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Summary

Transparency and Accountability form the foundation of any civic institution. Increasing them will help LA Unified build the trust and support needed to make the increasingly difficult decisions about where to invest its limited resources. This will benefit everyone involved in our schools—from students and parents, to educators and community members. Measuring performance should not be viewed as punitive, but rather as a tool to help understand, manage, and improve upon the work.

Efforts to increase transparency and develop school and District accountability have undergone rapid change over the past several years, in both California and nationwide. California has changed the way it funds schools requiring accountability plans while giving districts more flexibility on spending. The federal government now requires states and districts to measure low performing schools and to be able to use data to target programming.

Transparency

At LA Unified, a significant amount of information on the District, school conditions, and student performance is collected and publicly reported to remain compliant with federal and state education policies. Unfortunately, most of it is buried in obscure filings and byzantine forms that are inaccessible to the average person.

It is important to draw the distinction between disclosure of information for compliance purposes and the sharing of information to inform and engage parents and the community. LA Unified does an adequate job of the former and can improve on the latter.

Further, LA Unified cannot rely on California’s accountability system or the online Dashboard to communicate with families and communities. A recent independent review by the Collaborative for Student Success and Bellwether Education Partners confirmed what community groups have said about the Dashboard, that it’s not easy to understand. Adam Ezring of the Collaborative noted that “If the overall system is this confusing, it’s hard to envision how parents make sense of the results of their schools and what that means for their students.”

LA Unified prepared school report cards, from 2007-2015, in an effort to engage parents in improving schools. However, the District eliminated school report cards in 2016 which leaves LA Unified as the only large public school district in the nation that does not issue a school report card or provide student progress data online. The ten largest school districts in the nation all produce either a school progress report, assign a letter grade for each school, or post achievement data online.
New efforts by the LA Unified Board coupled with the District’s robust data systems provide an opportunity to make meaningful progress towards increasing transparency. The Board recently voted to make information and data available to the public through an online Open Data site to better engage parents in the District’s progress toward reaching its goals.

Accountability

Transparency is a good start, but information alone is not sufficient. Proper analysis and insight is needed to improve upon the work and help provide accountability.

The District embarked on a well-intentioned and ambitious $1.3 billion initiative in 2012 to provide every student in LA Unified an iPad, but amidst controversy, two years later the District ended the initiative, canceled contracts, and outside investigations were launched.

The U.S. Department of Education’s report was very clear that at the root of the problem was an overall lack of strategy, planning, and clear-eyed questioning. The report went further in recommending the creation of an external advisory group to “help the district set a clear vision…and ensure alignment with the vision set by district leadership.”

As made clear by a controversy like this is the lack of sufficient, outside observers of LA Unified. The State of California has the LAO, Congress has the CBO and New York City has the IBO. LA Unified needs to create an independent body to serve this role.

Recommendations

We recommend the LA Unified issue annual school reports cards and increase its efforts to actively communicate this information with families and communities and engage them to gather feedback.

In addition, we recommend creating a Community Accountability Commission to provide the public, the Board, and the District with objective, non-partisan analysis on progress towards District goals, the budget, and proposed policy changes.
Introduction

Increased transparency and accountability are important tools LA Unified can use to build support within the community. An open and honest discussion around how well schools are performing and taking responsibility for the actions needed to improve performance will build the trust needed in an era where the District will have to make increasingly difficult decisions about where to invest its limited resources.

Too often the District views transparency and accountability as an exercise in criticism and compliance rather than an opportunity to engage communities, learn, and progress. Parents and community members should be able to access easy-to-understand information on their children’s school and school district. However, LA Unified no longer publishes a report card on its own results.

The Education Trust notes that school improvement should “begin with a meaningful needs assessment — a systematic process for understanding the underlying school- and district-based causes of underperformance.”

The Data Quality Campaign (DQC), a national advocate for school data policy and use, believes information is one of the most powerful tools to engage students, families, and communities and creates opportunities to improve the education of students. DQC adds that district and school report cards are essential to individual student performance.

