

School	Rubric Score Developing, Approaching, Conditionally Approved, Approved	Next Steps for Planning Planning, Tuning Draft, Implementation with Tuning, Implementation
Bunche	Approved (\$850)	Implementation
Castlemont	Approved (\$850)	Implementation
CCPA	Approved (\$850)	Implementation
Community Day	Approved (\$850)	Implementation
Dewey	Approved (\$850)	Implementation
Fremont	Approved (\$850)	Implementation
Life Academy	Approved (\$850)	Implementation
MetWest	Approved (\$850)	Implementation
Oakland High	Approved (\$850)	Implementation
Oakland International	Approved (\$850)	Implementation
Rudsdale	Approved (\$850)	Implementation
Sojourner Truth	Approved (\$850)	Implementation
LPS	Conditionally Approved (\$850)	Implementation with Tuning
Skyline	Conditionally Approved (\$850)	Implementation with Tuning

**Ability to Step Up to Higher
Funding with Summer
Planning**

Notes

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

LPS needs to revise the goals as the improvements that are suggested do not seem to align to the ambitiousness of the goals.
Strong pathway plans but the overall school proposal is lacking cohesiveness in the planning that reflects the overall direction of the school and the 9th grade program.

N/A

School	Rubric Score Developing, Approaching, Conditionally Approved, Approved	Next Steps for Planning	Ability to Step Up to Higher Funding with Summer Planning
Oakland Tech	Approaching (\$500 per student)	Planning, Tuning Draft, Implementation with Tuning, Implementation Tuning Draft	Yes With clear innovations to address root causes.
Lionel Wilson	Approaching (\$500 per student)	Tuning Draft	Yes
McClymonds	Approaching (\$500 per student)	Tuning Draft	Yes
ARISE	Approaching (\$500 per student)	Tuning Draft	Yes

Notes

Pathways are approved based on full funding. Oakland Tech must address key root cause of students not able to meet graduation requirements based on ERS findings and the disproportionality at the school sites. Strategies to include providing more supports for students or other innovations that would support African American and Latino students meet the graduation and A-G Requirements.

During the Measure N presentation they named 4 pathways but there is little mention of these pathways in their plan and although they have a strong plan there is not pathway development plan. Plan focuses on college readiness and persistence while the root cause clearly outlines disengagement of a significant population of students. The answer to the root cause analysis was that the school provided few opportunities for students to engage in "hands on" experiences. There are no expenditures that are directed to address issues with disengaged students other than providing more academic supports and misses two other key areas of the Measure N required elements in the plan.

Leadership transition has left gaps in the design process that must be captured in the plan. The design team must meet to revise and unify the plan with the design work that is happening as part of the ISS process. During the presentation, it was not clear how the ISS planning was incorporated into the site plan. There was not alignment between the presentation and the site plan.

SPSA doesn't reflect a deep dive into data and/or disaggregation of data (No demographic data provided at all). Data points that stand out are not addressed as challenges and aren't incorporated in root-cause analysis (ie. 66% graduation rate for 13-14, 14% of students leaving for 14-15 - school discipline could be something to be further investigated). The plan does not look at subgroups who aren't achieving in key outcome indicators. Challenges listed don't appear to be challenges for the most part or need to be further investigated. The root cause analysis isn't addressed for all the challenges lifted in the proposal. They state that they are an Education/Community Organizing pathway but haven't started to think about the career component of this pathway. As required by the Measure, what CTE courses, WBL opportunities will students have access to? What jobs will students be getting? Certifications? Major focus of plan is on strengthening their current partnerships with little/no inquiry evidence on how to further improve or transform them in order to improve student outcomes. The theory of action seems to be grounded in the more of the same will lead to better outcomes with out targeting those resources.

The budget seems focused on paying for part-time staff to become full-time staff. It would be beneficial for them to continue to do design thinking and do school site visits of other social justice/community organizing pathways.

