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Executive Summary

Request for a Redesign of the Continuous School Improvement Division

In September 2018, California Governor Brown signed Assembly Bill 1840 which was designed to provide Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) with additional funds to assist the district in repaying a $100 million loan that the district received in 2003. One provision of that legislation required OUSD to complete comprehensive operational reviews that compare the needs of the school district with similar school districts and provide data and recommendations regarding changes that the district can make to achieve fiscal stability. In 2020, OUSD contracted with School Services of California to conduct a review of the Business Services, Talent, and Technology divisions of the district that partially fulfilled the requirement under AB 1840.

On January 25, 2023, the OUSD Board of Education approved a contract with Public Works LLC to conduct a redesign of the Continuous School Improvement (CSI) Division, to partially fulfill the AB 1840 requirement. The major purpose of the redesign according to the Request for Proposal (No. 22-127 CSI) was “to ensure that school sites are supported by an efficient central office staff to reach the goals of the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP). The requested analysis of the CSI division is to focus on the level of staffing necessary to reach intended goals of the LCAP and the district’s vision mission and values.”

While the study was mandated, the Chief Academic Officer and CSI staff were cooperative, provided our team with documents requested, and in general welcomed the opportunity to find ways to improve services to students and schools.

Overview of CSI and Overarching Redesign Theory

OUSD's CSI Division is responsible for developing and implementing educational programs that align with the district’s goals, strategic plan, LCAP, and state standards. The Division’s primary function is to ensure that all OUSD students receive a high-quality education that prepares them for college, career, and life success.

The main functions of the CSI Division are to:

1. Develop and implement curriculum: The division is responsible for developing and implementing the district’s curriculum, which includes academic standards, instructional materials, and assessments.
2. Provide professional development: The division provides professional development to teachers and staff to ensure they have the skills and knowledge needed to deliver the curriculum effectively.
3. Assess student learning: The division is responsible for assessing student learning and using data to improve instruction and curriculum.
4. Ensure equitable access to education: The division ensures that all students have equitable access to high-quality education, regardless of their background or current achievement level.
5. Collaborate with community partners: The division works with community partners, such as parents, businesses, and non-profit organizations, to support student learning and achievement.
6. Monitor and evaluate programs: The division monitors and evaluates educational programs to ensure they are effective and aligned with district goals and state standards.

Overall, the CSI Division plays a crucial role in ensuring that students receive a high-quality education that prepares them for success in the 21st century.
OUSD's Chief Academic Officer (CAO) has been instrumental in navigating the range of needs, especially in light of the high number of direct reports (15). The CAO has the heavy responsibility for making sure all the pieces contributing to academics—instruction, assessment, research, and supporting services, are working together. Our staffing recommendations include lessening the CAO's direct reports to 11 to provide the CAO with additional time to focus on implementing this redesign with fidelity and to facilitate the development, implementation, and evaluation of the district's curriculum, instructional materials, teaching practices, and supporting services. To do so, time is needed to breakdown some existing silos and improve collaboration among CSI departments. While there are examples of excellent collaboration within CSI (examples are included in the full report), much work is yet to be accomplished.

The reader should also note that one of our primary recommendations is to reduce the number of Network Superintendents by one and move the Network Superintendents to the top of the CSI Redesign organizational chart to oversee the key departments within CSI. Under the redesign, the four Network Superintendents would report to the CAO to assist in bringing a systematic and coherent approach to delivering central office services to schools. This approach must balance allowing school sites autonomy while simultaneously holding school leadership accountable with non-negotiable strategies and practices expected of all schools.

It is important to note that our key recommendation to eliminate one Elementary Network Superintendent is contingent upon the district reducing the number of schools. OUSD has the largest number of schools among the comparison districts with 77 and an average number of students in each school of 447. Sacramento City Unified School District (SCUSD) has 3,500 more students in 68 schools with an average school size of 559 students. Fontana Unified School District (FUSD) has a student population of about 500 more students in 46 schools with an average school size of 763 students. San Jose Unified School District (SJUSD) has fewer than 26,000 students in 41 schools with an average school size of 626.

OUSD and two of the comparison school districts have charter schools in their attendance areas. Oakland has the most with 28, SCUSD has 15, and SJUSD has five. There are no charter schools in FUSD.

All of the districts include private schools which are significant because the public school district, under Federal law, is required to provide private schools some services. Again, OUSD has the most with 37, followed by SCUSD with 27, SJUSD with 24, and FUSD with 6.

School consolidation is always fraught with controversy and hurt feelings that may continue for decades. Schools throughout the nation are experiencing similar decline in enrollment as happened in the early 1980s. Schools were closed and repurposed. Even districts that have experienced rapid growth in the 2000s like San Ramon Unified, are now in decline. The Staff Report: Resolution No 2223-036 at the January 25, 2023 Board meeting provides a thoughtful and compelling rationale and impact for consolidating and merging small schools in OUSD.

The OUSD Board of Education must act to consolidate schools for the 2024-25 school year. Under AB 1840, OUSD is required to take “affirmative board action to continue planning for, and timely implementation of, a school and facility closure and consolidation plan that supports the sale or lease of surplus property.” The Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) has recommended school closures in Oakland for several years.

To accompany the consolidation of elementary schools, OUSD should reduce the elementary networks from three to two for the 2024-25 school year. Reducing one of the elementary networks would result in each network supervising schools that serve approximately 8,800 students and approximately 520 classrooms. While the intended key focus of the project was to analyze the CSI Division’s staffing, the Public Works LLC team went beyond staffing recommendations and found numerous best practices as we conducted our work.
and those commendations can be found throughout the report. Our team analyzed voluminous data and interviewed 135 OUSD district and school-level staff and we learned much more about CSI than just the effectiveness of its level of staffing. Thus, we have included several findings and recommendations within each section of the review related to the efficiency and effectiveness of CSI’s operations.

In this report our team uses the terms central office, district, or OUSD interchangeably.
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Overview of OUSD
OUSD serves 34,265 students in grades TK-12 at 77 district-run schools and the district’s student population is one of the most ethnically and linguistically diverse school districts in the nation. According to the California Department of Education’s Data Quest, OUSD students are 45% Hispanic/Latino, 21% African American, 11% Asian, 11% White, 6% two or more races, and all others 5%. More than 50% of OUSD students speak a language other than English at home, and 33% of the students are English Language Learners. Nonetheless, OUSD faces some of the same challenges as any high-needs urban district in this country. Nearly 75% of OUSD students are low income, 17.5% of the students receive Special Education services, and 18% of school-aged children live below the US poverty standard.

REDESIGN METHODOLOGY

Project Kick-Off Meetings
For each phase of the project, Public Works LLC held a project kick-off meeting to review the scope of work with OUSD leadership and provide them with a road map of project expectations for the study.

Data Analysis
We began by gathering, reviewing, and evaluating data, manuals, procedures, organizational charts, and other documentation. Our team reviewed and analyzed over 300 documents in the nine areas of the study.

Peer District Analysis
In conjunction with OUSD leadership, three school districts were chosen as comparison school districts based on student enrollment, and percentages of students receiving free and reduced lunch. Superintendent Kyla Johnson-Trammell wrote to each of the peer district superintendents to ask for their cooperation in providing our team requested data. The majority of the peer districts complied with our request for information. Appendix D is a summary of comparison data and our team used various data points and our findings to support some of
our recommendations. It is important to note that Public Works LLC did not solely rely on peer data to make any recommendations. Our team's standard procedure is to use multiple data sources to support any of our recommendations.

**Peer District Comparisons**

Three California unified school districts were selected as comparison districts for the study, Sacramento City, Fontana, and San Jose. For some measures, it was not possible to get information and data from San Jose, so Public Works LLC gathered information for West Contra Costa Unified to supplement the information from the other two districts and OUSD. The comparison districts are similar in size and student population.

The comparison districts range in student enrollment between 26,000 and 38,000 with enrollment declining in each district. Hispanic/Latino students are the largest population in each of the districts, ranging from 41% in Sacramento City to 87% in Fontana.

In the academic measures, OUSD students perform about as well as students from Sacramento City and Fontana and less well than students in San Jose. OUSD lags behind all of the comparison districts in graduation and college-going rates.

OUSD has a smaller percentage of long-term English Language learners than the peer school districts. OUSD has the highest rate of chronic absenteeism and second highest suspension rate among the comparison districts.

Oakland Unified has more financial resources than any of the other districts both in total spending as well as per pupil spending. OUSD spends 22% more per pupil than Fontana, 23% more than Sacramento, and 37% more than San Jose. Much of that difference is from the amount that OUSD spends on classified salaries, which is 67% more than Sacramento City, 40% more than San Jose, and 37% more than Fontana.

Teacher salaries lag in OUSD with the average salary 17% lower than Sacramento City, 23% lower than Fontana, and 15% lower than San Jose. The differences in average salaries comes in large part from OUSD's much lower rate of average teacher experience. High levels of teacher turnover in OUSD explain the differences in teacher experience. OUSD's average three-year return rate is just over 50%. *(See Appendix D for details on the peer district comparisons.)*

**Partner Surveys**

Two major partner groups—district-wide central office staff, teachers, principals and staff, and CSI Division staff—received a survey focusing on resources and staffing of the CSI Division’s capacity and service delivery that provide school leadership, staff, and students with the tools, resources, supports and technical assistance needed to ensure that every school is on a path towards excellence. Request #2 The 13-question survey with a mix of matrix measures and open-ended comments generated well over 700 comments among 414 respondents. *While the focus of the questions related specifically to CSI, a few of the questions sought information about all of OUSD district operations.*

**District-Wide Survey:** An e-survey invitation was sent to 2,460 district-wide OUSD staff upon which responses were gathered over a ten-day period during February 22-March 4, 2023. There were 329 respondents, yielding a 13.4% response rate. Among them, the majority of respondents were teachers (52%), while 21% identified as Central Office Staff and the remaining were principals and classified staff. Nearly 30% have worked five or fewer years for OUSD, and a quarter have been employees between six and ten years. Nearly half (46%) have worked with the district for eleven-plus years.

Overall, respondents believe that the district faces uphill challenges in meeting the multiple and significant needs of students exacerbated by the lack of resources to do so. The majority (58%) rated
Social, Emotional, & Academic Supports as Fair/Poor while needs of English Language Learners are high. More than half (52%) disagree that the budget is well managed by the administration, many of whom state that the money spent on administrators could be better spent on employing direct service positions serving students. Three-quarters believe that “work practices to attract and retain staff” should be a high priority of the district and CSI. A repeated theme throughout the comments suggested that CSI would do well to embed their staff at school sites to inform their “real-world” understanding of how policies and practices they promulgate impact teaching and learning. Working alongside each other would also foster collaborative policy-making and problem-solving with principals, teachers, students, and families. Respondents repeatedly reported that they knew very little as to what CSI does or the services it offers.

**Continuous School Improvement Division Survey:** The same survey was also distributed to 21 departments within CSI accounting for 294 persons receiving an e-survey invitation during a ten-day period (February 22-March 4, 2023) of which 85 responded, yielding a 29% response rate. The majority (59%) have worked for the district for five or fewer years which is in stark contrast to the district-wide respondents whose bulk of respondents (46%) have been with the district for eleven-plus years.

Overall, most CSI staff believe they are doing the best they can with the resources they have to allocate. Over three-quarters agree that staff collaborate, have technology to support their work, and believe they prioritize student needs. Nearly half (49%) disagree that there is adequate staff to carry out Central Office functions, and (29%) disagree that the budget is well managed. Emotional Supports received the most Fair/Poor rating (44%), and just over one-third gave the same rating for Social Supports (37%) and Academic Supports (35%). Sixty percent report that they collaborate with each other, however, one-third disagree that CSI works collaboratively or has adequate staff. Thirty-one percent contend that needs of exceptional students are not being met, especially impacting English Language Learners, due to lack of staff and resources.

Nearly 70 percent say reducing central office administrators is a low/no priority. Nearly half (46%) disagree that OUSD Central Office is appropriately staffed, while 39% do not believe CSI is appropriately staffed. This is in stark contrast with the views of district-wide respondents who believe both entities are over-staffed. Eighty percent see identifying workplace practices and benefits that attract and retain staff as a high priority.

A 50-slide presentation of the findings of both surveys with quantitative tables, summaries of comments and actual quotes capturing major highlights of both surveys is presented in Appendices A and B of the report.

**Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) Peer Comparisons**
As part of our team’s analysis, we conducted a comparison of OUSD and peer district’s LCAP plans. Some of the findings included the following. The full comparison can be found in Appendix C.

- Three of the four districts identify college and career readiness as a goal (Fontana Goal 3, Oakland Goal 1, and Sacramento City Goal 1).
- Oakland (Goal 2) and Sacramento City (Goals 9, 10, 11) specify the focal student groups in their goals.
- Oakland (Goal 3) and Sacramento City (Goal 6) identify implementation/expansion of MTSS services as a goal.
- All four districts include academic improvement, achievement, and growth among their goals.
• Other common goals include systems of support, student, community and family engagement, and climate and safety.
• Oakland is the only district that directly addresses staffing in the goals (Goals 4 and 5).
• The districts share common successes such as college and career readiness. The districts also have common needs regarding chronic absenteeism, suspensions, and graduation rates, although Sacramento City also reports improvements in chronic absenteeism and suspension rates among their successes.

Interviews and Focus Groups
Our team interviewed 135 OUSD district and school-level staff as well as Board members and parents. We tried to schedule a focus group with All City Council (students); however, the meeting never materialized. All of the interviews were confidential. Some staff were interviewed multiple times.

Draft Report Zoom Meetings
Public Works LLC held numerous tollgate/zoom meetings with the leads of each CSI Department to review the draft findings and recommendations and permit staff to provide written and oral feedback. The majority of CSI staff members who oversee each of the areas of evaluation were supportive and welcoming of Public Works LLC’s findings and recommendations for improvement in their respective areas. The Public Works LLC team corrected any factual errors brought to our attention and modified the draft where we believed the feedback was appropriate.

Final Report and Board Presentation
The draft report revisions were made as a result of the tollgate meetings and the written feedback forms provided by OUSD. The final report and Board PowerPoint presentation were provided to OUSD Board, Superintendent, and the CAO in June 2023.

The final report includes:
• Table of Contents
• Executive Summary
• 9 Sections (one section for each of the CSI review areas)
• 2 Sections with a list of all commendations and recommendations
• Appendices (survey analyses, peer district analysis, LCAP comparisons, and sample job description)

The full report has 46 recommendations and 22 commendations. Our team recommends implementation of the recommendations for the 2023-24 school year.

Limitations/Challenges
• In our standard review process, we conduct extensive onsite meetings so that we can talk with staff face-to-face, see school sites and work areas firsthand, and meet with students, teachers, parents, community members, and others outside the district hierarchy who otherwise are hard to reach remotely, but important to seek face-to-face input. Unfortunately, that was not possible in this project due to the tight project timeline: The project launch was pushed back twice, due to delays in contract approval by the OUSD Board of Trustees; project completion and various intermediate deadlines remained fixed, however. The information-gathering period thus was severely compressed on the front-end and our engagement process had to be streamlined. As a result, no onsite activities were conducted by our team as part of this review.
- Our team requested up-to-date organizational charts for each of the departments reviewed. The majority of the charts provided were outdated and in inconsistent formats. We received a variety of documents showing different FTEs for each of the departments in CSI. Much time was spent clarifying and documenting what exists in the status quo of the organization of CSI.

- Information on OUSD’s website is frequently outdated. Our team had to rely on documentation and interviews to learn the current status.

- Our team requested data on how many CSI staff had undergone formal evaluations; however, that information was not provided.

- Some of the data provided to our team had not been vetted by OUSD’s Research, Assessment and Data Department. We did not know the data had not been vetted until late into the writing process and therefore had to delay progress (and change some commendations and recommendations) until we received the accurate, vetted data.

**Commendations and Recommendations**

**Exhibit ES-1** shows the total number of recommendations for each CSI department. As shown, there are a total of 22 commendations and 46 recommendations in the report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section #</th>
<th># of Commendations</th>
<th># of Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Division of CSI Redesign</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics and Instruction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Superintendents Team</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Schools &amp; Student Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner and Multilingual Achievement (ELLMA)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Assessment and Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Equity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This executive summary highlights only a few of the 46 recommendations and 22 commendations. For a complete list of all recommendations and commendations by page number, see Sections 10 and 11.
Select Commendations by Section

- OUSD is commended for placing a high priority on reinventing its MTSS process and for ensuring it is in alignment with the California Department of Education MTSS model and in alignment with OUSD’s Local Control and Accountability Plan. (Commendation 2-A)
- OUSD is commended for creating a research-based TK-5 literacy framework. (Commendation 2-B)
- CSI is commended for creating and implementing a research-based walk-through instrument to guide improved instruction. (Commendation 2-D)
- The Instructional Technology Team is commended for the development, coordination, and maintenance of the Teacher Central and Family Central websites. (Commendation 2-E)
- OUSD Special Education Department is commended for using the FCMAT Special Education Efficiency Tool. (Commendation 4-C)
- OUSD is commended for transitioning to an intervention and prevention organization. (Commendation 5-A)
- The English Language Learning and Multilingual Achievement (ELLMA) Department is commended for their efforts in meeting the needs of the Whole Child. These efforts are evident in the design of support services and programs and the allocation of resources to address the physical, social, and emotional needs of students and families. (Commendation 6-B)
- The Early Learning Department is commended for using a Whole Child approach that prioritizes the development of the whole child including their emotional and social well-being, in addition to their academic progress. (Commendation 7-C)
- OUSD is commended for developing and implementing an extensive set of data dashboards that staff can use to make decisions in their professional work and that the public can use to gain detailed information about a variety of topics. (Commendation 8-A)
- The African American Male Achievement (AAMA) Program has implemented an effective Student Leadership Council. (Commendation 9-B)

Select Recommendations by Section

- Restructure the CSI Division for the 2024-25 school year to reduce silos, ensure stronger collaboration between Academics & Instruction, and reduce the number of direct reports to the CAO from 15 to 11. (Recommendation 1-1)
- Charge the CAO with forming a task force to collect all of the various frameworks being used by central office and school-level staff, synthesize existing ones, and adopt fewer frameworks to ensure alignment to the district’s strategic plan and LCAP plan. (Recommendation 1-3)
- Update Board Policy 6005 to ensure a clear definition of site-based autonomy and delineate non-negotiables that all schools should be required to implement to ensure a strong and consistent implementation of the district’s instructional vision and plans. (Recommendation 1-4)
- Assign all CSI staff space in schools beginning July 1, 2023 until the new central office building is opened and require staff to contribute two hours a week in assisting the school leadership with various teaching and learning initiatives. (Recommendation 1-5)
- Hold OUSD Departments accountable for collecting, codifying, and updating important OUSD staffing data and organizational charts. (Recommendation 1-6)
- Reorganize and streamline the Department of Academics and Instruction in order to better facilitate the growth of teachers in content area and pedagogy, design innovative curricula, and develop more meaningful partnerships with school sites and other CSI units. (Recommendation 2-1)
• Dissolve the OUSD Board Curriculum and Instruction Committee and replace it with a district wide Curriculum and Instruction Advisory Committee. (Recommendation 2-4)
• Reduce the number of elementary schools for the school year 2024-25 and reduce from three elementary networks to two elementary networks and Network Superintendents. (Recommendation 3-2)
• Eliminate the position of Executive Director of Alternative Education when those responsibilities are assigned to the Middle School Network Superintendent. (Recommendation 3-4)
• Ensure all OUSD networks develop and implement the planning and tracking system as used in Network 3. (Recommendation 3-8)
• Assign the supervision and evaluation of the speech therapists to the principals and the psychologists to special education network directors and combine the remaining functions of the two positions into one. (Recommendation 4-1)
• Create and fill four Director of Community Schools positions (internally) that report jointly to the Executive Director of Community Schools and to the Network Superintendents for the 2024-25 school year. (Recommendation 5-1)
• Immediately hire a Director of Behavioral Health and conduct an analysis of mental health personnel needs at the school level. (Recommendation 5-4)
• Reorganize the English Language Learner & Multilingual Achievement Department to facilitate greater alignment of instructional programs and services for ELLs and Multilingual students and to build stronger collaboration with the Academics & Instruction Department. (Recommendation 6-1)
• Ensure adequate staffing for the delivery of base and supplemental instructional programs and services for ELLs, specifically Newcomers, as identified in OUSD’s EL Master Plan. (Recommendation 6-2)
• Realign the 13 elementary schools with Newcomer Programs and all the Multilingual schools under one Elementary Network Superintendent for effective implementation of best practices for ELLs and to support improved communication to sites impacted with high numbers of ELLs. (Recommendation 6-3)
• Reorganize the Early Learning Department (PK-2) and establish a developmental pathway for early elementary grades that continues to build on what children learn in preschool/transitional kindergarten, building connections in curriculum, pedagogy, and assessments between early childhood programs and elementary education. (Recommendation 7-1)
• Reduce the Research, Assessment and Data Department’s deliverables to enable the reduction of one analyst position. (Recommendation 8-2)
• Transfer the Family Engagement Specialists from the Office of Equity to the Network Superintendents. (Recommendation 9-1)

Exhibit ES-2 shows the number of positions our team recommended eliminating, adding, and/or realigning within the CSI. As shown, if implemented the redesign would entail the elimination of 29 CSI positions, adding six new positions, and realigning 25 existing positions. The net difference results in a reduction of -13 positions/full-time equivalent.
### EXHIBIT ES-2
RECOMMENDED TOTAL NUMBER OF CSI POSITIONS ELIMINATED, CREATED, OR REALIGNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eliminations of Positions</th>
<th>Creation of New Positions</th>
<th>Realignment of Existing Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Director of PK-3 Literacy</td>
<td>• Director of ELLMA</td>
<td>25 positions were realigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 Elementary Network Superintendent (if schools are closed)</td>
<td>• Senior Director of Early Learning PK-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Executive Director of ECE</td>
<td>• Executive Director of Academics and Instruction /EC and Literacy PK-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Director of Elementary Instruction</td>
<td>• *Upgrade the Coordinator of Instructional Technology to the Director of Instructional Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2.5 Early Learning Specialists</td>
<td>• Instructional Technology Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vacant positions of .5 N 3 Literacy Specialists, HS Math Coordinator, and Library Specialist</td>
<td>• Director of MTSS (6-12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2 School Technology Specialists</td>
<td>• Director of Early Childhood Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Network 4 MTSS Partner Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vacant Network 2 MTSS Partner Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Network 3 MTSS Partner Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Executive Director of Alternative Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Combining the 2 Special Education Director positions into 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Director of Newcomers Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multilingual Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Director of Kindergarten Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 RAD Analyst Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2 Special Education Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 7 Special Education teaches by Special Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**  29  
**Creation of New Positions**  6  
**Realignment of Existing Positions**  25

Source: Created by Public Works LLC, 2023.

*Note: This position exists, but we recommend it be upgraded to a director-level position. It is not counted as a new position.*
Next Steps

Although the redesign of CSI study was mandatory, our team suggests the district leadership consider the following next steps.

The OUSD Superintendent and CAO should create a recommendation implementation plan including which recommendations will be implemented as is, which recommendations to modify and implement, and/or which recommendations should not be implemented with a sound rationale for not doing so. A realistic timeline is important. The redesign is not an overnight, quick fix and will take careful planning to execute appropriately. Each section should be assigned to a point person to monitor the implementation status of all recommendations.

1. On a monthly basis, a point person should collect the information from each of the appointed staff and assemble it into a report for the superintendent and/or board’s review.

2. At the end of 6 months or a year, the district should determine the overall rate of implementation and the associated fiscal impacts (costs and savings).

Some districts have established an electronic database to assist in monitoring implementation of the recommendations.

In addition, the report shares a number of commendations. Many districts have found showcasing the commendations to the parents, media, and public helps promote improved community relations and respect for the best practices being conducted in the district.

The OUSD Board should direct the Superintendent and CAO to develop an implementation plan and present that plan to the Board within 90 days.

The Board should review the implementation progress quarterly.
SECTION 1

Overall Division of Continuous School Improvement (CSI) Redesign

Note: Section 1 provides the overall CSI findings and recommendations for the executive-level redesign of the Division of Continuous School Improvement. In Sections 2-9, additional findings and recommendations below this executive-level organizational structure will be provided for each CSI department. The Public Works LLC team found numerous commendations regarding the work and accomplishments of CSI. The commendations are distributed throughout Sections 2-9.

Overview of the Division of Continuous School Improvement

OUSD's Continuous School Improvement (CSI) Division is responsible for developing and implementing educational programs that align with the district's goals, strategic plan, Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) and state standards. Its primary function is to ensure that all OUSD students receive a high-quality education that prepares them for college, career, and life success.

The main functions of the CSI Division are to:

1. Develop and implement curriculum: The CSI Division is responsible for developing and implementing the district’s curriculum, which includes academic standards, instructional materials, and assessments.
2. Provide professional development: The division provides professional development to teachers and staff to ensure they have the skills and knowledge needed to deliver the curriculum effectively.
3. Assess student learning: The division is responsible for assessing student learning and using data to improve instruction and curriculum.
4. Ensure equitable access to education: The division ensures that all students have equitable access to high-quality education, regardless of their background or ability level.
5. Collaborate with community partners: The division works with community partners, such as parents, businesses, and non-profit organizations, to support student learning and achievement.
6. Monitor and evaluate programs: The division monitors and evaluates educational programs to ensure they are effective and aligned with district goals and state standards.

Overall, the CSI Division plays a crucial role in ensuring that students receive a high-quality education that prepares them for success in the 21st century.

OUSD has made significant reductions in central office staffing over the last 9 years, from a high of 1,906 in 2016 to 982 in 2022.
FINDING

The Division of Continuous School Improvement (CSI) organizational structure, neither effective nor efficient, has a broad span of control that exceeds best practices. The current structure has created isolated and silo-like effects with a lack of sufficient coordination, communication, and collaboration among its departments.

Exhibit 1-1 shows the current organizational chart for CSI.

As shown, the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) has 13 direct reports including: Senior Executive Assistant, Director of Early Childhood, Executive Director of Instruction, Executive Director of English Language Learners, Executive Director of Research, Data, and Assessment, Executive Director of Community Schools & Student Services, the Executive Director of Equity, Executive Director of Special Education, and five Network Superintendents. In August 2022, a new Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) team was formed with the Director of MTSS also reporting to the CAO. The MTSS Director position is not shown on the chart in Exhibit 1-1. Although not shown on the organizational chart, a Deputy Chief of Continuous School Improvement also reports to the CAO making the count of direct reports a total of 15. According to the job description that position is responsible for the continuous school improvement process, analyzing data, planning the work of schools to align to the vision of the strategic plan, implementing the strategies and action steps outlined in the strategic plan, and gathering data to support the impact.

Additionally, while the positions on the organizational chart in Exhibit 1-1 are accurate, the names of some of the staff filling those positions have changed.

According to our team’s interviews, we found the organizational charts for CSI outdated. For example, Laresha Martin and Matin Abdel-Oawi are no longer with OUSD. Leroy Gaines is now the Network 4 Superintendent and Kate Sugarman is the Network 3 Deputy Superintendent. Adult Education is now with the High School network and Kim Jones is the Director. For the Middle school network: Cliff Hong is still the Network Superintendent; however, the Manager of Publications is no longer with OUSD and the Network Partner is Aubrey Layne. In RAD there are staff changes (Juan Du is still the Exec Director). Christian McClain is the statistician replacing Kaia Vitberg. Keith Welch is no longer with OUSD under Research Associate in Early Childhood and replaced by Hailey Jordon. Al-Taher is a Data Analyst II and does not appear on the chart.
EXHIBIT 1-1
2022-23 CONTINUOUS SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ORGANIZATIONAL CHART

Note: The Department of Academic shown in the organizational chart is in practice called the Academics and Instruction Department. In some documents it is also referred to as the Teaching and Learning Department. For this report, the department will be called Academics and Instruction. Public Works LLC recommends OUSD use a consistent name for the department on all documents to avoid confusion.

Exhibit 1-2 shows the total number of FTEs and current vacancies in each of the CSI department as well as the name of the department lead. As shown, there is a total of 297.8 FTEs and 7.5 vacancies in the division.
### EXHIBIT 1-2
TOTAL FTEs IN THE CONTINUOUS SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT DIVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Lead</th>
<th>CSI Department Name</th>
<th>Current Central FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sondra Aguilera</td>
<td>Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes Jacques</td>
<td>Academics and Instruction</td>
<td>31.5 + 2.5 vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie Herrera</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Sifuentes</td>
<td>HS Linked Learning</td>
<td>20 + 2 vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Bustamante</td>
<td>Community Schools &amp; Student Services</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroy Gaines</td>
<td>Network 4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Sifuentes</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raquel Jimenez</td>
<td>Office of Equity</td>
<td>39.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Navarro</td>
<td>Oakland Athletic League</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie McCalmont</td>
<td>Summer Learning</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Du</td>
<td>Research Assessment &amp; Data</td>
<td>13 + 2 vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Knight</td>
<td>English Language Learner and Multilingual Achievement (ELLMA)</td>
<td>16.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Thomas</td>
<td>Continuous School Improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Arnold</td>
<td>Network 2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Thomas</td>
<td>Network 3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Sifuentes</td>
<td>High School Network</td>
<td>9 + 1.0 vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford Hong</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Blake (Justin Anderson)</td>
<td>Health Services (Nurses)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Blake</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Blake</td>
<td>SELPA</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Bustamante</td>
<td>Indian Education</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CSI FTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>297.8 PLUS 7.5 VACANCIES</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*See Chapter 4 for specific FTE data.
The current organization for CSI lacks coherence and is a fragmented approach to providing services to schools. Organization development appears to have been done in a completely piecemeal fashion. It is almost as if when a problem is identified, a position or even a department is created giving the appearance that the problem is being addressed when in reality, the landscape of who does what for whom in the schools has become less clear. Many principals interviewed complained that they received emails with work directions and deadlines for report production from several CSI departments. Principals meeting for professional development devolve in a series of presentations from various central office departments.

Two principals (out of 12 interviewed) didn’t know what CSI is, even after hearing that the acronym stands for “Continuous School Improvement”.

For example, one principal expressed the observation shared by many that different district office departments “don’t talk to each other. They tell us to do things that don’t line up with what we heard from another department. They need more coordination between them.” Another remarked, “the due dates sent to principal by departments don’t know about others that we have to get done.” Still another said, “I feel tied to my computer by the number of emails I get from central staff every day.” One more said, “It feels like we serve central office and not the other way around.”

At the same time, principals, by long-standing practice and Board policy have a great deal of autonomy in OUSD. One Network Superintendent noted that, “even after all that’s been done, Single Plan for Student Achievement’s (SPSA) are still not aligned with LCAP and because they are done every year, they become a drill.” One principal observed, “the connection between academics and high schools is almost non-existent.”

Network Superintendents are the supervisors and evaluators of school principals but have limited input in hiring principals because according to the Network Superintendents, the Talent Division makes the recommendation to the Superintendent. In the current organizational structure, they are not in a position to align the work required and the services provided by the other departments. One remarked that in OUSD “leadership is horizontal” and that there are no ‘clear systems’ for aligning what ultimately happens in schools. Another said that “Oakland is insular, there is a lack of continuity how we serve schools. We need to connect under one umbrella.”

Principal meetings have become a forum for central office staff to talk to, and not with, principals. “Over three hours, we might hear from six different central office staff, telling us about programs and what we need to do.”

The Chief Academic Officer has a broad span of control that exceeds best practices and is considerably higher than the peer districts’ equivalent division. Currently, the OUSD CAO has 15 direct reports. OUSD’s CAO is charged with making sure all of the pieces contributing to curriculum, assessment, instruction and professional development all work together toward accomplishing the district’s mission and LCAP goals.

Interviews indicate that there is a disconnect among CSI departments and the Network Superintendents. Some examples include the following: the Network Superintendents do not attend many of the Academic & Instruction Department meetings designed to ensure consistency in the delivery of services across all networks. Further, this academic school year, the Academics and Instruction Department has developed a template for a newsletter that was developed to bring about consistency in messaging to schools. The newsletters are filled with helpful information for school leaders including items such as kudos for school-level achievements, information on the end of cycle 2 assessments, budgeting guidance, trimester 2 student goals, data dashboards, reminders, early literacy updates, STEM updates, and ELLMA updates. The newsletter also includes quick links to Principal and Teacher Central, Early Literacy Central, the Assessment Calendar and other important websites. The three elementary networks send out a weekly newsletter, although it is not the same newsletter. Interviews indicate that the middle and high School networks do not send out a newsletter.
The Department of Academics & Instruction hosts regular Academic Leadership meetings where many of the CSI leadership attend (Office of Equity, Special Education, Community Schools, ELLMA, etc.); however, none of the Network Superintendents attend this collaborative meeting. Also, interviews indicate that many of the CSI department leads have not been a principal in the past and because of this, some principals believe the CSI department leads may not have a strong lens on effectively implementing initiatives in schools. This also may be a part of the theme emerging from interviews that schools/principals do not follow-up on decisions/directions from central office staff.

A stronger relationship is needed among all CSI departments with the Network Superintendents to provide school-level staff with consistent and equitable services and information and to provide Peter Senge’s view of the purpose of central office leadership “…the real role of executive leadership is not in driving people to change, but in creating organizational environments that inspire, support and leverage the imagination and initiative that exists at all levels.” (Senge et al, 1999. P. 566).

The level of fragmentation is significant. In the departments of Academics and Instruction, Early Childhood Education, Community Schools & Student Services, Equity, English Language Learners, Health Services, and Special Education / SELPA there are 148 job titles with 473 staff. Eight of those job titles, Nurses, Occupational Therapists, Para Educators, Psychologists, Speech Therapists, Social Workers, SDC Severe and Special Education TSA, have 197 of the 473 positions. That means after accounting for the positions in which there are more than 10 people working in job title, in these eight departments there are 140 job titles with a total of 276 staff members serving in those positions, or just fewer than two people in each job titled position. Community Schools & Student Services has 43 job titles for 62 positions.

In 2022, OUSD conducted a survey of principals on their perception of central office services. Many of the comments share that principals are seeking more authentic assistance from CSI staff. Below is a sampling of principals’ comments regarding central office/CSI services.

**Behavioral Health Service**

- I am not sure what these folks do, can’t think of any direct impact to my site that is notable.
- I don’t know what they do and they don’t engage with our school.
- The disbanding of the Behavioral Health Unit is a major mistake and will have a significantly negative impact on students and school communities.

**Community School Managers**

- The CSM position is overpaid and under trained. I’m not sure what this department is supposed to do but they aren’t supporting us to train up our CSM and they aren’t supporting our CSM. It seems like a major waste of money when this could have been a TSA position with some additional RJ training. VERY disappointed in this position when it could be such a support to the school.
- They don’t communicate with us, just with our CSM.
- What is purpose of having an outside supervisor for CSM’s? They do not know what happens on an everyday basis. If schools are paying for CSM’s, why do we need an outside supervisor? We know what we need them to do.
Health and Wellness Services
- I don’t know what they do and they don’t engage with our school.
- Nurse assigned not very competent - did not instill confidence in her knowledge of issues of lice, foot and mouth disease, etc. School nurse job description should be expanded.

Network Partners
- We could have used a more onsite presence from Network partners.

