to suggest one teacher with multiple credentials or degrees will teach a class of 25. (p. 235.) In any case, the budget does not appear to provide for anything other than a single multiple subject teacher for every 25 students, and it also does not budget sufficient money to pay for teachers with these highly specific and unique educational background and credentials. Further, the budget and the assumptions are inconsistent in terms of how many teachers the charter school intends to hire, and what they will be paid. In any case, it is clear that Petitioners did not budget for the caliber or number of teachers required to implement the educational programs described in the Petition.
 - i. The Petition describes a teacher recruitment plan, but it, too, is very vaguely described and unrealistic. (p. 270.) It promises that BBI will "conduct professional development activities once a week for faculty and staff" to include "lecture series in which distinguished scholars will be invited to share the latest academic strategies and techniques for closing the academic achievement gap." (Id.) No money appears budgeted for this purpose, and it is not clear how teachers will have the time to participate in weekly professional development lectures, the regular interdisciplinary lesson-planning and teaching also promised, and then also dedicate each Wednesday to support implementation and understanding of the SIP model. (p. 274.) As such, the description is inadequate.
5. Addressing the Needs of All Learners (p. 271): The Petition unrealistically proposes to serve every student of all backgrounds at all levels of skill in one either an IB Program or an immersion program. The "one size fits all" approach fails to recognize that not all students are interested in or would benefit from such programs, and both programs require much more than the Petition describes and accounts for. The Petition does not identify any local IB-based high school program into which its students could feed and actually graduate with an IB diploma or recognized coursework. The Petition further does not recognize

what is necessary to maintain an immersion program. To that extent, it is inadequately described.

6. Plan for Students Who are Academically High Achieving (p.271-272): The Petition indicates the IB Program is designed for high achieving students, and then promises "opportunities that allow for rigorous instructional programs that are planned to provide differentiated learning experience throughout the regular school date. . .BBI [will] provide professional development opportunities for all teacher staff in the area of Gifted and Talented Education instruction practices . . .[and] plan to have at least one GATE trained teacher to serve as the teacher leader to facilitate GATE identification implementation procedure." (p. 271). It then goes on to list several sample GATE "modifications" and nothing else. This is simply not a comprehensive description, and focuses on identifying these students and things they can do, instead of what BBI plans to do to meet their unique needs.
7. Plan for English Language Learners (p. 272-275): The Petition promises an English Language Support Coordinator/Teacher as the leader of the EL program, but this is not budgeted for, and the role or scope of duties of the ELL Coordinator are also not clearly defined or described. (p. 272.) It appears as though this person will be expected to serve as a teacher of EL students, professional development provider and consultant to classroom teachers, parent trainer/liaison, translator, and administrator of the entire EL program, including CELDT testing, scoring and reclassification. The Petition promises that each Wednesday will be designed to support implementation and understanding of the SIOP model, and to provide collaborative opportunities to evaluate data derived from the protocol, but this does not seem to be accommodated in the school's schedule or instructional minute requirements. (p. 274.) The Petition also indicates classroom teachers will provide translated content specific to each new unit, but does not appear to provide them with the time or resources necessary to accomplish this. (p. 279.) There is no plan for or description of how the Charter School will make placement decisions for students who need systematic English Language Development services in addition to the sheltered immersion in English classrooms, or how the program will be different for newcomers to the English language versus those with higher proficiencies, but not yet reclassified. There is no curriculum described for EL students. The Charter School's plan to monitor progress towards reclassification and the standards for reclassification are also inadequately described.
8. Plan for Students who Are Low Achieving Academically: The Petition laudably promises over a dozen activities to address academically low achieving students, but none of them are adequately described or conform to the identified population. The Petition lists: small class sizes and small teacher to student ratios, individualized instructional plans, after schools tutoring and skills instruction programs, extended day, after school language and math tutoring, homework support/remedial tutoring services, leveled reading practice for two hours a day after school, and after school enrichment programs, to include among others, orchestra, equestrian training, entrepreneur club, sailing, and skiing. (p. 280.) The budget does not account for any of these services and programs, other than \$15 per student for fieldtrips.

Additionally, the Petition promises direct phonetic-based instruction taught in both Spanish and English, and a 180-minute period of language arts teaching.

(Id.) Nowhere does it describe how small the classes or ratios will be, nor does it describe how this programming is different from the programming offered to the rest of the students or tailored to meet the needs of low achieving students. The budget simply provides for several classes of 25 students. The personnel to conduct these programs are not included in budget. The student study team process, a general education function, includes both resource teachers and school psychologist; these positions are similarly not budgeted. The student study team process also demonstrates some confusion as to extent it includes conducting assessments, meeting with the parents to review assessment results, and developing and implementing IEPs.

9. Meeting Needs of Students with Special Needs: The sections of the Petition addressing how the needs of students with special needs will be met is not substantive, and is mostly listing of topics with little elaboration. Although there are numerous educational and legal aspects to addressing these student populations, the Petition uses boilerplate, stock provisions from template charter petitions to address only broad, selected aspects of complex compliance issues.
 - a. Plan for Special Education: In evaluating the "reasonably comprehensive" description of the educational program, the SBE regulations point to the specificity of the charter school's "special education plan, including, but not limited to, the means by which the charter school will comply with the provisions of Education Code section 47641, the process to be used to identify students who qualify for special education programs and services, how the school will provide or access special education programs and services, the school's understanding of its responsibilities under law for special education pupils, and how the school intends to meet those responsibilities." (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11967.5(f)(1)(H).)

The Petition descriptions are weak on numerous fronts:

- The Petition does not adequately describe the Charter School's plan to serve students with disabilities and is not consistent or compliant with the requirements of the IDEA or the Charter Schools Act. (Petition, pp. 281-286.) As the following bullets demonstrate, the Petition's description misstates the law and demonstrates a lack of understanding of their obligations and responsibilities to ensure a free and appropriate public education ("FAPE") is provided to eligible charter school students.
- The Petition does not commit to be either a "school of the district" or an independent LEA member of the District's or any other SELPA, and does not seem to recognize that it will be, by default, a school of the District. It briefly indicates it will do one or the other, and then goes on to describe a plan that is not consistent with either model. For example, the Petition indicates BBI will use District forms and enter IEP data into the District's designated data system, and also that it will maintain copies of assessments and IEPs for district review. (p. 282.) However, it also indicates BBI will be "responsible for the management of its special education budgets, personnel, programs and services" and that it will implement the services required by the IEPs of students enrolled either from the District or some other unidentified private providers. (Id.) As either a school of the District or an LEA, this combination would not be appropriate.

