

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	25-2610
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: Emiliano Zapata Street Academy

Action Requested and Recommendation

Discussion of Emiliano Zapata Street Academy's Conditionally Approved status, projected timeline and areas of improvement.

Background

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

Last May 2025, the Measures N and H Commission designated Street Academy as **Conditionally Approved (CA)** based on their 2025–26 EIP and presentation to the Commission in April.

Competitively Bid

Was this contract competitively bid? No
If no, exception: N/A

Fiscal Impact

Funding resource(s): Measure H

Attachments

- 1. Street Academy 25-27 Conditionally Approved status timeline
- 2. 25-26 Emiliano Zapata Street Academy EIP Assessment

MEASURE H CONDITIONALLY APPROVED SITE: STREET ACADEMY

Projected Timeline: 2025-2027

YEAR 1: 2025-2026

Deadline	Site Action	Lead
October 30, 2025	Individual Site Consultations - Review of current MNH Conditionally approved policy - Review of Street Academy EIP assessment and feedback - Overview of Timeline and support from HSN and Linked Learning Office - Site Visit Expectations and Scheduling of Visit - Discuss the following: - Based on the EIP assessment received, what strategies are you planning on implementing for this school year until Fall 2026 (Quality improvement visit)? - Who will be involved in implementing your strategies? What is your timeline in implementing these plans? - Do you have any responses or questions regarding your EIP assessment?	Jan Han Rebecca Vanessa Invites: Bukola Lawal Jonathan Overmeyer Street Academy Foundation Board
November 4, 2025	Measure H Context Building Site Visit <i>Purpose:</i> This non-evaluative visit provides an opportunity for HSLLO staff and Commission members to develop a deeper understanding of the site's areas of strength and growth. 1 week prior to visit, Site must submit - A 2 hour site visit agenda that includes the following elements and their locations: 20 min meeting with site leadership team on school site updates (see below) 25 min Staff Panel Interview (CTE Teachers, Core Content) to more deeply understand how the school is implementing Linked Learning 25 min Student Panel Interview (students selected from submitted list) 30 min classroom visits (at least 2 classrooms at 15 mins each) 10 min Site Visit Debrief (site visit team only) 10-minute quick feedback from the site visit team to Street Academy staff. A more in-depth feedback and proposed quality improvement plan meeting will be scheduled at a later time. - School site updates (slides): slides template draft - Based on the EIP assessment received, what strategies are you planning on implementing for this school year until Fall 2026 (Quality improvement visit)? - Who will be involved in implementing your strategies? What is your timeline in	Jan School Site team Invites: Max 2 Commissioners

	<i>implementing these plans?</i> iii. <i>Do you have any responses or questions regarding your EIP assessment?</i>	
Late November	MNH team develops and shares Quality Improvement Plan with Site	Jan Rebecca
December 16, 2025	MNH staff presents Quality Improvement Plans to Measures N and H Commission	Jan Rebecca
Spring 2026	MNH staff conducts check-ins with Conditionally Approved sites to assess progress, make course corrections on the Quality Improvement Plan, and update the Quality Improvement Plan for the following year.	Jan Rebecca
April 2026	2026-27 EIP Presentation to Measures N and H Commission	Site team

YEAR 2: 2026-2027

Deadline	Site Action	Lead
September	Individual Site Consultations - Review of current MNH Conditionally approved policy - Overview of Timeline - Site Visit Expectations and Scheduling of visit	Jan Han
October	Measure H Quality Review Site Visit <i>Pre-Site Visit: Schools must submit the following documents</i> 1 week prior to visit: - Updated Program of Study - Master Schedule with CTE courses highlighted and names of all teachers - List of all Students in the Linked Learning Pathway a. Name, Gender, Ethnicity, and GPA in excel - School Site Presentation - Agenda for Site Visit <i>Site Visit by Linked Learning Team:</i> The Site Visit will consist of the following - - School Site Presentation - Review of Program of Study - Classroom Visits - Staff Panel Interview (CTE Teachers, Core Content) - Student Panel Interview (students selected from submitted list) - Site Visit Debrief	Jan School site team
November	Presentation to Measures N and H Commission <i>School site must submit the following 10 days prior to meeting:</i> - School Site Presentation - Statement of Intent, which includes the site's scores on Self Assessment Rubric	Jan Site team
December	Measures N and H Commission Approval of Funding Recommendations for Conditionally approved status	Jan

Measures N and H 2025-2026 Education Improvement Plan Assessment (Year Three of Three-Year Cycle)

Street Academy

Criterion 1: Measures N and H Pathway Improvement Progress Reflection: To what extent have schools engaged in meaningful reflection about progress toward their strategic goals and articulated the connections between their reflections and new or adapted strategic actions? What progress is evident in the school's reflection on Year 1 (2023-24) and Year 2 (2024-2025)?