Office of Equity
- Very frustrated that they aren’t a larger part of our school.
- I am not exactly sure what they do except for PD from time to time that seems drive-by instead of actually impacting structural change for equity.
- Unsure how department supports schools.
- Would have loved more direct offers of support!
- Our parent liaison is awesome. We need more of them.
- Not sure what they do.
- SSC self-assessment is a one size fits all, not differentiated for elementary vs secondary, is clunky and not parent friendly.
- Not helpful. Person in this position for my network is absent way more than present. She hasn’t supported me nor have I heard from her at all. Person needs to be more involved.
- Unsure how department supports schools.

Linked Learning
- Great folks, always looking out for teams, and great at proffering resources

ELLMA
- Best department in OUSD. HELLA helpful, hella useful, Nicole Knight is amazing.
- This is the best department in the whole district. Nicole Knight and her team truly understand what it is to support students. They are school and student centered in everything they do. We need an ELD assessment for progress monitoring.
- Information on website outdated. Limited reclassification information.

STEM Team
- Early childhood has no access to this team.
- Not this year. Very little outreach or support.
- Please bring back stipend Math Leads!
- There were no Science PLCs this year. They did a mediocre job with the Math adoption.

ELA Language and Literacy
- There could be more connectedness with early childhood.
- I am not sure who is on this team. Early Literacy has been most helpful with following up with coaching, learning walks, observations, feedback, meeting with our TSA, helping us self-reflect on a rubric etc.
• My team felt the EL PD this year was not as strong as our first year (20-21).
• Better than the STEM team, but the focus has still been on curriculum and not standards. Our North Star should be how do we use the curriculum to teach STANDARDS.
• We should have seen the team on site much more often this year.

Visual and Performing Arts

• In some aspects, the instrumental music department structure seems inequitable for students. Because those teachers are assigned, often at the elementary level, to one or more schools, there needs to be accountability for their work hours and productivity with observations, walk throughs and feedback from the department head who assigns those teachers and oversees this work. The instrumental music program looks vastly different from school to school within the District.
• Early childhood has no access to this team.
• Never had any interaction with VAPA, as they don’t present at principal PD’s. Would be good to know what happens.

Social-Emotional Learning Team

• I thought this office didn’t exist anymore.
• Who is on SEL team?
• We would have liked more PD. It was too late when we found out that our teachers could have had CSC PD.

Special Education

• While I appreciate the direct service staff we have had at our school this year, the fact that said staff changes yearly has been frustrating. I think it isn’t right to change service providers such as the RSP, psych, and speech therapist every year.
• The new teachers need more support than what they are getting.
• Too much on their plates to adequately support.
• IEP writing-teachers need more support.

Public Works LLC also conducted a central office and school-level survey in February 2023.

Exhibit 1-3 shows an excerpt from the survey.

(Please see Appendix A & B for the full survey results.) As shown, over 47 percent of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that the needs of exceptional children are being met. Over 36 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed that the needs of English Language Learners are being met, over 17 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed that the needs of Early Childhood students’ needs are being met, and over 16 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed that the needs of Adult and Career Education students’ needs are being met.
**EXHIBIT 1-3**

**EXCERPT FROM PUBLIC WORKS LLC SURVEY OF ALL OUSD STAFF**

Q9 How much do the following statements reflect your view of the Division of CSI?

Answered: 320  Skipped: 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs of exceptional students are met.</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>16.88%</td>
<td>33.44%</td>
<td>26.25%</td>
<td>20.94%</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs of English Language Learners are met.</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.63%</td>
<td>25.62%</td>
<td>32.50%</td>
<td>22.19%</td>
<td>14.06%</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs of children in Early Childhood programs are met.</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>18.81%</td>
<td>60.19%</td>
<td>8.78%</td>
<td>8.78%</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs of students in Adult &amp; Career Education are met.</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>12.85%</td>
<td>67.71%</td>
<td>8.46%</td>
<td>7.84%</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Exhibit 1-4** shows additional survey findings. As shown, over 76 percent of the respondents rated increasing the number of central office administrators as either a low priority or not a priority at all. Over 32 percent of the respondents rated the realigning of the staff reporting structure as being a high or very high priority.

**EXHIBIT 1-4**

**OUSD SURVEY RESULTS ON CSI PRIORITIES**

Q11 How much of a priority would you rate the following for CSI to implement?

Answered: 319  Skipped: 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase the number of central office administrators.</th>
<th>VERY HIGH</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>NOT A PRIORITY AT ALL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.29%</td>
<td>5.79%</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
<td>22.19%</td>
<td>54.02%</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Realign the staff reporting structure.</th>
<th>VERY HIGH</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>NOT A PRIORITY AT ALL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.78%</td>
<td>21.57%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>16.01%</td>
<td>18.30%</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exhibit 1-5** shows the level of satisfaction in interacting with the various CSI departments.

- Over 23 percent of the respondents have either a low or very low level of satisfaction with Academic Innovation/Teaching and Learning Department.
- Over 24 percent of the respondents have either a low or very low level of satisfaction with the Network Teams.
- Over 32 percent of the respondents have either a low or very low level of satisfaction with the Exceptional Children/Special Education Department.
- Over 25 percent of the respondents have either a low or very low level of satisfaction with the Community Schools & Student Services Department.
- Over 17 percent of the respondents have either a low or very low level of satisfaction with the ELLMA Department.
- Over 26 percent of the respondents have either a low or very low level of satisfaction with the Research, Data, and Assessment Department;
- Almost 30 percent of the respondents have either a low or very low level of satisfaction with the Office of Equity.
- Just over 13 percent of the respondents have either a low or very low level of satisfaction with the Early Childhood Department.
- Over 30 percent of the respondents have either a low or very low level of satisfaction with the Multi-Tiered System of Support Department.
- Over 36 percent of the respondents have a high or very high level of satisfaction with the English Language Learners (ELLMA) Department.
- Over 30 percent of the respondents have a high or very high level of satisfaction with the Research, Data & Assessment Department.
EXHIBIT 1-5
SURVEY RESULTS OF OUSD STAFF LEVELS OF SATISFACTION WITH CIS DEPARTMENTS

Q12 What’s your level of satisfaction interacting with the following CSI departments?

Answered: 317   Skipped: 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERY HIGH</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>VERY LOW</th>
<th>NO OPINION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Innovation/Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>7.28%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>21.20%</td>
<td>10.44%</td>
<td>12.97%</td>
<td>34.18%</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Teams</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
<td>16.88%</td>
<td>25.16%</td>
<td>10.51%</td>
<td>14.33%</td>
<td>27.71%</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for Exceptional Children (SPED)</td>
<td>4.75%</td>
<td>15.51%</td>
<td>23.42%</td>
<td>13.29%</td>
<td>18.99%</td>
<td>24.05%</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Schools/Student Services</td>
<td>7.59%</td>
<td>16.14%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>11.08%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>26.27%</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners (ELLMA)</td>
<td>13.29%</td>
<td>23.10%</td>
<td>24.68%</td>
<td>7.91%</td>
<td>9.18%</td>
<td>21.84%</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Data &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>13.02%</td>
<td>17.46%</td>
<td>18.10%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>15.24%</td>
<td>25.08%</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Equity</td>
<td>9.87%</td>
<td>17.83%</td>
<td>20.06%</td>
<td>14.97%</td>
<td>14.97%</td>
<td>22.29%</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood (ECS)</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>16.61%</td>
<td>7.03%</td>
<td>6.71%</td>
<td>52.40%</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
<td>8.28%</td>
<td>17.52%</td>
<td>13.06%</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
<td>38.49%</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The survey provided an opportunity for respondents to include open-ended comments. Below is a sampling of the comments that supports the need to reorganize CSI. Please note that some of the comments do not specify CSI specifically, but apply to “central office” in general. Some of the comments include:

- I don’t see a clear vision or theory of action for improving academic outcomes for our students. Academic supports for teachers and schools have been eroded in recent years, and schools are left on their own to fulfill functions that the district Academics team should provide. The result is that academic programs across the district vary HUGELY by site--- which is not equitable for our students.
- There is a definite lack of responsiveness to school site needs from many central departments.
- I have only seen one CSI staff at my school in 4 years.
- I have worked here for 10 years and have never seen this department do work that impacts students.
- We have too many employees that talk about working with students. We need more workers that actually work with students.
- The only communication that I get from central office is when there are deadlines they need to meet and need my input. All the work that I have done here, process, workflow, come from my own prior experience. There is nothing that the central office has provided me that makes my job easier.
- OUSD has too many administrative positions and not enough staff who work directly with students.
- Within each network there are folks that support principals from different departments. Some provide quality, efficient, effective services and some do not. Most times this feels relational which should not be the case.
• It seems like a restructuring of Academic Innovation/Academics and Instruction could be a good thing in order to bring about real results for all students to achieve more.
• The school feels as though it’s on its own as an individual entity struggling to get through each day instead of being part of a thoughtful organization focused on equity and the needs of students with trauma and a school with no sense of community building or procedures in place. Where is the central office staff? No sign of them.
• Many components of central office work in silos and do not seem to communicate between said silos. As a result, all departments require deliverables from school leaders/school sites and teachers without realizing how unrealistic their demands. This is true with decreased amount of human resources on school sites.
• I feel ignored when trying to communicate with downtown staff. I can never get a live person and my emails are go unanswered. If I had to get something resolved immediately, I am afraid that would not happen. What happened to customer service downtown? Are people held accountable to return emails and calls within a reasonable time frame?
• We have a sufficient number of staff members to carry out central office functions. The quality of these staff members is a different question.
• The people at the highest levels don’t seem to have a clear plan about how to serve students best. Academics and Linked Learning need to talk. The people below (coaches, etc.) are doing the best they can with this lack of direction. There aren’t enough of them and what they should be doing isn’t clear.
• OUSD spends too much of its budget on admin positions, people who do not work directly with students. OUSD needs to change the admin/teacher ratio, among the worst in the state.
• If CSI has been present at either of the OUSD schools I have worked at it has not been apparent. (There were over 25 similar comments that staff are unaware of what CSI does and how the division’s services could assist their schools.)

Throughout the various departments in CSI, our team found several areas of collaboration among key staff within CSI and across the school district. However, the collaborative efforts are not yielding many examples of positive outcomes and results.

The current structure has created isolated and silo-like effects with a lack of effective coordination, communications and collaboration among CSI departments. Many specific examples of the fragmentation are explained in Sections 2-9 of this report. The recommendation to reorganize the direct reports to the CAO is based on a review of documents, interviews, focus groups, survey results, and an analysis of peer district organizational structures. The comments in the Public Works LLC survey confirm the need for CSI reorganization.

In comparison, peer district, Fontana Unified School District’s (FUSD) Associate Superintendent for Teaching and Learning has 10 direct reports (five fewer than OUSD’s CAO).

Exhibit 1-6 shows FUSD’s Division of Teaching and Learning.
Exhibit 1-7 shows the Sacramento City USD (SCUSD) Academics Office organization. As shown, the SCUSD Chief Academic Officer has 10 direct reports (five fewer than OUSD's CAO).
The Public Works LLC team tried repeatedly to access peer district, San Jose Unified School District (SJUSD) organization chart; however, all requests were left unfulfilled. Because West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD) is a single district SELPA like OUSD, SCUSD and FUSD, Public Works LLC determined WCCUSD will supplement the available comparisons of each district’s organizational structure of its Curriculum and Instructional Division.

As seen in Exhibit 1-8, WCCUSD’s Chief Academic Officer has seven direct reports, compared to the 15 direct reports to OUSD’s Chief Academic Officer.

As seen in Exhibit 1-8, WCCUSD’s Chief Academic Officer has seven direct reports, compared to the 15 direct reports to OUSD’s Chief Academic Officer.

Source: [https://www.wccusd.net/Page/12252](https://www.wccusd.net/Page/12252).

Staff in the Academics & Instruction Department report some of their main challenges are getting into visit schools and the lack of centralized professional development. Many interviewees indicate that each Network Superintendent has their own instructional staff and that it often feels like a “competition” with the instructional staff within the other CSI departments.

When central office operates in silos, schools flounder in responding to uncoordinated initiatives and to a large degree that has not changed over many waves of OUSD school improvement.
**Recommendation 1-1**

Restructure the CSI Division for the 2024-25 school year to reduce silos, ensure stronger collaboration between Academics & Instruction, and reduce the number of direct reports to the CAO from 15 to 10.

**Recommendation 1-2**

Charge the proposed four Network Superintendents with the development of a coordinated professional development plan based on data analysis and input from school staff and together with the proposed Executive Director of Academics/Instruction/Early Childhood, Literacy PK-5 and the Executive Director of Academics/Instruction/Literacy 6-12, Executive Director of ELL/Multilingual, and the Executive Director of Special Education develop and implement well-coordinated professional development offerings for CSI and school-based staff.

To address the problem of silos and fragmentation, the Network Superintendents need to be leaders of teams that unite curriculum, instruction, professional development, English language development, community schools, equity, MTSS and at the elementary networks, early childhood development. This would lead to a greater probability that services and communications would be better aligned within each network. It also means that each of the CSI departments would have to be transformed from providing individual functions to holistic services.

“Historically though, school district central offices have been ill equipped to support ambitious goals. For example, a host of major school improvement initiatives—from the “effective schools” movement to site-based management and comprehensive school reform—have stumbled, or failed outright, at least in part because central offices did not help schools implement these reforms successfully.” (Assessing District Policy Alignment with the Whole School, Whole Community, Whole Child Model in Connecticut, 2019 to 2020).

Central office staff often feel like they have done everything they can to support schools and cannot see the relationship between what they do and the disappointing results, year after year, in school data.

Our findings and observations point to the need for a fundamental redesign of most CSI functions, as well as some major departures from business-as-usual for most if not all central office staff, especially those in human resources, student services, curriculum and instruction, and principal supervision. Many researchers have found that “while high standards and expectations set the stage for student success, the in-school factors that tend to have the most powerful influences on student learning are teaching and principal leadership.” (How School Districts Can Support Deeper Learning, the Need for Performance Alignment, by Meredith I. Honig & Lydia R. Rainey, University of Washington, October 2015).

The fragmentation is not unique to OUSD, but there is some research to support a more integrated approach.

“In a potentially promising development, some district leaders have begun to assign cross-functional teams—including representatives from several central office units—to work together to support teaching and learning in a cluster of schools. Such teams may be able to build bridges among organizational silos, and we find that they sometimes lead to better working relationships between principals and individual central office staff members.” (How School Districts Can Support Deeper Learning, the Need for Performance Alignment, by Meredith I. Honig & Lydia R. Rainey, University of Washington, October 2015).
Our team’s proposed restructuring should better align and coordinate key work in curriculum, instruction, community and student services, English language development, equity special education, and health services by consolidating services under a total of four Network Superintendents.

**Exhibit 1-9** shows the proposed redesign of the Continuous School Improvement Division.

This structure reduces the number of direct reports to the CAO from 15 to 11, which are:

1. Executive Director of Research, Assessment & Data (RAD) (see Section 8 for more details)
2. Executive Director of Community Schools & Student Services (see Section 5 for more details)
3. Executive Director of Special Education (see Section 4 for more details)
4. Executive Director of ELL/Multilingual (see Section 6 for more details)
5. Deputy Chief of Continuous School Improvement
6. Executive Director of Equity
7. Network Superintendent X serving approximately 8,871 elementary students (see Section 3 for more details)
8. Network Superintendent Y serving approximately 8,871 elementary students (see Section 3 for more details)
9. Middle School Network Superintendent serving approximately 6,839 middle school students (see Section 3 for more details)
10. High School Network Superintendent; serving approximately 9,824 high school students (see Section 3 for more details)
11. Senior Executive Assistant

The proposed redesigned CSI organizational structure includes the following staff changes:

- Upgrade the Coordinator of Instructional Technology to Director of Instructional Technology and have that position report to the Executive Director of Research, Data, and Accountability (see Section 2 for more details)
- Transfer the Director of Visual and Performing Arts to report to the Executive Director of Academics/Instruction/Literacy TK-5 (see Section 2 for more details)
- Eliminate the Director of PK-2 Literacy position and combine that department under the leadership of the Executive Director Academics/Instruction/Literacy TK-5 (see Sections 2 and 7 for more details)
- Eliminate one Elementary Network Superintendent position and redistribute the schools and responsibilities to the other two Elementary Network Superintendents. This recommendation is coupled with reducing the number of elementary schools in the District. (see Section 3 for more details.)
- Create a Director of Secondary ELLMA position focused on Grades 6-12 and keep the position of the existing Director of Newcomers, retitling that position to ELLMA Elementary Director (see Section 6 for additional details)
- Eliminate the Executive Director of ECE position and transfer those responsibilities to the newly created Senior Director of Early Learning (PK-2) responsibilities (see Section 7 for more details)
The four Network Superintendents should be responsible for ensuring that all TK-12 staff, the Department of Equity, the Community Schools, Linked Learning, MTSS, ELL, Early Childhood, Special Education, and principals orient their work in meaningful ways toward supporting the development of school’s capacity for high quality teaching and expanding students’ opportunity to learn. They should work together with the leadership of the CAO to build the capacity of all staff throughout CSI in the unrelenting focus on central office administrators’ engagement in providing coordinated and consistent services to meet the needs of the school-level staff.

With the proposed reorganization, the responsibility for the development and coordination of data-driven professional development (PD) should now be the responsibility of the four Network Superintendents and their staff. Interviews and a review of documents shows that OUSD’s PD is a set of course offerings. These are unlikely to help build overall instructional capacity given their lack of coherence or alignment to the district’s instructional priorities, the LCAP plan, and the strategic plan. CSI’s various departments along with the Network Superintendents and other departments offering teaching and learning PD offer a variety of professional learning as a "menu of options” for teachers or leaders. In practice, this menu-driven approach fails to enhance coherence or district capacity to make progress on its academic goals. While teachers may earn the course credits they need for step increases, the district has missed its opportunity to instill the
kinds of instructional practices and quality necessary to drive system wide improvement and realize its larger instructional vision. There also exists a lack of PD related to leadership development in OUSD.

Peer district, Sacramento City USD has a similar position to the Network Superintendents. These positions are called Instructional Superintendents.

**Exhibit 1-10** shows a snapshot of the job description for the Instructional Superintendents which is in alignment with the duties we see the OUSD Network Superintendents performing in the CSI Redesign Organization. The full job description can be found in Appendix E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE:</strong> Instructional Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSIFICATION:</strong> Non-Represented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, Certificated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERIES:</strong> Assistant Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLSA:</strong> Exempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JOB CLASS CODE:</strong> 9733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORK YEAR:</strong> 12 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT:</strong> Accountability Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALARY:</strong> Range 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Schedule A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPORTS TO:</strong> Chief Academic Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HR APPROVAL:</strong> 06-11-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CABINET REVISION:</strong> 07-10-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BASIC FUNCTION:**

Plan, organize, support, and provide administrative leadership to the instructional and operational functions of K-12 schools within an assigned area of the school district. Provide instructional and curricular leadership that creates, implements, maintains, and enhances excellence, scholarship, creativity, and achievement for all students.

**REPRESENTATIVE DUTIES:** (Incumbents may perform any combination of the essential functions shown below [E]. This position description is not intended to be an exhaustive list of all duties, knowledge, or abilities associated with this classification, but is intended to accurately reflect the principle job elements.)

Provide leadership, direction, support, and accountability to principals to ensure that instructional and curriculum programs approved by the Board of Education are fully and appropriately implemented in all assigned schools. E

Responsible for the implementation of curriculum aligned with state frameworks, student and teacher performance objectives, curriculum standards, and proficiencies in all subjects; provide leadership in developing plans for instructional research; pilot studies for curriculum, instruction, and technology. E

Supervise, train, and evaluate the performance of principals for all assigned district schools based on campus performance, academic growth, identified school targets, operations management, and family and community engagement. E

Provide professional and leadership development to principals and leadership teams. E

Provide coaching, counseling, and assistance to site administrators with management issues at assigned schools, including those related to the operational functions of building maintenance, finance, human resources, transportation, food services, etc. E
Interviews with OUSD staff indicate that many central office departments compete for various days or various training sessions with school leaders and teachers rather than work collaboratively as one team with a common vision. The Executive Director of Academics and Instruction has assumed the role of trying to collaborate PD across OUSD’s central office instructional departments. A calendar of PD is also shared on Teacher Central, but the system lacks a coherent and data-driven approach to providing PD.

This siloed approach to PD reflects an overall lack of coordination between general education, special education, ELLMA, Office of Equity, Community Schools and other CSI departments which calls into question the ability of OUSD to effectively support its instructional vision. District leaders articulate a message of educational equity and shared accountability for all students, but without the training, skills, and resources teachers must have to address the needs of diverse learners, this is not a realistic or well-supported vision.

The advantages of redesigning the CSI and reducing the number of direct reports to the CAO includes:

- Frees the CAO to more fully concentrate on academics and instruction.
- Enables stronger collaboration among all CSI departments under the direction of the Network Superintendents.
- Increases consistency in messaging to all principals and schools.
- Reduces silos.
- Strengthens the alignment of professional development and curriculum by assigning professional development oversight and coordination to the Network Superintendents.

The proposed CSI redesigned organizational structure involves dual reporting which means an employee has a solid line supervisor, but also reports to a secondary supervisor. Several OUSD staff have experienced dual reporting in the current structure. One of the most important pros of dual reporting is when a full-time role opens up on a team, the manager already has a clear sense of the staff member’s work ethic and skills.

Dual reporting can have many other benefits in an organization such as:

- **Efficient use of resources.** When budgets are tight and headcounts shrinking, dual reporting can be an efficient way to do more with less. With employees split across teams to get things done, dual reporting can increase efficiency.
- **Increases delegation and collaboration.** If teams are cross-functionally collaborating, it might make sense to pool resources in a dual reporting relationship. This structure may help to break down silos that exist in CSI.
- **Offers opportunities to learn new skills.** Dual reporting structures give employees a chance to learn new things in more than one work environment.

Research shows this type of reporting structure is more successful if the following practices are implemented:

- **Don’t put the employee in a game of tug of war.** Putting staff in the middle makes for a less productive employee experience. Disagreements or misalignments on priorities should be dealt with supervisor to supervisor in a dual reporting relationship, not supervisor to employee.
- **Communicate often with the other supervisor.** Your employee is responsible for workstreams from two different supervisors. If you don’t know what sort of work the other manager is giving,
that is problematic. Communicate clearly and often with the supervisor and set up regular meetings to discuss priorities and workload. Align on priorities, time spent, and expectations from the beginning.

- **Align on performance evaluations.** Both supervisors should provide input into dual reporting employees’ performance evaluations.

Steps to assist the district in implementing this recommendation include:

1. Determine the additional training that the Network Superintendents will need, implement the training and determine if the current individuals in those roles can adjust to the expanded responsibilities.
2. Determine how to realign the elementary schools from three networks to two. Finding and Recommendation 3-2 provide the rationale for making this change.
3. Develop position descriptions for the Community Schools, Equity, MTSS and ELL staff and Early Childhood Development staff in the elementary network. Assigned to the Network Superintendents.
4. Revise the position description for the Special Education directors who currently serve in Networks to adjust for dual supervision and to account for changes in Recommendation 4-1 in assuming additional supervisory responsibilities for speech and psychologists in each network.
5. Revise and update the position descriptions for the Network Superintendents to accommodate the changes in the role. *(See Appendix E for an example.)*
6. Revise the budgets and position control changes for all the impacted departments.
7. Develop a decision grid to clarify what decisions align with which positions, which decisions require collaboration and which come from a recommendation to the supervisor.
8. Develop a communication strategy so that all communications from the central office to the schools are coordinated.

**FINDING**

CSI Department staff use multiple frameworks to drive instruction; however, not all of them are aligned.

When interviewees were asked the question about what instructional frameworks are being used in OUSD, the typical response was, “there are so many frameworks in action in OUSD, I wouldn’t be able to provide all of them to you.” One Academics & Instruction staff member led a cross department team focused on Tier 1 high school instruction and asked the group at the beginning of the year to share the frameworks they were using to guide high quality instruction: the response included about nine different frameworks.
Exhibit 1-11 shows a sampling of the types of instructional frameworks being used in OUSD just in the high school network alone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Instruction Frameworks</th>
<th>Instructional Practice Guides: ELA, Math, Science</th>
<th>Behaviors of Learning &amp; Teaching</th>
<th>Studio Habits of Mind</th>
<th>SEL Standards</th>
<th>Culturally Responsive Teaching</th>
<th>ELLMA Essential Practices and Focal Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Level Frameworks</td>
<td>Instructional Focus Plan</td>
<td>Instruction Focus 2.0</td>
<td>Gold Standards LL</td>
<td>Graduate Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This is not a new issue to OUSD. The 2020-21 Systemic Instructional Review (SIR) conducted by the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence stated in their findings that in addition to the Instructional Focus Plan, there are many other plans that support the implementation of LCAP and the Instructional Focus Plan. For example, the ELLMA Roadmap Plan, the Annual Plan, and the Literacy Plan. The report stated that “the challenge the district faces is integrating these plans into a cohesive and coherent message with a shared focus that creates connections for district departments, networks, and schools for their implementation.”

The SIR report also stated that “there is a misalignment, acknowledged by multiple partners, between district plans and the ways in which they are implemented at school sites.” The Public Works LLC Team found this statement continues to hold true.

Additionally, multiple interviews indicate that there continues to exist a lack of clear guidelines (or non-negotiables) for site level autonomy which has been a “historical issue” in OUSD. Unfortunately, the lack of non-negotiables for school-level staff adds to the issue of a consistent and systemwide implementation of the instructional vision as outlined in the district’s LCAP plan. The district lacks systematic implementation of foundational agreements of what is expected of ALL schools (instructional frameworks, instructional programs, MTSS, literacy instruction, etc.)

Central office and the Network Superintendents should provide clarity on the non-negotiables and the support needed to achieve those non-negotiables. In addition, an accountability system must be established for holding principals accountable for attaining the non-negotiables required of each school.

According to interviews with select Board members, Board Policy 6005 on Redefining Autonomy is up for revision. The policy is called Quality School Development Policy and has not been revised since February 7, 2015. Part of this policy is to ensure and “create a defined autonomy framework whereby schools receive differentiated levels of autonomy and support based on the achievement of goals set forth by the school community and administration.”
**Recommendation 1-3**

Charge the CAO with forming a task force to collect all of the various frameworks being used by central office and school-level staff, synthesize existing ones, and adopt fewer frameworks to ensure alignment to the district’s strategic plan and LCAP plan.

**Recommendation 1-4**

Update Board Policy 6005 to ensure a clear definition of site-based autonomy and delineate non-negotiables that all schools should be required to implement to ensure a strong and consistent implementation of the district’s instructional vision and plans.

**FINDING**

The majority of the CSI staff are temporarily working from home although space is available in various OUSD schools where they could be more actively involved in the day-to-day teaching and learning in schools.

The lease of the central office building located at 1000 Broadway in Oakland housing the majority of the CSI staff will be up in May 2023. The last group of staff working in the building will be out by June 1. The plan is to move the central office staff to COLE Administrative/Education Center (formerly Cole Middle School) which is being remodeled and could take up to over a year to be opened as the new central office. The anticipated opening date is Spring 2024. The new central office would involve construction of a new two-story, 56,176 square-foot Cole Administrative/Education Center building. The first floor of the new building would hold new OUSD school functions accommodating the OUSD Adult and Career Education programs. The 27,350 square-foot second floor of the building would accommodate OUSD administrative functions, including a large meeting room, individual and shared office spaces, and collaboration rooms.

**Recommendation 1-5**

Assign all CSI staff space in schools beginning July 1, 2023 until the new central office building is opened and require staff to contribute two hours a week in assisting the school leadership with various teaching and learning initiatives.

The implementation of this recommendation would provide central office staff with more exposure to day-to-day activities in schools and also allow for a small amount of their time and expertise to be tapped by school administrators. OUSD should consider continuing the implementation of this recommendation even after the new central office building is opened.

**FINDING**

OUSD’s Office of Business and Operations and Talent Departments did not provide accurate staffing data requested by the Public Works LLC team and not only did the issue create a lot more work in deciphering accurate staffing charts and position/FTE data, our team learned that some staff in OUSD have been struggling with the same issue for years.
Untangling and getting the current organizational structure was most challenging for our team because of the data submitted to our requests. The organizational charts were woefully out-of-date and when we requested total number of positions in CSI, we were given a document that showed a total of 712.34 FTE which was an inaccurate number. This number was inflated because some school-based staff were coded as staff within the CSI Division. According to interviews, this has been an issue for years and the finance department has not rectified the mis-information in various documents. The inaccuracy of accounting for FTE’s is problematic and negatively affects accurate staffing processes. Another example is that within the CAO’s office, there are only three positions; however, tutors, plus culture keeper positions and ambassador positions are reported as CSI central office staff when in reality they are school-based staff.

The Public Works LLC team waded through issues of position control, inaccurate organizational charts, and misleading data supplied to us. Interviews with CSI staff shared they spend an inordinate amount of time trying to untangle the “gordian knot” of data; when, the Finance staff should be the responsible department for its accuracy. With the help of OUSD’s CAO, our team believes we ultimately have accurate data, but it is important for the reader to note that it took a great deal of time just to locate accurate data. Data analysis takes valuable time in projects such as these and starting with accurate data allows our team to focus on analysis and ensure we are asking the right questions in interviews. That was not the case in this redesign study. Over half of our time was spent just trying to track down accurate data, some of which we never did receive. For example, on January 25, 2023 we submitted a data request list to OUSD leadership.

One of the requests was critical to our analysis of CSI staffing.

**Exhibit 1-12** shows the request.

**EXHIBIT 1-12**
**EXCERPT FROM PUBLIC WORKS LLC’S DATA REQUEST LIST**
**ITEM G-12**

In an Excel or CSV format, a list of all current employees with the following fields of information:

- Emp ID
- Job Class Code
- First Name
- Last Name
- Location Code
- Location Description
- Position #
- Position Description
- Bargaining Unit Code
- Bargaining Unit Description
- Original Hire Date
- Current Position Start Date
- Supervisor Name
- Days Worked Per Year

*Source: Public Works LLC’s Data Request list, January 25, 2023.*
Instead of the data requested in **Exhibit 1-12**, we first received an Excel spreadsheet, with 964 entries that had the following headers. The data were not what we requested, nor was it in a usable format with what data it actually provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Funding Site Code Name</th>
<th>Position Location Code Name</th>
<th>Emp Id</th>
<th>Pos Id</th>
<th>Job Class Descr</th>
<th>Name First</th>
<th>Name Last</th>
<th>Email Work</th>
<th>Vacancy</th>
<th>Authorized FTE</th>
<th>Sum of Used FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Our team unsuccessfully tried to establish an interview with leadership from the Talent office to clarify some of the data points or retrieve more accurate data; however, we were unsuccessful in establishing those interviews.

Further, various departments within OUSD gave our team department created data that had not been vetted by the OUSD Research, Data, and Assessment Department and our team spent a fair amount of time working with inaccurate data and consequently lost analysis time in writing the report.

**Recommendation 1-6**

Hold OUSD Departments accountable for collecting, codifying, and updating important OUSD staffing data and organizational charts.

**Recommendation 1-7**

Require that any data shared externally by OUSD staff be vetted appropriately by the Research, Data, and Assessment Department to ensure its accuracy.
SECTION 2

Academics and Instruction Department

Overview of Department

The Department of Academics and Instruction has gone through many name changes and to date, many documents, organization charts, and the OUSD website reflects the various names which causes confusion among various partners. For years, the department was called Teaching and Learning; five years ago, it was renamed to Academics and Instructional Innovation. Due to apparent confusion about what “innovation” meant, it was requested that the department name be changed to Academics and Instruction in 2022-23. For the purpose of this report, our team will use the Department of Academics and Instruction. However, in the survey the term Academics Innovation is used as it was the name used in the request for proposal.

The key function of this department is to oversee the development, implementation, and evaluation of the district’s curriculum, instructional materials, and teaching practices. This department is responsible for ensuring that curriculum meets state and national standards, is appropriate for the students, and is aligned with the district’s LCAP goals and priorities as well as the district’s strategic plan. This department’s staff also works with school-site level staff to provide professional development and support to improve instructional practices, and to assess student learning and progress.

According to OUSD’s website, the mission of this department is to improve the quality of learning for all students by:

• Facilitating the growth and development of teachers in content area and pedagogy;
• Building the instructional leadership capacity of principals;
• Developing meaningful partnerships with school sites and communities, central departments, and external partners;
• Designing innovative curricula aligned to the Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards;
• Building school leadership capacity; and
• Empowering schools to disrupt inequitable instructional practices.

The Department of Academics and Instruction is led by an Executive Director who has been in the position for five years. According to the Executive Director, the total number of staff in the department is 31.5 FTE positions in literacy, math, science, history/social studies, Visual and Performing Arts, PE, Social Emotional Learning, and Instructional Technology. There are 2.5 vacant positions (.5 N3 Literacy Specialist/Teacher on Special Assignment, the HS Math Coordinator, and the Library Specialist).

This does not include the 24 teachers who report to the Visual and Performing Arts Director or the literacy tutors who may appear on the organizational chart; however, these positions are school-based and are not included in the central office FTEs although central office staff are responsible for their oversight and training.
The bullets below show a history of reductions and additions in the Department of Academics and Instruction:

- **Previous reductions 2+ Years ago:** Administrative assistant, SEL Cdr., SEL program manager, Instructional Tech Cdr., Director of STEM, Director of Literacy, Social Studies TSA, Libraries Program Manager
- **Additions in 2021-22:** Administrative assistant .5 FTE; 3 Early Literacy TSAs; 1 Early Literacy Director (prev. Cdr.); 2 Inst. Tech Specialists; 1.0 Social Studies TSA; 1 additional Director of Instruction (2 total FTE for elem + secondary); PE TSA (moved from CCSS dept)
- **Additions in 2022-23:** Administrative assistant .5 FTE (1.0 total); K-12 History/SS Coordinator; HS ELA Coordinator; HS Science Coordinator; HS Math Coordinator (vacant); Libraries TSA (vacant)
- **Many of the positions that were reduced prior to pandemic were reinstated in some capacity after the pandemic; Adult Education moved to HSLLO in 2021-22; ELA and STEM Directors were reinstated as elementary and secondary directors as strategy shifted to align content across levels.**

**Exhibit 2-1** shows the Department of Academics and Instruction’s current organizational chart.

As shown, the Executive Director has five direct reports and 1.0 Administrative Assistant. The direct reports include the Director of PK-2 Literacy, the Director of Elementary Instruction, the Director of Secondary Instruction, the Director of Visual and Performing Arts, and a Coordinator of Instructional Technology.
**Exhibit 2-1**
OUSD ACADEMICS & INSTRUCTION DEPARTMENT
2022-23

Source: OUSD Department of Academics and Instruction, 2023.

**Exhibit 2-2** shows the key questions that drive the Department of Academics and Instruction’s daily work.

The six wheels shown is what drives their work: Providing quality standards-based curriculum, standards-based assessment and grading, foundational professional development, curriculum-based professional learning, on-site coaching, and tiered support structures (MTSS).
EXHIBIT 2-2
DRIVING SYSTEMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ACADEMICS AND INSTRUCTION WORK

Coherent Instructional System 2.0

The six gears of our coherent instructional system are the organizational practices that we employ to ensure conditions for improved teaching and learning at schools.

**Quality Standards-Based Curriculum:** Daily tasks predict student performance and high-quality instructional materials provide teachers the base for rigorous and relevant standards-based instruction.

**Standard-based Assessment:** Common assessments guide standards-based grading, feedback and tiered support for students.

**Curriculum-based Professional Learning:** Educators participate in ongoing professional learning and collaboration grounded in core curriculum and assessment.

