MEASURES N AND H – COLLEGE AND CAREER READINESS COMMISSION
1016 Union Street, #940
Oakland, CA 94607

OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Community Schools, Thriving Students

Measures N and H –
College & Career Readiness Commission

David Kakishiba, Chair
kakishiba@gmail.com

Marc Tafolla, Vice Chair
marctafolla@gmail.com

Katy Nuñez-Adler, Secretary
katynunez.adler@gmail com

James. Harris, Member
james@educateoakland.com

Gary Yee, Member
Yeega125@gmail.com

Board Office Use: **Legislative File Info.**	
File ID Number	25-2609
Introduction Date	Nov 4, 2025
Enactment Number	
Enactment Date	

Memo

To	Measures N and H – College and Career Readiness Commission
From	Vanessa Sifuentes, Deputy Chief of Post-Secondary Readiness
Board Meeting Date	
Subject	Services For: High School Linked Learning

Action Requested and Recommendation

Continued discussion and possible adoption of the Measures N and H Commission Implementation Priorities for the Educational Improvement Plan (EIP) Policy.

Background

(Why do we need these services? Why have you selected this vendor?

Last August 2025, a Commission discussion regarding the possible changes to the Education Improvement plan began after receiving feedback from staff and stakeholders. The discussion continued in the September 2025 andOctober 2025 Commission meetings. At the Nov 4, 2025 Commission meeting, a list of priorities was introduced by the Commission to direct senior staff on specific areas of implementation.

Competitively Bid

Was this contract competitively bid? No

If no, exception: N/A

Fiscal Impact

Funding resource(s): Measure H

Attachments

Commission Implementation Priorities for the Educational Improvement Plan (EIP) Policy

Commission Implementation Priorities for the Educational Improvement Plan (EIP) Policy

OUSD reaffirms its commitment to ensuring that the Educational Improvement Plan (EIP) policy strengthens Linked Learning implementation and directly advances student academic achievement. To that end, the Commission authorizes senior staff to prioritize the following areas of implementation in the development of systems, tools, and supports. The Measure N/H commission intends that these standards and systems should be applied to all participating OUSD and charter schools.

Governance & Flexibility
Senior staff retain discretion over tools, platforms, observation protocols, and analytic methods, provided the standards and indicators are met. The Commission oversees adherence to timelines, transparency, and progress against outcomes.

Measurement & Reporting Expectations

- **Annual Cycle:** Ratings and tier assignments occur within a defined annual cycle that leverages complete academic-year data (timing aligned to Commission schedules).
- **Data Sources:** Use existing student performance, attendance, certification, and implementation fidelity data wherever possible; minimize new data collection.
- **Disaggregation & Equity:** Report outcomes by student subgroups and pathway characteristics to identify and address inequities.
- **Continuous Improvement:** Document Plan–Do–Study–Act (PDSA) cycles or equivalent reflective processes; share learning across pathways.

1. Policy Standard: Timing and Structure of Public Reporting

Purpose:
To provide transparent information to the public about the impact of its investment in Linked Learning.

Desired Outcome:

- Senior staff shall design a public reporting cycle that ensures timely, transparent, and accessible reporting of pathway outcomes and fidelity measures.

- Annual public reports shall be released no later than January 31 of each year.

- Reports must be publicly accessible online, presented at a public Commission meeting, and translated into family-friendly formats (e.g., summaries, visuals, and multilingual resources).

- Reports must include year-to-year comparisons and disaggregated student outcomes by subgroup, consistent with student privacy protections.

2. Policy Standard: Increasing Coherence, Alignment, and Integration

Purpose:
Ensure that the Educational Improvement Plan (EIP) process is coherent, aligned with state and federal accountability frameworks, and integrated with existing school planning efforts, while minimizing duplication and administrative burden.

Desired Outcomes:

1. **Alignment Across Systems:** EIP content should demonstrate clear alignment with major accountability and improvement frameworks (e.g., state and federal systems [i.e., Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP)], WASC, local plans) so that schools can leverage existing work rather than duplicating efforts.
2. **Efficiency and Accessibility:** The submission process should reduce unnecessary manual data entry and facilitate integration with existing data systems, enabling timely and accurate reporting
3. **Evidence-Based Reporting:** Schools should primarily use existing, verifiable data sources (e.g., student performance, attendance, certification metrics) to substantiate EIP goals and progress.
4. **Timely Public Reporting:** Annual public reports should be scheduled to allow reflection on complete academic-year data and inform strategic planning and budget decisions for the following year.

3. Policy Standard: System for Evaluation and Differentiated Support

Standard: Develop a comprehensive system that objectively evaluates schoolwide outcomes and the impact of linked learning pathways and provides differentiated support and oversight tailored to performance, ensuring continuous improvement and equity in student outcomes.

Desired Outcomes

1. **Clear Differentiation of Support Levels:** Schools and pathways receive supports that vary in intensity and type based on demonstrated needs and performance, with transparent expectations for improvement.

2. **Transparent Entry and Exit Criteria:** Schools understand how they enter a given support level and what conditions must be met to exit or transition to another level.
3. **Proportionate Oversight:** Oversight is scaled to performance—reduced for consistently high-performing schools and increased for those with persistent gaps—while maintaining minimum accountability for all.
4. **Continuous Improvement:** All schools demonstrate measurable progress toward fidelity and student outcome goals, supported by timely interventions and monitored through public accountability.

Indicators of Adequacy

- **Transparency:** Criteria for assigning support levels and oversight calibration are published and applied consistently.
- **Support Plans:** Schools receiving elevated support have documented improvement plans with measurable milestones and timelines.
- **Progress Monitoring:** Schools in higher support levels provide regular updates on progress toward milestones and barriers encountered.
- **Results:** Evidence of improvement in fidelity and student outcomes over defined intervals, or documented decisions to escalate or de-escalate support.

4. Pathway Size Analysis & Guidance

Standard: Provide evidence-based guidance on optimal and minimum pathway size for effective Linked Learning implementation; articulate programmatic alternatives for schools and pathways of sub-optimal sizes.

Indicators of Adequacy:

- **Analysis Delivered:** A report to the Commission defines optimal/minimum size ranges and includes implications for staffing, WBL, and scheduling.
- **Decision Guidance:** Published guidance outlines acceptable alternatives (e.g., shared resources, consolidation, cohorting) for sub-optimal sizes.
- **Adoption & Use:** Pathways below the minimum size have an approved plan aligning to the guidance; progress is monitored annually.

5. Funding Schema (Measures N/H)

Standard: Codify a funding schema that is transparent, aligned to tiers and demonstrated needs, and compliant with administrative cost guardrails (e.g., the Administrative 10%).

Indicators of Adequacy:

- **Schema Published:** The funding model, allocation rules, and tier linkages are publicly documented and accessible.
- **Compliance:** Annual verification shows allocations are consistent with the schema and administrative cost limits.
- **Equity Lens:** Funding decisions demonstrate consideration of need, student demographics, and gap-closing potential (with disaggregated reporting).

6. Peer Learning & Communities of Practice

Standard: Establish mechanisms that enable robust peer learning and practice transfer across pathways and between schools

Indicators of Adequacy:

- **Participation:** Regular convenings or platforms show broad participation across roles (e.g., pathway leads, WBL, CTE, counselors).
- **Feedback & Iteration:** Participant feedback informs improvements to the peer learning mechanism (e.g., agenda focus, facilitation, cadence).