- The Petition promises to provide students with their IEP services upon enrollment, but then inconsistently and inexplicably requires the District to continue to fund any non-public agency services identified on the IEP for 30 days. (p. 282.) The Petition does not require other school districts in which incoming students may reside to fund any non-public agency IEP services, and does not explain the discrepancy in treatment between students who are residents of Culver City versus other school districts. (p. 283.) The Petition does not recognize BBI's obligation to implement comparable services when a student with an IEP enrolls, and also does not recognize that the obligation depends on the SELPA that developed the IEP. It also requires a District special education representative to participate in the initial IEP meeting if the Charter School requests such, without explanation, and does not recognize BBI's obligation to consult with the District when making decisions involving special education. This plan would simply not be appropriate anytime the Charter School was operating as a school of the District for purposes of special education.
- The Petition also indicates BBI will be responsible for every aspect of identifying students, developing IEPs, and implementing them, but it does not employ or account for the personnel necessary to do this, and does not describe the process beyond summarily promising to comply. (p. 282.) It fails to recognize doing so is not consistent with operating as a school of the district, and also fails to identify any SELPA with which it may affiliate that would allow the Charter School to do what's described in the Petition. To the extent Petitioners have not done so, staff can only analyze the petition for compliance with school of the District requirements, and Petitioners wholly fail to describe a plan that complies with that default model.
- The Petition summarily promises to "make necessary adjustments to comply with the mandates of State and federal laws, including the IDEA and Section 504" in disciplining students with disabilities. (p. 284.) It identifies key concepts, such as a manifestation determination, but does not describe that process with any specificity, nor does it describe any of the other requirements for achieving the promised compliance. The student discipline section fails to recognize or explain even the basic procedures necessary to ensure students with disabilities are appropriately and lawfully disciplined.
- While the description provided is more consistent with operating as an LEA member of a SELPA, and describes little to no District involvement other than period review and consult, the Petition then indicates "[i]n the event that a parent or guardian of a student attending the Charter School initiates due process proceedings, both the Charter School and the District will be named as respondents." (p.284.) The Petition also inaccurately indicates the District could use due process procedures to bring BBI into compliance with federal and state special education laws and regulations, when a due process hearing is not available for that purpose. (p. 284.) Additionally, the Petition indicates the District will investigate and respond to all special education complaints pertaining to the Charter School, "including the District's Uniform Complaint Procedures, Office for Civil Rights and California Department of Education Compliance Complaints."

(p. 285.) The District does not necessary have this obligation or jurisdiction, and the fact Petitioners assume the District will investigate on behalf of OCR or CDE, and that parents of charter school students may use the District's Uniform Complaint procedure to address special education complaints, causes great concern for staff in terms of Petitioner's knowledge of special education. As such, the District cannot reasonably rely on the Petition's summary promises to be responsible for every aspect of special education at the Charter School.

- The Petition inaccurately states the District is its own SELPA, and also incorrectly assumes that it will be allocated the full amount of AB 602 funds it generates. (p. 285.) It also inaccurately and inconsistently states that all charter schools authorized by the District are deemed to be public schools within the District, and that the District will determine the policies and procedures necessary to ensure FAPE to all students. (Id.) Culminating the confusion, the Petition ends the special education description with a section entitled "District Responsibilities related to Charter School Special Education Program." (p. 286.) Therein, the Petition finally commits to operating as a school of the District, but then indicates the District will only "provide information regarding District special education decisions policies and procedures" to the Charter School. (p. 286.) This renders the prior pages even more confusing, because while describing itself essentially as an LEA, the Charter School expects to remain a school of the District.
- While the Petition promises to take full responsibility for special education, including the costs of due process hearings and attorneys' fees, none of this is budgeted. This is particularly concerning at the current time given the suspension of County Mental Health's obligations to serve student's mental health needs, and the costs that suspension shifts back to school districts. BBI would have to fund these high mental health costs under the Petition's proposal, but it has yet to account for them. To the extent the total special education costs are not accounted for in the budget, the special education plan is also inadequately described.

b. Plan for Complying with Section 504:

- The Petition summarily promises to comply with Section 504 without evidencing any understanding of what that operationally and practically requires. (p. 282.) Petitioners merely added a sentence on to the special education description indicating BBI will comply with Section 504 in the paragraph that also promises compliance with the District's policies and procedures regarding special education. Petitioners do not recognize that Section 504 is a general education function separate and apart from special education. It appears Petitioners are confused and/or unclear as to what Section 504 is designed to accomplish, who the law designed to protect and from whom, its requirements, and what is necessary for compliance therewith.

The Petition does not describe or otherwise account for any additional personnel, types of services or accommodations that are necessary to ensure eligible students are appropriately evaluated and provided with 504 plans and services, when determined necessary through evaluation.

The budget narrative and monthly cash flows attached to the Petition fail to specify the costs associated with fulfilling the promises made in the Petition in terms of complying with Section 504, and there is nothing in the Petition which indicates what sorts of supports, services, and accommodations BBI is willing, qualified, and able to make available in order to provide the FAPE to BBI students with 504 plans.

The Petition provides no plan for resolving disputes with parents of 504 eligible or potentially eligible students or dealing with complaints filed surrounding such.

- c. Plan for Socio-Economically Disadvantaged Students: The Petition indicates BBI will serve the needs of socio-economically disadvantaged students by having four field trips per year to provide broad, enriching exposure to the world, a uniform policy, an IB program with front-loaded field trip experiences, and after school enrichment, to include sports and after school tutoring, and by encouraging parent donations and volunteering. (p. 287.) For the first time, the Petition acknowledges these programs will require payment, but then indicates scholarships will be available for families in need. (Id.) It does not indicate how the Charter School will comply with the prohibition on providing students things of value and fee charging, it does not indicate any scholarship or assistance criteria, and it does not include an application or selection process for those scholarships or assistance.