**On-site Coaching:** Teachers and other educators receive regular 1:1 coaching to reflect on impact and improve practice.

**Tiered Support Structures:** Time, people and processes are utilized to provide targeted instruction to students who need more support to reach grade-level standards.

Source: OUSD Department of Academics and Instruction, 2023.

**Exhibit 2-3** shows the department’s goals and measure of success.
### EXHIBIT 2-3

**INSTRUCTIONAL FOCUS PLAN 2.0**

**ACADEMICS AND INSTRUCTION DEPARTMENT’S GOALS AND MEASURES OF SUCCESS**

**2021-24**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCAP Goals</th>
<th>Measures and Annual Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1-All students graduate college- career- and community-ready.             | Early Literacy: i-Ready + Additional Measures (PK-3)  
  - At least 80% of PK students building phonological awareness and letter/word knowledge (middle to later)  
  - At least 80% of TK and Kindergarten students master letter names & phonological awareness skills  
  - Increase the percentage of students reading at grade level or above in grades 1-3 by 10 percentage points (pp)  
  English Language Arts: SBAC (Grades 3-8, 11)  
  - Increase the percentage of students meeting standard by 10pp (and decrease students "below standard" by 10pp)  
  Math: SBAC (Grades 3-8, 11)  
  - Increase the percentage of students meeting standard by 10pp (and decrease students "below standard" by 10pp)  
  Science: CAST (Grades 5, 8, 11)  
  - Increase the percentage of students meeting standard by 10pp (and decrease students "below standard" by 10pp)  
  Graduation  
  - Increase the number of 9th grade students on track to graduate by 10pp  
  - Increase the number of 9th grade students earning a C or better in A-G courses by 5pp  
  - Increase the percentage of graduates A-G eligible by 5pp  |
| 2-Focal student groups demonstrate accelerated growth to close equity gaps. | English Language Learner Reclassification:  
  - Overall reclassification: increase by 3 percentage points  
  - LTEL reclassification: increase by 3 percentage points  
  - ELPI: Increase rate of annual growth on the ELPI  
  Targeted Groups make accelerated growth:  
  - Early Literacy, ELA, Math, Science  
  - Graduation, On Track to Graduate  
  - Connectedness, Chronic Absenteeism, Suspension  
  Students with Special Education Services:  
  - Increase the number of students with disabilities graduating college and career ready by six percentage points  
  - Increase reading proficiency of students with disabilities  |
| 3-Students and families are welcomed, safe, healthy, and engaged.          | Increase Student Connectedness by 5 pp (CHKS)  
  - Decrease Chronic Absenteeism for by 2pp  
  - Decrease Suspension by 2pp  |

Source: OUSD Department of Academics and Instruction, 2023.

**Exhibit 2-4** provides the department’s theory of action as a guide to what drives their daily activities.
FINDING

The current organizational structure of the Academics and Instruction Department is not laser-focused on ensuring adequate support and services for all PK-12 schools and the structure does not promote true collaboration with the Network Superintendent Teams and school-level implementation of instructional initiatives. There is a lack of clarity on whether the Network Superintendents or the Academics and Instruction Department sets clear direction for instruction.

Interviews with staff within the Department of Academics and Instruction as well as other departments in CSI indicate that there are pockets of excellence in the services provided by this department; however, there is a lack of coordination between and among the other departments in CSI which contributes to overlap and limits the ability of the Academics and Instruction staff and other department staff to collaborate and provide coherent and aligned services to schools. The Public Works LLC survey conducted of OUSD staff confirmed this theme of fragmentation and lack of collaboration.
The Academics and Instruction Department has made concerted efforts to collaborate with other departments. For example, the department hosts:

- Weekly elementary and secondary alignment meetings with instructional staff from the Academics and Instruction Department and other departments. Members of RAD, Equity, Linked Learning, ELLMA, Early Learning and other departments regularly participate in hosted meetings.
- Participation in or co-facilitation of (e.g., MSN ILT) weekly/biweekly instructional leadership meetings facilitated by network leadership or co-facilitated with academic directors at elementary and middle school level.
- Biweekly High School Alignment meetings with staff from the Academics and Instruction Department, ELLMA, RAD, Equity, and Special Education facilitated by the Secondary Director of Instruction.
- Weekly or biweekly meetings between academic directors and network superintendents at all levels.
- Collaboration meetings between ELLMA and ELA departments to develop and implement ELD lessons derived from the ELA content.

While these collaborative efforts are to be commended, there is a lack of tangible outcomes as a result of the joint meetings.

**Exhibit 2-8** shows that over 23 percent of the respondents’ level of satisfaction with interacting with the Academic Innovation/Teaching and Learning Department (now called Academics and Instruction) is either low or very low.

**EXHIBIT 2-8**
**OUSD DISTRICTWIDE SURVEY RESULTS**

Q12 What’s your level of satisfaction interacting with the following CSI departments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERY HIGH</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>VERY LOW</th>
<th>NO OPINION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Innovation/Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>7.28%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>21.20%</td>
<td>10.44%</td>
<td>12.97%</td>
<td>34.18%</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered: 317  Skipped: 13


**Exhibit 2-9** asked the same question, “What is the level of satisfaction with Academic Innovation/Teaching and Learning”) to staff working within CSI division.

Over 50 percent of the central office CSI staff who responded to the survey as either very high or highly satisfied with the level of satisfaction of the CSI department. There is a significant disparity between the level of satisfaction districtwide versus the level of satisfaction of those working within CSI.
EXHIBIT 2-9
CSI DEPARTMENT SURVEY RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERY HIGH</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>VERY LOW</th>
<th>NO OPINION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Innovation/Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
<td>37.35%</td>
<td>14.46%</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
<td>25.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Exhibit 2-10 shows that over 35 percent of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree that staff/partners have input on curriculum and instructional initiatives. Research shows how important it is to provide adequate input from teachers and school-based staff when making curriculum decisions that affect their daily operations.

EXHIBIT 2-10
OUSD DISTRICTWIDE SURVEY RESULTS

Q8 How much do the following statements reflect your view of the CSI Division?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department staff communicate with Central Office staff.</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58.26%</td>
<td>12.46%</td>
<td>5.23%</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff communicate with principals in schools.</td>
<td>7.48%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49.53%</td>
<td>9.97%</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff communicate with teachers in schools.</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.30%</td>
<td>18.94%</td>
<td>14.60%</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff communicate with parents and community members.</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.88%</td>
<td>14.37%</td>
<td>10.94%</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI departments provide consistent information to schools.</td>
<td>3.76%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.39%</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI departments provide data needed for staff &amp; leadership to make decisions.</td>
<td>7.52%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42.32%</td>
<td>18.81%</td>
<td>3.46%</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input on curriculum &amp; instructional initiatives is sought from stakeholders.</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.06%</td>
<td>21.77%</td>
<td>14.20%</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several open-ended survey comments also validate the need for restructuring the department including:

- I don’t see a clear vision or theory of action for improving academic outcomes for our students. Academic supports for teachers and schools have been eroded in recent years, and schools are left on their own to fulfill functions that the district Academics team should provide. The result is that academic programs across our district vary HUGELY by site—which is not equitable for our students.

- Accountability looks different among the different departments or within members which created inequities and misalignment. ELLMA office holds academics and yet they are not part of the Academic department which leads to constant misalignments, unnecessary meetings with unresolved issues, miscommunication with sites, leaders, teachers, etc. ELLMA office should NOT hold ANY academics and the support of Dual Language sites Benchmark should be delegated to Academics department to foster alignment and equity of support. A new Dual Language networks should be created.

- The people at the highest levels don’t seem to have a clear plan about how to serve students best. Academics and Linked Learning need to talk. The people below (coaches, etc.) are doing the best they can with this lack of direction. There aren’t enough of them and what they should be doing isn’t clear. The middle school team seems to have done a much better job of figuring things out.

- In general, those of us on school sites feel very little support from central. For example, why isn’t RAD reaching out to us and asking what kind of data we need in order to better serve our students? Why doesn’t teaching and learning do walk throughs, support our school in particular with curriculum development? Again, there is no proactive work to improve, just emails about useless deliverables.

- Some central office functions are critical yet provide just ok services (i.e., tech & financial services is too short staffed to provide great service) Other central offices are over staffed and provide just ok services i.e., curriculum, instruction, & data). CIA demands a lot from schools but gives back very little.

- I believe the central office is staffed at the expense of classrooms. I also feel the central office staff seem to forget what it is like to be in the classroom based on the decisions they make—especially in regards to testing and how much curriculum needs to be covered in a day.

- Reading levels are still low. There are so many different platforms and interim assessment options, it doesn’t appear that anyone has a sense of how effective the programs, curriculum are.

- I have not seen any of these supports offered. Our teachers need more than just walkthroughs to help them unpack and truly utilize new curriculum—especially EL, there is so much there and teachers do not have time to dig through all the guides to make best use of it.

All public schools, (non-charter and charter), are required to participate in the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP). The CAASPP system uses the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics in grades three through eight and grade eleven. The California Department of Education reports the percentage of students who meet or exceed the state standards. Our team conducted a peer district analysis for this study. The agreed upon peer districts are Sacramento Unified School District (SCUSD), Fontana Unified School District (FUSD), and San Jose Unified School District (SJUSD). The full peer comparisons are located in Appendix D.
An excerpt from the peer comparison shows that:

**English Language Arts**
- Overall, OUSD students performed about as well as two of the three comparison districts and significantly below SJUSD.
- OUSD and SCUSD African American students performed not nearly as well as those from Fontana and San Jose.
- Fewer than a quarter of OUSD Latino students met or exceeded standards, significantly underperforming the comparison districts.
- OUSD White students outperformed the comparison districts.

**Mathematics**
- Overall, OUSD students performed about as well as two of the three comparison districts and significantly below SJUSD.
- Just over a quarter of OUSD students met or exceeded standards in mathematics, ranking third of the four districts in the study.
- Only one in ten OUSD African American students met math standards, outperforming only SCUSD.
- None of the districts reached a one in five mark for Latino students.
- OUSD White students outperformed the comparison districts.

**English Learners**
- English Language Learners performed similarly in each of the districts with success in meeting or exceeding the standards ranging in ELA from 8.3% to 10.4%. In mathematics, the rates ranged from 5.3% to 8.0%.

**Graduation**
- OUSD had the lowest overall graduation rate among the comparison districts with only three-fourths of OUSD students graduating in four years of high school.
- OUSD Latino student graduation rate was far below the comparison districts with 63% graduating compared to 85% in SCUSD, 92% in FUSD and 96% in SJUSD.

**College-Going Rate**
- OUSD had the lowest college going rate of the four comparison districts with just under half of the students enrolling in post-secondary education.
- OUSD lagged significantly behind the other districts in the proportion of Latino students going to college.

**Attendance and Suspensions**
- OUSD had the highest proportion of chronically absent students among the comparison districts with nearly 48% missing more than 10% of the school year.
- OUSD African American, Asian and Hispanic/Latino students had the highest percentage of chronically absent students in the comparison group.
- OUSD White students had the second lowest percentage of chronically absent students at just under 22% compared to SJUSD White students at 17%.
• SCUSD had the highest suspension rate compared to the size of the population for African American students with 1,184 suspensions out of total African American population of 5,550 students whereas OUSD had 1,213 suspensions of African American students out of a population of 7,992 students.

OUSD has experienced successful progress in various instructional initiatives. According to Dr. Kyla Johnson-Trammell, Superintendent Report dated January 25, 2023, the following progress has been made in the area of curriculum since November 2022:

• Consistent implementation of EL Education/Benchmark, and Foundational Skills, now building out Designated ELD blocks
• Over 200 teachers and leaders joining D-ELD training on January 3
• ELLMA launched a platform for Designated ELD Lessons
• Site-based literacy coaches have received 3 professional developments on observation/feedback practices as well as Designated ELD content
• 30 kindergarten teachers joined SIPPS Beginning Professional Development on 11/30

Additionally, other accomplishments of the Academics and Instruction Department include:

• Almost complete alignment in use of core curriculum (only 3% of classes observed on Winter learning walks lacked evidence of usage); Similar levels of curricular alignment have been observed and reported in elementary math and MS ELA, Math and science as well.
• Improvement in focal practices like students and teachers citing textual evidence from year 1 to 2.
• Improved implementation of foundational skills block and SIPPS curriculum (e.g., second grade increase in percentage of students complete 10 lessons/month has increased from 12% baseline to a high of 75% in January this year)

The Department of Academics and Instruction plays a tremendous role in improving student achievement and should be restructured to produce improved student outcomes. A review of data and interviews with staff indicate that much work is still needed in the areas of academics and instruction in OUSD. The current Department of Academics and Instruction must be restructured and streamlined to provide more consistent and aligned services to school-based staff.

The rationale for the reorganization of this department includes the following:

There are three Literacy Coordinators that report to the Director of Elementary and three Early Literacy Specialists (Teacher on Special Assignment) that report to the Director of PK-2 Literacy. All six positions have similar job responsibilities and according to interviews and a review of documents, the workload does not warrant having the three Early Literacy Specialists.

Further, in the Office of Equity there are four Targeted Student Intervention Specialists who also work specifically on early literacy initiatives. There are also staff from Expanded Learning who are charged with working on Early Literacy.
Additionally, there are also site-based Teachers on Special Assignment (TSA) at every elementary school and some of the schools have more than one TSA focused on literacy. According to interviews, 49 schools currently have a TSA staff designated as a literacy coach. It was reported that less than half of the literacy coaches have attended central office professional development series which would assist in ensuring all of the literacy coaches at all of OUSD’s elementary schools are using the same framework and best practices for improving literacy outcomes. The literacy TSAs should be held accountable for attending the appropriate training to ensure the consistency of delivering literacy services to staff and students.

OUSD has numerous departments and initiatives that are focused on early literacy; however, the initiatives are working in silos and in some cases, duplicating staff efforts.

In addition to the literacy work and initiatives being conducted in the Academics and Instruction Department, the Office of Equity has a partnership with the Early Childhood Education Department and together they have formed a program called Early Literacy Kings that provides African-American and Latino students with tutors at nine schools. Interviews also indicate that all after-school programs are required to have a literacy component and the Director of After-School Learning organizes these literacy initiatives. According to data our team received, on March 2023, the Elementary Instruction Department had the first meeting with the Expanded Learning leaders to coordinate foundational skills training for the Expanded Learning Staff. While this effort is admirable, the Elementary Instruction Department has been teaching literacy for a long time and this collaboration is long overdue.

Interviews found that there is more collaboration with the summer school program and Academics and Instruction; however, this does not hold true for collaboration with the Expanded Learning Programs.

OUSD also has the Literacy Liberators (LL) Program which is similar to the Literacy Kings Literacy Initiative.

The bottom line is that OUSD has numerous high functioning literacy initiatives that began as partnerships funded by grants, but they are not all coordinated, using the same frameworks, and may have overlapping goals. These various literacy staff and initiatives are working in silos and should be all working in tandem using the district created research-based Language and Literacy Framework. There are sufficient staff working on early literacy initiatives, but they are not all collaborating and working with the same literacy framework.

A position in the Academics and Instruction Department should be responsible for setting clear directions so that all literacy initiatives are synergistic. As discussed in Section 1, the restructuring of the Network Superintendents should have a positive impact on the functioning of the Department of Academics and Instruction by having a better alignment of services to all schools.

Reporting to the Director of Secondary Instruction is the Social-Emotional Learning (SEL) Coordinator. This position is responsible for providing leadership and management to support the development of infrastructure that creates the conditions, culture and competencies to guide Social Emotional Learning district-wide which is a large component of MTSS. Many of the initiatives this staff member focuses on is to increase student connectedness to school, understanding and use of SEL skills to be a successful member of a learning community. Many of this position’s goals involve MTSS-related initiatives and in fact, the job description calls for MTSS experience. The SEL Coordinator is already involved with the MTSS initiatives. They have several collaborative meetings together around the MTSS framework. Several of their projects are aligned. For example, the HS MTSS partner and the SEL Coordinator work closely together on the McKinney Vento Youth/Unhoused Youth project. This position would be better aligned with MTSS staff and as an MTSS partner as opposed to reporting to the Director of Secondary Instruction.
The Director of Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA) reports to the Executive Director, but primarily works with the 55 OUSD elementary schools. Twenty-three (23) elementary school teachers report to the VAPA Director as well as one part-time teacher who works in West Oakland Middle School. A more appropriate organizational alignment would be for the VAPA Director to report to the elementary side of the department. With that said, the VAPA Director still must serve the middle and high school VAPA needs, but the workload does not warrant a second director for secondary schools.

The Coordinator of Instructional Technology who currently reports to the Executive Director serves PK-12 schools. Analysis of the job description, workload, and interviews, reveals this Coordinator is doing the work of a director-level position. The coordinator started as a team of one; when the pandemic hit, two specialists were hired to help get 36,000 students online and to have Zoom access. The specialists, however, are not skilled in educational technology, but rather in hardware and software issues. They now operate a help desk to troubleshoot hardware and software issues. These tasks should be assumed by the OUSD IT Department. What is lacking is a specialist skilled in analyzing, designing, developing, implementing, and evaluating the instructional environment, learning materials, learners, and the learning process in order to improve teaching and learning that can work with the coordinator. The coordinator also led the development of the Teacher and Parent Central websites as well as assisted in the development of the district’s new elementary report card. All of these initiatives rely heavily on the use of research, data, and assessment and therefore the coordinator position should be transferred to the Research, Data, and Assessment Department. By doing so, the coordinator’s team will have close access to research and data, yet still be under the umbrella of academics led by the CAO.

**Recommendation 2-1**

Reorganize and streamline the Department of Academics and Instruction in order to better facilitate the growth of teachers in content area and pedagogy, design innovative curricula, and develop more meaningful partnerships with school sites and other CSI units.

To reorganize, OUSD should:

- Transfer the current Executive Director of Academics and Instruction to lead the proposed Department of Academics and Instruction/Literacy 6-12 that focuses on Grades 6-12 teaching and learning.
- Eliminate the Director of Elementary Instruction position and create a position of Executive Director of Academics and Instruction/Early Childhood and Literacy PK-5 to oversee Grades PK-5th teaching and learning, and to coordinate all of OUSD’s Grades PK-5 literacy initiatives (including EC literacy initiatives, the Office of Equity literacy initiatives, and the literacy initiatives in the Expanded Learning Office).
- Eliminate 2.5 FTE Early Literacy Specialists (Teachers on Special Assignment).
- Eliminate the vacant positions of .5 N3 Literacy Specialist/Teacher on Special Assignment, the HS Math Coordinator, and the Library Specialist/Teacher on Special Assignment.
- Transfer the Early Learning Specialist TK position to the proposed Senior Director of Early Learning and Literacy.
- Transfer the Early Tutoring /Family Literacy position to the proposed Senior Director of Early Learning and Literacy.
- Once the grant funded position of the ELA/ELD Curriculum Coordinator ends, the position title should be changed to ELA Curriculum Coordinator and transfer the ELD duties to the proposed Director of ELL/Multilingual Achievement PK-5 position and OUSD should consider making this an ongoing district-funded position.
• Upgrade the Coordinator of Instructional Technology to a director-level position and transfer this unit to report to the Executive Director of Research, Data, and Assessment.

• Eliminate the two School Technology Specialists positions in the Office of Instructional Technology as they focus primarily on hardware troubleshooting that should be covered by the OUSD IT staff.

• Hire one Instructional Technology Specialist to solely focus on assisting teachers and school-based staff in the integration of technology into instruction.

• Transfer the Director of Visual and Performing Arts to the newly formed Department of Academic and Instruction/Early Childhood and Literacy PK-5.

• Transfer the current MTSS Director to the proposed Department of Academics/Instruction/Early Childhood and Literacy PK-5.

• Transfer the Coordinator of Social-Emotional Learning to report to the proposed Director of Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) in the Academics/Instruction/Early Childhood and Literacy PK-5 unit as an MTSS partner.

• Create a 6-12 Director of Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) to report to the proposed Executive Director of Academics/Instruction/Literacy 6-12.

• Transfer the High School MTSS Partner to report to the proposed Director of Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) 6-1)

• Eliminate the Network 4 MTSS Partner position.

• Eliminate the vacant positions of Network 2 MTSS Partner, Network 3 MTSS Partner, Middle School Network Partner vacant positions.

Exhibit 2-11 shows the proposed organizational structure for the Department of Academics and Instruction.
EXHIBIT 2-11
PROPOSED ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ACADEMICS AND INSTRUCTION

Source: Created by Public Works LLC Team 2023.
The proposed redesign of the organizational structure will assist in the following:

- Increases alignment and collaboration among all CSI departments;
- Reduces the direct reports to leadership of Academics and Instruction to provide more concentrated oversight to academics;
- Allows dual reporting for the positions of the Director of ELL/Multilingual and the Director of VAPA to both the elementary and secondary sides of the department;
- Provides for two MTSS partners to oversee and provide services to the two elementary networks;
- Provides for two MTSS partners to oversee and provide services to the secondary network;
- Ensures the Network Superintendents are an integral part of Academics and Instruction leadership and provides for more continuity of services for all OUSD schools; and
- Ensures that curriculum meets state and national standards, is appropriate for the students, and is aligned with the district’s LCAP goals and priorities as well as the district’s strategic plan.

**FINDING**

While placing a high priority on reinventing the district’s Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) in OUSD is commendable, the creation of a separate MTSS Team reporting to the CAO is not warranted.

An MTSS framework enables schools to provide timely, targeted, and evidence-based support when a student is struggling in one or more domains, academic or behavioral health. MTSS consists of three tiers. Tier I instruction should be differentiated through Universal Design for Learning and accommodated to meet the needs of learners at varying levels. These are not interventions, but rather quality universal teaching practices. Tiers II and III include interventions for behavior, social-emotional development, and academic achievement that are grounded in research and include ongoing progress monitoring.

A new MTSS team was formed in August 2022 and a Director of MTSS was hired to lead the team. Currently, the Director of MTSS has two direct reports: a high school MTSS Network Partner and a Network 4 MTSS Partner. The plan is to hire three additional partners (one for each of the five networks).

Prior to the new MTSS team being formed, MTSS’s history in OUSD includes:

**March 2022**

- Five (Network Based) MTSS Coach Positions (previously PBIS Coach Positions) Eliminated
- Five (Network Based) Attendance Liaison Positions - Eliminated
- Five Behavioral Program Managers, consolidated into three positions

**Late July 2022**

- MTSS Director Position Posted
- Five MTSS Network Partner Position Posted

**Hiring New MTSS Team**

- Director, MTSS hired in August 2022
- Network 4 MTSS Partner hired in September 2022
- HS MTSS Partner hired in October 2022
- Three Network Partner Positions still unfilled (as of January 2023)
Exhibit 2-12 shows the current MTSS Team organizational chart.

EXHIBIT 2-12
MTSS TEAM ORGANIZATIONAL CHART 2022-23

The creation of the MTSS Team was to ensure OUSD’s system was in alignment with the California State Department of Education’s MTSS system and to provide more central office support for MTSS. The California MTSS framework uses a whole system engagement to effectively link school, district, county, regional, state, and federal resources in efficient and innovative ways. By building local capacity aligned with the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) goals, the California MTSS framework builds on the strengths of those in the school community while mapping all resources to the effort. The state MTSS framework includes:

- Students and Family are the purpose of our work and why we do what we do.
- Schools have the most direct influence on students. They are the place of transformation.
- District/LEA is the point of intervention, school-wide transformation, and improved student outcomes aren’t possible without the support from the district.
- County, Region, and State is the primary source of technical support for LEAs and schools to sustain the framework.

Exhibit 2-13 shows the California DOE’s model for an effective MTSS system.
Interviews with staff show that some of the issues with the previous and current MTSS process in OUSD is that not all of the key players (i.e., some of the Network Superintendents, some of the CSI department leadership) have agreed to the new model and are not fully supporting the system.

By using grant funding, OUSD entered into a three year, one-million-dollar contract with an outside partner, Swift of the University of Kansas, to assist the district in conducting an MTSS needs assessment, designing an MTSS system based on the needs assessment, and providing professional development to support the implementation of MTSS. The new model is expected to launch its first cohort in 2023-24. One of the charges in this initiative is to ensure that OUSD's MTSS system and LCAP goals are in alignment.

**Exhibit 2-14** provides a schematic showing the importance of this alignment.
EXHIBIT 2-14  
MTSS AND LCAP ALIGNMENT MODEL

Commendation 2-A
OUSD is commended for placing a high priority on reinventing its MTSS process and for ensuring it is in alignment with the California DOE MTSS model and in alignment with OUSD’s Local Control and Accountability Plan.

FINDING
In order to operate from a shared understanding of high-quality literacy instruction, in 2021, CSI created a literacy framework for Grades TK-5. This framework is based on the belief that all students can and will achieve if they are provided rigorous and relevant literacy experiences every day. Below are the essential components of the framework.
Essential Components:

- **Foundational Literacy:** Systematic and sequential instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency
- **Content Units Anchored in Complex Text Sets:** Knowledge building and inquiry grounded in rich and culturally-relevant materials
- **English Language Development (ELD):** Integrated ELD to teach language and provide access to the core curriculum, plus designated ELD to target student language levels
- **Assessment and Differentiated Instruction:** Use of data and to tailor instruction to student needs.

Interviews indicate staff have been using the framework as a foundation for its literacy initiatives; however, as mentioned previously, not all literacy initiatives are using it to drive literacy instruction.

**Commendation 2-B**

OUSD is commended for creating a research-based TK-5 literacy framework.

**Recommendation 2-2**

Ensure all staff responsible for leading literacy initiatives and instruction use OUSD’s research-based TK-5 Literacy Framework.

**FINDING**

Staff interviews indicate the need for more direct support from the Director of Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA), particularly in the secondary schools, and interviews indicate the need for the VAPA Director to provide site-level staff with assistance in completing grant applications and paperwork.

The Director of VAPA primarily works with the 55 OUSD elementary schools. Twenty-three (23) elementary school teachers report to the Director as well as one part-time teacher who works in West Oakland Middle School. The Director’s job description states that the Director of Visual and Performing Arts should plan, organize, manage, support, and direct services and programs designed to foster sustained improvement in student understanding and achievement in the Visual and Performing Arts. The Director of Visual and Performing Arts will supervise elementary music program and team members who provide direction, coaching, and professional development focused on delivering high-quality arts experiences to K-12 students.

The majority of the director’s time is spent on elementary-level programs and professional development and interviews indicate that the middle and high schools must determine their own visual and performing arts programs and that there are no teachers assigned to assist secondary schools visual and performing arts teachers. There has been little professional development at the secondary level for VAPA staff.

The job description also states that the director should identify, submit and manage grants in support of the district visual and performing arts program. School-level staff interviewed indicated a need for the director’s assistance in identifying, submitting, and managing VAPA grants.

Survey comments included *I have almost no relationship with central office, I don’t know who these people are, what their role is, or how they relate to me (music teacher.)*
The OUSD website shows that the middle and high schools have a variety of performing arts programs.

An example of some of the middle school programs can be seen in **Exhibit 2-15**.

**EXHIBIT 2-15**

EDNA BREWER MIDDLE SCHOOL VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS OFFERINGS

Edna Brewer Middle School

- Orchestra (three cohorts by grade)
- Band (three cohorts by grade)
- Orff World Music (6th and 7th grade)
- Music Explorer (General Music with a Ukulele focus - 6th and 8th grade)
- Jazz Ensemble (by audition) and Jazz Lab
- Latin American Folk Music Ensemble
- Chinese orchestra (afterschool collaboration with Purple Silk Foundation)

*Source: OUSD Website, 2023.*

The VAPA Director produces a newsletter filled with information on the activities and successes of the OUSD's Visual and Performing Arts Community.

**Exhibit 2-16** shows a list of recent newsletter topics.
EXHIBIT 2-16
LISTS OF RECENT VAPA DEPARTMENT’S NEWSLETTERS

Email Campaign Archive
from OUSD Visual and Performing Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/23/2023</td>
<td>Feb: 28 Black Artists Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/26/2023</td>
<td>Jan: Music’s positive impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/09/2022</td>
<td>Celebrating OUSD artists throughout the district this month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/2022</td>
<td>Giving gratitude for all the creative work happening in OUSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/2022</td>
<td>Announcing the Arts Incentive Grant 2025 Funding Recipients!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/2022</td>
<td>One Week Left to Apply for AIG 2025!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/2022</td>
<td>Newly Added Arts Incentive Grant Workshop Thursday at 4:15pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/11/2022</td>
<td>Deadline Extended for the Arts Incentive Grant 2025!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/06/2022</td>
<td>Learn More about OUSD’s Arts Incentive Grant Next Tuesday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OUSD Website, 2023.

**Commendation 2-C**

The Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA) Department is commended for producing a regular newsletter to publicize the talent, programs, and successes of the district’s VAPA programs.

**Recommendation 2-3**

Ensure the workplan for the Director of Visual and Performing Arts includes providing more visual and performing arts support to secondary schools and to assist principals with tasks such as grant paperwork.

**FINDING**

OUSD does not have a districtwide and community/parent curriculum committee to assist in the development, review, renewal, and recommendations of curriculum to be approved by the Board.

While the OUSD Board recently established a Board Curriculum and Instruction Committee, best practices indicate the district should have a Curriculum Committee with a wide range of partners, including a Board member. The Board Curriculum and Instruction Committee would not be necessary if the district created and operated a districtwide curriculum committee.
Exhibit 2-17 shows survey responses from CSI staff regarding input on curriculum. The CSI staff member survey shows that over 67 percent of the survey respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that there is sufficient input on curriculum and instructional initiatives being sought from partners.

**EXHIBIT 2-17**

**CSI DIVISION STAFF INPUT ON CURRICULUM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.05%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.81%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.05%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Exhibit 2-18 shows school-based staff responses from regarding input on curriculum. When school-based staff were asked the same question, only just over 23 percent agreed or strongly agreed that there is adequate input on curriculum and instructional initiatives from partners.

**EXHIBIT 2-18**

**SCHOOL-BASED STAFF INPUT ON CURRICULUM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.93%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.06%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.77%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.20%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Survey comments include:

- Teacher retention is low, many procedures at our school are not in place, and curriculum changes every few years.
- I also feel the central office staff seem to forget what it is like to be in the classroom based on the decisions they make—especially in regards to testing and how much curriculum needs to be covered in a day.
- Reading levels are still low. There are so many different platforms and interim assessment options, it doesn’t appear that anyone has a sense of how effective the programs, curriculum are.
- I also feel like ECE has to fight for the developmental needs of children for curriculum, within OUSD. I wish our district would look at the data and brain research about how our students are doing when we don’t address their developmental needs.
- We need comprehensive curriculum for high school students in special day classes. We also need more highly trained staff and personal to help our students with IEPs.
- There are sometimes departments that relay contradictory messages as to strategy and priorities, which I believe confuses schools. For example, are we working toward stronger educational programs through the adoption and use of standards-aligned curriculum, or are we encouraging teachers to create their own, locally-focused units? Do all individuals in the CSI division agree?
Interviews showed that some community involvement has been exercised in the past such as over 20 community partner meetings, including open monthly meetings on first Fridays with civic leaders, CBOs, literacy support providers, etc., with regular updates on process and one full meeting to collect feedback. However, the involvement is not consistent. Interviews with both central office and school-level staff did indicate that teachers and principals are invited to provide input into curriculum and instructional decisions, but there was little indication that other partners such as community and business members, parents, board members and other qualified partners have any input.

A school district curriculum committee should include a diverse group of partners including teachers, administrators, a board member well-versed in curriculum and instruction, parents, community members, students, and curriculum specialist. This ensures that the curriculum is developed and implemented with the needs and perspectives of all partners in mind. Research shows the following advantages to having a curriculum committee that meets on a regular basis:

**Ensuring Consistency:** the curriculum and instructional committee ensures that all students within the district receive a consistent educational experience. By establishing a set of curriculum and instructional standards, the committee helps to ensure that all teachers are teaching the same material at the same level.

**Continuous Improvement:** the committee should be responsible for reviewing and updating the curriculum and instructional practices on an ongoing basis. This ensures that the educational materials and teaching practices used by the district are up-to-date and effective in meeting the needs of students.

**Collaboration:** the committee provides a forum for teacher’s administrators in the community to collaborate and share ideas on the best ways to improve instruction and learning outcomes.

**Accountability:** the committee is responsible for ensuring that the district is meeting state and federal education standards by reviewing and approving the curriculum and instructional practices, the committee provides accountability for the district’s performance.

**Resource Allocation:** the committee plays a role in allocating resources to support the implementation of the district’s curriculum and instructional practices. This ensures that the district’s resources are being used effectively to support student learning.

Fremont Unified School District (https://www.fremont.k12.ca.us/candi) as well as other districts in California and across the nation have adopted the best practice of instituting a districtwide curriculum committee.

**Recommendation 2-4**

Dissolve the OUSD Board Curriculum and Instruction Committee and replace it with a districtwide Curriculum and Instruction Advisory Committee.

**FINDING**

The Academics and Instruction Department has developed a research-based systemwide Learning Walk tool to provide consistency in observing and modifying best teaching practices in all of its schools. The Director of Elementary Instruction facilitated the process along with the literacy team and the STEM team.
When developing the learning walk tools, the team used the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG) by Achieve the Core as a model and research behind the IPG. The IPG is designed around Core Actions that encompass the shifts in instructional practice required for college and/or career-ready state standards.

The indicators determined in both the literacy learning walk tool and math learning walk tool were determined based on implementation tools provided by the curriculum, Oakland Teacher Effectiveness Framework (evaluation system) and indicators determined by the learning walks team. Additionally, they determine focal indicators based on analysis that the team conducts after each learning walk.

STEM and Literacy coordinators facilitate learning walks at schools in their network. Network Supes, Directors, Principals and Teachers on Special Assignment also attend. OUSD completes one learning walk at the beginning of the year, middle of the year, and end of the year at over 90% of sites across the district.

According to the Executive Director of Academics and Instruction, the following walk-throughs have been conducted this year.

**Elementary**
- Math Fall: 48/50 schools
- Math Winter: 45/50
- Literacy Fall: 47/50
- Literacy Winter: 42/50 (still in progress through March)
- Spring Learning Walks will bring total close to 300 (150 Math/150 literacy)

**Middle School**
- Fall: 11/11 MS for Math, Science, ELA
- Winter: Schools completed 2 learning walks with their ILT
- Spring: Just started (1/11) for Math, Science, ELA, History

**High School**
- 1 annually at all schools: 15/18 complete with 3 scheduled in next 2 weeks

Prior to the development of this instrument, the walk-throughs were inconsistent from school-to-school and a variety of tools were used.

**Exhibit 2-19** shows a sample analysis of one school’s walk-through.

As shown, the follow-up from a walk-through consists of knowing the curriculum indicator being observed, and lists action steps for students and teachers as well as school principals. Research has shown this type of follow-up with specific actions assists in improved instruction.
### Next steps from our debrief:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Action steps for students</th>
<th>Action steps for teachers</th>
<th>Action steps for leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3C Students engage in mathematical discourse.</td>
<td>• Use sentence frames/talking tools to discuss your thinking with a partner</td>
<td>• In grade levels, re-select pieces of the talking tool to support discussion in classrooms.</td>
<td>• X and X meet with Principal X to review learning walk feedback and the next steps and implications for cycle 2 and 3 plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Pacing is consistent with OUSD EM2 Pacing guide with the understanding that students develop proficiency over time.</td>
<td>• Ask your teacher and partner questions about your math topic and their understanding.</td>
<td>• Continue using turns and talks to support students with making meaning of the math</td>
<td>• X shares vertical articulation of Talking Tool in Math based on grade-level considerations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinator Next Steps + Site Support Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Revisit Focal School Action Plan with X/Principal X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources to support the site with Language + Discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <a href="#">Planning Guide</a> (to support with Topic-level internalization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <a href="#">Achievement Descriptors and Content Standards</a> (to determine where Major work of the grade shows up in lessons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <a href="#">Math Focus by Grade</a> (to revisit major math concepts per grade level)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OUSD Academic and Instruction Department, 2023.