The Education Trust-West takes this further saying transparency and building a robust accountability system can benefit all:

• District leaders will have more visibility into high performing schools
• Teachers and principals can learn from the success of their colleagues
• Communities will be more informed allowing them to reward excellence and push for change in the lower performing schools
• Parents and families will be better able to compare school performance when choosing the school for their children to attend
• Limited resources can be used more efficiently when knowing which programs are producing results versus the programs in need of change
• Funding can focus on struggling students and schools, and compel more support for these students and schools
• District can improve communications with families and community organizations leading to better partnerships and more constructive problem solving
• All stakeholders can increase their influence and better advocate for public schools with state and federal leaders
• Most importantly, students will benefit from a better education giving them more opportunities to succeed in life

Being transparent about student achievement and the District’s resource choices will positively influence the work and support the efforts made every day by the committed teachers, principals, and employees of the District. Measuring District, school, and student performance should not be viewed as punitive, but rather as a tool to help understand, manage, and improve upon the work.
Transparency

Current Efforts

State and National
Efforts to increase transparency and develop school district accountability systems have undergone rapid change over the past several years, particularly in California. The state has been credited for taking an important step forward and for its focus on equity and academic performance measures.

In 2013, the state changed the way it funded schools with the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) that requires districts to create 3-year accountability plans and update them annually (Local Control Accountability Plans or LCAP) while giving districts more flexibility on spending and programs.

California also launched in March 2017 its school Dashboard, which is an online tool that shows how local districts and schools are performing on education indicators included in its school accountability system. California created this new transparency tool to provide a more complete view of schools and cites three important differences from past reports: provides multiple measures of student success, increases focus on equity, and supports local decision making.

At the federal level, the Education Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was passed in 2015 requiring states and districts to measure low performing schools, groups of students within schools, and to be able to use data to target programming by race and ethnicity, disability, English language learners, and income. ESSA also gives states more flexibility in designing their own school accountability systems and encourages districts to go beyond test scores to measure performance.

LA Unified
At LA Unified, a significant amount of information on the District, school conditions, and student performance is collected and publicly reported to remain compliant with these federal and state education policies. Unfortunately, most of it is buried in obscure filings and byzantine forms that are inaccessible to the average person.

LA Unified released its first set of LCAP goals and has continued to update these goals annually. It also released a LCAP Scorecard that tracks the District’s progress since the 2015 school year and outlines future goals. In 2017, LA Unified reported its first set of school and student data information on the California School Dashboard. Finally, LA Unified published its School Accountability Report Card (SARC), also required by state law, that contains information about the performance and condition of each school.
LA Unified began producing a school report card almost a decade ago. Foundations funded the efforts of a consulting group to design the report card with the goals of providing the right information and making it easy for parents to understand. School Report cards were produced from 2007 to 2015.

Recently, the LA Unified Board voted to make information and data available to the public through an online Open Data site. Board Vice President Nick Melvoin and Board Member Dr. Richard Vladovic, the authors of the resolution, are striving to make information publicly available and easily accessible so the public is able to engage and participate in LA Unified’s progress toward goals like 100% graduation, literacy and numeracy for all, closing achievement gaps and college and career readiness for all students.10

LA Unified is also working to develop an online school-finder tool and a parent app. The smartphone app aims to modernize how the District communicates with parents by overhauling the “antiquated robo-calls and paper surveys, opting for a more modern system of push notifications to alert parents and school staff of any relevant updates, such as emergency notifications, school closures, and calendar updates.”11

The school-finder tool would feature online information on the public school options open to parents. LA Unified currently has ten different public school choice programs that is confusing to navigate. The community coalition PEAPS-LA is working with the District to make school comparative information accessible and readily available to ensure the school choice programs are equitable, inclusive, and useful for all families.”12

It should also be noted that LA Unified currently maintains an online parent portal and a school safety app.

The District also has an Independent Analysis Unit (IAU) that conducts research on behalf of the Board of Education and reports directly to the Board.