2. Element B – Measurable Student Outcomes

The Statute and Regulations provide for a charter petition to identify the specific skills, knowledge and attitudes that reflect the school's educational objectives and that can be assessed frequently and sufficiently by objective means to determine satisfactory progress and provide for the frequency of the objective means for measuring outcomes to vary by factors such as grade level, subject matter, and previous outcomes. (Ed. Code, § 47605, subd. (b)(5)(B); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11967.5.1, subd. (f)(2).) To be sufficiently detailed, objective means of measuring pupil outcomes must be capable of being used readily to evaluate the effectiveness of and to modify instruction for individual students and for groups of students during the school year. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11967.5.1, subd. (f)(2)(A).)

Based on the following enumerated findings, Staff concludes the Petition does not contain a sufficient description of the Charter School's measurable pupil outcomes.

1. School and Student Outcomes. The Petition proposes vague, immeasurable, and insufficiently frequent or specific goals to describe desired school and student outcomes. (pp. 288-295.) The Petition confusingly indicates its goal is to ensure BBI students "master language arts, writing, social studies, science, mathematics, foreign language, fine arts, health and physical education skills equal to those expected of charter students in the District within five years." (p. 288.) It never identifies whose expectations, or what those are, but instead, indicates BBI's "goal is to academically exceed the percentage number of students in the district who score proficient and above" on unnamed standardized measures within a vague period of 3-5 years. (Id.) Further, while the broadly stated goals are followed up by some additional detail, no concept is broken down by grade level and there is no curricular or standards explanation, and more

importantly, no explanation as to how the information will be used to inform instructional decision making or assist the Charter School in evaluating its program. Some of the goals are also immeasurable, for example, "develop[ing] a professional atmosphere that will serve to retain its students, teachers, and classified personnel." (p. 289.)

2. Curriculum Design. The Petition promises to meet or exceed all established California state content standards, but it does not describe how. The goals appear unrealistic, and also lack specificity or connection to the Charter School's program. For example, the first goal is for students, presumably all, to reach their academic potential in core subject areas." Nowhere does the petition describe how the Charter School will identify student's potential or whether they are functioning to their potential. (p. 290.) The remaining goals are equally vague and immeasurable. (pp. 291-293.) While it is laudable for all students to "master grade level competencies" and develop career awareness, these need to be concrete and connected to the educational program the Charter School is providing, rather than expressed in general, theoretical terms.
3. Use and Reporting of Data. The petition relies on Power School and an office manager to collect data about student performance and analyze it, in addition to the principal and teachers, but neither is identified or accounted for in the budget documents. (p. 307-310.)

3. Element D – Governance

The Statute and Regulations provide for a charter petition to identify the governance structure including, at a minimum, evidence of the charter school's incorporation as a non-profit public benefit corporation, if applicable, the organizational and technical designs to reflect a seriousness of purposes to ensure that the school will become and remain a viable enterprise, there will be active and effective representation of interested parties, and the educational program will be successful. (Ed. Code, § 47605, subd. (b)(5)(D); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11967.5.1, subd. (f)(4).) The Statute and Regulations also provide for evidence that parental involvement is encouraged in various ways. (*Ibid.*)

Based on the following enumerated findings, Staff concludes the Petition does not contain a sufficient description of the Charter School's governance structure.

1. Nonprofit Corporation/Conflict of Interest Standards. The governance section of the Petition is not substantive, and is more in the nature of a listing of topics with little elaboration.

The Petition does not identify the conflict of interest standards that would govern the Board of Directors of the nonprofit corporation that would run the Charter School, and the information the Petition offers on that score is confusing and mixes legal standards. The Petition states, for example, that the Charter School will comply with "federal and state laws, nonprofit integrity standards, and CCUSD's Charter School policies and regulations," without identifying the specific standards it intends to observe. (p. 311-313.) The corporate bylaws submitted with the Petition further exacerbate this concern, since they do not recognize key laws such as Government Code section 1090, and in fact propose a Board structure, the composition of which would violate that important law (e.g. the school's directors would serve on the board for a perpetual term). (Bylaws, p. 4-

- 5.) The Annual Statement description also raises concern, in that it only reports transactions involving financial interests of board members that are valued at over \$50,000, and limits potentially interested persons to board members and officers, rather than those with decision making authority. (Bylaws, p. 13.) This is inconsistent with the Conflict of Interest Policy, causing further confusion. In any case, that conflict policy also inaccurately states the conflict standards applicable to public funds, and does not adequately protect against conflicts.
2. Board Composition/Bylaws. The Petition indicates that the corporation was established in 2010, but the Petition does not describe the Board's composition or other specific information about the corporation. (p. 311-312.) The Petition provides little, if any, information about the proposed operations of the Charter School's Board of Directors. (pp. 311-314.) The Petition does attach Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, but those too raise concern. The Articles of Incorporation provided with the Petition are not signed or filed, and do not contain the correct address. The Bylaws are inconsistent with the Petition and the budget in several aspects. For example, the Bylaws provide that 15% of the yearly budgeted income shall be from fund raising activities and also that essential program elements should be reflected in the budget, but nothing is consistently reflected in the Petition or the budget documents submitted therewith. (Bylaws, p. 13.) Petitioners do not seem to understand that decisions must be made publicly by the Board as a whole, rather than single members or administrators confidentially. (See, e.g. Bylaws, p. 3.) The Bylaws refer to the founding officer, but do not identify who that person is, and allows the Board to range from 3 to 9 members, without explanation. (p. 4-5.) The Petition must provide a reasonably comprehensive description of its governance structure, including its board composition and operations, and it does not.
3. Board Legal Compliance. The Petition fails to include a substantive description of which laws the Board intends to observe and follow, such as Government Code section 1090, the Political Reform Act, and the California Public Records Act, or how the Charter School plans to ensure compliance. There is no specific or complete discussion of conflict of interest or inclusion of or reference to a conflict of interest code. While the Petition promises it will comply with conflict of interest laws, it indicates the school's founding director is a voting member of the board. The abstention described in one sentence is not sufficient to meet even the Political Reform Act standards, much less the more stringent standards in Government Code section 1090. The Petition also only promises to involve the board in contracts valued at more than \$20,000, which does not appear to allow for adequate monitoring or involvement. (p. 315.) The Bylaws delegate too much of the Board's authority to the President, and provides the President more authority than is suggested in the Petition. (Bylaws, p. 7-8, 14.) The Bylaws also promise compliance with the Brown Act, but describe operations that are not compliant with open meeting act principles. For example, the Bylaws indicate agendas for special meetings "need not specify the purpose of the meeting" and further fail to identify or describe any requirements for agenda items. (Bylaws, p.9.) The quorum description is also confusing in that it allows a majority of half of the Board to make decisions, but then allows decisions to be made when a quorum is no longer present. (Bylaws, p. 10.)
4. Board Committees. The Petition describes what are called "Board committees," but the involvement of those committees in the governance of the Charter School is not clear or comprehensively described. (pp. 316-317.) The Bylaws indicate