### Commendation 2-D

CSI is commended for creating and implementing a research-based walk-through instrument to guide improved instruction.
FINDING

The Instructional Technology Team orchestrated the development of Teacher Central and Family Central websites which are highly used by teachers and OUSD Families.

Prior to the development of Teacher Central, teachers had to search numerous documents and websites for various documents, useful links, data dashboards, professional development opportunities, sample lesson plans, and other instructional materials. With the creation of Teacher Central, the majority of their needed materials, resources, and guidance is now found in one location.

**Exhibit 2-20** shows a sampling of resources on Teacher Central.
The website can be found at [https://teachercentral.ousd.org/](https://teachercentral.ousd.org/).
Parents interviewed reported that the Family Central website has made it much easier to quickly locate important information and keep up-to-date on district and school events and news. The Family Central URL address is [https://familycentral.ousd.org/](https://familycentral.ousd.org/)

**Exhibit 2-21** shows an excerpt from Family Central.

Other resources include, but is not limited to spring break reminders, video highlighting OUSD’s Excellence (in four different languages), links to various CSI departments, and other helpful parent information.

![Exhibit 2-21 Sampling of Family Central Resources](https://familycentral.ousd.org/)

The Family Central site has grade level specific curriculum guidance for parents.

**Exhibit 2-22** shows what each guide offers to assist parents in being an active participant in their child’s education.
EXHIBIT 2-22
SAMPLE OF GRADE SPECIFIC PARENT GUIDES OFFERED ON OUSD FAMILY CENTRAL

THIS GUIDE INCLUDES

- **What 6th Graders Are Learning** – What experts say is the most important content (knowledge and skills) for students to learn in literacy and math by the end of sixth grade.

- **Talking About Literacy and Math with Your 6th Grader** – Ways families can talk with their 6th grader about what they are learning in school, find related resources, and connect learnings to the world around them.

- **Education Words** – Sometimes, you’ll hear educators use a word that has a specific meaning in schools. Those words are bolded. Understanding those terms will help you speak the same language.

- **Tips for Talking with Teachers** – How you and your child’s teachers can work together to help students grow.

- **Connecting Classrooms to Careers** – Helping your middle schooler see the connection between classroom learning and their future.

- **Tools and Resources to Help** – We’ve chosen a few internet resources that best match each grade’s content.

Source: [https://familycentral.ousd.org/](https://familycentral.ousd.org/)

**Commendation 2-E**

The Instructional Technology Department is commended for the development, coordination, and maintenance of the Teacher Central and Family Central websites.
Network Superintendents Team

Overview of the Network Superintendents Team

The basic functions of the Network Superintendents are delineated in the job descriptions for each of the positions, Elementary K-5, Middle School and High Schools.

Under the direction of the Chief of Schools and in cooperation with other District administrators, the High Schools Network Superintendent is responsible for providing leadership for all of the assigned network schools aligning schools and other programs, and facilitating the integration of all District resources of assigned schools. In partnership with local community-based organizations and city/county agencies (police, social services, health, juvenile justice), facilitate the optimum use of resources to enable the academic and social emotional success of all students. The Network Superintendent ensures the use of effective instruction in every classroom for every student, every day; the development of safe and supportive schools; and the cultivation of student literacy necessary for success in college and career. The Network Superintendent is responsible for understanding the needs of the students, families, and the community of the assigned schools and implementing the best strategies for meeting those needs. The Network Superintendent is responsible for supporting and leading efforts to turn around struggling schools and plays a critical leadership role in transforming each school to a full-service community school model, supporting the District’s transition to a full-service community District. Duties will also involve access to confidential information concerning employer-employee relations.

Source: OUSD Job Descriptions for Network Superintendent as of August 2014.

Exhibits 3-1, 3-2, 3-3, and 3-4 provide the current organization charts for each of the five Network Superintendents.

Please note that the MTSS partners work with all the networks, but are not shown in the organization charts.

**EXHIBIT 3-1**
CURRENT ELEMENTARY NETWORKS 2 & 4 ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS

Source: OUSD 2023.
EXHIBIT 3-2
CURRENT ELEMENTARY NETWORK 3 ORGANIZATION CHART

Source: OUSD 2023.

EXHIBIT 3-3
CURRENT MIDDLE SCHOOL NETWORK ORGANIZATION CHART

Source: OUSD 2023.
There have been several recent changes in the Networks as reported by the Network Superintendents.

Changes in the Elementary Network include:

- Base funding for each Elementary School Network was reduced to 1.0 Network Superintendent, 1.0 Network Partner, .5 Executive Assistant;
- In 2022-23, Elementary Network Superintendent for Network 3 was promoted to a split position and a 1.0 Deputy Network Superintendent for Network 3 was hired;
- 1.0 Deputy Chief funded out of CSI, serves to implement the redesign efforts to improve schools, which has included the design process for merging and closing schools (now changed given Board vote in January 2023); and,
- In 2022-23, Network Partner for Network 2 was vacant through November; that position has now been filled.

Changes in the Middle School Network include:

- In 2022-23, filled the Network Partner Position that remained vacant for all of 2021-22 and most of 2022-23. No positions were eliminated or added.
- In 2021-22, added a Coordinator Environmental Education (grant funded); and
- In 2022-23, added an Administrative Assistant for Environmental Education (grant funded).
Changes in the High School Network include:

- Former HS Network Superintendent transitioned out of role in June 2022 after two years; the current Network Superintendent transitioned into role in July 2022;
- The High School Network Partner position was vacant for the 2019-20 and 2020-21 school years. The position was filled in the fall of 2021; however, the former Network Partner transitioned out of the role two months into the school year. The position remained vacant until July 2022 when the current Network Partner transitioned into the role after serving as a long-time middle school principal in OUSD;
- The Executive Director of College and Career Readiness position was eliminated in July of 2022;
- The Executive Director of Instruction position was eliminated in July 2022;
- The HS Deputy Network Superintendent position was created and posted in July 2022 but has remained vacant since then; and
- The High School Network Executive Assistant position was vacant for the majority of the 2021-22 school year; the position was filled in March of 2022.

The responsibilities for the elementary, middle and high school networks vary by level, but have a great deal of overlap. A key focus in all the networks is the achievement of the LCAP goals. The LCAP goals and the activities to be accomplished by the network include:

**Goal 1: Students graduate college, career, and community ready.**

- Improve instruction at all sites by facilitating the development of instructional leadership teams, leading learning walks to collect data, facilitating action plan development and implementation
- Improve Elementary Math and ELA outcomes
- Improve Reclassification for ELL learner

**Goal 2: Focal student groups demonstrate accelerated growth to close our equity gap.**

- Reading acceleration for ELL, Sped, and Black students

**Goal 3: Students and families are welcomed, safe, healthy and engaged.**

- Increase in positive daily attendance
- Decrease in Chronic Absence
- Decrease in Suspension

**Goal 4: Our staff are high quality, stable, and reflective of Oakland’s rich diversity.**

- Recruit, retain, and hire diverse elementary staff

The Elementary School Network responsibilities include:

**Network Superintendent**

1. Leadership Development – Set and implement vision for high quality leadership of Elementary Schools;
2. High Quality Instruction, Curriculum and Assessment – Ensure high quality access, delivery and assessment of Common Core State Standards;
3. School Operations – Ensure effective and efficient school operations;
4. School Culture / Community Engagement – Set and implement vision for safe and supportive schools; increase attendance rates;

5. MTSS Implementation – Design, articulate and implement tiered academic and behavioral supports for schools.

Network Partner
1. Leadership Development – Differentiated coaching and support;
2. High Quality Instruction, Curriculum and Assessment – Progress monitoring;

Administrative Assistant
1. Leadership Development – Ensure effective and efficient network operations;
2. School Operations – Monitor and support effective school operations.

Network Superintendent Department Goals – Elementary Networks

**Goal 1**
1. Increase the percentage of students reading at grade level K-2 by 20% as measured by iReady.
2. Increase the percentage of students performing at standard in 3-5 Literacy and Math by +10 percentage points as measured by SBAC.

**Goal 2**
1. Increase the percentage of EL students re-classified by 20% at all schools;
2. Increase the percentage of AA students reading at standard in K-2 as measured by iReady;
3. Increase the percentage of SpEd students meeting standards as measured by iReady.

**Goal 3**
1. Reduce chronic absenteeism rates (missing 10% of more of school days) for all students;
2. Reduce the out-of-school suspension rate for Black students and students with IEP's;
3. Increase the number of schools with at least 70% of students and parents who feel connected to their schools.

**Goal 4**
1. Increase the one-year teacher retention rate, network-wide and at school sites;
2. Increase the number of site engaged in equity / anti-racist learning.
The Middle School Network responsibilities include:

1. Maintain a positive and professional culture in the network.
2. Hold base vision, metrics, and theory of action for building schools, especially instruction.
3. Hire, train, coach, motivate school leaders.
4. Create efficient/effective central systems to support school leaders lead their school communities.
5. Help school leaders problem solve challenges at their sites.
6. Hold school leaders accountable for results.

Below are the specific initiatives or tasks that the Middle School Network produces to support specific LCAP goals.

**Goal 1: All students graduate college, career, and community ready.**
- Improve instruction at all sites by facilitating the development of instructional leadership teams, leading learning walks to collect data, facilitating action plan development and implementation to act on the data.
- Improve middle school math outcomes.

**Goal 2: Focal student groups demonstrate accelerated growth to close our equity gap.**
- Reading acceleration for Black students.

**Goal 3: Students and families are welcomed, safe, healthy and engaged.**
- Update processes to manage Measure G1 parcel tax to fund positive school communities and art/music/language programs.
- Positive experience for Black students with IEPs.
- Transition into network-wide use of a learning management system to give families better access to student progress.

**Goal 4: Our staff are high quality, stable, and reflective of Oakland’s rich diversity.**
- Hiring school leaders that reflect Oakland’s demographics.
- Training, coaching, and motivating school leaders.

The High School Network has the following responsibilities:

1. Maintain a positive and professional culture in the network.
2. Hold base vision, metrics, and theory of action for building schools in alignment with OUSD’s strategic plan.
3. Support high school principals and their teams to develop coherent and aligned site plans for student achievement.
4. Hire, coach, develop, supervise, and evaluate high school leaders.
5. Create efficient/effective central systems to support principals lead their school communities.
6. Help school leaders solve for operational and instructional challenges at their sites.
The responsibilities for the Link Learning office include:

1. Support the design, development and implementation of linked learning pathways across comprehensive and alternative high schools to prepare students for college and career.

2. Provide coaching and development for teachers, Pathway Coaches, Assistant Principals, and Principals grounded in the 4 pillars of linked learning (Rigorous Academics, Career Technical Education, Comprehensive Student Supports, and Work-Based Learning).

3. Develop summer and year-round internship/apprenticeship opportunities for students (paid and unpaid).

4. Develop, implement, and refine a vision for Dual Enrollment in partnership with the Peralta Community College District to ensure students have access to college courses while still in high school.

5. Provide coaching and technical assistance to site teams to develop master schedules and provide course offerings aligned with A-G and OUSD graduation requirements.

6. Support and develop all counselors in grades 6-12 to provide robust and holistic social-emotional and academic support.

7. Lead and develop site-based post-secondary readiness staff to support students to plan for and implement their post-secondary goals upon graduation.

8. Develop and manage central credit recovery options, including summer and school-year academic recovery courses.

9. Develop and implement an instructional blueprint for Tier 1 instructional practices across all content areas in high school, including core, elective, and CTE.

10. Manage the compliant and effective implementation of the Measure N Parcel Tax across all high schools, including eligible charter schools.

Below are the specific initiatives or tasks that the High School Network produces to support specific LCAP goals.

**Goal 1: All students graduate college, career, and community ready.**

- Prepare students for post-secondary success:
  1. Develop systems to ensure all students have an individualized post-secondary (5-year plan).
  2. Build an experiential scope and sequence to ensure students have opportunities to gain awareness of and experience post-secondary options, work-based learning, A-G and graduation requirements, and financial aid applications.
  3. Ensure students have a seamless transition to a post-secondary opportunity (2/4-year college, pre-apprenticeship/apprenticeship, workforce training).
  4. Provide students opportunities for dual enrollment and other early college credit opportunities that will inform their post-secondary goals.

- Develop systems of personalized supports:
  1. Build out strategies across all high schools to ensure personalized supports are available and provided to all students via their Pathway or 9th grade House structure to ensure students transition from one grade to the next on-track to meet A-G, graduation, and career awareness goals, with a specific focus on students who are part of the LCAP focal groups (Black, Latino,
Pacific Islander, SpEd, ELL, Foster, Unhoused Youth)

a. Adult teaming: regular pathway and staff collaboration around student interventions; staff alignment by Pathway/Small Learning Community/house;

b. Regular opportunities for academic intervention: tutoring, credit recovery during the school year and summer to support A-G completion

2. Integrate Real World Learning:

a. Develop an Instructional Blueprint that defines Tier 1 instructional practices across all content areas in high school to be implemented within core, elective, and CTE courses

b. Develop and implement professional development for teachers to implement HS Instructional Blueprint

c. Provide teachers direct instructional support via individual and small group coaching

d. Support teachers to develop capstone and standards-aligned performance tasks that integrate core, CTE and work-based learning standards

Public Works LLC conducted a central office and school-level survey in February 2023. (Please see Appendices A & B for the full survey results.) Respondents had mixed views of the efficacy of the Network Superintendents with 28% of the survey respondents rating their services high or very high, 30% rating them as moderate, and 41% rating them as low or very low. A total of 87 of the 323 total respondents had no opinion.

The key customers of the Network Superintendents are the school principals. Each year for the past three years, principals have responded to a lengthy OUSD survey about their experiences. The survey includes 112 items that cover nearly every aspect of the district operations from the quality of building alarm systems to the warehouse. Five of the most relevant items were selected that address the support that principals receive from the Network Superintendents and their staffs.

**Elementary Networks**

Eighty percent (80%) of elementary principals agree or strongly agree that they know what is expected of them. They have high trust—82.8% at the agree / strongly agree that they trust their supervisors. Assessing the impact on professional practice of professional development was not as strong with 57.8% agreeing or strongly agreeing. Elementary principals see their supervisors as effective in solving problems at schools with an agreement rate of 77.1%. Over half of the elementary principals had discussed their performance with their supervisors in the last six months.

**Exhibit 3-5** shows the results of the 2022 principal survey for the Elementary Networks.
Middle School Network

Just over 78% percent of middle school principals agree or strongly agree that they know what is expected of them. They have high trust as 77.7% at the agree / strongly agree that they have trust in their supervisors. Being able to describe the impact on professional practice of professional development was just as strong with 77.8% agreeing or strongly agreeing. Not as many middle school principals see their supervisors as effective in solving problems at schools with an agreement rate of 66.6%. Over half of the middle school principals had discussed their performance with their supervisors in the last six months.

Exhibit 3-6 shows the results from the 2022 principal survey of district office departments.
High School Network

Just under 85% of high school principals agree or strongly agree that they know what is expected of them. They have high trust 77% at the agree / strongly agree that they have trust in their supervisors. Being able to describe the impact on professional practice of professional development was quite different from the other two levels with only 41.6% agreeing or strongly agreeing. High school principals see their supervisors as effective in solving problems at schools with an agreement rate of 69.3%. Only 30.8% had discussed their performance with their supervisors in the last six months.

Exhibit 3-7 shows the results of the 2022 high school principal survey of district office departments.
EXHIBIT 3-7
SELECTED RESPONSES PRINCIPAL SURVEY 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Sum of Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know what is expected of me at work</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust my direct supervisor and feel comfortable being vulnerable with</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>him/her about issues in my school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can describe how participation in Principal PD has improved my</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My direct supervisor is able to effectively help me solve problems on</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my campus and central office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last six months, someone at work has talked to me about my</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OUSD Principal Survey Data Dashboard, 2022.

FINDING

In OUSD the rate of principal turnover is too high. The “Retention of School Leaders” dashboard asserts “Over the past 10 years, ... the yearly retention rate has averaged 87.3% returning in any position and 80.2% returning as principals each year” (although not necessarily in the same school). An 80% retention rate of principals means that 14 or 15 of the 77 schools have had a change in school leadership.

Over the past 13 years in OUSD, three schools have had seven principals, seven schools have had six principals, 13 schools have had five principals, 17 schools have had four principals, 22 schools have had three principals, nine schools have had two principals and four schools have had one principal. Ten of 16 high schools have had four or more principals. Half of the middle schools have had four or more principals. More than half of the elementary schools have had four or more principals.

In June 2022 the District administered the “Quality School Survey” of principals. When asked “Are you staying in OUSD next year” only 71% indicated that they were returning to OUSD in the same position. Another 10% were unsure if they would return to OUSD and 10% said they were definitely leaving. Only 66% agreed or strongly agreed that they “feel good returning as principal next year.”

In many school districts there is a correlation between principal turnover and the socio-economic status of students as determined by eligibility for free / reduced lunches. This is not the case in OUSD for all schools nor for any grouping of schools, elementary, middle or high school. The overall correlation coefficient was near zero for all schools. At the elementary level the correlation coefficient was slightly negative, but far from statistically significant. This means that the turnover problem is rooted in other issues rather than correlated with student socio-economic status.
Principals are vital for ensuring student success. Their actions help maintain a positive school climate, motivate school staff, and enhance teachers’ practice. Therefore, they play a major role in retaining effective teachers and ensuring their success in the classroom. The average return rate of teachers to schools in OUSD is a significant problem in attempting to improve student learning. The three-year teacher return rate for the elementary networks is just over 50% and for the middle and high school networks about 45%. (See Appendix D for school level teacher turnover rates). This is, in part, fostered by the high turnover rate of principals.

Ultimately, principal leadership has significant implications for students’ experiences and accomplishments. Research notes that principal turnover can be disruptive to school progress, often resulting in higher teacher turnover and, ultimately, lower gains in student achievement. Research on the relationship between principal turnover and teacher retention shows that teacher turnover spikes in schools experiencing leadership turnover, and these effects are greater among high-poverty and urban schools, in schools with low average teacher experience, and in schools experiencing chronic principal turnover. (Source: Educational Administrator Quarterly, The Principal-Teacher Churn: Understanding the Relationship Between Leadership Turnover and Teacher Attrition, Volume 58, Issue 1, November 2021. Teacher turnover rates for all OUSD schools are in Appendix D.)

Further, the relationship between principal turnover and declines in student outcomes is stronger in high-poverty, low-achieving schools—the schools in which students most rely on education for their future success. In addition to the costs to students and teachers if good principals leave, schools and districts must devote time and resources to replace the outgoing principals. The financial implications are significant and, often, covered by redirecting funds that had been slated for the classroom. (Source: Levin, S. & Bradley, K. (2019). Understanding and Addressing Principal Turnover: A Review of the Research, Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.)

The study cited above found that the research points to the following five reasons that principals leave their jobs, aside from retirement or dismissal.

1. **Several elements of professional learning opportunities are associated with principal retention:**
   - high-quality preparation programs that carefully select and deeply prepare principals for challenging schools;
   - access to in-service training, mentoring, and coaching that continue to support and develop principals;
   - and collaborations between professional learning programs and school districts.

For many years, OUSD has been connected with two highly effective principal preparation programs, the University of California Berkeley’s Principal Leadership Institute and New Leaders for New Schools. These programs provided and continue to provide training for aspiring principals. One of the challenges in OUSD has been the lack of on-the-job training as assistant principals. At the elementary level, small school size limits the number of assistant principals to just seven assistant principals in 50 elementary schools. There are 51 Assistant Principals at the middle and high school levels, but as noted in a Finding below, leadership training is inadequate.

2. **Poor working conditions. A number of conditions can influence principals’ decisions about employment, including access to support; the complexity of the job and amount of time needed to complete all necessary activities; relationships with colleagues, parents, and students; and disciplinary climate.**

As noted in a finding in Chapter 1, principals are frequently confused by multiple work directions from various departments with deadlines that are not aligned and do not consider the multiple demands on the principal. In the annual principal survey of district office functions, a large proportion of principals report that they simply do not have the time to complete all of their responsibilities.
3. **Insufficient salaries.** Salaries matter to principals in choosing new positions and in deciding whether to stay. Low salaries that do not adequately compensate principals and are not competitive with other jobs lead to higher rates of principal departure.

Principal salaries in OUSD lag behind comparison districts.

**Exhibit 3-8** below illustrates the average salaries for elementary, middle and high school principals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>OUSD</th>
<th>SCUSD</th>
<th>FUSD</th>
<th>WCCUSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>$117,227</td>
<td>$121,414</td>
<td>$133,908</td>
<td>$119,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>$119,508</td>
<td>$123,789</td>
<td>$138,604</td>
<td>$122,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>$133,301</td>
<td>$141,451</td>
<td>$137,734</td>
<td>$138,098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Transparent California 2021. West Contra Costa Unified was substituted for San Jose because the San Jose report does not separate principal reporting by level.*

4. **Lack of decision-making authority.** Principals are less likely to leave their positions when they believe they have greater control of their work environment and the ability to make decisions across a range of issues such as spending, teacher hiring and evaluation, and student discipline.

OUSD Board Policy 3625 School Governance (adopted in 2012 and revised in 2018) gives substantial authority to school governance teams which consists of employees, parents, students and community partners.

Provide school governance teams increased decision-making responsibility and authority to:

a. Engage their entire school community - employees, parents, students, and community partners - in a continuous process of school improvement.

b. Establish a coherent theory-of-action and program strategy to improve student attendance, academic achievement, and wellness based on a specific understanding of the needs and conditions of their students.

c. Align and manage resources - people, programs, money, and time - to their school’s established theory-of-action and program strategy.

In this governance model, the principal remains accountable for achieving the goals of the Single Plan for Student achievement, but is one member of the teams that make those decisions. Instead of the central office making decisions as is the case in so many districts, the local governance councils make them. Having a formalized process with representative groups in a decision-making role, is a recipe for conflict and one in which the groups that ‘shouts the loudest’ often prevails.
This is not to suggest that principals return to an authoritarian model. Collaboration is essential and effective principals are skilled at engaging staff, students and families in making plans and addressing issues.

5. **High-stakes accountability policies.** Counter-productive accountability polices can create disincentives for principals to remain in low-performing schools and can influence principals’ mobility decisions.

This does not appear to be a deterrent to principal stability in OUSD as accountability seems weak at best. As noted in Chapter 2, many CSI staff and school principals reported that they are not regularly evaluated, if at all. District plans that are designed to be implemented in a certain way based on research and best practices are, with some regularity, undermined by schools that either fail to implement the intervention or modify it so substantially that it lacks efficacy. For example, for the current school year, the disproportionality plan which is mandated by the state to reduce the disproportionate discipline for African American male students in special education called for using the Board-Certified Behavior Specialists (BCBS) to train teachers in how they manage classroom discipline. But some schools instead utilized the BCBS to work directly with students. The approach of training teachers is showing promise in addressing disproportionate discipline. The approach of working directly with students is not.

**Recommendation 3-1**

*Develop a research-based strategy to increase the longevity of principals in schools.*

Steps that may help OUSD in implementing this recommendation includes:

1. While continuing the partnerships with the UC Berkeley Principals Leadership Institute and New Leaders for New Schools, develop an Assistant Principal training program as recommended in the Finding below. In order to have elementary schools large enough to have assistant principals, the Board will have to take action to approve the Superintendent’s recommendation to consolidate small schools as in the Finding earlier in this chapter.

2. To improve working conditions, OUSD should implement the Recommendation 1-1 above to reduce the silos and align central office in support of principals and schools.

3. OUSD should increase principal salaries so that the principalship is viewed as the career goal for principals. With higher salaries they will be less interested in moving to positions in the central office. The average salaries of directors, network partners, executive directors and network superintendents are significantly higher than principals.

4. The OUSD Board should reconsider Policies 3625 and 6005 to limit the scope of site-based decision making to that which is required under Ed Code and to delineate non-negotiables that all schools should be required to implement to ensure a strong and consistent implementation of the district’s instructional vision and plans.

5. The Network Superintendent should develop and implement a decision-grid or matrix to clarify which decisions are made at each level so that principals know what is in their domain.

---

**Exhibit 3-9** shows the average salaries of administrative positions in the CSI division.
EXHIBIT 3-9
AVERAGE SALARIES FOR OUSD DISTRICT LEADERSHIP POSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>SALARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director Educational Services</td>
<td>$138,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>$142,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>$145,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Superintendent</td>
<td>$153,467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


FINDING

The number of small elementary schools causes significant roadblocks to fiscal solvency, student learning improvement, facilities and maintenance management of the schools, all of which have been well documented in the January 25, 2023 Superintendent’s report to the Board on Rescission of School Consolidation for 2022-23. The focus of this finding is on school size comparison with other districts in this study and the impact on management of schools via the Network Superintendents.

Exhibit 3-10 lists the number of elementary (K-5, K-6 and K-8) schools in each of the comparison districts as of 2022. As shown, OUSD has much smaller elementary schools than the peer districts.
## EXHIBIT 3-10
### ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SIZE IN COMPARISON DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAKLAND</th>
<th>SACRAMENTO CITY</th>
<th>FONTANA</th>
<th>SAN JOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>ESK-8</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESK-8</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>ESK-8</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESK-8</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>ESK-8</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>ESK3</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESK-8</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESK8</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>ESK8</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>ESK6</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2022, OUSD had 50 elementary schools to serve 17,692 students with an average enrollment of 354 in each school. OUSD had 18 elementary schools with fewer than 300 students. Sacramento City had 49 elementary schools to serve 20,638 students and an average school size of 421 students. SCUSD had 14 schools with fewer than 300 students. Fontana had 30 elementary schools to serve 15,784 students and an average school size of 526. FUSD had no school with fewer than 300 students. San Jose had 26 schools to serve 10,556 students with an average school size of 406. SJUSD had 9 schools with an enrollment of fewer than 300 students. West Contra Costa Unified (an alternate peer district) has 38 elementary schools with three having fewer than 300 students.

As enrollment declines, as is projected, OUSD will be faced with continued reductions in resources as the need for services continues to grow.

Currently, OUSD has divided the supervision of the elementary schools into three networks. Network 2 has 18 schools with a total of 5,530 students; Network 3 has 15 schools with a total of 5,515 students; and Network 4 has 16 schools with a total of 6,647 students (based on 2022 enrollment).

Sacramento City has five Assistant Superintendents in positions similar to the Network Superintendents for 3,000 more students than in OUSD. Fontana Unified has one elementary director and one secondary director, who supervise 46 schools and 35,000 students. Since organization charts for SJUSD were not provided, West Contra Costa Unified is in many ways similar to Oakland Unified. In WCCUSD, there are three executive directors who supervise the schools and 26,000 students.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAKLAND</th>
<th>SACRAMENTO CITY</th>
<th>FONTANA</th>
<th>SAN JOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ES 275</td>
<td>ESK6 291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 271</td>
<td>ESK6 278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 268</td>
<td>ESK6 277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 266</td>
<td>ESK6 276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 237</td>
<td>ESK6 275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 227</td>
<td>ESK6 274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 213</td>
<td>ESK6 267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 213</td>
<td>ESK6 263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 207</td>
<td>ESK6 260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 202</td>
<td>ESK6 249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 199</td>
<td>ESK6 242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 197</td>
<td>ESK6 241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 180</td>
<td>ESK6 231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 172</td>
<td>ESK6 182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education Data Quest, 2022.
**Recommendation 3-2**

Reduce the number of elementary schools for the school year 2024-25 and reduce from three elementary networks to two elementary networks and Network Superintendents.¹

School consolidation is always fraught with controversy and hurt feelings that continue for decades. School Districts throughout the nation are experiencing a similar decline in enrollment as experienced in the early 1980’s. Schools were closed and repurposed. Even districts that have experienced rapid growth in the 2000’s like San Ramon Unified, are now in decline.

The OUSD Board must act to consolidate schools for the 2024-25 school year. The Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT) has recommended school closures in Oakland for several years. Under AB1840, OUSD is required to take “affirmative board action to continue planning for, and timely implementation of, a school and facility closure and consolidation plan that supports the sale or lease of surplus property.”

To accompany the consolidation of elementary schools, OUSD should reduce the elementary networks from three to two for the 2024-25 school year. Reducing one of the elementary networks would result in each network supervising schools that serve approximately 8,800 students and approximately 520 classrooms. OUSD would still have a more favorable ratio of network superintendents to the number of students than any of the comparison districts.

**Exhibit 3-11, 3-12, 3-13, and 3-14** shows the proposed redesign of the Network Superintendents Team.

---

¹ Should the OUSD Board of Education fail to reduce the number of elementary schools, it will not be feasible to reduce the number of elementary network superintendents from three to two.
EXHIBIT 3-11
PROPOSED HIGH SCHOOL / LINKED LEARNING HIGH SCHOOL NETWORK SUPERINTENDENT ORGANIZATION

Source: Created by Public Works LLC Team 2023.

*Directors of ELL/Multilingual report jointly to Network Supt and Exec Dir ELL Multilingual
**SpEd/SELPA/Health serves both SpEd School Support K-5 and SpEd School Support 6-12
***Directors of Community Schools report jointly to Network Supt and Exec Dir Comm Schools
EXHIBIT 3-12
PROPOSED MIDDLE SCHOOL / ALT ED/ ADULT ED NETWORK SUPERINTENDENT ORGANIZATION

*Directors of ELL/Multilingual report jointly to Network Supt and Exec Dir ELL Multilingual
**SpEd/SELPA/Health serves both SpEd School Support K-5 and SpEd School Support 6-12
***Directors of Community Schools report jointly to Network Supt and Exec Dir Comm Schools

Source: Created by Public Works LLC Team 2023.
EXHIBIT 3-13
PROPOSED ELEMENTARY NETWORK Y SUPERINTENDENT ORGANIZATION

Network Partner ➔ Elementary Network Y Superintendent ➔ Executive Assistant

Elementary Principals
Network Y

Director Equity
Network Y

Director Community
Schs Network Y***

Family Engagement
Specialist

Exec Dir Academics /
Instruction / Early Childhood
& Literacy (PK-5)**

Sr Director Early Learning
& Literacy (PK-2)

Dir Elementary Education

Dir Multi-tiered System of
Support (MTSS) (PK-5)**

Dir ELL / Multilingual*

Dir SpEd School
Support (K-5)**

Dir Visual &
Performing Arts

Coordinator Social
Emotional Learning

*Directors of ELL/Multilingual report jointly to Network Supt and
Exec Dir ELL Multilingual
**SpEd/SELPA/Health serves both SpEd School Support K-5 and
SpEd School Support 6-12
***Directors of Community Schools report jointly to Network Supt
and Exec Dir Comm Schools

Source: Created by Public Works LLC Team 2023.
EXHIBIT 3-14
PROPOSED ELEMENTARY NETWORK X SUPERINTENDENT ORGANIZATION

*Directors of ELL/Multilingual report jointly to Network Supt and Exec Dir ELL Multilingual
**SpEd/SELPA/Health serves both SpEd School Support K-5 and SpEd School Support 6-12
***Directors of Community Schools report jointly to Network Supt and Exec Dir Comm Schools

Source: Created by Public Works LLC Team 2023.
FINDING

The scope of responsibility for the middle school and high school networks are significantly out-of-balance in term of students served and classrooms.

The Middle School Network Superintendent supervises 12 schools with approximately 305 classrooms with a total of 6,839 students. The High School Network Superintendent supervises 16 schools with approximately 597 classrooms with a total of 9,841 students. The imbalance requires that the high school network must have additional administration.

Recommendation 3-3

Reassign the responsibility for the alternative schools and adult education to the middle school network superintendent and reduce one administrative position.

The total enrollment supervised by the High School Network Superintendent would reduce from 9,841 students to 9,045 students. The impact would be larger than the changes in the numbers might otherwise indicate because supervision of the alternative and adult education programs has an Executive Director as a supervisor, a position that could be eliminated.

Recommendation 3-4

Eliminate the position of Executive Director of Alternative Education when those responsibilities are assigned to the Middle School Network Superintendent.

FINDING

The district has too many high school alternative education schools.

OUSD has four high school alternative schools with a total enrollment of 436 students with well above average absence rates. (OUSD also has an independent study school and a small program at Laney College. For the purposes of comparison with the other districts these are not included).

Exhibit 3-15 shows the alternative school enrollment and absence rates.
EXHIBIT 3-15
OUSD ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND ABSENCE RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>ABSENCE RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rudsdale Continuation High</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewey Academy</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Academy Alternative High</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph J. Bunche Continuation High</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: California Department of Education Data Quest / OUSD Attendance Dashboard.

Exhibit 3-16 shows the degree to which OUSD students in alternative schools perform significantly below standards set by the State. The performance of these schools suggests that students are not making adequate progress.

EXHIBIT 3-16
ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF OUSD ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS, POINTS BELOW STANDARD</th>
<th>MATHEMATICS, POINTS BELOW STANDARD</th>
<th>ENGLISH LEARNER, MAKING PROGRESS TOWARD PROFICIENCY</th>
<th>GRAD RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rudsdale Continuation High</td>
<td>-277</td>
<td>-247</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewey Academy</td>
<td>-277</td>
<td>-246</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Academy Alternative High</td>
<td>-277</td>
<td>-246</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph J. Bunche Continuation High</td>
<td>-216</td>
<td>-229</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education, Data Quest, 2022.

Sacramento City Unified has one continuation high school with 176 students. Fontana has two continuation high schools with a total enrollment of 599 students. San Jose does not have an alternative high school. West Contra Costa has one continuation high school with 201 students. Each of these schools performs at a higher level than any of the OUSD alternative schools.
Exhibit 3-17 shows the academic performance of students in the alternative schools of the comparison districts.

### EXHIBIT 3-17
ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF COMPARISON DISTRICT ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS, POINTS BELOW STANDARD</th>
<th>MATHEMATICS, POINTS BELOW STANDARD</th>
<th>ENGLISH LEARNER, MAKING PROGRESS TOWARD PROFICIENCY</th>
<th>GRAD RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Legion High SCUSD</td>
<td>-131</td>
<td>-198</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch High Fontana</td>
<td>-101</td>
<td>-178</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus High Fontana</td>
<td>-123</td>
<td>-210</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood Academy WCCUSD</td>
<td>-183</td>
<td>-199</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education, Data Quest, 2022.

The experience of West Contra Costa Unified school district in reducing the number of alternative high school program is illustrative. In the early 2000s, the district added necessary small school programs at five of the six comprehensive high schools. Since each of those programs had a CDS code, the regular high schools were relieved of dealing with low graduation rates, low test scores and high drop-out rates when struggling students were moved to the necessary small schools. When the proposal to eliminate the necessary small schools came before the Board of Education, staff and community spoke out in opposition to the proposal claiming that students would be less safe and not as well served. Over two years, the district consolidated those schools, assigning students to their home high schools and/or one of the two continuation programs. At the same time, services were added at the regular high schools including health clinics, restorative practices, and others were enhanced. Rather than deteriorating the high schools, all showed positive results in lower drop-out rates, high graduation rates and fewer expulsions.