(NOTE: If a school does not receive a four in this category, the highest final recommendation they can receive is "Approved," and the final recommendation will reflect the quality of the plan and the alignment of expenditures to build out Linked Learning Pathways.)

Category	Comprehensive Analysis	Developing Analysis	Emergent Analysis	Unclear Analysis
Evidence of Progress toward Pathway Program(s)' 2023-26 College and Career for All and Linked Learning Quality Standards	4	3	2	1
Instructions: Review 2024-2025 whole school and pathway three-year goals, the blue reflection and actions sections, and Linked Learning One-Pager(s) for evidence of:	FEEDBACK: Provide feedback only if the site receives a score of 3 or below.			
☐ Meaningful reflection about progress toward strategic goals (whole school and pathway)	EIP does not clearly identify needed reflection to meet program goals. Please consider providing student, staff, and community assessments on the needs and goals of the program. Consider establishing a site team to monitor the pathway is meeting its stated goals.			
☐ Clear articulation of connections between these reflections and new or adapted strategic actions	The connection between strategic actions and program goals is unclear. Additionally, consider meeting with Alternative Education Pathway Coach for input in identifying specific goals. I.e. Increase graduation rate by 20%. Provide a additional case manager to provide guidance towards credit recovery.			
☐ Evidence of progress toward pathway programs' quality standards	There is minimal evidence of progress towards program goals.			
Score: <u>2</u> Rationale: The EIP provides minimal reflection on a clear theory of action. The connection between goals and strategic actions to meet those goals is unclear. No clear connection between goals and an improvement in graduation rate.	Suggestions for 25-26 Continued Progress Monitoring: Revisit program goals and structure by collecting input from impacted stakeholders. I.e. Students, Parents, and staff for program improvement. Establish a site monitoring team to include Alternative Education Pathway Coach or additional Linked Learning designee.			

--	--

Criterion 2: Measures N and H Pathway Improvement Plan (Actions): How does the EIP clearly articulate new or revised actions grounded in schools' and pathways' reflection on the implementation of Year 2 strategic actions?

Category	Excelling 4	Meeting 3	Approaching 2	Beginning 1
Strategic Actions	FEEDBACK: <i>Provide feedback only if the site receives a score of 3 or below.</i>			
☐ Strategies meet the goals, address the needs, are research-based, and have proven effective for improving equitable student outcomes and building the three domains of Linked Learning ☐ Integrated Program of Study ☐ Work-Based Learning ☐ Integrated Student Support	The EIP does not clearly list student support towards graduation. The integrated program of study is unclear.			
☐ Strategies are embedded in inquiry design to produce evidence of their enacting the theory of action and achieving the identified goals	The EIP does not contain clear evidence of how the site team monitors the pathway to ensure goals are met. Site would benefit in naming specific actions to accomplish how goals are met and when. I.e. Team will meet bi-weekly to identify and update which colleges to partner with.			
☐ Coherence is evident as an explicit theory of action that bridges their reflection logically into their actions	The EIP does not demonstrate a clear reflection tool that connects the theory of action to its goals and action steps to achieve them. Site would benefit by being more specific with the actions to meet the goals of the pathway. Tasks vs. Goals.			



Score: _____**1**_____

Rationale: The EIP does not state a clear connection between work based visits and the pathway. Integrated student supports are not clearly identified.

Suggestions for 25-26 Continued Progress Monitoring: Revisit goals and actions with OUSD Alternative Education Pathway Coach for ongoing progress monitoring.

Criterion 3: Alignment of Funding to Linked Learning Criteria, Strategic Actions, Permissible Expenses, and Measures N and H Plan