the Charter School will have four committees, a Planning Committee, Fundraising Committee, Community Outreach Committee, and an Executive or Administrative Committee. (By Laws, p. 8.) It is not clear how these committees will function, or whether and what decision making authority they have, and the Articles seem inconsistent with the Petition and confusing in places. For example, the Bylaws provide that the Executive or Administrative committee "is responsible for day-to-day activities of the school. . . includ[ing] determining [and] implementing/enforcing school policies." (Id.) This duty seems to be delegated to the Principal in the Petition, and even the Bylaws provide that the "Principal is in charge of the actual day to day running of the school. . ." (Id.) The Bylaws further refer to the School Executive Committee processing grievances and making final decisions through a grievance procedure not otherwise described. (Id.) Further, the Petition suggests these committees will be subject to the Brown Act, but the Bylaws are silent on that issue.

5. Administration. The Petition periodically refers to an Assistant Principal, but the role is not described, and it is also not budgeted, even though accounted for in the assumptions. (p. 318.) It is also not clear whether the Director referenced throughout the Petition is the same role as the Principal.

4. Element E – Employee Qualifications

The Statute and Regulations provide for a charter petition to identify general qualifications for various categories of employees the school anticipates, identify those positions that the charter school regards as key in each category and specify the additional qualifications expected of individuals assigned to those positions, and specify that all employment requirements set forth in applicable provisions of law will be met, including but not limited to credentials as necessary. (Ed. Code, § 47605, subd. (b)(5)(E); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11967.5.1, subd. (f)(5).)

Based on the following enumerated findings, Staff concludes the Petition does not contain a sufficient description of the Charter School's employee qualifications.

1. Descriptions Unrealistic. The Petition's description of personnel is inconsistent with the budget documents submitted with the Petition, and does not appear realistic or sustainable. There are no certificated classroom personnel other than teachers described in the Petition or included in the budget documents, and besides vague description of instructional aides, no additional classified staff are described. (p.321.) The Petition promises an IB Program, a language immersion program, and several coordinators, and describes teachers collaborating and team teaching, but the budget only contemplates 7 classrooms and 7 teachers.
2. Compensation Structure. The Petition places a substantial amount of responsibility on classroom teachers, including planning, designing, creating, implementing, and monitoring efficacy of curriculum, exchanging ideas in cross grade planning, and continuously re-evaluating the scope and sequence of the curriculum, but the budget only allots teachers a salary of \$48,000 for the first year. (See, e.g., p.9) The Petition indicates that educators are the primary factor in "How Students Learn Best," and goes on to describe a very specialized, unique, and dedicated teaching staff. (p. 9-10.) It does not indicate how BBI will ensure this caliber of staff, nor does the budget support it. This is further confused by the fact the assumptions describe something other than what is provided for in the budget.

3. Professional Development. Similarly, the Petition proposes substantial professional development, without funding or adequately describing how and when it will be provided to such a busy and small group of teachers.
4. Principal's Responsibilities (p.322). The Principal both reports to and advises the Charter School's governing board, and is also a member of the governing board. In addition to the conflicts this creates, the Principal's job duties are also extremely broad and varied, to the point they appear unattainable for one person. The Petition does not consistently describe how much involvement the governing board will have versus delegation to the Principal or other committees, and the Bylaws do not appear to meet oversight obligations for boards spending public dollars. (See e.g. p. 336.)
5. Foreign Language Coordinators / Support Teachers (p. 323-324). The Petition indicates the Charter School will hire a Second Language Support Coordinator that is bi- or multi-lingual, including Mandarin and French, and another "support coordinator/ teacher." These positions are not accounted for in the budget, and it does not appear realistic for a Charter School to find and successfully employ individuals with such rare skills. Like the Principal, the Coordinator's and Support Teacher's duties are vast and seemingly impossible to accomplish by one person. There is also no mention of these positions in the budget, and they do not appear to be otherwise accounted for.
6. International Baccalaureate Coordinator (p. 324-325). The Petition further identifies and describes, albeit vaguely and unrealistically, an "international baccalaureate coordinator." This position is not budgeted for, nor is the IB certification this person will be in charge of obtaining.

5. Element G – Racial and Ethnic Balance

The Statute provides for the charter petition to identify the means whereby the charter school will achieve a racial and ethnic balance among its students that is reflective of the authorizing district's general population. (Ed. Code, § 47605, subd. (b)(5)(G).)

Based on the following enumerated findings, Staff concludes the Petition does not contain a sufficient description of the Charter School's means of ensuring racial and ethnic balance consistent with the District's demographics.

1. Lack of Specificity. The Petition provides that BBI "will provide a written plan in the charter petition and upon further request by the District outlining how it would achieve and maintain the ethnic goal of 70:30 or 30:70 ratios." (p. 345.) It refers to a "court-ordered integration plan" without explaining how or why the Charter School would be subject to it. The Petition does not identify the racial and ethnic balance of the District, nor does it explain what would constitute the 70:30 or 30:70 ratio it refers to or how that would reflect the general population of the District. The Petitioners then describe transfer rights under NCLB, without describing how that would relate to maintaining racial and ethnic balances. None of the outreach, meetings, or advertising appears sufficiently accounted for in the budget documents or cash flow.
2. Community Outreach Plan. The Petition indicates the Charter School will achieve racial and ethnic balance through "a carefully considered recruitment and

community outreach drive.” (p. 347.) The description is only promises of developing calendars and plans in the future. Without any explanation, the Petition indicates the IB program and emphasis on global awareness will attract ethnically and socio-economically diverse student population.” (Id.) Further, to the extent this relies on the IB program, it is inadequately described because the Petition does not fund or describe how the Charter School will become an IB program.

6. Element H – Admission Requirements

The Statute and Regulations provide for the charter petition to identify admission requirements that are in compliance with applicable law. (Ed. Code, § 47605, subd. (b)(5)(H); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11967.5.1, subd. (f)(8).)

Based on the following enumerated finding, Staff concludes the Petition does not contain a sufficient description of the Charter School’s admission requirements.