Supporting much of this work is LA Unified’s Office of Data and Accountability that collects, analyzes, and reports student information to keep the District compliant and to help inform the operational and instructional practice in schools.

Finally, LA Unified has two data systems. As noted in our first report, the District’s student data system, MiSiS (My Integrated Student Information System), contains academic information, attendance records and more. MyData is a web-based tool for teachers and administrators that provides student-level information to help support and improve instruction, identify and provide interventions for at-risk students, and monitor the performance of students.
Opportunities

While the District produces significant amounts of information, it is not shared regularly or in a consistent or coherent fashion. LA Unified’s accountability (LCAP) goals and scorecard are reported only online and on a different website than the California Dashboard. The School Accountability Report Card, also required by California, is reported separately and only online. And while the IAU presented a report to the Board in December 2017, it hasn’t made information available on its website since 2004.¹³

Further, it is clear that LA Unified should not rely on California’s accountability system to communicate with families and the community. In December 2017, the U.S. Department of Education was extremely critical of California’s efforts saying plans did not offer enough detail nor accountability. An independent review by the Collaborative for Student Success and Bellwether Education Partners placed California’s plan at the bottom of the national rankings and confirmed what community groups have said about the Dashboard, that it’s not easy to understand. Adam Ezring of the Collaborative noted that “If the overall system is this confusing, it’s hard to envision how parents make sense of the results of their schools and what that means for their students.”¹⁴

In 2016, LA Unified eliminated its own school report cards citing budget constraints. LA Unified is the only large public school district in the nation that does not issue a school report card or provide student progress data online. The ten largest school districts in the nation all produce either a school progress report, a letter grade for each school, or an online site with information.

District and School Report Cards
LA Unified has the tools and has developed the capacity to collect and analyze data on student performance. Significant time and resources are already being spent to produce the information needed to remain compliant with state and federal policy. This is the very same information that families and communities crave and are entitled to have.

LA Unified should publish annual school report cards using existing data, but in a more accessible and meaningful way to better inform and engage families and communities.

The school report cards will complement the District’s efforts to create an online Open Data site by providing families and communities with multiple ways to access the information they need to make informed decisions.

Engagement
A parent focus group hosted by LA Unified and the Task Force and moderated by Nadia Funn, Director of the Alliance for Better Communities, underscored the need for actively communicating with families and communities.
The parents noted that without relevant information coming from either the District or schools, many parents do not know how well their schools are performing. Parents are the most important partners to teachers. Without an understanding of the quality of their school or what needs to be improved, parents cannot fully support teachers and principals.

The parents also supported the idea of an independent body providing relevant, timely, and easy-to-understand information to families and communities. These parents did not fully trust the District to give them complete information.

Finally, parents suggested the District needs to do more to reach parents. Parents, by definition, are busy people and may miss an email or the regular mail. The District should engage families and communities through the multiple forms of communications that are now available: online, email, mobile apps, social media, text messages, mail and town halls.

**Best Practices**

The Data Quality Campaign (DQC) conducted a comprehensive review of state report cards in 2016 and recently released its follow-up report, *Show Me the Data 2017*. The reports ask whether state report cards are providing the public with timely, accurate, relevant, easy-to-understand, and easy-to-find data.

Its findings show state report cards are growing stronger, however, much improvement is still needed and every state is in a position to improve.

DQC highlighted several states as emerging best practices. Illinois and Virginia were cited as providing data that went beyond compliance and were relevant to a deeper look at school quality. Louisiana was noted as being easy-to-find and Wisconsin and New Mexico were easy for families and communities to understand.

Examples of best practices are provided in the Appendix of this report. Please note these samples do not reflect the full report cards nor the online, interactive features.
Accountability

The District embarked on a well-intentioned and ambitious $1.3 billion initiative in 2012 to provide every student in LA Unified an iPad loaded with curriculum. Two years later, unfortunately, the District ended the initiative, canceled contracts, and outside investigations were launched.