Category	Strategic & Aligned 4	Partially Strategic & Aligned 3	Unclear Strategy & Alignment 2	Missing or Non-Compliant 1
Instructions: Review the Budget in Whole School, Pathway Tabs, and 9th Grade Tab (where relevant) for evidence that the school has thoughtfully allocated Measures N and H funds to support the continuous improvement of Linked Learning pathways via specific whole-school and pathway strategic actions for 2025-2026	FEEDBACK: Provide feedback only if the site receives a score of 3 or below.			
☐ A through line is evident between expenditures and the strategic actions (whole-school and pathway) identified in the Education Improvement Plan	EIP expenditures are not aligned with pathway goals.			
☐ Expenditures provide clear justifications that demonstrate the alignment between the three domains of Linked Learning	Budget is not aligned with all the domains of Linked Learning.			
☐ Expenditures are necessary due to the existence of Linked Learning pathways at the school site (not supplanting core programming)				
Score: <u> 2 </u> Rationale: EIP does not provide a clear connection between expenditures and pathway goals.	Suggestions for 25-26 Continued Progress Monitoring: Review expenditures with OUSD Alternative Education Pathway Coach and Linked Learning Office to provide a clear connection with EIP and student success.			

Final Recommendation

Instructions: Based on the entirety of the school's EIP, provide your assessment rating for the EIP, a summary of the Plan's Strengths, note any Key Questions, and overall Budget feedback. Identify the Next Steps for the Site. See Rating descriptions below.

Rating¹: Conditionally Approved

Strengths:

- ☐ EIP demonstrates a connection between students who enroll at Street Academy.

Key Questions:

- ☐ How is your root cause analysis connected to improving student outcomes towards graduation and A-G completion? How does reflection take place to improve student outcomes? How can the CTM model be supported to improve student outcomes?

Budget Feedback:

- ☐ Revisit budget expenditures and ensure they align with pathway goals and student interventions.

Next Steps (for Conditionally Approved Sites) - add rows as needed

What	Suggested Lead	Deliverable	Date
Recommend Principal and Site Team meet with Alternative Education Pathway Coach to re-visit improvement plan.	Principal	Ongoing.	

¹Fully Approved

- School has **fully implemented** a whole-school pathways model with all three domains of Linked Learning are evidenced for all students: Integrated Program of Study (a distinct CTE program plus integrated and cohorted core academics), Work-Based Learning (career awareness, exploration, and preparation embedded in classes), and Integrated Supports (strategically embedded supports, Tiers 1-3, through the pathway community of practice)
- School is deeply engaged in the strategic continuous improvement of the Linked Learning pathway(s) and addressing the root causes of current student outcomes through pathways

Approved

- School is **actively developing and implementing** a whole-school pathways model with the three domains of Linked Learning as evidenced by the establishment of all three domains of Linked Learning: Integrated Program of Study (a distinct CTE program plus integrated core academics), Work-Based Learning (career awareness, exploration, and preparation embedded in classes), and Integrated Supports (strategically embedded supports, Tiers 1-3, through the pathway community of practice)
- School has evidence of continuous improvement of the Linked Learning pathway(s) and addressing the root causes of current student outcomes through pathways

Conditionally Approved

- School is **actively developing** a whole-school pathways model as evidenced by early implementation of key elements of Linked Learning: Integrated Program of Study (a distinct CTE program plus integrated core academics), Work-Based Learning (career awareness, exploration, and preparation embedded in classes), and Integrated Supports (strategically embedded supports, Tiers 1-3, through the pathway community of practice)
- School does not demonstrate continuous improvement of the Linked Learning pathway(s) and addressing the root causes of current student outcomes through pathways



Criterion 4 Evidence of Progress and Linked Learning Implementation

Category to be completed by High School Linked Learning Office

Instructions: Review the *Work-Based Learning template*, *EIP Presentation*, *Master Schedule*, and *Program of Study* to demonstrate an understanding of and development of high-quality pathway implementation.

☐ Program of Study	Which academic core courses reflect alignment and integration in terms of expectation, support, and industry theme? There is no evidence of pathway programming in G12. Activities and support <i>appear</i> to be outside of core academics. How can these be embedded in core academics for equitable access? Despite many internships, the number of industry partners is low (2). Which partners are providing internships?
☐ Work-Based Learning Plan	How can you leverage the Education sector to provide career exploration for scholars? For example, partnering with ACOE and OUSD to explore careers in law, labor, facilities and grounds, culinary, early childhood education, etc.? To what extent is work-based learning integrated in core academics to support relevance and rigor as well as post-secondary goals and plans? What types of employer-evaluated internships are provided to students? Which partners provide internships?
☐ Master Schedule	Unclear why some students are not taking the CTE/English course. What are the college and career supports in 12th grade that are embedded in required and core classes? Which courses are part of the pathway, and which teachers have common planning time to coordinate services and integrate curriculum and support?
☐ EIP Presentation	Significant time was spent talking about what <i>could be</i> and not as much about the analysis of current data and current practice.