1. School Contracts. The Petition refers to school contracts and parent volunteer hours, and parent attendance at meetings, without any further description or sufficient explanation of how the charter school will handle students whose parents are unable or unwilling to sign such an agreement or participate in meetings and volunteer opportunities. (pp. 287, 350-351.) Contracting and parent volunteer requirements such as those mentioned in the Petition may violate the free school guarantee, even though the Petition promises that no student will be turned away. While BBI is free to encourage such a level of parent involvement in the admission process and ongoing education of their child, it cannot require it.

7. Element J – Suspension and Expulsion Procedures

The Statute and Regulations require a charter petition to specify procedures by which students can be suspended or expelled that provides due process for all pupils. These shall include, at a minimum, identification of a preliminary list of offenses for which students must and may be disciplined, the procedures for suspending and expelling pupils who have committed such offenses, and how parents, guardians and students will be informed of the grounds and their due process rights. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11967.5.1, subd. (f)(10)).

A petition must also provide evidence that in preparing the list of offenses and the procedures, the petitioners reviewed the lists of offenses and procedures that apply to students attending non-charter public schools, as well as evidence that petitioners have reviewed their list and believe it provides for adequate safety for students, staff and visitors. (*Ibid.*) The charter petition must also include a description of due process for and understanding of the rights of students with disabilities with regard to suspensions and expulsion and how discipline policies and procedures will be periodically reviewed and modified. Finally, the petition must outline how detailed policies and procedures regarding suspension and expulsion will be developed and periodically reviewed, including, but not limited to, periodic review and (as necessary) modification of the lists of offenses for which students are subject to suspension or expulsion. (Ed. Code, § 47605, subd. (b)(5)(J); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11967.5.1, subd. (f)(10).)

Based on the following enumerated findings, Staff concludes the Petition does not contain a sufficient description of the Charter School’s student discipline process.

1. Policies Not Yet Drafted. The Petition promises to develop and adopt procedures that comply with the Education Code disciplinary scheme, but do not otherwise describe or evidence any understanding of them. (pp. 357-371.) As described, the disciplinary scheme does not appear to meet minimum due process requirements when expulsion is a consideration.
2. Confusing and Inconsistent Descriptions. The Petition's description of student discipline policies and procedures, which admittedly are not yet developed or attached, is a mainly described in incomplete, statutory "boilerplate" language and at times, is confusing. For example, Petitioners promise to convene a Student Study Team prior to suspension and expulsions, when this is really not possible or consistent with the remaining descriptions in this section. The Petition promises to provide "adequate notice," but does not indicate or further describe what accomplishing that entails.
3. Discipline of Disabled Students. The Petition provides no description and demonstrates no understanding or explanation of the unique and critical differences in federal law required in discipline of disabled students. (p. 358.) This undermines staff confidence as to the ability of the Petitioners to successfully manage the complexities of public school student discipline.

8. Element N-Dispute Resolution Procedures

The Statute requires the Petition describe the procedures to be followed by the charter school and the entity granting the charter to resolve disputes relating to provisions of the charter. (Ed. Code, § 47605, subd. (b)(5)(N).) The Regulations require a description of how the costs of the dispute resolution process, if needed, would be funded, and also a recognition that if the substance of a dispute is a matter that could result in the taking of appropriate action, including, but not limited to, revocation of the charter, it will be handled in accordance with that provision of law and any regulations pertaining thereto.

Based on the following enumerated findings, Staff concludes the Petition does not contain a sufficient description of the Charter School's dispute resolution process.

1. The Petition provides that "any dispute between the District and [BBI] shall be resolved in accordance with the procedures set forth" in the Petition. (p.377.) The Petition goes on to list binding arbitration as a required component. There is no description of what would and would not qualify under this clause, and in any case, the impingement on the District's oversight obligations is not described or accounted for. There is no acknowledgement of the District obligation to intervene in any dispute that involves any of the conditions that could subject the charter to revocation.
2. The Petitioners cannot commit the District to participating in binding arbitration. (p. 378.) Additionally, the dispute resolution process is not accounted for in the budget documents.

B. The Petition should be denied because Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program. (Ed. Code, § 47605, subd. (b)(2).)

The Statute requires Petitioners to show they are demonstrably likely to successfully implement the program set forth in the Petition. (Ed. Code, § 47605(b)(2).) The

Regulations also require consideration of whether a petition has presented a realistic financial and operational plan, including the areas of administrative services, financial administration, insurance and facilities. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11967.5.1, subds. (c)(1) and (c)(3).) In the area of administrative services, the charter or supporting documents must adequately describe: the structure for providing administrative services, accounting and payroll that reflects an understanding of school business practices and expertise to carry out the necessary administrative services, or a reasonable plan and time line to develop and assemble such practices and expertise. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11967.5.1, subds. (c)(3)(A)(1).) For any contract services, the Regulations require a description of the criteria for the selection of a contractor or contractors that demonstrate necessary expertise and the procedure for selection of the contractor or contractors. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 11967.5.1, subds. (c)(3)(A)(2).)

Under section 11967.5.1(c)(3)(B), an unrealistic financial and operational plan for the proposed charter exists when the charter or supporting documents do not adequately describe: a) At a minimum, the first year operational budget, start-up costs, and cash flow, and financial projections for the first three years; b) Include in the operational budget reasonable estimates of all anticipated revenues and expenditures, necessary to operate the school including, but not limited to, special education, based, when possible, on historical data from schools or school districts of similar type, size, and location; c) include budget notes that clearly describe assumptions on revenue estimates, including, but not limited to, the basis for average daily attendance estimates and staffing levels; and d) present a budget that in its totality appears viable and over a period of no less than two years of operations provides for the amassing of a reserve equivalent to that required by law for a school district of similar size to the proposed charter school. California Education Code 47605(g) and 5 CCR 11967.5.1(c)(3)(B) also require Petitioners "to provide financial statements that include a proposed first year operational budget, including start-up costs, and cash flow, and financial projections for the first three years of operation."

Under section 11967.5.1(c)(3)(C), the Regulations require, in the area of insurance, for the charter and supporting documents to adequately provide for the acquisition of and budgeting for general liability, workers compensations, and other necessary insurance of the type and in the amounts required for an enterprise of similar purpose and circumstance.