LA Unified quickly invited the U.S. Department of Education to review the initiative and provide recommendations for the future use of technology in improving instruction. The report was very clear that at the root of the problem was an overall lack of strategy and planning with “no district educational technology plan, goals, or metrics for success for how technology will support learning at the district level.” Further, support for planning at the individual school level was insufficient; training and support available for teachers didn’t match need; and, metrics were neither established nor reported. Finally, the initiative was dependent on one single commercial product raising issues about the procurement process and lacking a vision and understanding of the need before purchasing the technology.15

The Department of Education addressed each specific issue with recommendations for leadership, strategic planning, school-site planning and support, metrics, open-source options, and procurement.

The report also offered recommendations for improving overall practice across the District starting with the creation of an external advisory group to “help the district set a clear vision for all technology (instructional and otherwise) and ensure alignment with the vision set by district leadership.” Recommendations also included beginning all future projects as pilot programs, consolidating multiple support centers, increasing coordination between departments, and implementing better product management practices.

Opportunities

The importance placed on transparency and accountability in improving student performance, must also be placed on District operations and ensuring the financial health of LA Unified.

A Community Accountability Commission publishing annual and ongoing nonpartisan, data-driven, objective analyses on LA Unified’s budget and operations would help leaders make the difficult decisions needed to sustain the District and to support the most efficient and effective management of public resources.

To clarify, the District does not need a new office in addition to the IAU, but rather one office with the independence needed to support District goals.
Best Practices

LA Unified can look to several examples that are considered best practices and effective models to increasing accountability and better engaging with students, families and communities.

Independent Office

• California Legislative Analyst’s Office
  The Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) is a nonpartisan government agency established in 1941 that to provide objective analyses and recommendations to the California Legislature on fiscal and policy issues.

  The LAO issues an annual report on the Governor’s budget as well as numerous analyses during the state budget process. In addition, the LAO analyzes legislation covering several policy areas. It is also required, along with the Department of Finance, to complete a joint analysis of propositions and their impact on state and local government finances.

  Created in 1941, the LAO has had an enormous influence on the California’s legislative process and has earned a reputation for both its effectiveness and nonpartisanship.

• Congressional Budget Office
  The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) was created in 1975 to provide Congress with objective and unbiased information about budgetary and economic issues.\(^{16}\)

  To support the Congressional budget process, each year the CBO releases an Economic and Budget Outlook with a mid-year update and An Analysis of the President’s Budgetary Proposals. The CBO also releases numerous reports on cost estimates for proposed legislation.

  Today, CBO has earned a reputation for its objective, nonpartisan economic analyses of legislation and economic forecasts.\(^{17}\) Both the public and news media rely on CBO’s analyses to cut through the political rhetoric when determining the possible impact of policy.

  As part of its effort to remain objective, the CBO does not make policy recommendations and publishes its methodology for its analyses.
Independent Budget Office of the City of New York

Independent Budget Office of the City of New York (IBO) provides nonpartisan information on the New York City’s budget, economy, and public schools to both city officials and the public.\textsuperscript{18}

The IBO has proven itself to city leaders and community groups to be an independent and objective voice based on its data-driven reports. The IBO often provides important information to the public that elected office holders may be reluctant to report.

Created in 1989 by voters, the New York City charter established the IBO’s independence by guaranteeing its funding and outlining the selection of the IBO’s director and advisory board. After earning the credibility with the public, IBO’s scope of work was expanded in 2009 to provide oversight of New York City’s Department of Education.

Today, the IBO publishes three annual reports (required by the charter), fiscal briefs, and background papers. It also publishes an annual Public Schools Education Indicators report and continually updates education data when it becomes available on student demographics, resources for schools, and student outcomes.

IBO testifies at public hearings including city council meetings as well as meetings hosted by community groups. Its reports are all made free to the public and are proactively communicated using social media and other tools.

Similar to the Congressional Budget Office, the IBO does not make policy recommendations in an effort to remain objective.
Recommendations

LA Unified needs to build upon its existing efforts to become more transparent, increase accountability, and shift from using data merely as a tool of compliance to a tool for driving meaningful change, improving student performance, and supporting effective management.