In 2014, WCCUSD staff proposed consolidating the two continuation schools into one. Again, many staff and community members raised similar objections saying that students affiliated with gangs could never be in the same school. But the Board approved the staff recommendation and the schools were consolidated. In so doing, district staff met with each student in the school that was to be closed to identify the best placement. Some returned to their home high schools, some went to the remaining continuation school which had just reopened in a new building after several years in portable classrooms, and others continued high school in independent study. The results again were positive.
**Recommendation 3-5**

Consolidate the four alternative schools into two schools in 2024-25 and implement a plan based on best practices in other schools to improve student performance.

**FINDING**

OUSD assistant principals receive only minimal professional development during the school year. While principals engage in professional development twice each month, assistant principals are engaged only before the school year begins.

OUSD has 58 assistant principals with seven at elementary schools, 20 at middle schools, and 31 at high schools. In the comparison school districts, Sacramento City has 38 assistant principals while Fontana has 41 and San Jose 45.

Assistant principalship serves as the entry level to educational administration and the gateway to the principalship, yet many OUSD assistant principals say they have been ill prepared for the principalship. Assistant principals are involved in every aspect of the school community. They work with teachers, manage students, communicate with parents, and collaborate with colleagues. The myriad duties and responsibilities assigned to assistant principals that occur primarily during the school day make it nearly impossible for them to leave the building to attend professional development seminars and workshops. Therefore, professional growth should be provided and embedded into their daily responsibilities. Job-embedded professional development has been proven to make sustainable changes and improve instructional practices.

While some principals do an outstanding job of providing professional development and learning experiences for assistant principals, many others are content to keep the assistant principals’ focus on school operations. (Source: Reculturing the Assistant Principalship, NASSP Bulletin May, 2020.)

Some school districts across the United States offer training and development for their own assistant principals. For example, the Miami-Dade County Public Schools developed the Assistant Principal Induction Academy in order to support new assistant principals in their district. The vision of this program is that “novice assistant principals will have a network of support as they lead their schools to heightened achievement, understand how their work connects to that of the District and develop the skills necessary to efficiently recognize and improve teacher effectiveness” (Miami-Dade County Schools). Similarly, assistant principals in New York City have an opportunity to participate in The Advanced Leadership Program for Assistant Principals. The purpose of this program is to “build capacity within the existing pool of assistant principals aspiring to principalship” (Drago-Severson & Aravena, Learning for Leadership). Designed as a yearlong learning experience, assistant principals have the opportunity to “hone existing skills and explore the complex nature of decision making and authentic leadership required for the principalship” (Drago-Severson & Aravena, Learning for Leadership). The experience includes advanced leadership seminars, mentoring by New York City principals, networking and coaching buddies, and after-school sessions.

The Lead in Denver Program in the Denver Public Schools, in partnership with the Wallace Foundation, has established a strong commitment to developing their assistant principals through programs like their School Leadership Framework and intensive pathway programs. The Lead in Denver Program helps assistant principals gain the tools, resources and support necessary to refine your craft as a current principal or assistant principal, or to pursue the new challenge of school leadership. “Lead in Denver will sharpen your passion and talent, resulting in a greater ability to run excellent schools and ensure that every student succeeds” (Denver Public Schools). Assistant principals desire professional development related to developing their content
knowledge and skills and that such learning is necessary throughout their careers as educational leaders. (Source: Interviews). Unfortunately, many assistant principals who do not have access to specialized training from national organizations and in OUSD they lack support, as well as access to the necessary ongoing professional development needed to help them grow as educational leaders.

**Recommendation 3-6**

Develop and implement a systematic professional development program for assistant principals.

Steps that should assist OUSD in implementing this recommendation includes:

1. Designate one of the Network Superintendents and a Network Partner from another level to collaborate in creating an ongoing assistant principal academy. Improving the assistant principalship should begin with assistant principals. They need to see themselves as instructional leaders working alongside their principals for the betterment of their students and their schools. Rather than merely being student managers, they must see themselves as principals. If they don’t see themselves that way, no one else will either.

2. Distill the monthly principal professional development into a two-hour training for assistant principals at a time outside the regular school day for students. Assistant principals must demonstrate their commitment to teaching and learning by helping their teachers build a repertoire of instructional practices and creating assessments that inform instruction based on multiple data sources and disaggregated data. They should regularly provide their teachers with resources to improve the effectiveness of daily instructional strategies. To do that, assistant principals must know emerging trends in educational research and pedagogical practices.

3. Direct principals who have assistants to engage assistants in one or more sets of tasks usually handled by principals each year. Principals must be willing to share leadership and responsibilities with their assistant principals.

**FINDING**

Special education staff and programs are treated as a parallel education process rather than one integrated into the work of the Networks and schools.

Interviews with special education staff have been consistent in describing with some exceptions how special education staff are not included in network meetings and training. Special education staff develop their own curriculum rather than building on those developed through Academics & Instruction. Rather than a collaborative effort, planning for summer school and extended year programs are done separately. Staff report that training in Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is seen as a special education initiative rather than as one applying to all classrooms.

Rather than working in partnership with special education, school and network staff segment special education and as a result the network staff become highly reliant on Special Education personnel to implement site-level programming and services. In other words, there is little ownership for the educational progress of special education students outside of the special education staff.

Special education staff prepare and analyze monthly data about Individualized Education Plans (IEP) timeliness for the network leaders as well as for teachers. The reason is that, according to special education staff, most
principals and network leaders still do not know how to use SEIS to gather this information for themselves, despite training, videos and one-pagers with step-by-step instructions. Many principals and other network staff fail to read or use special education developed guides and one-pagers despite the special education team’s efforts in sending them out multiple times and creating video shorts to accompany them for staff who prefer to access information differently. Because special education staff must pick up the pieces, they are eager to respond to questions from schools, but this has resulted in learned helplessness on the part of school staff.

Special education staff manages enrollment for all students who require self-contained placement for half of their day or more and vetting new enrollees to confirm if they need general education placements, which includes updating two student information systems, informing the site welcoming the student, and informing the family. Special education staff reported that no one at the Student Welcome Center is trained to read IEPs or understand services. Special education staff are also responsible for creating projections, seat counts, and manual placements for enrollment of incoming and transitioning students each year during the enrollment season.

School and district special education staff report that ableism is endemic within OUSD. “Ableism is the discrimination of and social prejudice against people with disabilities based on the belief that typical abilities are superior. At its heart, ableism is rooted in the assumption that disabled people require ‘fixing’ and defines people by their disability. Like racism and sexism, ableism classifies entire groups of people as ‘less than,’ and includes harmful stereotypes, misconceptions, and generalizations of people with disabilities.” (Source: Access Living Newsletter December 2019.)

Special Education Staff report that the current system almost assumes students should ‘earn’ their spot in the general student body rather than starting from a place of belonging and letting data-driven needs drive any separate setting. Those patterns seem most acute when they intersect with racist thinking, leading to high levels of separate setting instruction for Black students, males especially, who then become the special education department’s responsibility to educate.

One of the reasons that OUSD allocates such a high percentage in local contribution to special education (see Finding in Chapter 4) is that teachers and principals see special education as a relief valve for difficult or challenging learners. An elementary principal, when asked why she didn’t use the Section 504 process to support a student with a disability or impairment, replied, “there’s no funding for 504 plans.” The implication is that special education provides substantial resources and may even place the difficult student in a more restricted program or another school. The backlog of referrals (see Finding in Chapter 4) is an indicator of this type of approach. OUSD is well above the state average for the percent of students who receive special education services (Exhibit 4-2 in Section 4 of this report).

**Recommendation 3-7**

Develop and implement a plan to better integrate, include, and involve special education district level staff in the work on the networks and provide training for and accountability of principals who have special education programs in their schools.
Strategies that may assist OUSD in implementing this recommendation include:

- Require a Special Education 101 institute for all site leaders at the onset of each year;
- Stipend principals with strong Special Education systems to provide collegial coaching/mentorship for principals who are new or struggling;
- Ensure all central leaders receive training in Special Education foundations, function-based approaches to behavior, crisis response, mental health first aid, as well as Universal Design for Learning (UDL) so they have the competencies needed to lead site leaders;
- Train network superintendents and partners in leading manifestation determination meetings;
- Train network superintendents and partners to review SEIS with principals during their routine site visits;
- Engage in site visits to observe Special Education instruction with network-aligned central staff to develop collaborative and cohesive supports to build educators’ skills and toolkits;
- Hold master scheduling and student grouping workshops for principals and counselors in the Spring.

**FINDING**

Linked Learning has been instrumental in improving outcomes for high school students in OUSD, improving the graduation rate, the rate at which students graduate meeting the rigorous A-G requirements, and participating in internships in businesses throughout Oakland and the Bay Area.

Linked Learning is a successful approach to education based on the idea that students work harder and dream bigger if their education is relevant to them. Linked Learning integrates rigorous academics that meet college-ready standards with sequenced, high-quality career-technical education, work-based learning, and supports to help students stay on track.

For Linked Learning students, education is organized around industry-sector themes. The student-selected industry theme is woven into lessons taught by teachers who collaborate across subject areas with input from working professionals, and reinforced by work-based learning with real employers.

*Source: Linked Learning department OUSD.*

The key operating tenets of Linked Learning include:

1. Rigorous academics, aligned to admissions requirements for state colleges and universities.
2. Career technical education, delivering concrete knowledge and skills through a carefully structured sequence of courses.
3. Work-based learning, providing students with exposure to real-world workplaces through job shadowing, apprenticeships, internships, and more.
4. Comprehensive support services, including counseling and supplemental instruction in reading, writing, and math to address the individual needs.

*Source: Linked Learning Alliance*

In 2011-12 there were 28% of OUSD 10th, 11th & 12th graders enrolled in Pathways. In 2022-23 88% are. In 2011-12, no students in the alternative high schools, no special education students, and few English Language learners were enrolled in Pathways. This year, nearly all are.
Because nearly all of the Linked Learning Career Technical Education courses meet the California A-G requirements, the proportion of students meeting those standards has grown from 44% in 2012 to 56% in 2022.

In 2022, 827 students were placed in industry-based internships.

Linked Learning has been a significant factor in improving outcomes for high school students in OUSD.

**Commendation 3-A**

OUSD is commended for the long-term commitment and successes generated through Linked Learning.

**FINDING**

Elementary Network 3 has developed an extensive planning and tracking system that is exemplary. Beginning with the LCAP goals, network leaders have developed a tool on a Google sheet that delineates the measures with details about what those measures mean and tracks periodic progress throughout the year. Network 3 has developed and operationalized a team work plan to track progress throughout three cycles of the school year. For each staff member there is a chart of a kind of ‘what by when’ to track progress and monitor the work. The network also sponsors a collaborative that involves one staff member from each school which meets monthly to review progress. Network 3 also keeps extensive meeting notes with links to source documents that are most helpful to staff in following up on tasks and responsibilities. These notes include the Coordination of Services team, the Early literacy group, English Language Learner and Multilingual Achievement Department, Family Engagement, Literacy and STEM teams.

**Commendation 3-B**

OUSD is commended for the work of Elementary Network 3 in developing and implementing extensive planning and tracking system that is exemplary.

**Recommendation 3-8**

Ensure all OUSD networks develop and implement the planning and tracking system as used in Network 3.
SECTION 4
Special Education Department

Overview of Department of Special Education

In Oakland Unified School District, the Special Education Department is charged with educating students who have learning disabilities or exceptional cognitive or physical needs and who are made eligible for services through an Individualized Education Program (IEP). Special Education provides services and support in district, alternative and select charter schools to all identified students from infancy through age 22.

Services include Specialized Academic Instruction, Speech-Language Therapy, Occupational and Physical Therapy, Assistive Technology, Adaptive Physical Education, mental health services, behavior intervention and assessment, career-transition services, and low incidence services for students with visual, hearing and orthopedic impairments. The Special Education Department also supervises two general education functions, health services provided by the school nurses and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.

According to interviews and substantiated by OUSD data dashboards, Oakland Unified has 6,506 (as of Feb 2023), identified Special Education students. The Special Education staff including teachers conducts more than 8,000 Individualized Education Program (IEP) meetings each year. The department operates a full continuum of programs to meet the needs of diverse students, from inclusion to specialized, self-contained settings, with at least one Special Education professional in every OUSD public school. In addition to the school-based programs, Special Education operates a preschool center, a diagnostic assessment center, home and hospital instruction, and a Young Adult Program that provides community-based instruction for eligible students aged 18-22.

The California state average for students served in special education enrollment is 12.5%. In the four districts for this study, OUSD and Sacramento City USD served 17.5% of the total school population in special education and San Jose USD served 14% while Fontana USD with 13% (Source: California Department of Education, 2022.)

The department administers an annual survey to staff, both certificated and classified, who serve students with IEPs. The survey for certificated staff includes 23 items in which the respondents rank the services they receive on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 the highest rating. It also provides seven opportunities for open-ended responses. The average rating of services for the spring 2022 survey was 3.8, indicating a high degree of satisfaction. The survey for classified staff consists of 11 ranking items and four open-ended responses. The average rating from the classified employees in the spring 2022 was 4.0, again indicating a high degree of satisfaction with services and support that classified employee received.
Description of the Department

The mission of the Special Education Department is to ensure that all school communities and departments embrace students with disabilities and provide evidence-based supports and resources to ensure that every student thrives.

The Special Education Department is responsible for:

- placement of students, program design and placement, curriculum selection, and staffing articulation for all Special Education programs across the Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA);
- provision of technical assistance to sites;
- direct recruitment, supervision, development and evaluation of over 300 hired and contracted service providers;
- provide staffing for over 120 students who require dedicated individual behavioral or functional/health personnel;
- all SELPA governance and reporting functions;
- case management of all students placed in private or nonpublic schools;
- conducting annual site visits across the state and country for nonpublic and residential schools;
- ensuring the participating charter offers compliant and comprehensive services;
- leading all IEP compliance monitoring activities;
- leading IEPs with legal involvement or following significant disciplinary action;
- professional development for Special Education and General Education staff;
- management of the Special Education budget;
- management and settlement of Special Education legal matters;
- central purchasing and distribution of supplemental curricula, IEP-specific tools and materials, assessment materials and SpEd-specific technology;
- child find and initial assessment of any Oakland resident aged 3-22 with a suspected disability, including a diagnostic center that evaluates over 800 students each year;
- offering extended school year services for eligible students; and
- running two school sites to support students aged 0-5 and 18-22.

Goals of the Department for 2022-23 include:

I. The Special Education department will develop and implement robust, multi-modal, multi-tiered effective professional learning opportunities. The through lines of professional Learning across the department are: Inclusive practices for both General and Special Educators, post-secondary readiness, and academic equity. This goal supports LCAP Goals 1 and 4. These will be measured by:

   a. attendance at professional learning opportunities and feedback surveys, with the goal of having 80% attendance at Coach-led PLCs, and positive feedback on feedback forms (use of a Likert scale and specific consistent question through all coaches to allow for comparison).

   b. The Special Education department will engage in walk-throughs and utilize the walkthrough tool with the goal of 80% of teachers observed engaging in exemplary behaviors on the form.

   c. 75% of IEPs reviewed for students 16+ in April and May will have completed ITPs.
II. Special Education department staff will provide effective, targeted, evidence-based services in the least restrictive environment to support students to make meaningful progress toward grade level standards and/or individual goals, as measured by classroom observations/walkthroughs and other implementation data (training records, curriculum distribution records & student data). This goal supports LCAP Goal 1 and Strategic Plan area for Supporting Graduates, Focus Areas 1 & 3.

Evidence-Based/ Curriculum Metrics:

- 100% of SpEd Teachers utilize district-adopted, evidence-based materials
- 100% of K-8 MM SDC Teachers implement SPIRE/Sounds Sensible
- 100% of K-12 Mod-ESN SDC Teachers implement Equals Math
- 100% of K-12 Mod-ESN SDC Teachers implement Unique Learning System
- 100% of K-8 RSP/Inclusive Teachers implement SPIRE/Sounds Sensible
- 100% of 9-12 MM SDC Teachers implement district adopted Math and ELA curriculum.
- 100% of SpEd Teachers have SpEd Curricula & have been trained on how to use it
- SpEd Department Walkthroughs reach 100% of SpEd Teachers
- 36 ECE, 150 Elem, 67 Middle, 113 HS, 12 YAP
- Baseline data will be collected and centralized by teacher and program

III. The Department will partner with other teams and site personnel to ensure that each student with an IEP has meaningful pathway experiences, access to paid and supported employment experiences, and transition services grounded in students’ own goals for their future as informed, engaged community members. This goal supports LCAP Goal 1.

a. By June, 2023, students with Individualized Education Programs in high school or young adult programming will:
   
   ii. Have increased access to dual-concurrent college courses/ CTE pathway experiences, resulting in at least 15% more students completing at least one course;
   
   iii. Have meaningful work experiences, resulting in at least 15% more students with IEPs having an active work permit and participating in an internship or supported employment opportunity; and,
   
   iv. Have a connection to a high school pathway, with 100% of students with IEPs being included in the pathway structure and 50% more students with IEPs participating in at least one general education pathway course. As measured by student course schedule analysis, graduation data, and work permit issuance.

IV. By June, 2023, the Special Education Department will provide monitoring, training and accountability to increase the number of timely, compliant and asset-driven IEPs. This goal supports LCAP Goal 1 and includes the following areas:

a. Reducing the number of past-due pending (Initials) records by 15% or fewer;

b. At least 93% of Plan Reviews (Annuals) will be held on time, and at least 90% of Eligibility Evaluations (Triennials) will be held on time;

c. An increase in the number of reviewed IEPs containing substantive qualitative and quantitative student baseline data of at least 30% from September baselines to May cycle closure;

d. Collection of robust baseline data from parents/rights holders about their IEP experience, with at least 50% of parents completing our IEP experience survey.
Student Population

The population of students with disabilities that OUSD serves has changed substantially over the last 17 years. While the district enrollment has declined from 48,135 students to 34,328, the number of students with IEPs has grown from 5,634 in 2005 to 6,506 in 2023. The number of students served in a disability category has changed as well. There are far fewer students identified with intellectual disabilities, emotional disabilities, and fewer students with specific learning disabilities. The proportion of students receiving services for speech and language impairments has remained relatively constant. Two disability categories have grown substantially, other health impaired and autism.

Exhibit 4-1 shows the changes in the population of students with disabilities since 2005. The “All Others” category includes Visually Impaired, Hearing Impairment, Orthopedic Impairment and Traumatic Brain Injury.

**EXHIBIT 4-1**
**OUSD CHANGES IN STUDENT POPULATION WITH DISABILITIES FROM 2005 TO 2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Intellectual Disability</th>
<th>Speech Language Impaired</th>
<th>Emotional Disability</th>
<th>Other Health Impaired</th>
<th>Other Specific Learning Disability</th>
<th>Autism</th>
<th>All Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1,839</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>1,799</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OUSD Special Education Department, 2023.
**Special Education Staffing**

The Special Education Department has a total of 924.66 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions in schools and the central office.

**Exhibit 4-2** shows the type, title and number of positions in the special education department.
# Exhibit 4-2
## Special Education/Health Services/Section 504 Staff by Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Dir of Elem Net 2,3,4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Dir MS Net &amp; Legal</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Dir HS Net &amp; Alt Ed</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Dir Young Adult Prgms</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Dir Psych Services</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Dir Related Services</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Director of Health &amp; Section 504</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Program Mgr Elem</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Program Mgr Secondary</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Coordinator Compliance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>Coordinator Health Services</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Case Managers</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>CDC Site Administrator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Occupational Therapist</td>
<td>13.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Speech Therapist</td>
<td>47.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Teacher RSP</td>
<td>120.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Teacher SDC Non</td>
<td>114.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>SP Health Data</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Licensed Vocational Nurse</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>School Nurses</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Teacher SDC Severe</td>
<td>85.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Teacher Structured English</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Teacher 11 M 12 P</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Teacher Hearing Impaired</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Teacher Orthopedic / Mobility</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Teacher Visually Impaired</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Teacher Adaptive PE</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Teacher Special Assignment</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>13.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Coordinator Special Education</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificated</td>
<td>Instruction Coach</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Community Services Worker</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Instructional Assistant</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Interpreter for Deaf</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Instructional Support Personnel</td>
<td>95.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Para Educator</td>
<td>259.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>SP Chinese Translator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>SP Spanish Translator</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>PM Health Services</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>Health Assistant Bilingual</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Staff Attorney</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 924.66

*Source: OUSD Special Education Department, 2023.*
Exhibit 4-3 shows the current organization chart for the OUSD special education department. As shown, the Executive Director has 17 direct reports.

EXHIBIT 4-3
CURRENT OUSD SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT ORGANIZATION CHART

Executive Director

- Director, Elementary Programs
- Director, Middle and Legal Supports
- Director, High School & Alternative Ed
- Director, Related Services
- Director, Psych & Mental Health
- Director, SELPA & ADR
- Director, Young Adult & Transition
- Director, Health Services

Site Administrator, Early Childhood

- Data Analyst
- Staff Attorney
- Legal Assistant
- Program Manager, Compliance
- Coordinator, Compliance
- Financial Operations Analyst
- Engagement Specialist

Program Manager, Operations

- Records & TPP Processing
- MIS Technician

*Jointly Supervised

Source: OUSD Special Education Department, 2023.
Special Education Responsibilities, Goals and Plan

To ensure as much access to the general education setting as possible most of the Special Education programs utilize the district-adopted curricula. OUSD provides a variety of evidence-based supplementary materials, intervention curricula and core replacement curricula for students working toward alternative, modified standards.

The OUSD team uses multisensory instruction as an approach to reduce disability-related barriers to instructional access. Staff are trained in and provide Spire multisensory literacy intervention for all of TK-8 mild-moderate and moderate programs, and staff have collaborated with the district’s academics division leaders to create small group mathematics intervention guidance using Eureka Squared. The Extensive Support Needs settings use Unique Learning System and Equals Math, which feature icon-supported text and embedded use of manipulatives and regalia.

To support social-emotional and behavioral needs, OUSD’s Special Education staff have invested in Superflex guides and training for our educators, Everyday Speech for pragmatic language and social skills instruction, and two evidence-based social-emotional intervention programs.

Public Works LLC conducted a central office and school-level survey in February 2023. (Please see Appendix A & B for the full survey results.) Survey completers had a mixed level of satisfaction regarding special education services with 27% rating Special Education services as high or very high, 31% rating Special Education at the moderate level and 43% rating Special Education as low or very low. Of the 323 surveys completed, 76 respondents had no opinion of Special Education.

Comments about the special education department included:

- I feel supported by the sped department but don’t really understand what value the rest of the central office brings.
- I rated SPED programs very low because I see that the Special Day classes at my school are in shambles and a main source of stress and derailment for my school, when they don’t have to be. Our SDC teachers feel violated at school and highly disrespected with the lack of support provided.
- Seems like cutting costs for the district involves cutting SPED support, behavior management support, attendance support at the expense of maintaining a bloated central office.
- I have seen very talented SPED teachers “babysitting” individual students with behavioral challenges instead of supporting students with LDs and co-teaching with Gen Ed teachers to maintain an equitable inclusion model. I started in an inclusion class where there were two teachers—SPED & GE—and an ISS, and we had 8 students out of 24 with IEPs. The students with IEPs got the support they needed to do standard level work, and the Gen Ed students benefited from working with a diverse set of students. In the current model, it’s a mess right now.
- The SPED department is understaffed and ineffective. Not enough ISS’s.
- Sites do not prioritize EL and Sped students when spending funds and CSI does not direct sites to do so.
- All the Special Ed students I work with need more support in general. They are mainstreamed with regular students. One third of the 11th & 12 graders (approximately 40 out of 120 students have (or need) an IEP. There’s one Special Ed teacher for all of them, plus he’s expected to be regular classroom teacher much of the time AND handle all the IEP meetings and whatever else. There should be at least one other person with my job title in these two classrooms. Overwhelming amount of work, an absolute black hole of work.
- More staffing and resources are needed. For example I have 8 IEP student in one class and my sped co-teacher can’t work with all them and neither do I.
Public Works LLC also conducted focus groups of parents as part of the redesign process. Below are some of the parent comments about special education services:

- Lack of IEP services;
- Dyslexia and ADHD services are lacking;
- Classes are too large;
- IEP plan – smooth process at elem but not at the high school level;
- Some staff are not full-time and not always there when needed;
- Too high caseloads;
- Assessments of students are not being completed;
- SPED is area least equitable and least well served;
- Viewed as self-contained;
- NO PD for gen ed teachers;
- No effort to bring these concerns to the general public;

On March 30, 2023, three members of the Special Education Community Advisory Council (CAC) met to provide their perspectives on issues in the OUSD special education department. Those issues included:

1. CAC members were concerned about the staffing for paraprofessionals and instructional support specialists regarding the formula for allocation of staff and the design for when a position is allocated;
2. Members felt that Special Day Classes are moved too frequently and without purpose, causing students and parents unnecessary disruption;
3. The staffing for the inclusion program has changed which has resulted in students being assigned to resource classrooms without the support they received in inclusion classrooms;
4. The budget allocation system allows schools to underfund special education classes and encourages schools to seek to transfer special education programs to other schools;
5. Schools are not adhering to the district approved ‘access resolution’ (2021-0159) and there is no enforcement when schools are not in compliance;
6. Although the district has had plans in place for several years, the disproportionality of black students in special education being suspended remains; and,
7. Because OUSD is a single member SELPA, the public cannot access meetings where program decisions are made.

Source: Public Works LLC CAC Focus Group, 2023.

Each year for the past three years, OUSD has surveyed principals to assess the quality of support that district office departments provide to schools.

The proportion of principals who agree or strongly agree that “The Special Education department partners with sites to build capacity among special education teaching staff that results in student grown and learning,” has essentially remained constant with 49.1% in 2020 to 48.3% in 2022. But when asked to respond to the statement “The Special Education department partners with school sites to build capacity for technical aspects of IEP writing and compliance among special education teaching staff that results in improved levels of technical proficiency” the proportion who agree or strongly agree dropped from 58% in 2020 to 52% in 2022. It is difficult to interpret and understand what principals are saying in their responses when the stem statements used in both items are asking about more than one thing. The second question noted above asks respondents to combine the notion of partnership, with building capacity for technical proficiency with improving levels of proficiency. A respondent who agrees with the stem statement may be agreeing with all three or just one or
two of the notions. A staff member who disagrees may agree with two of the three ideas, but not the third. This type of survey item tends to push respondents toward a neutral or a response of disagreement.

**Exhibit 4-4** shows the results of the principal surveys for special education for each of the last three years.

**EXHIBIT 4-4**
**PRINCIPAL SURVEY / SELECTED ITEMS – SPECIAL EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Sum of Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Special Education department partners with sites to build capacity among special education teaching staff that results in student growth and learning.</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Special Education department partners with school sites to build capacity for technical aspects of IEP writing and compliance among special education teaching staff that results in improved levels of technical proficiency.</td>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses for are color coded as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Green" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Yellow" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Yellow" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Orange" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Red" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: OUSD Data Dashboards 2022.*

The special education portion of the principal survey has two other items: The Special Education department partners with sites to build capacity among paraprofessional staff that results in student growth and learning which essentially stayed the same over the three years of the survey.

**Exhibit 4-5** provides principal survey results for additional items regarding special education services to schools.
**EXHIBIT 4-5**
**PRINCIPAL SURVEY ADDITIONAL ITEMS FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION**

| The Special Education department partners with sites to build capacity among paraprofessional staff that results in student growth and learning. | 2019-20 | 50 | 12.6% | 29 | 30.0% | 16 | 22.0% | 11 | 8.8% | 4 |
| Special Education provides good service and supports my school adequately. | 2019-20 | 50 | 19.6% | 11 | 58.0% | 29 | 18.0% | 9 | 0% | 0 |
| | 2020-21 | 56 | 23.7% | 14 | 20.3% | 12 | 23.7% | 14 | 18.6% | 11 |
| | 2021-22 | 59 | 8.5% | 5 | 42.4% | 25 | 20.3% | 12 | 16.0% | 10 | 10.2% | 6 |


**FINDING**

The spans of control for the Director of Related Services, and the Director of Psychological and Mental Health Services are beyond reasonable. The Director of Related Services is responsible for Speech, Occupational Therapy (OT), Physical Therapy (PT), Adaptive Physical Education (APE), Deaf, Hard of Hearing, (DHH), Assistive Technology / Augmentative & Alternative Communication (AT/AAC), Visually Impaired (VI), Orientation & Mobility (O&M), and is the liaison for Simultaneous Membership Programs (SMP).

The Director of Related Services is responsible for hiring, training, professional development, supervision and evaluation for the following groups of employees:

- 100 Speech Therapists, 50 of whom are paid by contracting agencies
- 17 Occupational Therapists and Physical Therapists
- 2 Deaf & Hard of Hearing itinerant teachers
- 3 Adaptive Physical Education Teachers
- 2 Augmentative & Alternative Communication
- 2 Assistive Technology Occupational Therapists
- 5 Visual Impairment teachers
Likewise, the span of control for the Director of Psychological and Mental Health directly supervises 63.9 psychologists as well as a large number of non-public schools provided contract positions. This director also supervises 17 social workers and that number is expected to increase to 23 for the 2023-24 school year.

Unlike other directors in other departments, the Directors of Related Services and Psychological and Mental Health Services are responsible for recruitment, selection, hiring, professional development, training and evaluation of these staff members with only minimal assistance from the OUSD Talent Division. By negotiated agreement the components required in evaluation include three observation cycles, pre- and post-observation conferences in addition to completing the evaluation document.

A number of factors contribute to determining the effective number of direct reports including:

- **Organization size**: The size of an organization is a great influencer. Larger organizations tend to have wider spans of control than smaller organizations. *Oakland is one of the 50 largest school districts in the state of California.*

- **Nature of an organization**: The culture of an organization can influence: a more relaxed, flexible culture is consistent with wider; while a hierarchical culture is consistent with narrow. *While the culture of OUSD appears to be a more informal one, the requirements of staff in special education are highly regulated with potentially litigious consequences for any non-compliance with laws, rules and regulations.*

- **Nature of job**: Routine and low complexity jobs/tasks require less supervision than jobs that are inherently complicated, loosely defined, and require frequent decision-making. *In OUSD, each of the related and psychological services is complicated and requires professional judgment in making service decisions.*

- **Skills and competencies of manager**: More experienced supervisors or managers can generally be wider than less experienced supervisors. It’s best to also consider to what degree supervisors and managers are responsible for technical aspects of the job (non-managerial duties). Both OUSD’s *Director of Related Services and Psychological and Mental Services have four years of experience in these roles.*

- **Employees’ skills and abilities**: Less experienced employees require more training, direction, and delegation (closer supervision, narrow); whereas more experienced employees require less training, direction, and delegation (less supervision, wider). *While the staff under the Director of Related Services run the gamut of experiences, more than 15% of the 2022-23 were new hires.*

- **Type of interaction between supervisors and employees**: More frequent interaction/supervision is characteristic of a narrower. Less interaction, such as supervisors primarily just answering questions and helping solve employee problems, is characteristic of a wider. *The sheer number of professional employees in the department limits the interaction with the director.*


There is nothing in the literature of best management practices that suggests a manager can efficiently and effectively supervise 130 professional staff or even 60.
Recommendation 4-1

Assign the supervision and evaluation of the speech therapists to the principals and the psychologists to special education network directors and combine the remaining functions of the two positions into one.

Steps that may assist the district in implementing this recommendation include the following:

- Engage the Talent Division in the screening of prospective professionals including recruitment and basics screening such as reviewing qualifications and reference checking.
- Engage the Academics and Instruction department in carrying out the professional development of related services professionals.
- Reassign supervision and evaluation services for the two largest groups of staff, speech language pathologist and psychologist to the directors assigned to each network can support the Director of Related Services in supervising and evaluating related services professional staff. In many districts, principals evaluate speech therapists.

FINDING

The Special Education Department is substantially behind in completing initial assessments of students referred for special education services as well as overdue triennial Individual Education Plans.

California Education code states:

> Once a child has been referred for an initial assessment to determine whether the child is an individual with exceptional needs and to determine the educational needs of the child, these determinations shall be made, and an individualized education program team meeting shall occur within 60 days of receiving parental consent for the assessment, pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 56302.1.

Exhibit 4-6 below shows the number of students with signed parent consent awaiting assessments as well as the average number of days that those assessments are outside the 60-day window in Education Code. The chart computed the days behind by subtracting the days when schools were not in session such as summer vacation and holiday breaks.

Education Code requires not only that the assessment be completed but that an individualized education (IEP) program team meeting occur within 60 days. Therefore, assessments must be completed far enough ahead to allow the scheduling and holding of the IEP team meeting.
EXHIBIT 4-6
COMPLIANCE NONFEASANCE FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Span</th>
<th># of Students Awaiting Testing</th>
<th>Average Days Behind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>547</strong></td>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OUSD Special Education Assessment Data as of February 13, 2023 as analyzed by Public Works LLC, 2023.

In addition to the number of referrals awaiting assessment and initial IEPs, the department is also in arrears in holding the required triennial IEP meetings. As of February 1, 2023, there were 181 prior year overdue IEPs and 583 current year overdue IEPs. These are substantial increases from the pre-pandemic year 2018-19 when, on February 1, 2019, there were 31 overdue prior year IEPs and 128 overdue IEPs for 2018-19.

The COVID 19 pandemic during which students were not in school for in-person instruction for more than a calendar year was especially harmful to students with disabilities. However, only five of the 547 students awaiting assessments were referred before March 30, 2021 when in-person instruction resumed. Currently OUSD employs and contracts for 63.9 full time equivalent psychologists who perform the initial assessments of students who are referred for special education eligibility.

According to the Fiscal Crisis and Management Assistance Team (FCMAT), the industry standard ratio for school psychologists is 1:977, one psychologist for every 977 students. OUSD exceeds that standard with a ratio of 1:650.

School psychologists have multifaceted role. They are directly responsible for the psychological assessment of academic, social, emotional, and behavioral domains utilizing problem-solving and standardized evaluations. The school psychologist monitors the completion of case study evaluations and participates in Individualized
Education Plan (IEP) conferences and problem-solving meetings designing systems, programs and services that maximize students' social, emotional, and educational success (National Association of School Psychologists website 2023).

The district being well out of compliance with assessment requirements is significant. According to district reports, just under 80% of students assessed for special education services are found eligible. If this ratio holds for the 547 students who are awaiting testing, more than 430 are awaiting services for which they may be eligible.

**Recommendation 4-2**

Take action to eliminate the backlog of pending assessments and establish procedures to complete initial assessments within the California Ed Code parameters.

OUSD should come into compliance with ED Code Section 56302.1 within the next 12 months while ensuring that referrals that come after February 13, 2023 receive assessments and initial IEP team meetings as required by EdCode.

Steps that OUSD may take to implement this recommendation include the following:

1. Increase current efforts to contract with agencies and individuals for educational psychologists;
2. Review the position expectations for OUSD employed psychologists to ensure that they are completing assessments at industry standards; and
3. Use both contracted and OUSD employed psychologists to do educational testing throughout the summer of 2023.

**FINDING**

OUSD’s unrestricted general fund contribution to special education is significantly larger than comparison districts and state average. A sizable portion of the funding that OUSD allocates to the special education local contribution is in central office staffing that is well above the levels of other districts.