Finally, under section 11967.5.1(c)(3)(D), the Regulations require, in the area of facilities, for the charter and supporting documents to adequately: one, describe the types and potential location of facilities needed to operate the size and scope of educational program proposed in the charter; two, in the event a specific facility has not been secured, provide evidence of the type and projected cost of the facilities that may be available in the location of the proposed charter school; and three reflect reasonable costs for the acquisition or leasing of facilities to house the charter school, taking into account the facilities the charter school may be allocated under the provisions of Education Code section 47614.

Based on the following enumerated findings, Staff concludes Petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the Petition.

1. Lack of Experience in Public Education and Past Experience with School Operation. The Petition devotes significant attention to documenting the founding team's expertise and qualifications in education, but none of it involves any experience in public education or operating a public school. (p. 4-7.) It also does not appear Petitioners are sufficiently knowledgeable about publicly funded education, its governance, and the sorts of fiscal controls and obligations that public officials must observe. The Petition otherwise also presents an unrealistic

financial and operational plan, including the areas of operations, financial administration and facilities.

2. Operational Plan is Not Realistic or Sound: The Petition and its supporting documents do not adequately describe the anticipated administrative or contracted services. The structure of administrative services, accounting and payroll are not adequately described and thereby do not reflect an understanding of school business practices and expertise to carry out the necessary administrative services. The Petition does not describe the accounting or payroll structure or plans, and instead just indicates BBI "at times require the contracting of outside services . . . [that] can include food supplies/prepared meals, police and security, credential and criminal review of personnel and other services common to nonprofit schools." (p. 320.) It is thus unclear as to what BBI intends to do in house or for administrative services. There are also administrators described in the Petition that are not accounted for in the budget, for example, the vice principal and coordinators. (p. 321-328.) For any contract services, there is no description of the procedure for selection of the contractor or contractors or criteria for the selection of a contractor that demonstrate necessary expertise. (p. 320, 339).
3. Realistic Financial Plan. The Petition does not present a sound, realistic financial plan, either. In terms of attendance recording and accounting systems, the Petition promises merely to implement a system that complies with state laws, without explaining anything specific that would be necessary under which laws. (p. 326-327.) The financial notes and budget assumptions presented within the charter Petition do not support the Budget presented by Petitioners. More specifically:
 - a. Fiscal Management – Annual Budget: The multi-year budget is not realistic, nor does it support the educational program and personnel quality described in the Petition. If the budget reflected the program described, the Charter School would be insolvent in its first year of operation.
 - b. Revenue: It appears Petitioners expect to receive revenue from other sources than those specified in the Petition, because the revenues described in the budget will not cover the expenses of the program described, in terms of professional development, bonuses, technology, supplemental hours and summer school and supplemental services, and facility costs. However, there is no explanation of the source, schedule, or surety of these private fund sources.
 - The Budget summary indicates BBI will attain a per-pupil revenue of \$9,477, a significant portion of which is based on funding sources for which BBI will have to meet funding criteria and is not certain, such as Title I funds. In addition, Petitioner's assumptions do not take into account the State Governor's plans for further cuts to education funding, and it is not clear how Petitioner will manage its cash flow and revenue expectations in light of current funding deferrals as well as additional cuts and deferrals that are expected as the State budget is finalized.
 - Funds for Educational Programs: The Budget indicates BBI will receive 7.5% of its budget from independent study funds, or

\$106,875 in Year 1, \$123, 270 in Year 2, \$137,051 in Year 3, \$150,842 in Year 4 and \$155,644 in Year 5, but the Petition describes no independent study program. The Petition promises field trips and other enrichment programs, but the assumptions only provide \$15 per student per year. There is no mention of the IB program, or immersion program in the budget or assumptions.

- Grants and Fundraising: The Budget indicates the Charter School will receive \$575,000 (\$225,000 this year, \$200,000 in year one, and \$150,000 in year three) in grant income, and 2012-2013, as well as \$469,374 (\$57,225 in year one, \$80,388 in year two, \$95,127 in year three, \$110,323 in year four, and \$126,311 in year five) in fundraising monies over the five year term. (Budget, p. 4.) These amounts represent over 15% of the revenues contained in the budget, and are not described anywhere in the Petition. Petition has not identified the sources of this fundraising. Without proper documentation supporting the validity and terms of a grant, this funding is potential revenue only. Without these funds, the Charter School would have a negative balance after the first year of operation, even taking into consideration the reserve. (Budget, p. 4-5.)
- The Budget identifies \$250,000 in "cash flow from financing activities," but this amount is not otherwise described or accounted for in the Budget. While the assumptions indicate this is a CDE revolving loan, the budget does not account for repaying this loan, only budgeting a few thousand dollars over the five year term for debt service.

c. Expenditures: Anticipated expenditures are under-documented in the budget provided. There is no information provided as to technology and other equipment expenses, nor is the information provided broken down into sufficient detail which would allow any determination as to whether it is realistic and viable. The expense assumptions provide information as to items not accounted for in the budget or cash flow, for example, student uniforms.

- Employee Compensation and Salaries: The Petition and budget notes and assumptions have not provided any information or supporting documentation of administration salaries or salaries of certificated and non-certificated teachers and staff. The budget does not budget for any teacher substitutes, extra duty or certificated pupil support. (Budget, p. 4.) There only appears to be one office person budgeted for the entire five year term, and no other classified staff the first year. The budget contains no salary for a maintenance position, although promises to employ a custodian. (Petition, p. 328, 339, Budget, p. 4.) It also contains no salary for the vice principal or any of the coordinator positions identified in the Petition. (p. 322-327.) There is little information as to the number of certificated teachers, non-certificated teachers and other classified staff, their individual salaries, and no information as to any substitute teachers, certificated stipends, if any, or how many employees, if any, accrue vacation and sick time. When a teacher is not working due to illness,

and if that teacher accrues compensable sick leave time, the teacher that is ill would not receive a reduction in pay for the time lost and the Charter School would still need the services of substitute teacher to fill in. Vacation and sick leave costs, or reasons why these costs were not a factor, are not otherwise addressed within the Petition, the budget notes or budget assumptions.