We recommend the LA Unified issue annual school reports cards, create a Community Accountability Commission, and actively communicate this information with families and communities.

Recommendation 1 | Publish school report cards

Create and publish annual report cards for each school in LA Unified. The goal of the school report card is to provide families and communities with information on student performance and school conditions that is timely, accurate, relevant, and easy-to-understand.

Report cards could use the information already collected for state compliance, thus no additional data is required.

Recommendation 2 | Engage with the community for feedback and discussion

Information published by the Community Accountability Commission as well as the annual school report cards should be actively communicated to families and communities.

Information needs to be published in a format and style that is easy for most to understand and in multiple languages. The goal should be to take complicated research and make it accessible for families and communities. Reports should be continually updated as new data and information become available. Information should be easy-to-find.

Families and communities should be engaged through the multiple forms of communications: online, email, mobile apps, social media, text messages, mail and town halls.

Community meetings should be held to discuss and gather feedback on school reports cards and District data.
Recommendation 3 | Create a Community Accountability Commission

Create a Community Accountability Commission (CAC) to provide nonpartisan, data-driven, objective analyst on LA Unified’s budget, operations, student performance, and proposed policy changes.

To clarify, the District does not need a new office in addition to the IAU, but rather one office with the independence needed to support District goals.

**Board**
The CAC will have a board of seven members. Each of the LA Unified Board Members will appoint one CAC-board member. Each CAC board member should serve a 3-year term with a limit of two terms. The terms should be staggered to limit the disruption of multiple new appointees at a given time.

**Staff**
The CAC board will appoint an Executive Director, who will be responsible for the day-to-day management and activities of the CAC.

**Responsibilities**
The CAC will analyze and report on the operations and student achievement of LA Unified. Areas will include, but not be limited to: the budget; Board resolutions; student performance metrics; District’s progress towards goals; achievement; student attendance, graduation rate; college-ready and job-ready goals; professional development; and, technology.

**Budget**
LA Unified will fund the operation of the CAC. The annual budget will provide for the sufficient funds for the Executive Director, staff, and additional funding for the CAC to commission analyses from outside experts when needed. This should be budget neutral to LA Unified as the amount of funding of IAU can be shifted to fund the CAC.
Appendix

School report cards and progress reports noted as best practices by DQC in its *Show Me the Data 2017*.

Virginia | Elizabeth Redd Elementary
Wisconsin | Chavez Elementary School

Cesar Chavez Elementary
Madison Metropolitan | Public - All Students
School Report Card | 2016-17 | Summary

Priority Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School Max</th>
<th>K-5 State</th>
<th>K-5 Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>75.2/100</td>
<td>69.4/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts (ELA) Achievement</td>
<td>36.9/50</td>
<td>34.7/50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Achievement</td>
<td>38.3/50</td>
<td>34.7/50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Growth</td>
<td>69.8/100</td>
<td>66.0/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts (ELA) Growth</td>
<td>29.2/50</td>
<td>33.0/50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Growth</td>
<td>40.6/50</td>
<td>33.0/50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Gaps</td>
<td>74.2/100</td>
<td>64.4/100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts (ELA) Achievement Gaps</td>
<td>33.6/50</td>
<td>33.6/50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Achievement Gaps</td>
<td>40.6/50</td>
<td>30.8/50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate Gaps</td>
<td>NA/NA</td>
<td>NA/NA</td>
<td>NA/NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On-Track and Postsecondary Readiness

|                        |         | 91.1/100 | 89.2/100 |
| Graduation Rate        | NA/NA    | NA/NA    | NA/NA    |
| Attendance Rate        | 76.7/80  | 75.4/80  |          |
| 3rd Grade English Language Arts (ELA) Achievement | 14.4/20 | 13.8/20 | |
| 8th Grade Mathematics Achievement | NA/NA | NA/NA | |