School districts receive state and federal funds to support education for students with disabilities. School districts receive funding each year (mainly as local general purpose funding from the Local Control Funding Formula) to educate all students, including students with disabilities. These funds can be used for any educational purpose but primarily cover general education costs such as teacher compensation. Beyond these general education costs, school districts incur additional costs to serve students with disabilities (for example, to provide specialized instructional support and adaptive equipment). To help cover these additional costs, school districts and charter schools for 2021-22 received more than $6 billion combined from state and federal categorical funding specifically for special education. These funding sources together cover roughly one third of the additional cost of special education services. School districts cover remaining special education costs with their local general purpose funding.

*Source: Legislative Analyst Office, 2022.*
Exhibit 4-7 illustrates the significant difference in the local contributions for each district.

Data for San Jose were not available because unlike the other three districts, San Jose is a member of a SELPA consortium rather than a single member Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) district. Data for West Contra Costa Unified which is similar in size to San Jose and similar to Oakland in student diversity and unduplicated percentage provide a third comparison district for this finding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Local Contribution</th>
<th>State SpEd Rev</th>
<th>Federal Rev</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Local Cont.</th>
<th>% IEPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>$88,844,923</td>
<td>$28,099,052</td>
<td>$7,776,817</td>
<td>$124,720,792</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>$79,906,513</td>
<td>$41,737,260</td>
<td>$7,859,515</td>
<td>$129,503,688</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>$37,189,018</td>
<td>$33,167,869</td>
<td>$7,871,010</td>
<td>$78,227,897</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Contra Costa Unified</td>
<td>$61,935,535</td>
<td>$24,876,581</td>
<td>$7,568,075</td>
<td>$94,380,161</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Special Education Local Service Plans 2022-23.

The state average for school district local contribution to special education is 65.5%. Were OUSD able to reduce the local contribution to the state average, the district would have more than $20 million to spend on other programs, services and salaries. Reducing the local contribution to 69% would save the unrestricted general fund nearly $11 million and reducing the contribution by 1.2% would save $5 million.

Most of the state revenue for special education comes from AB 602 funding which is based on Average Daily Attendance (ADA). For the 2017-18 school year, the absence rate for all students in OUSD was 5.9% and for
special education students, 7.7%. As of February 2023, the absence rate for all students is 10.4% and for special education 13.0%. The chronic absence rate for all OUSD students has increased from 13.9% in 2018 to 39.7% this year. Chronic absenteeism for special education students has increased from 23% in 2017-18 to 43.9% so far this school year (2022-23). As absenteeism rises, state AB 602 funds decrease.

The well-above-average allocation of the local contribution is not sourced in teacher salaries. As shown in Appendix D, OUSD has the lowest average teacher salary of the three comparison districts and is $14,259 lower than Sacramento City, $20,378 lower than Fontana and $11,756 lower than San Jose.

Several factors do contribute to OUSD's high level of local contribution to special education. The first is that OUSD has too many small schools (See Findings / Recommendations 3-2 and 3-4).

The second is that OUSD employs more special education administrators and teachers on special assignments (TSAs) than the comparison districts provide. As noted earlier in this report, it was difficult to receive data from the comparison districts other than organization charts from two of the three. The Sacramento City organization shows that SCUSD has six administrators for a department that provides services for more than 6,800 students. The Fontana Unified organization chart was up-to-date as of July, 2022, but shows only six administrators for nearly 4,000 students with disabilities. Because it was not possible to get even an organization chart from San Jose, the data from West Contra Costa (WCCUSD) provides another comparison. WCCUSD has eight administrators in the special education department. WCCUSD also has seven teachers on assignment as program specialists. OUSD has 12 administrators and 13 teachers on special assignment.

A compounding factor is the number and the cost of students placed in non-public schools and specialty staff provided by non-public agencies which accounts for 27% of the total special education budget or more than $33 million (Oakland Unified School District, Board Report January 25, 2023).

**Recommendation 4-3**

Initiate a multi-year plan to reduce the local contribution to special education services as well as enhance state special education revenue by improving student attendance with a target adjusting the local contribution to special education to the state average.

Over the next two years, OUSD should reduce administration in special education by two positions and reduce the number of teachers on special assignment by at least half. As noted in Recommendation 4-1, the Network-based special education directors should assume the supervision and evaluation responsibilities for the psychologists and speech language pathologist. This action may allow for combining the roles of the Directors of Related Services and Psychological Services and Mental Health or it may allow one of both of those directors to take other duties such as representing the district in responding to legal complaints.

A reduction of Teachers on Special Assignment could be accomplished by increasing the ratio of instructional coaches to teachers from 1 to 30 to 1 to 60 or 70.

OUSD should use available space in under enrolled district schools to provide programs that would allow OUSD to meet its Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) requirement in OUSD rather than non-public school.

**Exhibit 4-8** shows the recommended organization chart for the Special Education Department for the 2024-25 school year.
EXHIBIT 4-8
PROPOSED OUSD SPECIAL EDUCATION ORGANIZATION CHART

- Executive Director
  - Director, Elementary Programs*
  - Director, Middle and Legal Supports*
  - Director High School & Alternative Ed*
  - Director, SELPA & NPS
  - Director, Young Adult & Transition
  - Director, Health Services
  - Director, Related & Psychological Services
  - Site Administrator, Early Childhood*
  - Data Analyst*
  - Staff Attorney*
  - Legal Assistant
  - Program Manager, Compliance
  - Coordinator, Compliance
  - Financial Operations Analyst
  - Engagement Specialist

- Program Manager, Operations
  - Records & TPP Processing
  - MIS Technician

*Dual reporting relationship with the Network Superintendents

Source: Created by Public Works LLC Team, 2023.
**FINDING**

The Special Education department has implemented a high quality and fully aligned curriculum for students in special education classes.

When special education students are included in general education classes, the regular education teacher adapts the adopted curriculum to meet objectives of the special needs student’s individualized education plan (IEP). Those adaptations may include:

- Adapting the environment such as the student’s cooperative group or seating area in the classroom;
- Adapting the presentation by using different models or providing students with an outline key concept;
- Change the pace of instructions to allow students with IEPs to have more time or be given shorter assignments;
- Adapt materials such as work sheets with more open space or larger print; and
- Adapt assessments such as giving oral tests or allowing students to practice and record their results (California Department of Education, Opportunities for All Branch).

A resource specialist teacher may also provide the adaptations and accommodations for students with IEPs.

While adapting the general education curriculum is essential, it is not sufficient. The OUSD Special Education Department has done an exemplary job in selecting and implementing curriculum that supplements and provides interventions for students with IEPs. After careful research and piloting in OUSD schools, the Special Education Department has implemented the following:

- SPIRE Multisensory Reading Intervention (TK-8)
- Superflex - Social Thinking (TK-8)
- Everyday Speech (SLPs and select teachers- focused on social skills and pragmatic language)
- Kimochis for SEL (ECE only this year, expanding to grade 2 next year)
- Oneder for Transition
- Education Associates JobReady Job Kits launching August 2023

**Commendation 4-A**

OUSD is commended for the quality of the curricula for special education students who are not able to be included in general education classes.

**FINDING**

The OUSD Special Education Department has developed and disseminated the “Site Leader Toolkit,” which provide school principals and other leaders in a school with essential and easy to access information that is essential to fulfilling their roles in relation to special education students and decreasing the likelihood of litigation.
The Special Education department has developed useful tools for general education staff to serve all students, including students with IEPs. The Site Leader Toolkit, which is updated every year, provides school administrators and staff essential information in an easy-to-access format. Information on IEP’s, Staffing, Classroom Standards, Accessing Support and Professional Development are included in a succinct 11-page electronic brochure.

Many principals and assistant principals do not have experience as special education teachers and few principal training programs provide more than the most cursory instruction of the challenges and requirements in administering special education classes. The principal needs to know about special education services and the different types of special education staff. Principals should be prepared to participate in special education evaluation meetings, IEP meetings, and discipline meetings, and should periodically observe special education classroom instruction—just like they observe general education classroom instruction.

Source: Principal’s Guide to Special Education, Council for Exceptional Children

**Commendation 4-B**

OUSD is commended for the quality of the Special Education Department’s Site Leader Toolkit.

**FINDING**

After a suggestion from Public Works LLC that the FCMAT Special Education Efficiency Tool could be helpful to the OUSD Special Education Department, the Executive Director of Special Education completed the tool.

FCMAT developed this Special Education Efficiency Tool as a resource for LEAs to analyze various areas within special education. The intent is for fiscal and special education staff to work together to complete the tool, and for this process to help guide a conversation about how to provide the best services for students in the most efficient manner.

Using the FCMAT Special Education Tool allowed the OUSD Special Education Department to identify areas where the district is meeting standards for identification and service delivery and to compare OUSD to state averages.

**Commendation 4-C**

OUSD Special Education Department is commended for using the FCMAT Special Education Efficiency Tool.
SECTION 5
Community Schools and Student Services Department

Overview of Community Schools and Student Services Department

Community Schools and Student Services (CSSS) is one of the largest departments in Oakland Unified School District (OUSD). The total number of FTEs in the CSSS is 62.4 in the central office and an additional 63 positions are working at school sites.

Exhibit 5-1 shows the current CSSS organizational chart.

As shown, the Executive Director has 12 direct reports. The direct reports include: two administrative assistants, Director Health & Wellness, Director The Center Programs, Director Student Safety & Support, Director Behavioral Health, Coordinator After School, Coordinator Summer, Coordinator Community Schools Leadership, Coordinator Juvenile Justice Center, Commissioner Oakland Athletic League, and Strategic Fellow - a position that is sunsetting.

Source: Created by Public Works LLC 2023 based on interviews and other OUSD org charts; the chart presented to our team was out of date so our team created the current organization chart.
According to data submitted to the Public Works LLC Team, the CSSS Department (and its partners) is responsible for a number of functions for OUSD including the following:

(After School) Expanded Learning Programs: Refers to restricted school-based government-funded, comprehensive programs provided by the district in partnership with community partners. Programs are offered daily and provide academic support, enrichment, and physical activity aligned with school day goals. Programs are open for all students, but because space is limited, each school has site-specific enrollment priorities and procedures that are in compliance with state and federal grant requirements.

Student Support & Safety (Attendance, Discipline & Safety): Works with OUSD schools to develop their Attendance Teams in order to support student attendance and facilitates the School Attendance Review Board (SARB).

Behavioral Health (Mental Health Supports): Works to remove institutional, social, and emotional barriers to learning and wellness. Behavioral Health staff lead and implement multi-tiered systems of support that are culturally responsive, evidence based and designed to create safe, equitable and inclusive schools. Behavioral Health includes School-based Mental Health Services.

California Healthy Kids Survey Administration: A cross-department partnership of Behavioral Health, Health and Wellness, Research, Assessment, and Data, Family Engagement, the Office of Equity, and school sites that collects student, staff, and parent experiences at schools in order to inform culture and climate strategies as well as play a role in determining funding allocations that support the community school district.

Central Kitchen, Education Center and Instructional Farm (The Center): The Center brings tremendous opportunity to Oakland students, families and staff in the areas of environment, food and gardens (EFG). The Center becomes the hub for this work and its alignment with the school meal program bringing fresher, less processed, and appealing food to students.

Community School Managers & Partnerships: A community school is both a place and a strategy for organizing the resources of the school and the community around student success. OUSD operates 66 full-service community schools led by Community School Managers (CSM) to coordinate programs and services to meet the holistic needs of youth, families, and the school community by focusing on community school priorities.

Central Culture and Climate Ambassadors: Promotes and engages in OUSD’s vision of safety by uplifting relationships, de-escalation and restorative practices. Central Culture & Climate Ambassadors work directly to support school networks to help devise and implement their site George Floyd Resolution (GFR) Village Response Plan and to aid in any student or community situation that may need assistance.

Culture Keepers (former SSOs) & Site Culture & Climate Ambassadors: Promotes school site safety through relationship building, de-escalation techniques and the use of trauma informed restorative practices. These skill sets should be utilized on a regular basis as they supervise, monitor and support school sites. There will be a site Culture and Climate Ambassador at each one of the seven large high schools.

Health Education: Supports are coordinated in partnership with Academics & Instructional Innovation. In addition to the jointly coordinated efforts around nutrition, CSSS is primarily responsible for the implementation of Middle School and High School Sex Education.

Juvenile Justice Center: Partners with Alameda County to serve as a resource and referral center providing warm hand-offs, in partnership with other county agencies, and offers services to youth and their caregivers.
LGBTQ Programming and Support: A component of OUSD's equity strategy, the Health and Wellness Unit works with site staff to convene Gender and Sexuality Alliances (GSAs) at all secondary schools, Rainbow Clubs in elementary sites, hosts central district-wide GSA Day and provides training to site and central staff to promote safe and supportive classrooms and environments for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer students.

Oakland Athletic League (OAL): Provides all students with a robust sports program that is inclusive and equitable for all students to develop self-confidence, interpersonal skills, teamwork, and leadership by providing quality school based athletic programs. OAL strives to enhance all schools’ ability to offer safe and organized school based athletic programs, increase opportunities for girls and students with disabilities, and promote healthy, safe and fair school based athletic programs that will increase academic achievement. OAL oversees 10 high school athletic programs and 17 middle school programs in three seasons of sports—Fall, Winter, and Spring.

Restorative Justice (RJ): Represents a paradigm shift from a punitive model of discipline to a caring model that encourages relationships, accountability, and allows for healing. Classroom circles help create community, increase empathy, and build solid relationships. RJ provides a framework that encourages an equitable school environment by allowing the students to bring their cultural values into the classroom.

School Based Health Centers: Offer free medical, mental health, health education, and youth development services for students at 16 campuses across the District. A number of sites also offer dental screening and treatment on-site. A vision clinic that can serve any student in OUSD has been embedded in the Youth Heart Health Center located at La Escuelita.

Staff Wellness: The Health and Wellness Unit provides stipends and training to school staff to lead staff wellness activities at their sites and connect colleagues to wellness resources.

Summer Learning Programs: Provides expanded learning opportunities for students in need of additional academic support as they prepare for the next grade level. In partnership with community agencies, Summer Learning programs also include enrichment opportunities. Bridge programs support students transitioning from elementary to middle school, and from middle to high school, as well as for students with no preschool experience transitioning into kindergarten.

Therapists/Social Work Interns: Provides students and families with mental health supports. Students referred for services receive one-on-one or group counseling to support social, emotional, and academic success.

Transitional Students & Families Unit (TSF): Provides supplemental education services to students and families in transition.

- **McKinney-Vento** specifically provides services to students and families that lack appropriate housing as defined though the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (1987).
- **Foster Youth Services** seeks to address the unique educational needs of youth in foster care systems. Many youths in foster care experience multiple changes in home placements as they are placed with foster parent(s), guardian homes (kinship/relative or non-relative), and group homes.
- **TUPE (Tobacco Use Prevention and Education)** works to support student success by providing education about the social, physical, emotional, and spiritual effects of drug use and transformational life skills coaching that connects them to their strengths, passions, and meaningful engagement in academics, life, and career.
• **Wellness** focuses on implementation of the district adopted Wellness Policy; the District Wellness Council; the Site Wellness Champion program; Nutrition and Garden Education/Food Corps Program; and Physical Education/Physical Activity programming. The Wellness Champion Program recruits school site leaders (teachers or other staff) to lead specific health and wellness systems and programs at a school, often in partnership with another Site Wellness Champion.

**COMMUNITY SCHOOLS DISTRICT PARTNERS**

Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support (PBIS) - partner with MTSS Team: is a nationally recognized framework for shifting school culture from punitive to culturally responsive and positively reinforcing. Students and staff work to collaborate in targeted school-wide positive behavioral expectations which are culturally informed and positively reinforced throughout the school day.

Community Schools seek to leverage community partnerships and resources to assist schools with an array of resources for students, families, and community members. In 2011, Oakland announced its intent to become the nation’s first full-service community school district.

San Francisco Foundation, Kaiser Community Fund, and the Federal Government funded the Community Schools expansion in recognition of Oakland’s successful efforts. $10 million was awarded to OUSD to provide additional school managers and other program needs. Subsequently, the state of California has provided $66M to OUSD for Community Schools expansion.

The John W. Gardner Center in the Stanford Graduate School of Education conducted research on OUSD’s Community Schools model. The research was conducted in 2015 and used a sample of five OUSD schools. The full report can be found at [https://www.ousd.org/cms/lib/CA01001176/Centricity/Domain/97/OUSD%20Report%20December%202015.pdf](https://www.ousd.org/cms/lib/CA01001176/Centricity/Domain/97/OUSD%20Report%20December%202015.pdf)

Overall, the research report found that:

- The OUSD community school model appears to be working as designed.
- The community school model offers an integrated, strategic approach to addressing student outcomes and needs.
- Implementing the community school model appears to be positively related to student readiness to learn, support for teachers, and school climate.
- There remains a need for increased resources—especially around behavioral health and trauma—and more robust student-level data on community school program participation.

**Exhibit 5-2** shows a detailed series of the research key findings.
EXHIBIT 5-2
JOHN W. GARDNER CENTER IN THE STANFORD GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION RESEARCH ON OUSD’S COMMUNITY SCHOOLS MODEL FINDINGS

Key Findings: Teaching and Learning in Oakland Community Schools

- The majority of respondents at all schools in this study report that community school interventions have positively affected student readiness to learn, support for teachers, and the school climate.
- School and partner staff reported that community school supports and services addressed important barriers to learning.
- Teachers noted that the system of supports and resources at their schools enabled them to focus more directly on teaching.
- School-level year-to-year student statistical trends are largely consistent with teacher and staff reports obtained during our first phase of interviews, although it is too early to conclude an association between community school interventions and aggregate student outcome trends.

Key Findings: Integrated Services and Supports in Oakland Community Schools

- The OUSD community schools in this study offered an array of services, supports, and opportunities to students and their families, especially in the areas of health and wellness, expanded learning, and family engagement.
- Many of these mature community schools showed high levels of service integration with the school’s academic mission, operations, and culture, with some variation and adaptation by site. For example, in some school’s teachers and afterschool program staff actively aligned lessons and activities; and in others health and mental health services had become a regular part of what students do at school.
- Community school organizational structures such as collaborative school leadership, partnerships, and coordination helped align services to student and school needs.
- Teachers noted that supports and services improve students’ readiness to learn, increase the amount of time students are in class, and allow teachers to focus more on teaching.

Key Findings: Organizational Structures to Support Oakland Community Schools

- The mature OUSD community school sites studied have implemented the key organizational structures of the OUSD community school design: collaborative leadership, strategic partnerships, and coordination. These elements were consistent across sites, with some adaptations to individual school contexts.
- Leadership, partnerships, and coordination were identified as essential structures in supporting schools to make progress toward desired school improvement and student outcomes. As the district increases the number of community schools, these structures continue to be important areas for investment and support.
- Principals helped create a school culture that views multiple partners as integral to schools’ functioning and success in promoting better student outcomes.
- The community school manager plays a critical role in integrating the partnership work of the school with its academic mission, serving as a high-level administrator managing, leading, and coordinating the community work to support school and student needs.

Some of the unique features of the community schools model include:

**Community School Managers (CSM):** OUSD, a district with possibly the largest concentration of community schools in the nation, was the biggest recipient of the state of California’s $3 billion Community Schools Partnership Program. OUSD will receive $66 million over five years to expand and supplement its community schools’ network. OUSD has expanded from 53 CSMs to 66. CSMs integrate a school’s partnership work with its academic mission. The CSM collaborates with principals to: (1) identify school goals; (2) align partners and resources to those goals; and (3) build relationships with families, students, and the community. At mature OUSD full-service community schools, the CSM operates as a school-level administrator who manages, leads, and coordinates partnerships and programs to support school and student needs.

**Collaborative Leadership:** Leadership at community schools often looks different from that of traditional schools. While the principal remains the guiding force, non-school site entities—such as partner agencies, community school coordinators, and sometimes families—may play an integral role in school vision, planning, coordination, and even management. Although cross-sector collaboration between school and community-based entities can entail challenges, the ultimate aim is a school culture in which adults work together to support students’ learning needs.

**Partnerships:** Research showed that school staff view partner organizations to be at the core—rather than the periphery—of the school’s academics. By providing and aligning resources, community-based partners are a critical ingredient of community schools, to supporting school goals. In practice, school-community partnerships are often complex and at times challenging, involving distinct organizational cultures, accountability systems, communication styles, and perspectives.

**Coordination:** Integrating the additional support services of community schools into the fabric of the school requires extensive coordination. The CSM and Coordination of Services Team (COST) are important components of this coordination work. COST is a team of staff members who come together on a biweekly basis to discuss how the school is providing additional services to at risk students. The goal of COST is to coordinate school-wide efforts focused on making sure students come to school every day, are in good health, are performing well academically, and are developing the social/emotional skills necessary to be successful in school and life.

**FINDING**

OUSD Community Schools and Student Services are not organized in such a manner as to optimally provide quality services to schools.

**Exhibit 5-3** shows that 25 percent of the respondents’ level of satisfaction with interacting with CSSS are either low or very low. Conversely, 23.73 percent rated them high or very high.
OUSD is a school district with a student population of 34,265 and employing 2,341 teachers, 1,892 other school-based staff, and 781 central office personnel. From interviews, it is clear that leadership and management staff have the talent and experience to perform a wide-ranging set of duties.

Consultants find that further organizational improvements and efficiencies may be obtained by organizing the four proposed networks of schools (see Section 1, Exhibit 1-9) to ensure operational effectiveness of the OUSD schools. The essence of the CSI redesign recommendation is to move administrators and managers away from narrowly tailored roles to generalist roles. As noted in Section 1, Community Schools & Student Services has 43 job titles for 62 professional positions. The result is that services to schools are fragmented rather than aligned. Community Schools and Student Services functions need to be integrated under the Network Superintendents.

The redesigned CSI organization chart introduced in Section 1 shows that there should be a Director of Community Services position reporting jointly to the Network Superintendent and to the Executive Director of Community Schools. Creating this new position requires that OUSD align:

1. The attendance and discipline strategies with the efforts of the Network Superintendents and school principals;
2. The behavioral health services with the Section 504 and special education programs;
3. The summer learning programs with special education extended year programs;
4. The after-school programs with school sponsored extracurricular activities;
5. The Juvenile Justice Center with Academics & Instruction as well as with high schools and alternative schools.

The new Directors of Community Services must be generalists who have skills in networking, finding resources, and in coordinating staff from schools and central services to achieve better outcomes for students. Operationalizing these new positions should allow for fewer rather than additional staff.

**Recommendation 5-1**

Create and fill four Director of Community Schools positions (internally) that report jointly to the Executive Director of Community Schools and to the Network Superintendents for the 2024-25 school year.

Steps that may assist in the implementation of this recommendation would include:

- Development of a draft position description through a collaboration of the Executive Director Community Schools, the Executive Director Special Education, and the Network Superintendents with input from Academics and Instruction;
- The Executive Director Community Schools should review coordinator and director positions and make a recommendation to the CSI that consolidates single-person job roles into more generalist roles that would operate in direct support of the newly created Director Community Schools position;
- The Executive Director of Community Schools along with Talent Division staff should collaborate with staff from the Service Employees International and the United Administrators of Oakland Schools to develop and recommend a process for making the transitions to generalist positions and determining appropriate salary placements;
- Upon approval by the Chief Academic Officer, these recommended changes should be presented to the Superintendent no later than December 2023.

**FINDING**

With the expansion of Community Schools and the rapid hiring of additional CSMs, OUSD is experiencing the growing pains associated with any rapid expansion initiative.

While OUSD does have a mentoring program established for the CSMs, many of them are struggling to fulfill their intended roles.

New CSMs are learning their roles. As noted in the survey results and in interviews, some CSMs are struggling to find their niche and many voiced the need for additional training and mentoring. One parent captured the challenge best, "I think there are so many fires being put out on sites that the engagement with CSMs is not meaningful with parents. I see many administrative duties being performed at certain sites vs relationships with parents within the scope of a CSM’s responsibility. Some CSMs function very well with other duties, some struggle with engagement."

The proposed Public Works LLC reorganization has the Network Superintendents (NS) at the hub of decision making with support from Central, e.g., CSSS. Thus, the NS must play a central role in ensuring that their principals are providing the leadership for their respective CSMs to ensure they are supporting families and
coordinating services. As noted in the findings and recommendations in the Office of Equity review, the Family Engagement (FE) Specialists have been moved to their respective NSs to facilitate better family coordination within their Community Schools and to ensure that principals and CSMs are supporting their FE Specialists and their initiatives, i.e., engaged at the School Site Council (SSC) level, providing support and resources to ensure that the state mandated School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) goals within their purview are achieved, and ultimately providing services to the families in coordination with the FE Specialists.

**Recommendation 5-2**

Redesign the existing Community School Manager (CSM) mentoring program to include key performance indicators (KPI) to track and monitor the outcomes of the program.

**FINDING**

OUSD disbanded their school police and reorganized around a prevention, restorative justice model, while still maintaining the ability to respond to serious incidents.

**Exhibit 5-4** shows the current Student Support and Safety Unit Organizational chart.

![Exhibit 5-4](image)

Source: Student Support and Safety Unit, 2023.

Culture Keepers and Site Culture & Climate Ambassadors perform a variety of prescribed duties requiring excellent communication and conflict mediation skills and use restorative justice practices. The Culture Keepers and Site Culture & Climate Ambassadors provide Tier 1 and Tier 2 culture and climate support.
Their primary responsibility is to welcome students and families and provide Tier 1 climate and culture support through the school community by intercepting emerging conflicts, providing conflict mediation and resolution, and are essential members of the school’s rapid response safety team. These Ambassadors play a key role in intervention and prevention.

The following descriptions reflect the type actions involved:

**Ambassadors:**
- Greet students throughout the day to create a positive and inviting climate and culture on campus.
- Support school team to implement Positive Behavioral Intervention Systems (PBIS) that support on-time return to class including encouraging students, giving positive rewards, and implementing tardy sweeps.
- Build positive relationships with students, parents, staff and community; communicate with students and staff to receive information.
- Monitor and support a small group of focal students that need additional support and guidance.
- Promote teamwork by sharing knowledge, cooperating with others, participating in meetings and work groups, and supporting the goals of the school and the District.

**School Safety/Culture Keepers:**
- Ensure that students are in compliance with District and school policies.
- Monitor established climate and culture zones and areas including lunch areas, walkways, restrooms, parking lots, observe and interact with students during passing periods, between classes, lunch and lunch breaks.
- Assist in the investigations, incident reports and situations that interrupt the climate and culture of the school.
- Oversee and coordinate security protocols with SSO’s at the school site location.

**Conflict Mediation:**
- Promote conflict mediation/resolution practices for students.
- Accurately read and interpret verbal and nonverbal communication.
- Be aware of and respectful of differences by avoiding disrespectful words, actions, or tones.
- Implement Crisis Prevention Strategies or other programs that prevent conflict and provide Tier 1 conflict mediation for students.
- Assist in the identification of students in need of conflict mediation and connect them directly with services on campus.

**Restorative Practices (according to job descriptions):**
- Assist in data collection for Tier 1 systems in the school.
- Review culture and climate data to improve the effectiveness of culture and climate interventions.
- Attend weekly Climate and Culture team meetings to discuss best practices and improve climate and culture on campus.
- Facilitate restorative practices with students and use de-escalation strategies with students.
- Support the re-entry of students returning from discipline and incarceration through restorative practices to increase the access to wrap-around supports and connection to school site staff and resources.
- Perform related duties as assigned.
**Culture Keepers (formerly School Security Officers)** provide all the above support and in the case of a serious incident, intervene using trauma-informed de-escalation, restorative practices, connecting with appropriate staff, and coordinating with the police, if necessary.

OUSD staff charged with student discipline and school safety use a Student Discipline and Intervention Matrix to assist in deescalating issues, to correct misbehavior, and reduce the number of suspensions. There are six levels of behavior/offenses:

1. **Type I – Classroom-Managed Behaviors** (dress code violations, profanity, truancy, failure to follow directions, etc.)
2. **Type II – Repeated Type I offense**
3. **Type III – Repeated Type II offense**
4. **Type IV – Assault (minor injuries), Bullying, etc. – Suspension Optional**
5. **Type V – Possession of a knife, taser, stun gun, or other dangerous object (brandishing a knife and possessing firearm/explosive) – Expulsion Conditional**
6. **Type VI – Brandishing a knife (Waving or pointing in a threatening manner), Committed or attempted sexual assault or battery (Title IX), Selling a controlled substance, Possessing, selling, or furnishing a firearm, or possessing an explosive device – Suspension/Expulsion Mandatory**

Click [here](#) to review the OUSD Student Discipline and Intervention Matrix.

**Exhibit 5-5** shows the elementary school, middle school, and high school suspensions, as well as suspensions for violence and weapons, for three comparison years, 2018-19, 2021-22, and 2022-23, from the start of school through the end of March. Suspensions have increased in all three school categories since 2019, with some decreases in 2021-22 due to COVID impacts.

**EXHIBIT 5-5**
**DISCIPLINARY DATA MARCH 2018-19 THROUGH MARCH 2022-23**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ELEMENTARY SCHOOL</th>
<th>MIDDLE SCHOOL</th>
<th>HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUSPENSIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-23</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSPENSIONS FOR VIOLENCE AND WEAPONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-23</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OUSD Data Dashboards 2023.
Commendation 5-A

OUSD is commended for transitioning to an intervention and prevention organization.

FINDING

Our team reviewed OUSD’s master lockdown protocols which were last updated in January 2023; however, the protocols are in draft form and have not been officially adopted.

Exhibit 5-6 shows an excerpt from the district’s incidents and lockdown protocols.

EXHIBIT 5-6
EXCERPT FROM THE SAFETY PROTOCOLS IN OUSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRUDER ON CAMPUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The campus intruder is defined as a non-student who loiters or creates disturbances on school property. Intruders are committing the crime of Criminal Trespass. Dangerous and/or concealed weapons are forbidden on school premises unless carried by law enforcement officers. Note: The campus is closed during Expanded/Summer Learning hours and any unauthorized person will be considered an “intruder”.
| If it is determined that the intruder has no rightful reason to be on campus, politely ask the person to leave campus.
| Ask the intruder to quietly leave the campus or invite him/her to accompany you to the office. If the intruder refuses to respond to your requests, advise the person of trespass laws.
| If the intruder gives no indication of voluntarily leaving the premises, reach out to site-based Culture & Climate Ambassadors/Assistants and/or centrally-based Culture & Climate team.
| If intruder is brandishing a deadly weapon or is putting anyone in immediate danger of physical harm, call 911 and spread EMERGENCY LOCKDOWN alarm throughout rest of school.
| If intruder(s) are on playground or at lunch time, Outdoor Supervisor should notify the office and move all students into cafeteria/gym unless otherwise directed.
| Lock exit doors to cafeteria/gym.
| Ask all students to sit on floor.
| Indoor Supervisor, aides, etc., help supervise students and personnel. |

Many school districts nationwide are rethinking how they organize their safety and security departments, particularly in the wake of nationwide school violence. For example, Sacramento City Unified School District (SCUSD) also disbanded their school police department and replaced their school resource officers with 54 Campus Monitors at Middle and High Schools, similar to OUSD’s Culture Keepers. SCUSD replaced their School Police Chief with the Director, Office of Safe Schools (DSS).

Exhibit 5-7 shows that SCUSD’s Safe Schools Unit reports directly to the Deputy Superintendent. Many school districts are shifting the reporting structure of school safety to be positioned closer to the superintendent or deputy superintendent to ensure it remains a high priority of top leadership.
According to the SCUSD Position Description, Director, Office of Safe Schools, OB CLASS CODE: 9735, reports to the Deputy Superintendent. The SCUSD Director of Safe Schools key responsibilities are:

- Directs and oversees the development, implementation, maintenance, and evaluation of the District’s Comprehensive Safe Schools Plan. The Director works in collaboration with the Superintendent’s Cabinet and District Administrators to establish appropriate regulations, procedures, and plans to ensure effective strategies are in place to provide a safe school environment for all students, staff, parents, and the community. The Director works in conjunction with Human Resources and Legal Counsel to conduct internal investigations and refers incidents to Federal and State Law Enforcement Agencies and represent as District liaison to the Sacramento Police Department, Sacramento County Sheriff’s Department, Sacramento City Fire Department, Sacramento County Probation Department, Juvenile Justice System, Federal Law Enforcement agencies, and other related agencies.

- Represent as a District liaison to the Sacramento Police Department, the Sacramento County Sheriff’s Department, the Sacramento City Fire Department, the Sacramento County Probation Department, the Juvenile Justice System, Federal Law Enforcement agencies, and other related agencies in relation to Office of Safe Schools programs and goals.

- Develop, train, implement, and evaluate a Comprehensive School Safety Plan with first responders and administrators to address California Department of Education requirements; provide guidelines regarding required Emergency Drills and ensure drills required at various levels of instruction are conducted and documented.
The SCUSD Director of Safe Schools also has five Supervisor Safety Officers.

- Supervise, plan, organize, coordinate, and direct resources at district sites; requiring independent judgment and analysis; assure the safety and security of district personnel and students. Follow-up and investigate incidents and crimes; assure protective services are provided to district sites. Oversee and coordinate the responsibilities of staff and safety team members according to the intervention/prevention strategy to address safety concerns. Develop and foster positive working relationships with local law enforcement and partners.

Many school districts are reexamining where safety and security should be placed in the organizational structure. More and more districts are moving this department closer to the superintendent.

For example, Exhibit 5-8 shows that Volusia County Schools (Florida) has a Director of Safety and Security that reports directly to the superintendent.

Source: Volusia County Schools, 2023.
Other examples of school districts that have placed safety and security under the superintendent’s leadership include:

- Palm Beach County School District (FL)
- Washoe County School District (NV) - WCSD Org Chart 2022.pdf

While OUSD is implementing a stronger intervention and prevention program, serious incidents still occur. There was a mass school shooting at an OUSD high school by outside perpetrators in September 2022, which resulted in six injuries and eventually one fatality. This shooting prompted the Acting Superintendent and the OUSD School Board to call for a review of campus security.

At the time of this review other serious school incidents resulting in many more deaths occurred in other parts of the United States (Texas, Tennessee, etc.). Unfortunately, the likelihood of these types of serious incidents continuing remains a possibility. OUSD’s senior leadership is required to facilitate an immediate response during a serious incident and is responsible for communicating to the Board, public, media, families, and other partners, and marshal internal and external resources to support the students and their families, and school staff during a crisis.

OUSD’s Lockdown Procedures shown previously in Exhibit 5-6 are currently in draft. The current flow of communications and command and control during a Lockdown is as follows:

1. The site principal is the site incident commander;
2. The Network Superintendent is the Central Incident Commander; and
3. The central incident commander is in direct communication with the Director, Student Support & Safety (see Exhibit 5-4), the Chief Academic Officer, and Communications Director.

This response organization then communicates with OUSD board members, legal, and Oakland Police Department. This protocol is currently being reviewed by a consultant recommended by state agencies.

**Recommendation 5-3**

Finalize OUSDs school safety response protocols and organizational model.

**Overview of the Behavioral Health Unit Organizational Structure**

The Director of Behavioral Health position shown in Exhibit 5-9 has been vacant since August 2022. There is also a vacant Program Manager and vacant Behavior Specialists that are not shown on the chart.