- Books & Supplies (p.5): It is difficult from the detail provided in the Petition to determine if line item budgets are properly projected. It appears textbooks, reference materials, office supplies, and custodial supplies are significantly under budgeted. There is no money budgeted for equipment rental, and no provision of start up money for the expensive office equipment that is usually leased, e.g. a copier. The legal fees are only budgeted at \$2000 this year and \$1000 in the first year, which appears understated, even with the modest increase to between \$6500 and \$6900 in years two through five do not relieve the concern. The advertisement and recruitment monies included in the budget are also insufficient to fund all of the advertising and recruitment activities promised in the Petition. (p. 347-349.) The petition indicates that technology is an integral part of the program, but very little money is budgeted to support that assertion.
- Services & Other Operating Expenditures: Utilities, communication, and housekeeping costs are drastically under-budgeted. The budget devotes substantial monies to instructional and non-instructional consultants, but the Petition does not describe what these are, nor the procedures or the criteria for contacting with these types of providers. There is also no indication as to what function these consultants would serve at the Charter School. The Budget identifies Ex-Ed as a service provider, but the Petition is silent as to what services this company will provide to the Charter School. The Charter School's fair share contribution to special education is also drastically underestimated. There is no money budgeted in terms of cash flow for the Charter School to comply with ELL requirements or Section 504 obligations, despite contrary and curt assurances in the Petition and contrary statements in the assumptions.
- Insurance: Petitioners drastically underestimate insurance costs, particularly for a corporation that owns its own facility. BBI only budgets \$9,750 in year one, \$13,000 in year two for insurance, and while it increases to \$22,750 by year five, it is unrealistic to assume total insurance costs will be less than 1% of the budget.

- d. Budget Notes and Assumptions: The Charter School assumes it will benefit from 1%-2% cost of living adjustment increases, even though COLA payments have not been funded for the last several years. The assumptions also clarify that the fundraising Petitioner's include in their revenue is from "parent fundraising." Petitioners do not explain how this is consistent or realistic for the target population they describe. The assumptions indicate teacher salary is \$56,000, with six teachers in the first year, but the annual budget allots \$48,000 per teacher per year and seven teachers. The assumptions provide for a vice principal salary starting in year two, but the

budget does not include this position. The remainder of the assumptions provides no more information than is contained in the budget, but instead essentially just restate the same whole numbers. The assumptions reveal that the Charter School intends to charge students for after school programs and summer school. This is inconsistent with the promises in the Petition that these things will be provided free of cost, particularly to low performing students. Further, while after school care may be provided on a fee-for-service basis, the Charter School may not charge tuition for summer school. This violates the free school guarantee. The expenses for summer school are also not adequately accounted for, and according to the assumptions, are nil. The budget does not account for summer school either.

- e. Start-Up Costs: Petitioners have budgeted very little in terms of start up costs, and it is not clear from the budget sheets and assumptions what Petitioners are classifying as start up costs. Start up costs would seem particularly important for an organization that is seeking to procure its own facility.
 - f. Cash Flow: The cash flow projections show the charter school to be \$30,322 short on cash by July 2011, and \$47,251 short by August 2011. While revenue is scheduled to be received at that point, by November 2011, Petitioner's anticipate being \$73,727 short on cash. This drastic monthly fluctuation in cash flow is not fiscally responsible and has the potential to drastically upset operations, at minimum.
4. Facilities (p. 343.): The Petition indicates BBI intends to purchase a facility, and describes a facility the District previously owned at 5950 Stoneview Drive. Property records indicate that the property identified is on the market for nearly \$6 million, but the Petition does not describe any financing or include sufficient funding in its budget to purchase a property. It also does not describe how Petitioners intend to acquire the facility. (Budget, p.5) It does indicate Petitioner's have hired an award winning architect that will remodel the property sometime before the 2011-2012 academic year. Again, this position or its funding is not reflected in the budget, and only \$25,000 is identified for property improvement. The Petition does not provide any alternative plan if Petitioner's are unable to purchase the property, and Petitioner's have not requested any facility from the District within the timelines required for a facility next school year. Fundamentally, it does not appear that Petitioners have budgeted sufficient money to procure or maintain its own facility over the life of the charter, as the Petition promises.

VII. CONCLUSION

As set forth above, staff finds that the Petition fails to meet applicable legal requirements and standards. For all of the foregoing reasons, Staff recommends that the Board deny the Petition of BBI and adopt this Staff Report as written findings in support of its denial.

14.1c Receipt of Petition from Innovate! Charter School Submitted by Kids Achieve! Foundation

Education Code 47605(b) sets forth the process for consideration of a petition to establish a charter school and provides that within 30 days of the governing board's receipt of a charter petition, the board must hold a public hearing on the provisions of the charter proposal, at which time the governing board of the district shall consider the level of support for the petition by the teachers employed by the district, other employees of the district, and parents.

The statute further provides that the governing board must make a determination whether to grant or deny the charter petition within 60 days of its receipt of the petition.

The Board receives the Innovative! Charter School Petition on March 28, 2011, and will consider the petition according to the agreed upon schedule:

March 22, 2011: The Petition will be placed on the January 25, 2011 Board of Education ("Board") agenda to be received by the Board Pursuant to Education Code Section 47605(b). This action will commence the statutory review period.

April 26, 2011: The Board will hold a public hearing on the provisions of the charter, to consider the level of support for the petition by District teachers, employees and parents.

May 24, 2011: The Board will render a decision to grant or deny the charter. If denial is recommended, the District will prepare findings in compliance with Education Code section 47605(b)(1)-(5).

A copy of the full petition can be reviewed in the Superintendent's office upon request.

RECOMMENDED MOTION

That the Board approve receipt of the petition from Innovate! Charter School Submitted by Kids Achieve! Foundation as presented.

Moved by:

Seconded by:

Vote:

**BEFORE THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE
CULVER CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

RESOLUTION NO. 23

**LIMITATION OF TRANSFERS PURSUANT TO EDUCATION CODE SECTION
48356 BASED CAPACITY LIMITS OF DISTRICT PROGRAMS, CLASSES,
GRADE LEVELS AND SCHOOL BUILDINGS**

On the motion of Member _____, seconded by _____, the following resolution is adopted:

RESOLVED, by the Governing Board of the Culver City Unified School District that:

The CCUSD Open Enrollment Application window is April 15th to April 30th of each year. By statute, the Superintendent or designee shall provide written notification, to the parent/guardian and the student's district of residence, within 60 days of receiving the application as to whether the application has been accepted or rejected.

The Open Enrollment Act specifically permits a school district of enrollment to adopt specific, written standards for acceptance and rejection of applications for transfer pursuant to the Open Enrollment Act, which standards may include consideration of the capacity of program, class, grade level, or school building.