Student Engagement Indicators

|                        |         | Total Deductions: 0 |
| Absenteeism Rate (goal <13%) | Goal met: no deduction | |
| Dropout Rate (goal <6%)       | Goal met: no deduction | |

School Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>K-4-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Type</td>
<td>Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Open Enrollment</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race/Ethnicity

|                        |        |
| Asian                  | 12.0%  |
| Black or African American | 7.4% |
| Hispanic/Latino        | 18.1%  |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 0.0% |
| White                  | 55.0%  |
| Two or More Races      | 7.6%   |

Student Groups

|                        |        |
| Students with Disabilities | 13.0% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 26.4% |
| Limited English Proficient | 19.4% |

Wisconsin Student Assessment System Percent Proficient and Advanced

Includes Forward Exam (grades 3-8), ACT (grade 11), and Dynamic Learning Maps (grades 9-11)

State proficiency is for all tested grades: 3-8 and 11

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School: ELA State: ELA School: Mathematics State: Mathematics

*Note: Outlier score fluctuation is noted by * when any school or district report card has a 10-point or greater change (up or down) in both Overall Score and Growth Score. This amount of change may or may not be reflective of actual school/district performance. DPI encourages review of other priority area scores in the detailed report card for a better understanding of school performance. Details: [http://dpi.wi.gov/accountability/report-cards](http://dpi.wi.gov/accountability/report-cards)

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction | dpi.wi.gov
Report cards for different types of schools or districts should not be directly compared.
Wisconsin | Madison Metropolitan School District

**Madison Metropolitan**
District Report Card | 2016-17 | Summary

**Overall Score**
66.5
Meets Expectations

**Priority Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>District Score</th>
<th>State Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Achievement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts (ELA)</td>
<td>58.9/100</td>
<td>66.7/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>30.3/50</td>
<td>34.3/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts (ELA)</td>
<td>61.2/100</td>
<td>66.0/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>28.2/50</td>
<td>33.0/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closing Gaps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts (ELA)</td>
<td>63.2/100</td>
<td>61.7/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>33.0/50</td>
<td>33.0/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-Track and Postsecondary Readiness</strong></td>
<td>82.2/100</td>
<td>86.5/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>33.8/40</td>
<td>36.4/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Rate</td>
<td>57.0/40</td>
<td>57.1/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade ELA</td>
<td>6.0/10</td>
<td>7.0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade Mathematics</td>
<td>5.4/10</td>
<td>6.0/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Engagement Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>District Score</th>
<th>State Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism Rate</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout Rate</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wisconsin Student Assessment System Percent Proficient and Advanced**
Includes Forward Exam (grades 3-8), ACT (grade 11), and Dynamic Learning Maps (grades 9-11)
State proficiency is for all tested grades: 3-11

**District Information**
- Grades: 64-12
- Enrollment: 27,136
- Within District Mobility: 2.0%
- Between District Mobility: 4.5%

**Race/Ethnicity**
- American Indian or Alaskan Native: 0.3%
- Asian: 9.0%
- Black or African American: 17.8%
- Hispanic/Latino: 23.2%
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 0.1%
- White: 42.8%
- Two or More Races: 8.9%

**Student Groups**
- Students with Disabilities: 14.3%
- Limited English Proficient: 18.6%

---

*Note: Outlier score fluctuation is noted by * when any school or district report card has a 10-point or greater change (up or down) in both Overall Score and Growth Score. This amount of change may or may not be reflective of actual school/district performance. DPI encourages review of other priority area scores in the detailed report card for a better understanding of school performance. Details: [dpi.wi.gov/accountability/report-cards](http://dpi.wi.gov/accountability/report-cards)*

---

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction | dpi.wi.gov
Report cards for different types of schools or districts should not be directly compared.
New Mexico | Albuquerque High School