School	Rubric Score	Next Steps for	Ability to Step Up to
	Developing, Approaching, Conditionally Approved, Approved	Planning Planning, Tuning Draft, Implementation with Tuning, Implementation	Higher Funding with Summer Planning
Envision	Developing (\$200 per student)	Planning	Yes
Lighthouse	Developing (\$200 per student)	Planning	Yes
Madison Park	Developing (\$200 per student)	Planning	Yes
Street Academy	Developing (\$200 per student)	Planning	Yes

Unity

Developing (\$200 per
student)

Planning

Yes

Staff Notes

Did not meet the basic criteria of the Measure N Education Improvement Plan

Data points that stand out and aren't addressed (ie. 17% of students leaving, Drop out has dropped by 10% but is at 9% and no disaggregation of who this 9% is, 90% graduation rate 77% accepted into 4 years and 49% enrolling in 4 years, high suspension rates and chronic absence rates)

Root cause analysis: The challenges highlighted sound like goals and/or strategies, have no clear root cause, and ignore the need to look deeper into disaggregated data. Envision is an Arts & Tech pathway and there was no allusion as to continuing to build out the pathway, very little mention of careers (a need is lifted up and a root cause but is ignored). Overall plan highlights what is working and seems to focus on improving that (still no disaggregation of data) and does not address some of key outcomes that the Measure calls out.

Did not meet the basic criteria of the Measure N Education Improvement Plan

Research question is general and doesn't target subgroups that look at subgroups who aren't achieving in key outcome indicators. Research question focuses on college readiness in general and is not informed by any root cause/data analysis. These sections of the plan were blank. There is no specific career pathway named/mentioned; sounds like their idea is "college pathway". No disaggregation of data and data points that stand out aren't addressed (11% of students have AP course access, no further inquiry; 14 students have continued issues with chronic absence, no further inquiry; 12% suspension rate, no further inquiry). Equity, access, achievement not addressed. No inquiry as to why students leave, only a blanket statement as to why high performing students leave (no disaggregation of who these students are). No root cause analysis to address these issues. Goals focused on improving outcomes that are already strong (goal of 100% of students applying for college, currently at 87%) without deep data disaggregation and dive to see if outcomes are equitable for all students. Goals/strategies to hire Director and hire more teachers for an increased amount of electives that they offer - no further inquiry on how these things will improve student outcomes. No mention of career readiness

Pathway: Business and Arts but there is very little regarding pathway development in the plan.

Root causes don't seem to get to the root of the challenges the school is currently confronting.

No Strategies listed in the SPSA at the time that plan was posted. Concern of supplanting raised by staff as budget actions are not aligned to what was presented. TSAs that are already part of the school community without articulating clear distinction in new role. Goals are to hire but does not provide deeper thinking on how challenges will be addressed (eg. How will hiring an AP solve Climate and culture challenges?) and these goals need to be . Very little data analysis in the plan. Graduate outcomes challenge is listed as a high percentage of 11th graders not on track to graduate and yet no root cause analysis is done or identified in the plan. There is no disaggregation of data for target groups. Very little discussion of career component of pathway and how these pathways will be built out and supported by the plan. Stated in the presentation that the site would hire a pathway coach which would support the site to continue to do deeper design thinking, but this must be incorporated into the overall plan.

Root causes sound like teacher issues which aren't being further investigated or addressed

Limited data analysis and data present, lack of disaggregation of data

Needs to tease apart root causes, goals, and strategies

Pathway: Social justice and community organizing

Limited inquiry on WBL and career aspects of the pathway and the pathway development. Focus seems to be on continuing to do what they do, no mention of how things could be done differently to improve student outcomes.

Little/no data analysis or disaggregation of data in the plan or referenced in the site plan that informed most decisions. School needs to do a deeper data analysis to ensure that major initiatives are aligned to student needs. Root cause analysis: root causes are not named. Goals are broad and unmeasurable and must be more closely linked to student outcomes. Goals not clearly related to the root causes and need to be developed as SMARTER goals that better reflect key targets and outcomes for students. The goals and targets are relative to comparative OUSD schools as opposed to their own root cause of analysis of their areas for improvement. Planning process has been focused on adding extra-curriculars or AP courses and not looking into programmatic shifts that could improve student outcomes (this point was brought up during Commission site visit). Might be misinterpreting/not fully understanding what Linked Learning pathways are and how to develop them into a career pathway theme where project based learning is linked to work based learning when each plays a different roll in the overall development of the pathway. The use of funding from Measure N to fund "stipends" is not an allowable expense for students.

pathways or academies that deliver challenging academics, career technical education, work-

Minimum Requirements

An approved education improvement plan shall include, at minimum:

continuum of an integrated college and career preparation program for all students.

goals of this Measure.

Evidence-based strategies designed to meet the accountability indicators.

equitably place all students in career pathways or academies.

implement the school improvement plan's strategies and activities.

Permissible Uses:

ensure students are qualified for admission to the University of California and other 4-

technical education courses, job shadowing, internships and job certifications;

support services to students **in danger of not graduating high school**;

succeed in high school, and to students transitioning from 12th grade to college to