The majority of the current remaining staff report to the Executive Director of Community Schools and Student Services with the exception of the Program Manager for Restorative Justice who reports to the Coordinator of Restorative Justice and the Specialist of Wellness who actually reports to the Director of Health Wellness & the Center Program. The Coordinator of Juvenile Justice also reports to the Executive Director of Community Schools and Student Services.
OUSD Behavioral Health services have expanded in the past ten years. In 2000-01, OUSD hosted School-Based Behavioral Health (SBBH) providers in fewer than 20 schools. In 2015-16, over 80 OUSD PreK-12 schools had on-site SBBH, reflecting a multi-million-dollar investment by Alameda County, the City of Oakland, and OUSD in school-based mental health services.

**FINDING**

A review of documents, interviews, and survey results indicate that the mental health issues with students post-COVID have increased, yet the OUSD position that oversees behavioral health remains vacant. The Director of Behavioral Health abruptly resigned, which has resulted in a leadership void in CSSS. That position has been vacant since August 2022. Additionally, there have been cuts in the Behavioral Health Department from five to three program managers for behavioral health, which has resulted in a significant increase in the workload of the remaining behavioral health program managers. There was an increase in behavior specialists from 2 to 5 positions. Further exacerbating the problem is an overall shortage of mental health personnel in Oakland and the surrounding areas. Thus, CSSS is competing with the city and county in hiring additional personnel.

As depicted in survey results shown previously (Exhibit 5-3), there is significant dissatisfaction with the services provided via the Behavioral Health unit: 37.69% of respondents consider the Emotional Support poor and 33.74% consider the Social Support poor. Many survey respondents are concerned about Behavioral Health and CSMs, as shown by examples of comments below:
• There are too many staff in middle management overall, and yet we have departments with almost zero staffing (like our Behavioral Health department) which are vital to supporting students (and staff who work directly with students)

• We have been lacking in adequate mental health supports for school sites this year due to the staffing changes in Behavioral Health and the creation of the MTSS positions which did not allow former PBIS and BHU Program Managers to apply. The time it takes to get things done is very slow. I don’t think all of this can be blamed on the process. I also think it’s due to staff reacting when others have tried to be proactive to avoid a rush situation.

• Please send more counselors to meet the mental health needs of students. I don’t see any social or emotional supports for students from the central office. I’m confused by this question.

• In recent years the Social Emotional Learning Department and Restorative Justice Department, Behavioral Health Departments seem to have lost funding and staffing. Restorative justice at our site is weak.

• Our CSM doesn’t believe in RJ and yells at kids. Our principal yells at teachers. New teachers get no support for students who are dysregulated. It’s sink or swim. How can kids with academic challenges be expected to lower their affective filter if the climate of the adults is so toxic?

• I’m really curious as to how Community Schools funds will be used at my school site-- my principal has not shared any information on this

• To sum up my comments, there are some units within the CSSS department that need to be reinforced, and that means increasing some central staffing. Also, there are some efforts that consultants or outside organizations could handle.

**Recommendation 5-4**

Immediately hire a Director of Behavioral Health and conduct an analysis of mental health personnel needs at the school level.

Conduct a nationwide search, if necessary, in order to secure an experienced director. During interviews, Behavioral Health specialists stated there is grant money available for mental health; procuring it will require a Behavioral Health Director knowledgeable about grant resources and focused on grant writing. With additional financial resources OUSD will be in a more competitive position to hire behavioral health and mental health counselors. Long-term, OUSD should provide educational incentives for personnel interested in transitioning to the mental health field.
SECTION 6

English Language Learner & Multilingual Achievement (ELLMA)

Overview of English Language Learner & Multilingual Achievement Department

The Oakland Unified School District’s (OUSD) English Language Learner and Multilingual Achievement Department (ELLMA) established in 2013 has a long history of building a collective responsibility for providing high quality equity-based instruction and services for all multilingual learners. ELLMA has been referred to as the English Language Learner and Multilingual Achievement Office, Central Office for ELLs, and English Language Learner and Multilingual Achievement Department. For the purpose of this report, our team will use the term English Language Learner and Multilingual Achievement Department (ELLMA).

OUSD serves a diverse subgroup of English Language Learners (ELLs) with over 50 percent of the district’s students speaking a language at home other than English. ELLs represent 90 home countries with over 57 world languages. According to OUSD’s Fast Facts 2022-23, there are 11,798 ELLs representing 34.4% of the OUSD’s student population. The 2,695 Newcomer students make up 22.8% of ELLs in OUSD. OUSD is a Sanctuary District. A Sanctuary District is one that ensures students feel safe in schools, regardless of birthplace, immigration status, race, culture, sexuality, or any other aspects of their identities. The OUSD Sanctuary Resolution, adopted in December 2016, affirms that OUSD will do everything possible to ensure students and families are safe at school regardless of immigration status.

According to the OUSD website, the Vision and Mission of English Language Learner and Multilingual Achievement Department is: The ELLMA team works collaboratively with all OUSD schools to support English Language Learners with Equity and access to an Excellent education.

The ELLMA department has four primary documents that frame its key roles and responsibilities. These documents, the OUSD Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP), OUSD Strategic Plan 2021-2024, OUSD English Learner Master Plan, and the 2021-2024 Roadmap to ELL Achievement, provide direction and guidance in meeting the needs of all OUSD ELL students.

Outlined in the 2021-2024 Roadmap to ELL Achievement are ELLMA’s three guiding beliefs:

- English Language Learners can achieve at high levels with the right supports.
- The language and cultural resources that students bring are tremendous assets to their learning and that of the community.
- All educators are responsible for the language development of ELLs; therefore, all teachers are teachers of language.

Superintendent Kyla Johnson-Trammell’s introductory statement “This ELL Master Plan, updated during the 2018-19 school year, provides critical guidance for that unfinished work, especially for site and district leaders. It names the legal requirements while also calling out the best practices that are vital for all Oakland students” speaks to the moral imperative of meeting the needs of ELLs.

For the past two years, many state and federal accountability requirements were waived or adjusted due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on districts, schools, and students. Beginning with the 2021–22 school
year, the requirements for student outcomes has returned with the release of the 2022 California School Dashboard.

According to the 2022 Dashboard, OUSD’s Reclassified English Learners far outweigh progress in both Mathematics and English Language Arts when compared to most other subgroups. Reclassified ELs are 2.8 points above standard as compared to English Only students being 40.3 points below standard in English Language Arts, and Reclassified ELs are 35.7 points below standard as compared to English Only students being 73.2 points below standard. Forty-nine percent of OUSD’s English Learners are making progress towards English Language proficiency.

ELLMA is led by an Executive Director who has been in this position for over 10 years. According to the Executive Director, there are 16.65 FTE positions in Newcomer Wellness Initiative, Refugee/Asylee and Unaccompanied Immigrant Youth, Language Specialists, and Multilingual Pathways. This does not include the site-based 6.0 FTE for High School Newcomer Assistants shown in Exhibit 6-1. Also not shown are 13 site-based Elementary Newcomer Teacher Leaders (ENTLs) which are not included in the ELLMA FTE although the Elementary Language Specialists support and provide oversight to these positions.

Following is a list of reductions and additions of staff in ELLMA over the last three years:

- **2020-21**: Elimination of 2 coordinators
  - 1.0 ELD coordinator
  - 1.0 Multilingual Pathways Coordinator

- **2021-22 Addition**
  - 1.0 FTE Unaccompanied Immigrant Youth Specialist – Grant Funded to targeted for re-engagement of disconnected immigrant youth

- **2022-23 Additions**
  - 0.4 Multilingual Pathway Coordinator (listed as .6 position inclusive of .2 of the FTE of the Director of Newcomers)
  - Refugee/Asylee Program Specialist 1.0 FTE (grant funded and focused on elementary students and families)
  - 0.75 Psychiatric Social Worker (grant funded (Increased from .5)

Unfilled Vacancy
- 1.0 FTE Newcomer Assistant (site-based)

**Exhibit 6-1** shows the organizational chart for ELLMA for 2022-23 provided by the Executive Director which shows 16.65 FTE and 1.0 FTE vacancy for Newcomer Assistant.

The Executive Director has seven direct reports: Business Manager, Director of Newcomer Programs, Coordinator of Multilingual Pathways, Middle School Language Specialist, High School Language Specialist, Elementary Language Specialist, and Early Childhood Language Specialist. In addition, the Secondary Newcomer Specialist works directly with six site-based Newcomer Assistants.
Exhibit 6-2 shows the five essential evidence-based practices that ELLMA believes are critical for ELLs to thrive and ensure high quality, equity-based instruction is provided for all multilingual learners.

In response to the request for an overview of programs and services of ELLMA, our team was referred to the 2021-2024 Roadmap to ELL Achievement. The charts below outline the priorities provided by the ELLMA Department.
**EXHIBIT 6-2**
THEORY OF ACTION FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNER & MULTILINGUAL ACHIEVEMENT DEPARTMENT

**OUSD Essential Practices for ELL Achievement:** Based on research from the field as well as what we have seen work for ELL students in OUSD schools, the 5 practices are important for all students, but absolutely essential for our ELLs to thrive. Our goal is to support all schools to implement these practices in ways that make sense for each unique context.

![ESSENTIAL PRACTICES for ELL ACHIEVEMENT](image)

Source: OUSD, ELLMA Department, 2022.

**Exhibits 6-3 to 6-5** show the ELLMA priority goals for Empowering Instruction, Quality Multilingual Programs, and the Whole Child.
EXHIBIT 6-3
ELLMA INSTRUCTION GOALS FOR ELLS

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY 1 GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPOWERING INSTRUCTION FOR ELLS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**GOAL 1**
Teachers provide culturally and linguistically sustaining practices that set the conditions for ELLs to thrive in the classroom.

111. Asset-based approaches that leverage students’ home languages and cultures will be increasingly evident in curriculum and instruction.

112. All LTEls will receive content and instruction that empower them as active agents in their learning and affirm their multilingual identities.

113. Teachers will build trust and relationships through learning partnerships with ELL students.

---

**GOAL 2**
ELLs receive quality, standards-aligned Integrated & Designated ELD.

121. All teachers at high ELL-count sites will engage in foundational and sustaining professional development on ELL instruction.

122. Integrated ELD practices will be evident throughout content-area instruction at all sites.

123. ELLs will have access to high-quality D-ELD materials and instruction differentiated to meet the diversity of ELL needs.

---

**GOAL 3**
A shared MTSS framework guides instructional support for ELLs in addition to Tier I comprehensive ELD.

131. Sites will implement clear guidance on supporting students in need of both literacy and language development.

132. ELLs with IEPs will be provided instruction that meets both language development and IEP needs.

---

**GOAL 4**
Evidence of adult practice and student data are effectively used to improve outcomes for ELLs.

141. Site leadership will strengthen implementation of quality comprehensive ELD through continuous improvement processes.

142. Site-based staff will regularly analyze ELL data to monitor progress and to make informed programmatic and instructional decisions.

143. LTEL outcomes and experiences will be a priority of data-based continuous improvement.

---

*Source: Roadmap to ELL Achievement, 2021-2024.*
EXHIBIT 6-4
ELLMA MULTILINGUAL PROGRAMS GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY 2 GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUALITY MULTILINGUAL PROGRAMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOAL 1 - MULTILINGUAL GOALS

OUSD has a PK-12 multilingual pathway, ensuring every child in OUSD has the opportunity to become biliterate and bilingual.

211. Multilingual opportunities will be expanded to include additional languages, diverse program options, and the PK and high school grade levels.

212. Leaders will engage in ongoing refinement of program design to meet articulated standards of quality.

213. Instructional materials and assessments will be effectively implemented to support biliteracy beginning in PK.

214. Student progress towards and attainment of multilingual goals will be monitored and celebrated.

GOAL 2 - NEWCOMER GOALS

OUSD provides newcomer programming at all grade levels that accelerates language and academic development in a linguistically diverse environment.

221. A sustainable newcomer instructional and program design at all three tiers of the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) pyramid will continue to be articulated and implemented.

222. Targeted instruction and new programmatic approaches for students with interrupted formal education (SIFE) will accelerate development of basic literacy and numeracy skills.

223. Improve newcomer-responsive systems and structures in elementary schools through sustaining and supporting the work of ENTLs and those in similar roles.

224. Newcomer students in secondary schools will be supported to gradually transition to the mainstream environment beginning no later than their 2nd year in US schools.

Source: Roadmap to ELL Achievement, 2021-2024.
EXHIBIT 6-5
ELLMA GOALS FOR WHOLE CHILD

PRIORITY 3 GOALS

THE WHOLE CHILD

GOAL 1

OUSD is an inclusive, safe, and welcoming place for all ELLs and immigrant families.

311. School sites will purposefully cultivate and sustain inclusive school communities that build upon and value differences in immigration status, language, and/or religion.

312. The needs and rights of newcomer students will be protected through a responsive and equitable enrollment process, both when entering OUSD and transitioning between schools.

GOAL 2

Families and youth are engaged as authentic partners with teachers, school and district leadership in improving outcomes and experiences for ELLs.

321. ELL and immigrant student perspectives will shape and inform programming and policy that affects them directly.

322. Families will have the resources, information, and materials needed to become informed and engaged partners in their children’s education.

323. An ELL parent “Bill of Rights” drives increased family engagement in SELLS and DELLS, and other school governance bodies.

GOAL 3

Newcomer students benefit from a range of targeted services that enable them to thrive.

3.3.1. Newcomer students and families’ health, wellness, and access to school and community support resources are supported through the work of the Newcomer Wellness Initiative and other providers.

3.1.2. Community partnerships to address needs of recent immigrant students and families will be sustained and expanded.

Source: Roadmap to ELL Achievement, 2021-2024.
When asked for ELLMA’s alignment to OUSD’s LCAP Goals, our team was provided the following Exhibit 6-6 that indicated LCAP goals for ELLS and multilingual learners.

**EXHIBIT 6-6**

**LCAP GOALS FOR ELLS**

**OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT’S**

**LCAP GOALS**

**GOAL 1**

**ALL STUDENTS GRADUATE COLLEGE, CAREER, AND COMMUNITY READY.**

LCAP Goal #1 sets metrics for all students in OUSD, with specific goals for English Language Learners and other student groups reflected in Goal #2 below.

- Move from Red (from 2019) to Yellow on California Dashboard in ELA for ELL group.
- Move from Orange (from 2019) to Yellow on California Dashboard in Math for ELL Subgroup.
- Double the number of graduating seniors earning the Seal of Biliteracy from 101 to 200.

**GOAL 2**

**FOCAL STUDENT GROUPS DEMONSTRATE ACCELERATED GROWTH TO CLOSE OUR EQUITY GAP. TARGETED STRATEGIES ARE IMPLEMENTED FOR AFRICAN AMERICAN, ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS AND UNHOUSED STUDENTS.**

- Increase the A-G completion rate with a grade of C or better for ELLs from 42.9% to 48.9% and for newcomers from 48.8% to 54.8%.
- Increase the 4-year cohort graduation rate for ELLs from 56.8% to 62.8%.
- Increase the EL reclassification rate from 5.6% to 14.6% and the LTEL reclassification rate from 5.9% to 20.9%.
- Increase the percentage of ELLs who make progress towards English proficiency as measured by the state English Learner Progress Indicator from 45.8% to 54.8%.

**GOAL 3**

**STUDENTS AND FAMILIES ARE WELcomed, SAFE, HEALTHY, AND ENGAgED.**

- Reduce chronic absenteeism rates for ELLs from 17.3% to 15.8%.
- Increase the percentage of students who feel safe at school from 60% to 66%.
- Increase the number of schools with at least 70% of parents who feel connected to their child’s school.

**GOAL 4**

**ALL STAFF ARE HIGH QUALITY, PROVIDING OPTIMAL SERVICE TO OUR STUDENTS, FAMILIES, AND STAFF.**

- Increase the percentage of all staff who have participated in foundational professional learning for ELLs and Multilingual Learners (Baseline to be set in 2021-22).
- Increase staff satisfaction on ELLMA-hosted professional development as measured by post-PD surveys on experience and impact on their practice (Baseline to be established in 2021-22).

Source: *Roadmap to ELL Achievement, 2021-2024.*
Exhibit 6-7 is the Summary of ELL Reclassification Data provided by ELLMA.

EXHIBIT 6-7
SUMMARY OF ELL RECLASSIFICATION DATA

Overall reclassification rates for grades K-5 from 2015-2022

- 2015-16: 11.4% K-5 All Students, N = 678, TOTAL = 5,933
- 2016-17: 13.1% K-5 All Students, N = 775, TOTAL = 5,928
- 2017-18: 17.5% K-5 All Students, N = 1,020, TOTAL = 5,835
- 2018-19: 16.1% K-5 All Students, N = 926, TOTAL = 5,743
- 2019-20: 7.1% K-5 All Students, N = 386, TOTAL = 5,475
- 2020-21: 3.2% K-5 All Students, N = 181, TOTAL = 5,621
- 2021-22: 13.1% K-5 All Students, N = 705, TOTAL = 5,402

Overall Reclassification rates for grades 6-8 from 2015-2022

- 2015-16: 15.8% 6-8 All Students, N = 256, TOTAL = 1,619
- 2016-17: 12.2% 6-8 All Students, N = 200, TOTAL = 1,648
- 2017-18: 14.7% 6-8 All Students, N = 256, TOTAL = 1,741
- 2018-19: 14.3% 6-8 All Students, N = 254, TOTAL = 1,781
- 2019-20: 6.0% 6-8 All Students, N = 108, TOTAL = 1,790
- 2020-21: 1.5% 6-8 All Students, N = 29, TOTAL = 1,966
- 2021-22: 17.0% 6-8 All Students, N = 348, TOTAL = 2,048
ELLMA provided the work plan shown in Exhibit 6-8 when asked for data to support what Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) the department uses to measure success of its goals.
### EXHIBIT 6-8
#### ELLMA DEPARTMENT WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Increase the 4-year cohort graduation rate for English Learners.</td>
<td>From 56.8% to 62.8%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>53% overall</td>
<td>-74% for non-newcomer ELLs</td>
<td>-41% for newcomer ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Increase the Long-Term English Learner (TEL) reclassification rate.</td>
<td>From 5.9% to 20.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Increase the percentage of English Learners who make progress toward English proficiency as measured by the state English Learner Progress Indicator.</td>
<td>From 45.8% to 54.8%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal 3: Students and families are welcomed, safe, healthy, and engaged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>Reduce chronic absenteeism rates for English Learners.</td>
<td>From 17.3% to 15.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>Increase the percentage of students who feel safe at school.</td>
<td>From 60% to 66%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>73% (elem. only) (MS HHS not available)</td>
<td></td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>Increase the percentage of all staff (certificated, classified, and confidential) who have participated in foundational professional learning.</td>
<td>GLAD: ALLAB: NC Foundations: POLL: d-ELD:</td>
<td>Baseline will be set next year</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>established baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>Increase staff satisfaction on professional development as measured by questions on staff surveys.</td>
<td>Overall ELLMA: Elementary: Secondary:</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ELLMA Department, 2023.
**FINDING**

Oversight for the Newcomers Specialists (2), the Language Specialists (4) and Multilingual Specialists (2) is split among three of the ELLMA administrators: the Newcomer Director, Multilingual Pathways Coordinator, and the Executive Director. This has led to silos within the instructional side of the ELLMA department and creates limited opportunities for collaboration across the newcomer, multilingual, and language specialists.

Survey responses from the Public Works LLC survey on Central Office echoed that the central office works in silos with limited insight and connection to sites, and lack of communication especially across the CSI departments. Siloed positions within a department can have a negative effect on the effective functioning and success of a department. Within ELLMA, the roles of the specialists are targeted to a specific ELL subgroup or the multilingual program, each focused on their specific responsibilities. Interviews indicated limited collaboration across the specialists, especially at the secondary level. This can result in duplication of effort, missed opportunities, and inefficiency. Ultimately, ELLMA needs to encourage collaboration and communication to ensure optimal efficiency, creativity for successful implementation of best practices for all ELLs and multilingual learners.

Poor communication was cited across many levels of the staff interviewed. Site level staff did not know the Director or Executive Director by name and could not state how they support the ELL, Newcomers, or Multilingual programs at the site level. There is an opportunity to build strong relationships with principals and the Network Superintendents assigned to schools serving the highest number of ELLS and Newcomers to ensure ELLMA's vision for high quality instruction and student achievement.

The Public Works LLC survey conducted of OUSD staff confirmed this theme of lack of collaboration and communication.

**Exhibit 6-9** shows that over 17% of respondents’ level of satisfaction of interacting with the ELLMA department is either low or very low with 24.69% being neutral.

---

**EXHIBIT 6-9**
OUSD DISTRICTWIDE SURVEY RESULTS

| Q12 What's your level of satisfaction interacting with the following CSI departments? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | VERY HIGH | HIGH | MODERATE | LOW | VERY LOW | NO OPINION | TOTAL |
| English Language Learners (ELLMA) | 13.29% | 23.10% | 24.68% | 7.91% | 9.18% | 21.84% | 316 |

*Source: Public Works LLC Survey of OUSD Staff, 2023.*
Exhibit 6-10 shows that over 36% of the respondents either disagree or strongly disagree that the needs of English Learners are met.

EXHIBIT 6-10
OUSD DISTRICTWIDE SURVEY RESULTS

Q9 How much do the following statements reflect your view of the Division of CSI?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs of exceptional students are met.</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>16.88%</td>
<td>33.44%</td>
<td>26.25%</td>
<td>20.94%</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs of English Language Learners are met.</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
<td>25.62%</td>
<td>32.50%</td>
<td>22.19%</td>
<td>14.06%</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


There are high levels of satisfaction for ELLMA programs and services; however, there is lack of collaboration among the different ELL specialists and between the Academics & Instruction Department. There appears to be stronger levels of collaboration at the elementary level strengthened by weekly collaboration meetings and the ELLMA language specialists co-facilitating the coaching collaborative for both literacy and math. Several of the open-ended survey responses from the Public Works LLC survey for OUSD staff validate the need for reorganizing ELLMAs instructional staff including the following:

- Accountability looks different among the different departments or within members which created inequities and misalignment. ELLMA office holds academics and yet they are not part of the Academic department which leads to constant misalignments, unnecessary meetings with unresolved issues, miscommunication with sites, leaders, teachers, etc.
- We are lacking a clear vision around what it means to serve newcomers. We’re defining their services by time that passes (years in the country) vs actual needs of the kids.
- We need more highly qualified human resources at elementary school sites to support English Learners at the schools. This includes teachers, TSAs, and ENTLs. I suggest that each elementary school site with over 50% ELs have at least one .8 - 1.0 FTE EL/ELD TSA dedicated to ELD intervention, ELD instructional leadership, ELPAC, reclassification, advocacy and/or other EL related responsibilities. I suggest that Elementary Newcomer Teacher Leaders together with ELLMA create a proposal for something like this which the district then funds.
- I feel that ELLMA is a strong enough department to support English Language Learners but that OUSD is not doing enough for ELLs.

Because of the complexity of meeting the needs of all ELLs and ELLMAs organization of K-12 specialists, (Language, Newcomers, Multilingual) reorganizing these positions under PK-5 and 6-12 levels would provide greater alignment and accountability of ELL instructional programs and services as well as the Dual Language programs primarily at the Elementary level. This would allow for direct collaboration and improvement in communication with the proposed Executive Director Academic/Instruction PK -5 and the proposed Executive Director Academic/Instruction 6-12.
**Recommendation 6-1**

Reorganize the English Language Learner & Multilingual Achievement Department to facilitate greater alignment of instructional programs and services for ELLs and Multilingual students and to build stronger collaboration with the Academics & Instruction Department.

To reorganize ELLMA, OUSD should:

- Eliminate the position of Director of Newcomers Program
- Transfer the Director of Newcomers Program to lead the proposed Director of ELL/Multilingual Achievement (PK-5)
- Reorganize the elementary language specialists to report to the proposed Director of ELL/Multilingual Achievement (PK-5)
- Eliminate the position of Multilingual Coordinator
- Reorganize the secondary language specialists to report to the Executive Director of ELL/Multilingual Achievement
- Move the supervision of Program Managers of the Newcomer Wellness Initiative and the Refugee, Asylee and Unaccompanied Immigrant Youth programs to the ELLMA Executive Director of ELL/Multilingual Achievement
- Assign the Executive Director of ELL/Multilingual Achievement to oversee the ELL/Multilingual Achievement (6-12)
- Continue the Academic Leadership Team model for Executive Directors and directors across the department to meet in service of alignment

While there is currently some evidence of collaboration across the language specialists, there is greater opportunity for continuous and timely collaboration leading to greater consistency in implementation of ELLs programs and services. These changes will create efficiency in the delivery of services and programs at designated schools serving high number of ELLS and Newcomers as well as the elementary schools implementing Dual Language programs. Streamlining supervision will allow for greater alignment across the ELLMA department and the Academics & Instruction Department to increase the efficacy of ELL instructional programs across the PK-12 system. The Director of ELL/Multilingual Achievement PK-5 and the Executive Director of ELLMA will be able to work more collaboratively with the Executive Director of Academic/Instruction/Early Literacy (PK-5) and Executive Director of Academic/Instruction/Literacy (6-12) in the implementation of all ELL and Multilingual initiatives, programs and services as shown in Exhibit 2-11, the Proposed Organizational Structure of the Department of Academics & Instruction (*Section 2: Academics and Instruction*).

The proposed redesign of the ELLMA department is shown in *Exhibit 6-11.*
FINDING

The staffing formula, based on a contractual agreement with Oakland Education Association, for Elementary Newcomer Teacher Leader (ENTLs) is .5 FTE for 50 Newcomer students and 1.0 FTE for 100 Newcomers which leads to some of the positions being multi-funded thereby creating challenges in delivery of services and resulting in a wide variance depending on the school and the leadership needs.

ENTLs provide direct supplemental ELD instruction and intervention to address the differentiated language and academic needs of ELL Newcomer students. Interviews and survey responses indicate that the ENTLs are highly valued for the instructional support they provide to targeted groups of newcomer learners, but implementation of their service varies across these schools.

In some schools, ENTLs spend most of their time conducting small group instruction for designated and/or integrated ELD to address the wide range linguistic skills of newcomers. During required administration of
state and local assessments, instruction for newcomer students is not conducted resulting in lost instructional time. In some schools, based on funding, personnel available, and decisions made at the site level, an additional .5 FTE position has been added to supplement the .5 ENTL position resulting in a 1.0 FTE position for that site. However, the use of additional site-based funding to create a 1.0 FTE position has led to the ENTLs performing other duties as directed by the site administrator who is their immediate supervisor. Several examples were cited that they are assigned to cover a classroom due to substitute teacher shortages. This has led to inconsistent implementation of newcomer services in the designated schools, inability to complete the lesson unit timelines and limited time for building site teachers’ capacity on implementation of best instructional practices and supports for newcomers in mainstream classrooms.

According to OUSD’s Fast Facts 2022-23 of the 11,798 English Language Learners, Newcomers comprise 22.8% of ELLs subgroup.

Research on newcomer students highlights their unique needs when compared to other ELs, most of whom are born in the United States:

- Newcomers enter U.S. schools with far lower English proficiency levels than their non-newcomer EL peers.
- Significant proportions of newcomer students have gaps in formal schooling and, as such, enter school academically behind their grade-level peers.
- Newcomers also frequently have other acute needs, as many arrive fleeing war, violence, and other hardships, and many experience trauma as they migrate.

Source: Getting Down to Facts II Research Brief, English Learners: Charting Their Experiences and Mapping Their Futures in California, 2018.

**Exhibit 6-12** indicates the ENTLs recommendation for site capacity building is 30% while interviews indicated only 10-20% of their time is spent on this important aspect of the ENTLs work.

**EXHIBIT 6-12**
RECOMMENDED DISTRIBUTION OF ELEMENTARY NEWCOMERS TEACHER LEADER WORK

Exhibit 6-13 shows the Public Works LLC survey questions regarding staffing and resources.

**EXHIBIT 6-13**  
OUSD CSI DIVISION DISTRICT-WIDE SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answered</th>
<th>Skipped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q10 Please share any comments you may have on the three previous questions. Did staffing and/or resource needs or issues factor into your answers?</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 Any other thoughts you’d like to share? How does staffing and resources factor into your assessment as to how well CSI functions?</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The following open-ended comments from Questions 10 and 13 that are pertinent to ELL include:

- Staffing and resources must be prioritized at the school site level. Salaries and benefits for teachers and TSAs must be increased. The substitute crisis must be dealt with so that TSAs are not functioning as overpaid, over-qualified substitute teachers. TSAs must be able to do the jobs they are assigned to do. To support newcomer students, ELs, low-income students, and other high-risk students, we need more highly qualified teachers at the site level and we need to improve teaching and learning conditions to retain those who we have.

- The ENTL position needs to be codified to become a more permanent position. We should prioritize newcomers but serve most or all ELs. We need at least 2 ENTLs at each elementary school, and we need ENTLs and TSAs to have job stability. We are highly qualified, seasoned teachers who are leading and modeling best instructional practices for ELs at elementary school sites.

- We need more highly qualified human resources at elementary school sites to support English Learners at the. This includes teachers, TSAs, and ENTLs.

- I suggest that each elementary school site with over 50% ELs have at least one .8 - 1.0 FTE EL/ELD TSA dedicated to ELD intervention, ELD instructional leadership, ELPAC, reclassification, advocacy and/or other EL related responsibilities. I suggest that Elementary Newcomer Teacher Leaders together with ELLMA create a proposal for something like this which the district then funds. This required, dedicated ELD TSA would include some or all of the current responsibilities of the ENTL, EL Ambassador, ELD.

Exhibit 6-14 shows ELLMA’s structures for districtwide implementation for English Language Acceleration Program (ELAP) but site-based decisions impede implementation at the school and classroom level.

ENTLs, Newcomer Assistants and all Language Specialists play a critical role in ensuring best practices and effective strategies to accelerate newcomers’ growth are implemented and using these ELL experts as substitutes prevents effective implementation.
ENTLs have been placed at selected elementary schools with a high concentration of newcomers to provide direct ELD instruction and to increase teachers’ capacity of embedding linguistically and culturally responsive supports for newcomer learners. Building from a research base that newcomers can progress very quickly in their first few years in U.S. schools, ELLMA has developed differentiated strategies to accelerate language development and strive to meet OUSD’s reclassification targets for Newcomer students.

**Recommendation 6-2**

Ensure adequate staffing for the delivery of base and supplemental instructional programs and services for ELLs, specifically Newcomers, as identified in OUSD’s EL Master Plan.

Direct Support for effective implementation of services for newcomer students must be staffed to ensure that the identified best practices can be effectively utilized. The formula for providing direct supports is written in the teachers’ contract. Best practices have been identified and included in OUSD’s EL Master Plan and ELLMA’s English Language Learner Road Map which include guiding principles, goals, accountability metrics, and list of priorities for ELLs advancement and achievement.
According the OUSD EL Master Plan, effective provision of Designated and Integrated ELD rests on the specific investments detailed below:

1. All teachers with ELLs in their classrooms, PK-12:
   - Must be skilled at providing Integrated ELD, including careful consideration of the language demands of a task (see Content-Language Objectives) and carefully planned language learning embedded in engaging content and activities.
   - Must be skilled at providing content-embedded Designated ELD when they teach this period or course.
   - Need ongoing training in effective planning and delivery of Designated and Integrated ELD.

2. The District and School Sites shall:
   - Ensure effective Integrated ELD is provided in all elementary and secondary classrooms.
   - Provide ongoing professional development that allows ALL teachers PK-12 to become experts in the delivery of effective Integrated ELD as well as Designated ELD where applicable.
   - Ensure all ELLs receive at least 30 minutes per day (elementary) or one period per day (secondary) of Designated ELD until they reclassify.
   - Ensure elementary schools as a whole and individual teachers reach Stage III: Consistent Implementation on the Stages and Next Steps for Elementary ELD Implementation (Essential Practice 2)

Fidelity to the role of the ENTLs is critical in providing robust elementary instructional programs for newcomers. This includes daily designated ELD for ELLs, monitoring the effectiveness of instruction for newcomer students, and providing ongoing support and professional development for classroom teachers on best practices at the site level. This dual responsibility of the ELLMA office and site administrators can be strengthened by building strong collaborative relationships, frequent check-ins in between Cycle of Inquiries, and learning walks.

FINDING

Thirteen elementary schools with a high number of ELLS and newcomers are assigned to three different Network Superintendents, resulting in inconsistent guidance and implementation of ELL, Newcomer, and Multilingual programs and services.

Currently elementary schools with high numbers of ELLS and Newcomer students are assigned to Network Superintendents as follows:
- Network 2 Superintendent has six schools.
- Network 3 Superintendent has three schools.
- Network 4 Superintendent has four schools.

There is a need for improved communication and greater alignment at the Network Superintendent level for ELL programs and services for all schools impacted with high numbers of ELLs to ensure accelerated progress towards reclassification and higher levels of achievement in grade level standards. This is especially critical for Dual Language schools because of the curricula, assessment, and desired student outcomes that are unique
to these programs. It should be noted that ELLs and newcomer student populations may shift from year to year and would need to be reviewed annually.

Interviews revealed a dynamic relationship between the principals and the Network Superintendents. Some of the interviewees felt that this relationship superseded some of requirements for full implementation of ELL programs while others felt one Network Superintendent fully supported ELL and Newcomer Initiatives and took the extra step to ensure principals understood they would be held accountable for full implementation and fidelity to ELL and Newcomer programs.

**Exhibit 6-15** asks the survey respondents questions on their views about Central Office collaboration and coordination with each other, prioritization of student needs, budget and technology, and providing quality services to schools.

**EXHIBIT 6-15**
**STAFF VIEWS REGARDING CENTRAL OFFICE**

Q4 How much do the following statements reflect your view re: the Central Office?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff collaborate &amp; coordinate with each other.</td>
<td>10.94%</td>
<td>25.53%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.17%</td>
<td>16.11%</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adequate staff to carry out Central Office operations.</td>
<td>17.38%</td>
<td>20.12%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29.38%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>21.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff prioritizes student needs when making decisions.</td>
<td>11.85%</td>
<td>23.71%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.58%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff has the technology needed to support their work.</td>
<td>13.72%</td>
<td>37.20%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35.37%</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>7.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The budget is well managed by the administration.</td>
<td>5.49%</td>
<td>12.80%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.18%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>21.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators &amp; staff provide quality services to schools.</td>
<td>10.33%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26.44%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>20.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


While the following two questions did not specify which staff or administrators within the CSI division the respondents may have been referring to, their responses paint a telling story on the perception of the lack of collaboration and coordination among central office divisions and supports the need for the realignment of services to schools.

- Staff prioritizes student needs when making decisions - over 42% responded as Disagree or Strongly Disagree
- Administrators and staff provide quality services to schools - over 35% selected Disagree or Strongly Disagree
Here are some comments that participants shared as further insights that reflected their ratings to this question:

- The only communication that I get from central office is when there are deadlines they need to meet and need my input. All the work that I have done here, process, workflow, come from my own prior experience. There is nothing that the central office has provided me that makes my job easier. Based on the incident that happened at my site, I believe that there is a lack of oversight and accountability for the decisions that greatly affect our students and our community. There are times when I feel like there is no direct line to get support, often feeling like I’m being passed around to another staff in hopes they can resolve or provide solutions to the challenges at hand.
- Within each network there are folks that support principals from different departments. Some provide quality, efficient, effective services and some do not. Most times this feels relational which should not be the case.
- There are too many funded central office positions that do not have a direct impact on student learning or school site. Many of these people have been away from working at a site too long they are totally disconnected from what schools look like today. (Especially post-COVID).
- Some Central Office departments don’t communicate with one another. It makes it challenging to navigate to meet the needs of children and site staff. About 10% of the time, Central Office staff - including administrators - do not respond within one week of an email. B&G Emergencies - during emergencies, sometimes no one is available to respond.
- The school feels as though it's on its own as an individual entity struggling to get through each day instead of being part of a thoughtful organization focused on equity and the needs of students with trauma and a school with no sense of community building or procedures in place. Where is the central office staff?
- The frustration with central office is the constant pointing fingers at each other and not knowing who to direct questions to.
- Often central office initiatives are not aligned with the student needs and priorities at my school site.
- New administrators are conflicted and cause issues as they worry about their position and not the students and staff. Admin supervisors care less and case more conflict then is needed in daily operations as they are centrally placed not school system based.