The Superintendent or designee is hereby directed to deny a transfer application if, as of June 7 of that year, the approval of the transfer application would negatively impact the capacity, as defined in this resolution for Open Enrollment Application purposes, of a CCUSD class, grade level, program, or school building (Board Policy 5118). The Superintendent or designee is hereby directed to leave sufficient room in each class, grade level, program, and school building for new Culver City residents who may move into the district over the summer or enroll during the school year. Therefore:

"Capacity," pursuant to Open Enrollment Transfer Applications, is defined as follows:

General Education Programs:

Each elementary grade level will be considered at capacity for Open Enrollment Application purposes when the school-wide average, on June 7, reaches a student: teacher ratio of 20:1 in Grades 1-3 and a student: teacher ratio of 27:1 in Grades 4 and 5.

Culver City Middle School will be considered at capacity for Open Enrollment Application purposes when 6th grade enrollment, on June 7, reaches 450 and when 7th and 8th grade enrollment, on June 7, reaches 470 students—or when the total school enrollment reaches 1,400.

Culver City High School will be considered at capacity for Open Enrollment Application purposes when 9th grade enrollment, on June 7, reaches 420 and when enrollment in Grades 10-12, on June 7, reaches 470 students—or when the total school enrollment reaches 1,900.

Culver Park School will be considered at capacity for Open Enrollment Application purposes when, on June 7, school-wide pre-enrollment reaches 60. Culver Park (Continuation) High School does not enroll students before their 16th birthday.

Special Education Classes and Programs:

The Resource Program (RSP)/Specialized Academic Instruction/Mild to Moderate Needs, will be considered at capacity for Open Enrollment Application purposes when district-wide average enrollment in the program, on June 7, reaches a student: teacher ratio of 25:1.

The Special Day Class Program/Specialized Academic Instruction/Moderate to Intensive Needs, will be considered at capacity for Open Enrollment Application purposes when, on June 7, enrollment in the program at the requested grade and school reaches a student: teacher ratio of 8:1.

The Basic Skills (Intensive) Program Classes will be considered at capacity for Open Enrollment Application purposes when, on June 7, enrollment in the program at the requested school reaches a student: teacher ratio of 5:1.

The Speech Services Program will be considered at capacity for Open Enrollment Application purposes when, on June 7, district-wide average enrollment in the program reaches a student: therapist ratio of 45:1.

Adaptive Physical Education (APE) will be considered at capacity for Open Enrollment Application purposes when, on June 7, district-wide average enrollment in the program reaches a student: teacher ratio of 37:1.

The Occupational Therapy (OT) program will be considered at capacity for Open Enrollment Application purposes when, on June 7, district-wide average enrollment in the program reaches a student: therapist ratio of 25:1.

As the district establishes new or different classes or programs for which a capacity limit is not included herein, it may establish an appropriate capacity, for Open Enrollment Application purposes, for any such class or program. For example:

If established, a new Adult Transition Program (ages 18-22) will be considered at capacity, for Open Enrollment Application purposes, when, on June 7, district-wide average enrollment in the program reaches a student: teacher ratio of 7:1.

If established, a new program for students with an emotional disturbance (Grades 6-12) will be considered at capacity for these purposes when, on June 7, district-wide average enrollment in the program reaches a student: teacher ratio of 5:1.

Capacity limits are intended to allow space for new residents and growth.

These capacity limits are intended to allow space for district residents who enroll during the summer or enroll in the program(s) during the school year. Establishment of these capacity limits are intended to assure that resident students receive the maximum amount of assistance by district staff and that the admission of non-resident students will not cause the total enrollment at Culver City Middle School to exceed 1,500, or total enrollment at Culver City High School to exceed 2,000.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Governing Board of the Culver City Unified School District on the 22th day of March, 2011 by the following vote:

AYES: _____

NOES: _____

ABSENT: _____

Scott Zeidman, Esq.
President, Governing Board
Culver City Unified School District

I, Katherine Paspalis, Esq., Clerk of the Governing Board of the Culver City Unified School District, do certify that the foregoing Resolution was regularly introduced, passed and adopted by the Governing Board at its regular meeting held on March 22, 2011.

Katherine Paspalis, Esq.
Clerk, Governing Board
Culver City Unified School District

14.3a Certification of the Second Interim Report for 2010-2011

In addition to other fiscal requirements, AB 1200 and AB 2756 legislation were enacted to insure full public disclosure of a public school district's financial position in the current and future years. The purpose of the interim reports, as required under AB 1200 and AB 2756, is to establish a procedure for the Board of Education, the public and other interested agencies to receive information regarding the financial condition of a school district during periodic intervals of the fiscal year.

Based upon a review of the interim report, the Board of Education certifies the district in one of the following three categories:

- (1) POSITIVE, if the district will be able to meet its financial obligations for the current fiscal year and subsequent two fiscal years,
- (2) QUALIFIED, if the district may not meet its financial obligations for the current fiscal year and subsequent two fiscal years,
- (3) NEGATIVE, if the district will be unable to meet its financial obligations for the remainder of the current fiscal year and subsequent two fiscal years.

Administration has been refining the budget since its First Interim Report and is submitting the Second Interim Report for a Positive Certification based upon budget modifications, reductions and revenue changes made since that time.

In certifying the 2010-11 Second Interim Report, the Board understands its fiduciary responsibility to maintain fiscal solvency for the current and subsequent two fiscal years. The Board recognizes that this Second Interim Report represents revenue and expenditure projections over the multi-year period which are based on the best known information at this time.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Education approve the 2010-11 Second Interim Report; and, certify that Culver City Unified School District will be able to meet its financial obligations for the remainder of the current fiscal year and two subsequent fiscal years.

Moved by:

Seconded by:

Vote:

BOARD REPORT

**3/22/11
14.3b**

14.3b Rejection of Claim

The District has received a claim for damages (File No. 11-91602DP) for alleged injuries sustained in an incident on October 26, 2010. The District's claims investigators have reviewed the claim and it is recommended that the claim be rejected.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Education authorize the Assistant Superintendent of Business Services to reject the claim for damages related to File No. 11-91602DP.

Moved by:

Seconded by:

Vote:

BOARD REPORT

15.1 Goals and Objectives of the Board

At the request of Board member Patricia G. Siever, Board members previously had a discussion about compiling the Board's goals and objectives, and at a later meeting reviewed a draft. The Board will review and further discuss the Goals and Objectives.