**School Grading Report Card 2017**

**Albuquerque High**

District: Albuquerque Public Schools
Grade Range: 9 - 12 Code: 1590

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>This School Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Standing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are students performing on grade level? Did they improve more or less than expected?</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Improvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the school as a whole making academic progress?</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement of Higher-Performing Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are higher-performing students improving more or less than expected?</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement of Lowest-Performing Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the lowest-performing students improving more or less than expected?</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunity to Learn</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do students and families believe their school is a good place to attend and learn?</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are students graduating high school, and is the graduation rate improving?</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College and Career Readiness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are students participating in college and career readiness opportunities? Are they demonstrating success?</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bonus Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools can earn points for reducing truancy, promoting extracurricular activities, engaging families, and using technology.</td>
<td>+ 5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Grade 2017**

**D**

**Overall Score 57.31**

**This School's History**

![Graph showing the school's overall score from 2014 to 2017]

**Note for Families**

If your student is enrolled in a school that has earned two “F” grades in the last four years, state law allows you to transfer your child to a school with a higher grade. Please call (505)-827-4527 to learn more. For information about other schools in your community, please visit the School Grading web page at [http://ped.state.nm.us/SchoolGrading](http://ped.state.nm.us/SchoolGrading).

*This school's grade was reduced by one letter because it failed to test 95% of eligible students.*
Cleveland Elementary School Fact Sheet

Address: 524 Palisade Street, Pasadena, CA, 91103
Phone: 626-396-5670
http://cleveland.pusd.us
School hours: 8:45 am - 3:10 pm
Monday Early Dismissal 1:30 pm

Grade levels: SDC Pre-K, ETK; K to 5
Regular school tours: 1st & 4th Weds at 9

Parent Ambassadors: Geraldine Kennedy
geraldinekennedy21@gmail.com or
Wendy Valencia
wendyv1983@yahoo.com

Principal
Debra Lucas - Ms. Lucas was selected as Cleveland’s principal in 2016. Prior to that she served as a District Elementary Instructional Coach for PUSD and as a Curriculum Resource Teacher and Language Development Resource Teacher at Longfellow Elementary School.

Teachers
All classroom teachers are certificated. Our dedicated teachers are highly qualified. We have a full time Librarian, Health Clerk and Counselor along with a part-time Nurse.

Students (2016-17) Total Enrollment: 150 (K thru 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Any race)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.54%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.54%</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more ethnicities</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other / No ethnicity given</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English Learners: 29% *11.8% of previous year’s English Learners were Redesignated Fluent English-Proficient Fall 2016.
Free/Reduced Meals: 86%

Open Enrollment (For 2017-18 School Year)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected Openings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfilled Lottery Seats (when OE closed)*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Availability of space at end of April 2017 does not indicate that space is available now. Projected openings for 2018-19 school year will be posted in January 2018.

Enrichment “Extras” See PEN Factsheet guide “Enrichment Basics” & PUSD School Profile

Designated STEAM focus school – all students visit science & computer labs weekly
Community gardens used for Earth & health science
Ceramics
Education Through Music – K-5 work with credentialed music teacher weekly; 3rd-5th graders have instrumental music, and there is also choral music
Full-time library coordinator on staff

©Pasadena Education Network, September 2017  Data from current year unless noted
### Are all students moving toward high school graduation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many students...</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>LAUSD Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...graduate in four years?</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Are all students demonstrating college and career readiness?

Success in Advanced Placement (AP) courses improves college readiness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many students...</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>LAUSD Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...are on track to pass all A-G courses with a ‘C’ or better?</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...are enrolled in at least one AP course?</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...earn a qualifying score of ‘3’ or higher on an AP exam?</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Do adults at this school talk to students about the future and have high expectations for their success?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students who...</th>
<th>Percent Agreement:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...know which A-G courses they need to take to get into college</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...know current progress toward meeting A-G requirements</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...feel most adults at this school expect them to go to college</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What is the highest level of education students PLAN to complete?

| Students responding: | |
|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| High school          | 17%     | 4-year college degree or higher | 63% |
| Technical/vocational school/2-year college | 8%     | Unsure of plans | 12% |

Note: On all pages, data are not shown when the number of respondents is 10 or fewer to protect privacy (displayed as "- -") or when data are not available (displayed as "**").
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