**Recommendation 6-3**

Realign the 13 elementary schools with Newcomer Programs and all the Multilingual schools under one Elementary Network Superintendent for effective implementation of best practices for ELLs and to support improved communication to sites impacted with high numbers of ELLs.

The rationale for realignment of schools to one Network Superintendent will provide for:

1. Increased consistency in the delivery of ELL, Newcomer and Multilingual programs and service.
2. Building capacity as an Instructional Leader on best practices for ELLs, Newcomers and Multilingual programs.
3. Appropriate guidance and support for more equitable site-based decision making on the location of resources for ELL students.
4. Improved communication and greater collaboration between schools showing success with implementation of best practices which can lead to sharing resources as well as more effective problem solving on what is working and what needs to be improved.

5. Greater accountability on fidelity on the implementation of ELL, Newcomer and Multilingual Programs to accelerate academic progress and increase opportunity for reclassification. The Network Superintendent can set clear performance metrics, track progress and intervene if necessary to ensure each school is meeting its goals for all students and targeted subgroups.

**FINDING**

OUSD primarily relies on grants and other outside funding to support the Newcomer Initiative Program; this reliance poses the challenge for long-term fiscal sustainability necessary to meeting these students’ learning needs and creating significant levels of fiscal vulnerability for the Newcomer staffing when coupled with state and federal grants that also have limited years of funding guarantees.

While the ELLMA Department is heavily dependent on state and federal funding, OUSD has identified local businesses to fund major initiatives. As a Sanctuary City, Oakland has opened the school doors for Refugee/Asylee and Unaccompanied Immigrant Youth.

When OUSD relies heavily on outside funding to completely fund a major initiative, the district can face several challenges. The following are reasons to consider for identifying and allocating resources that are sustainable over time:

- There is no guarantee that funding will be available in the future. Changes in economic or political circumstances place programs at risk for funding and leave the district struggling to continue essential services for the most vulnerable students.
- Lack of sustainability could lead to interruption in services if the district is not positioned to continue to provide programs and services one funding expires.
- Loss of trust can occur when partners feel essential services are no longer available.

While outside funding is currently providing important resources to support the Newcomer Wellness Initiative, OUSD must identify internal funding sources to support direct services to schools and students.

The following open-ended survey comments reinforce the perception of the vulnerability of funding for ELLs. Loss of funding for what is already perceived as great need will create another layer of distrust and lack of transparency.

- *The ELMA Department is way too small for the number of EL students we have.*
- *Sites do not prioritize EL and Sped students when spending funds and CSI does not direct sites to do so.*
- *Many of these departments could be supported with state funds, federal funds, and school site needs with CS money. There needs to be transparency and shared leadership.*
**Recommendation 6-4**

Develop a long-term fiscal sustainability plan to ensure the viability of providing Newcomer Wellness Initiative and Refugee/Asylee and Unaccompanied Immigrant Youth services when grant and outside funding sources have expired.

This recommendation should not be new to OUSD. There were two recommendations in a report published in February 2015 by Understanding Language, Stanford University Graduate School of Education, “The Review of Services for English Language Learners in Oakland Unified School District”. This report was commissioned to support OUSD and ELLMA to move beyond compliance to provide ELLs with higher standards for quality instruction and support structure to ensure success. Below are two of recommendations for OUSD from the Stanford report:

- Align fiscal and human resources to support the complex and diverse needs of current and former ELLs.
- Design and finance differentiated supports for Long Term ELLs, Newcomers, Unaccompanied Minors, SPED-ELLS and Bilingual Programs (Valdésetal., 2005; Walqui & Heritage, 2012).

**FINDING**

Created in 2013 on the principles of providing equity-based services and effective instructional programs for all subgroups ELLs and multilingual students, the ELLMA Department has continually developed and refined systems and structures to ensure that all ELLs have access to essential services and high-quality instructional programs.

ELLMA’s guiding documents, 2021-2024 Roadmap to ELL Achievement and OUSD ELL Master Plan provide a comprehensive framework for achieving bold goals and is grounded in research-based pedagogy with the potential of accelerating achievement for all ELLs and meeting the outcomes in OUSD LCAP.

**Commendation 6-A**

ELLMA is commended for their ongoing passion and commitment in providing exemplary services for ELLs and their continued dedication to targeting equity-based resource allocations for essential services and programs needed to meet the diverse ELL student population.

**FINDING**

ELLMA recognizes that the success of ELLs is dependent on systemic structures that address the needs of the Whole Child. Utilizing OUSD’S full-service district approach, ELLMA is committed to addressing the critical non-academic needs of ELLs, especially for Newcomer students. An underlying theme in all aspects of ELLMA’s approach to teaching and learning is an asset-based philosophy that honors the linguistic and cultural assets that every ELL brings.

One example is the Newcomer Wellness Initiative which employs clinical social workers at middle and high schools to support Newcomer students with social emotional and mental health needs to break through the barriers that impact student learning.
ELLMA’s ability to leverage community, grant and internal funds to establish structures for providing students and families access to school and community resources as well as creating welcoming and inclusive school entry for newcomers is highly noteworthy.

**Commendation 6-B**

ELLMA is commended for their efforts in meeting the needs of the Whole Child. These efforts are evident in the design of support services and programs and the allocation of resources to address the physical, social, and emotional needs of students and families.
Early Childhood Education Department

Overview of Early Childhood Education Department

The Early Childhood Education (ECE) Department, also known as Early Learning Department, is dedicated and deeply committed to offering Oakland’s youngest children a rich developmentally, linguistically, and culturally appropriate program to prepare them for a successful entry to OUSD’s Transitional Kindergarten (TK) and Kindergarten (Kinder). The Early Learning Department’s high-quality preschool program offers instruction in early literacy, math, science, and physical development that is built upon the California Preschool Learning Foundations. The Early Learning Department continues to experience growth in its programming. Beginning in 2022-23, the Department reopened the formerly closed Kaiser Elementary as an inclusive early learning center for 3- and 4-year-old children. Additionally, the Department is building a robust program to serve infants and toddlers for our most educationally dependent families.

The ECE believes that early childhood education is a catalyst to high student achievement and strives to build a solid foundation of success for all children and their families. The department’s mission, promise, and primary goal are stated in the Early Learning Department’s Strategic Plan 2020-2025.

Mission and Values

- We strive to build a solid foundation of success for all children and their families.
- We believe early childhood education is a catalyst to high student achievement.
- We are committed to providing each child in our program access to a high-quality educational experience.

Our promise is to prove kindergarten readiness will be accomplished through instruction, assessment and curriculum that is developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate. The curriculum includes instruction in early literacy, math, science, art, physical development, and social/emotional development and is rooted in the California Preschool Learning Foundations.

Our goal is to serve the families of Oakland’s youngest children as they prepare for school success. Our ECE program strives to build relationships between families, schools and the broader Oakland community and partners.

OUSD is a California State Preschool Program (CSPP) and General Child Care and Development (CCTR) contractor which funds infant, toddler, and preschool programs through the ECD department. The Early Learning Department is responsible for ensuring that all local, state and federal licensing requirements are met. All classroom staff (lead teacher and instructional assistants) and ECE site administrators are centrally funded through the Early Learning Department’s contract with CDE. The teaching staff has permits from CDE rather than certificates as the CTE recognizes the differences between 0-5 childcare and K-12 academics. As part of Title 22 and Title 5 contract responsibilities, ECE ensures the permitted teachers meet licensing requirements, health & safety, CPR, developmental screenings, ratio requirements, and professional development requirements. Funding for CSPP and CCTR is restricted to only Birth-5 programs.
In addition to the partnership with Special Education and ELLMA, Early Learning actively partners with Academics and Instruction and pays 50% of the TK TSA's position. Early Learning also partners with the Office of Equity to fund 100% of a program manager's salary to increase alignment. Finally, Early Learning also partners with the RAD department to fund 100% of the research analyst's position.

The ECE Department is led by an Executive Director with total staff in the department, according to the organizational chart, of 30.0 FTE positions. However, this chart includes a Teacher on Special Assignment (TSA) from ELLMA and a Program Specialist and one TSA from Special Education which are not included as Early Childhood FTEs. The actual number of FTEs for this department is 27 FTE which is the number listed on the table provided by the Continuous School Improvement (CSI) Chief Academic Officer.

Currently, the ECE Enrollment Center administrator has three Enrollment Specialists. The site administrator provides dual supervision for seven Family Navigators. The ECE Enrollment Center site administrator is also responsible for maintaining enrollment and eligibility policies as directed through the CSPP and CCTR contracts with CDE.

The Director of Quality Enhancement and Professional Development position was created in 2015 through First 5 and Packard Foundation funding as a requirement to implement QRIS for CSPP contracts for Birth to 5 programs. This Director is not only responsible for Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) participation but also ensures compliance with CSPP and CCTR contracts related to whole child assessment through DRDP, parent/teacher conferences, environmental rating scale, and parent surveys as required by CDE’s annual program self-evaluation process. This position ensures the program’s full participation in QRIS, a requirement for funding. The professional development opportunities offered by Early Learning Department and coordinated through the Director of Quality Enhancement & PD are funded through OUSD’s CSPP contract for the CSPP funded PreK-aged classrooms. In addition, this director is supported by three TSAs. There are 17 child development centers in OUSD. These centers are led by seven site administrators, each with one to three early education center sites depending on the size. The site administrator (equivalent to an elementary principal position) is responsible for the day-to-day operations of centers’ facilities. The administrators provide supervision and direction of the instructional programs, establishes and maintains a positive school climate for the learning, behavior, safety, health, and welfare of students and personnel. Additional responsibilities include maintaining Title 5 and Title 22 rules and regulations, staffing, and compliance with OUSD’s CSPP and CCTR contracts.

Exhibit 7-1 is the organizational chart for 2022-23 provided by the Executive Director of the Early Learning Department.

As shown, the Executive Director has 14 direct reports which include the following: Administrative Assistant II, Director of Kindergarten Readiness, Director of Quality Enhancement and Professional Development, two Teachers on Special Assignment, one Research Associate, seven Early Childhood Administrators and one CDC Enrollment Center site administrator. Also, indicated in the organizational chart is the responsibility of supervising the Manager, Office of Equity.
Exhibit 7-2 shows three overarching goals for early learning department: Kindergarten Readiness, Quality Child and Family Connections, and Oral Language Instruction.
When asked how the Early Learning Department aligns their goals to OUSD’s LCAP and Strategic Plan, the work plan shown in Exhibit 7-3 was provided to the Public Works LLC team. The work plan shows the key actions and deliverables.
## EXHIBIT 7-3
### EARLY LEARNING DEPARTMENT WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Code</th>
<th>Key Action</th>
<th>Key Action Description</th>
<th>Specific Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELSD</td>
<td>1.0.1</td>
<td>Increase access to high-quality early childhood education programs</td>
<td>1.1 Develop partnerships with local businesses and community organizations to increase funding for early childhood education programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0.2</td>
<td>Expand early childhood education programs to underserved communities</td>
<td>1.2 Conduct a needs assessment to identify gaps in early childhood education programs in underserved communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0.3</td>
<td>Improve teacher training and professional development opportunities</td>
<td>1.3 Work with local universities to develop and implement teacher training programs in early childhood education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0.4</td>
<td>Enhance family engagement and support services</td>
<td>1.4 Establish a family resource center to provide support services and information to families.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Early Learning Department, 2023.
FINDING

Alignment from PK to Kinder and the primary grades between two different departments, Early Childhood Education (ECE) and Academics & Instruction is fragmented and there is opportunity to strengthen Pre-K to 2nd grade coherence.

The Early Learning efforts with K-3 Early Literacy have joint P-3 grants and have increased alignment the last two years by engaging in weekly meetings, cycle planning, learning walks, PD planning and training.

In this section of the report, the proposed PreK-2 alignment is defined as a pathway for a seamless early educational experience as young children move from preschool through the primary grades, each grade building on what was learned in the previous grade.

The alignment areas include:

- Alignment of curriculum, standards, and assessments
- Alignment of early childhood pedagogy for developmentally appropriate teaching strategies and practices
- Alignment of family engagement and supports

Due to the OUSD structure of TK-5 for the elementary grades to provide a balance between primary (TK-2) and intermediate grades (3-5), the Public Works LLC team is proposing a recommendation to focus on PreK to 2nd grade alignment of the whole child’s needs, including social-emotional, cognitive, physical, and language/literacy. This should not preclude alignment across the entire elementary system specifically PK-3 in the future.

Research has shown that PreK-3 alignment—coordinating PreK-3 standards, curricula, instructional practices, assessments, and teacher professional development from PreK through the early elementary years—can be an effective strategy and may lower the risk of learning loss that young learners gained when in early learning programs. (Adapted from Coburn et al., 2018; Engel et al., 2013; Reynolds et al.; Stipek et al., 2017).

These recurring themes in the ECE Department interviews validated the findings of several studies and research on PK-3 framework:

- Due to long-term funding from the Packard and Rainin Foundations, OUSD’S Early Learning Department has developed a robust PK and TK alignment but with K-2 there is a defined separation, from the primary grades Kindergarten to 2nd grade.
- Early learning educators focus on the whole child and social-emotional development and emphasize play-based learning while elementary leadership primarily focus on teaching academic subjects with teacher-initiated learning activities.
- There are fundamental differences in how district leaders in early childhood and elementary view instruction, pedagogy, and the role and purpose of PreK-2 alignment.
- OUSD risks compromising optimal opportunities for student learning and will fail to take advantage of gains made in PK and TK programs.
- District leaders and principals also often have less preparation for overseeing early childhood classrooms.
- OUSD elementary principals have varying views on their formal responsibility for PreK-TK and spend most of their time on administrative or operational oversight.
• The Early Learning Department offered an Early Learning Leadership Program for elementary principals in previous years with the goal of building capacity for high-quality early childhood programs at elementary schools; however, the series was canceled due to low participation and competing initiatives.

• Achieving both alignment and continuity between Pre-K with the K-12 system has been challenging, due to separate funding sources, content expertise, standards/assessments, credentialing requirements, and regulations.

• Due to different educational licensing requirements, salaries and job expectations for PreK and elementary teachers are at a lower salary scale.


In a study of 25 California school districts, Julie E. Koppich and Deborah Stipek from Stanford University outline the Challenges and Opportunities PreK-3 Alignment and the following Implication for Districts:

• Offer PreK directors a significant place in the district’s administrative structure.

• Include PreK in deliberations about fiscal priorities.

• Provide elementary principals with early childhood professional development.

• Align curricula and assessments across PreK and early elementary grades.

• Ensure PreK-3 teachers have regular opportunities to collaborate and participate together in PD.

The disconnect between PK-2 in OUSD is also evident in the assignment of Teachers on Special Assignment. There are Early Literacy Specialist positions in Academic and Instruction that focus on literacy development in early learning to 2nd grade. Public Works LLC interviews indicated opportunities for shared professional development and team collaboration, but overwhelmingly the Early Learning Department felt that the Early Learning Specialists are isolated from interacting directly with the Early Learning Department.

In addition, OUSD’S Early Literacy initiatives can be found in different departments: ECE, Academics & Instruction, and Office of Equity, creating siloed efforts around early literacy. Specialists supporting literacy programs are split across two different departments. Targeted Student Intervention Specialists serve both the Office of Equity and ECE, and an Early Learning and Multilingual Specialist serves both ELLMA and ECE. For more details related to this finding, see Section 2.

Public Works LLC conducted OUSD staff surveys. Exhibit 7-4 shows excerpts from the survey regarding the Early Childhood Department.
EXHIBIT 7-4
OUSD SURVEY EXCERPTS REGARDING EARLY CHILDHOOD DEPARTMENT

Q9 How much do the following statements reflect your view of the Division of CSI?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs of children in Early Childhood programs are met.</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>18.81%</td>
<td>60.19%</td>
<td>8.78%</td>
<td>8.78%</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q12 What’s your level of satisfaction interacting with the following CSI departments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>VERY HIGH</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>VERY LOW</th>
<th>NO OPINION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood (ECS)</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
<td>9.90%</td>
<td>16.61%</td>
<td>7.03%</td>
<td>6.71%</td>
<td>52.40%</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Below are some comments from the open-ended part of the survey regarding the Early Childhood Department.

- Some departments provide quality services, such as ELLMA and ECE, but others have next to zero impact.
- I wasn’t even aware CSI existed until this survey. I’m not sure how they work with the Early Childhood Education network (which isn’t even included on the list of networks, so that says something). Sounds great in theory but have seen little (at least concretely labeled) in terms of involvement in ECE.
- Get new ECE admin. that truly understand equity.
- The ECE dept. Admin. need people who understand what it means to be equitable.

Recommendation 7-1

Reorganize the Early Learning Department (PK-2) and establish a developmental pathway for early elementary grades that continues to build on what children learn in preschool/transitional kindergarten, building connections in curriculum, pedagogy, and assessments between early childhood programs and elementary education.
To reorganize the Early Learning Department (PK-2) and bring greater levels of instructional coherence from PK to the early grades, OUSD should:

- Create a Senior Director of Early Learning and Literacy PK-2 to work directly with the Executive Director of Academic/Instruction/Early Childhood and Literacy PK-5.
- Eliminate the position of Executive Director of Early Learning.
- Create a Director of Early Childhood to span responsibilities from PK-2nd grade to include professional development opportunities in early literacy development.
- Eliminate the Director of Kindergarten Readiness.
- Transfer the Targeted Student Intervention Specialist to the proposed Senior Director of Early Learning and Literacy.
- Transfer the Early Learning Specialist TK position to the proposed Senior Director of Early Learning and Literacy.
- Transfer the Early Tutoring/Family Literacy position to the proposed Senior Director of Early Learning and Literacy.
- Realign roles and responsibilities of the five Teachers on Special Assignment across PK-2
  ° Based on CSPP and Prop 10 funding restrictions – 1-2 of the TSAs focus on PK-TK
- OUSD should explore opportunities to create partnerships with local universities for PK teachers and TK-3rd grade teachers to receive the required certification with little or no cost for the participants.

The proposed position of Senior Director of Early Learning and Literacy (PK-2) should work directly with Elementary Network Superintendents to ensure they maintain a significant place in the district’s administrative structure. The Senior Director of Early Learning will work in tandem with the proposed position of Executive Director of Academic and Instruction/Early Childhood and Literacy (PK-5) to develop a developmental pathway for early elementary grades that continues to build on what children learn in preschool/transitional kindergarten.

As noted in Chapter 2, Academic and Instruction Department, OUSD has numerous high functioning literacy initiatives, but they are not all coordinated, use the same frameworks, and may have overlap in goals. They need to work in tandem using the district created research-based Language and Literacy Framework to accelerate learning for young learners. This recommendation will call for comprehensive planning. There are many PK-3 frameworks that can provide guidance for Planning, Implementing and Evaluating PK-3 approaches to OUSD’s realignment of PK-2 efforts.

The Director of Quality Enhancement and Professional Development position should remain currently as is to meet the requirements to implement QRIS for CSPP contracts for Birth to 5 programs as created in 2015 through First 5 and Packard Foundation Funding. This position will continue to ensure compliance with CSPP and CCTR contracts related to whole child assessment through DRDP, parent/teacher conferences, environmental rating scale, and parent surveys as required by CDE’s annual program self-evaluation process.

**Exhibit 7-5** shows the proposed organizational structure for the Department of Early Learning and Literacy (PK-2).
With the proposed reorganization of the department, OUSD would benefit from using the PK-3 strategies for administrator effectiveness as shown in Exhibit 7-6.
**FINDING**

There is a need for specialized expertise for Preschool Teachers on Special Assignment (TSAs). TSAs need to be highly proficient in being able to help teachers improve their comprehension and skills on how to incorporate knowledge of children’s cultural, linguistic, ethnic, economic characteristics, skill levels, and dual-language acquisition and development from infants/toddlers to TK. Some TSAs have received cross training from the Special Education Program Specialist to build greater knowledge in inclusive pedagogical practices, universal design, accessibility, and adaptation to advance the development and learning of young children.

---

Currently ECE has five TSAs that serve 66 Preschool classrooms, 44 Transitional Kinder classrooms, and 34 Special Education classrooms. For 2023-24 the Early Learning Department will focus on developing TSA knowledge related to infant/toddlers through TK and supporting the needs of the whole child (social-emotional, cognitive, language, physical, and cognitive).

The TSAs are spread quite thin and serve in many different capacities such as providing ongoing support for teachers including coaching and mentoring, providing teachers feedback on effective developmentally appropriate instructional strategies and implementation of core curriculum, assisting with assessments, serving as the second adults in PK/TK classrooms to meet the ratio, and subbing when necessary.

**Recommendation 7-2**

Align the roles and responsibilities of a minimum of two Teachers on Special Assignment in the Early Learning Department to serve preschool teachers.

These TSAs support teachers in developing or improving their knowledge on the use of Preschool Learning Foundations to provide guidance for the development and learning of young learners.

If possible, increase the number of Teachers on Special Assignment (TSAs) assigned as coaches for preschool teachers based on enrollment for 2023-24 Preschool.

Cross-train the four TSAs under the proposed position of Director of Early Childhood Development to support TK and primary elementary teachers in developing or improving their knowledge and skills in the implementation of developmentally-appropriate curriculum and effective teaching strategies across the PK-2 learning continuums.

Professional development for Early Learning TSAs would ensure:

- A consistent approach to literacy across PK-2 that builds from one grade to another.
- Knowledge on early identification of literacy difficulties and intervening with appropriate interventions.
- Understanding of developmental stages of literacy in young children to tailor instruction to meet the needs of each young learner.
- Increased collaboration across PK-2 to prevent gaps in literacy instruction.
- Providing best practice for a smoother transition as children move from one grade to another.
- Improved outcomes in language development, reading and writing skills.

**FINDING**

The Early Learning Department receives funding from a variety of sources; CSPP, CCTR, Foundation grants, Prop 10 funds and potential funding from the Oakland Children's Initiative Measure AA. Some of these funding sources are dependent on enrollment, which can fluctuate year to year and foundation and/or grant funds may have specific requirements for staffing positions and programs. This poses a challenge for long-term sustainability and creates a significant level of fiscal vulnerability for staffing and programs in the Early Learning Department.

The Early Learning Department receives funding from the State of California to serve low-income children ages 3-4 years old; thus, the Department’s responsibility is to serve preschool-age children. Early Learning has
a $26,386,261.00 contract with the State of California to provide preschool services of which $23M is used for salaries, while the remaining amount is spent on curriculum, nutrition services, custodial/buildings and grounds, professional development, materials, supplies, etc.

OUSD has been keen on leveraging outside support to garner momentum to implement new initiatives. This strategy has brought millions of dollars to fund many noteworthy efforts on a short-term basis but also brings several risks and challenges in the long-term. Through the generous support of the David and Lucile Packard Foundation and other funders, OUSD will have received over $5M by 2025 to build the capacity of the preschool program since 2015 to better serve preschool-age children and families. This has included having leadership positions to support the teaching staff through effective administration, quality improvement efforts, and professional development opportunities.

The Early Learning Department is set to receive approximately $10M/year for the next 30 years to expand services for 3- and 4-year-old children. The Oakland Children’s Initiative (Measure AA) is a parcel tax, driven to the ballot by community advocacy, a 2018 Charter Amendment passed by the citizens of Oakland to deepen the early investment in children and support them through college graduation, by dramatically expanding access to high quality preschool and providing college access, mentorship, and scholarship support services for students to obtain 4-year or 2-year college or technical degrees. The City of Oakland projects it will leverage +$30M in annual revenue to dramatically expand access to and the quality of preschool and significantly increase college enrollment and graduation rates.

As stated in the OUSD SIR Report 2021, OUSD faces the statewide challenge of declining enrollment and has the potential for less resources at risk of sustaining efforts to assure that key programs and student supports remain in place. Short-term funding from grants supports initiatives, programs, and staff that serve the development of a positive culture and climate, but the nature of the funding creates longer-term issues of fiscal sustainability, an added stress on a system already fiscally burdened.

Each year this uncertainty has caused low staff morale especially when faced with reduction in staff and receiving layoff notices not knowing if the grant monies paying for their positions will be renewed. In interviews some individuals were concerned about job security though they were working diligently to meet or exceed their department goals. There was a great level of anxiety caused by the unknown and unforeseen future for certain positions that fall under grant funding.

**Recommendation 7-3**

Develop a long-term sustainability plan to ensure the viability for funding the Kinder Readiness administrators, Early Literacy Coaches and the Family Navigators whose positions are grant funded and at risk when outside funding sources have expired.

California has recently made efforts to align pre-K standards to K–12 standards and allocated over $2 billion to early childhood education programs in preschool and transitional kindergartens in 2017–18.

As OUSD applies and receives new Early Learning Resources, the district should review all outside grant funded programs, measure their impact, and prioritize which programs OUSD can fund on a long-term basis.
FINDING

The Early Learning Department has created inclusive structures for expanded collaborative partnerships with Special Education (Program Specialist) and ELLMA (TSA) to ensure inclusive and equitable practices are identified and implemented in the Early Learning Department.

ECE has been intentional in addressing opportunity and achievement gaps, influencing their partners to shift their mindset in believing all children can learn and excel.

The ECE knows that despite many reform efforts, disparities persist and examines growing evidence that different approaches are needed. There is a deep-seated belief that in early learning and the early grades, it is the moral imperative to understand that what a child currently knows and can do is largely reflective of the opportunities that child has been provided, not an indicator of what the child is capable of learning. (Adapted from Kauerz, K., Ballard, R., Soli, M., & Hagerman, S. (2021) and Leading learning communities: A principal’s guide to early learning and the early grades (Pre-K–3rd Grade). Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.)

Commendation 7-A

The ECE Department is commended for developing intentional strategies that provide optimal opportunity for inclusion-based practices and inclusive learning environments that support all learners, including dual language learners and children with special needs.

Recommendation 7-4

Build on the existing PK-TK learning environment structure in the expansion of K-2nd grade to ensure learning environments are culturally inclusive, have strong supportive relationships, and are structured to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Framework for Planning, Implementing and Evaluating P-3 Approaches, 2019 by the National P-3 Center identifies Learning Environment as one of eight major areas of effort for high quality and comprehensive P-3 approaches. This framework is used to think strategically to plan for implementation of P-3 approach, with strategies to deepen the approach for high impact for young children.

This framework is shown in Exhibit 7-7.
## EXHIBIT 7-7
DEVELOPING SUPPORTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-3 Strategies</th>
<th>Example Implementation Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culturally Inclusive</strong></td>
<td><strong>District, Site, and Community Administrators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning environments are</td>
<td>• Use nationally recognized tools and rubrics to understand and improve the quality of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>welcoming and reflect the</td>
<td>environments, P-3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community of children and their</td>
<td>• Dedicate space and resources for families to meet with teachers and to access culturally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>families, home communities,</td>
<td>inclusive resources that support their children’s learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultures, and languages.</td>
<td>• Ensure that cultural and linguistic responsiveness is a priority for all school and program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promote Relationships</strong></td>
<td><strong>District, Site, and Community Administrators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning environments provide a</td>
<td>• Establish priorities and plans for every building to have dedicated resources that promote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climate that promotes positive</td>
<td>staff collaboration, adult learning, and joint-decision-making (e.g., time, opportunity, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactions and supportive</td>
<td>space for adults to meet and work together comfortably).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships for children and adults.</td>
<td>• Support teachers’ shared efforts to improve quality (e.g., professional learning, resource allocation), both within and across age/grade levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structured to Support Diverse Learners</strong></td>
<td><strong>District, Site, and Community Administrators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning environments are</td>
<td>• Ensure multiple indoor and outdoor spaces exist that support active project-based learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organized and provided with</td>
<td>• Ensure learning environments support learning in multi-age/grade level groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources to support a wide</td>
<td>• Ensure learning environments provide appropriate space for individualized instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range of development, abilities,</td>
<td>• Ensure learning environments provide access for children and adults with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and interests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td>• Demonstrate understanding of how to create and maintain cultural and linguistic responsiveness in their classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase availability and use of a rich variety of objects and materials (e.g., books, math materials, technology, manipulatives) that reflect diverse language, cultures, and home communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrate an understanding of creating and maintaining environments that are conducive to child learning (e.g., well-managed classrooms that support young children’s executive functioning, including self-regulation of emotions and behavior).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Report satisfaction about the space, materials, and climate for their teamwork, on-going professional learning, and partnerships with families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td>• Establish environments that support individual, small-group, and whole-group learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organize classrooms and learning environments that exhibit order, safety, and clear routines so that children are not distracted or spend excessive time in transitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have well-organized classrooms that exhibit clear routines and access to high-quality materials that support diverse learning activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase availability and use of a rich variety of objects and materials (e.g., books, math materials, technology, manipulatives) in classrooms, P-3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure materials are accessible in multiple languages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINDING

ECE has developed a comprehensive webpage for ECE staff called Early Learning Central. This one stop virtual resource center provides calendars, professional development opportunities, and other resources.

Exhibit 7-8 shows an excerpt from the Early Learning Central Website.

**EXHIBIT 7-8**
EXCERPT FROM THE EARLY LEARNING WEBSITE

Source: [https://sites.google.com/ousd.org/earlylearningcentral/home](https://sites.google.com/ousd.org/earlylearningcentral/home), 2023.

Commendation 7-B

The Early Learning Central site provides educators access to important information, with a multitude of tools and resources. The professional development calendar offers a variety of learning opportunities identified by staff as priorities.
FINDING

The Early Learning Department ensures that administrators, teacher leaders, teachers and classified staff understand and use the Whole Child Approach to meet the needs of young learners in the areas of language and literacy, social/emotional, physical and cognitive development.

Interviews indicated that all levels of staff in Early Learning were proud and passionate of addressing the needs of the Whole Child.

The Whole Child Approach includes:

- 100% of all PreK and TK Teachers and Instructional assistants will participate in POLL Training to focus on oral language skills 3x a year and participate in a monthly inquiry group. We will focus on songs and chants, turn, and talk to support oral language growth.
- 100% of early learning classrooms utilize Creative Curriculum intentional teaching cards to facilitate playful and engaging learning experiences during planned small- and large-group time to teach important language and literacy skills to children.
- 100% of early learning classrooms offer anti-bias education to promote acceptance of diversity.
- 100% of classrooms implement a version of the Anti-Bias Language and Reasoning Checklist to facilitate culturally responsive classrooms.
- Training on social-emotional, trauma informed practices, managing challenging behaviors, and universal approaches.
- Ensure the Family Engagement component of school site plans include K/TK welcome, school tours, enrollment sessions.
- Highlight examples of successful family engagement in district communications
- Implement similar cross-grade level age-appropriate routines and strategies (i.e. SEL strategies).
- Collaborate with TK and K teachers to align programs and practices.
- Facilitate connections between Pre-K/TK/K throughout year.

Commendation 7-C

The Early Learning Department is commended for using a Whole Child approach that prioritizes the development of the whole child including their emotional and social well-being, in addition to their academic progress. They embrace the philosophy with the belief that this approach will develop self-confidence, emotional resilience, a love for learning and respect of self and others.

Recommendation 7-5

Continue the Whole Child approach in the development of the PK-2 continuum for teaching and learning to support young children to develop the skills they need to become successful academically, confident and capable young scholars.
Overview of the Department

The Department of Research, Assessment and Data (RAD) is composed of three interconnected units that collaborate to support student outcomes across the district.

- The data reporting team collaborates with schools and central office teams to explore, plan, implement, and optimize data processes for progress monitoring, problem-solving and decision-making. RAD produces comprehensive, interactive online dashboards for both state and local indicators to track student learning and operational progress. The data dashboards allow users to examine results by student groups to help with early intervention and targeted support.
- The research and analytics team conducts in-depth data analytics and geo-special analysis as well as generating customized maps to support high-stake district initiatives.
- The assessment team coordinates the administration and processing of district, state, and federally-mandated assessments.

The RAD department gathers data to populate 59 public and more than 200 internal dashboards. A data dashboard is a tool many school districts and businesses use to track, analyze, and display data—usually to gain insight into the overall wellbeing of an organization, department, and above all to contribute to understanding of student progress.

The department is led by an Executive Director who supervises a staff of 12 including five data analysts, two research associates for early learning, a statistician, a state/federal testing specialist, an analytics and GIS (Global Positioning system) specialist, a data architect, and one staff member who serves both as ELPAC (English Language Proficiency Assessments) and as the department business manager. While the comparison district staff departments gather and share data, none do so at the level of RAD.

The OUSD Research, Assessment and Data department is staffed much more generously than the comparison districts. The most significant reason that OUSD has many more staff members is that RAD gathers and makes available substantially more data than most districts through its dashboard. Principal survey data shows that RAD achieves a high level of satisfaction in serving the needs of the schools.
Exhibit 8-1 provides the current organization chart for the OUSD Research, Assessment and Data Department.

The RAD department has developed the following goals for 2022-23:

**Goal 1** Customized Data Tools: Co-design customized data tools with our users that will enable them to dive into and monitor progress on specific metrics that matter most to them.

**Key Actions:**
- Engages and empowers our partners in creating the tool they find most useful; Provide daily data update (or other appropriate frequencies) that provides timely data for timely intervention and decision-making; Offer more disaggregation options for easy identification of achievement gaps among student groups; Build customized student list for targeted intervention; Release more public-facing data tools for greater data transparency and for grounding data conversations with common datasets within the community.
**Goal 2** Strategic Analytics: Continue to provide data reporting and analytics support for Blueprint, Asset Management, LCP and other district strategic and accountability initiatives and projects.

- Stay connected with key partners to adjust needs for existing strategic projects;
- Refine existing research request procedure to provide more clarity for both internal and external partners;

**Goal 3** Thought Partnership for Data Process: Strengthen and expand collaboration with central office teams and schools in exploring, planning, implementing and optimizing data processes for progress monitoring, problem-solving and decision-making.

- Continue to foster existing cross-departmental collaboration by listening to their needs, understanding their challenges, seeking common interests, and aligning our data tools and support to their work.
- Assign data point person for each area of collaboration to establish long-lasting trust so users feel comfortable to share their struggles and seek data support.

**Goal 4** Improve Service to Sites for State Assessments: Strengthen and expand support services for ELPAC testing provided to site testing coordinators, which includes principals.

- Hire and train new assessment specialists;
- Integrate data into assessment work to identify needs, monitor progress, allocate resources and do course-corrections;
- Keep good documentation of assessment logistics, processes, good practices and lessons learned;
- Involve data team members in supporting relevant assessment work to nurture collegiality within and encourage collaboration between the two teams;
- Stop unnecessary data collection practices.

For each goal there are a number of deliverables for 2022-23. As of February 2023, 39 of the deliverables are complete, 30 are in progress, and three have not yet started.

Each year for the past three years, OUSD has surveyed principals to assess the quality of support that district office departments provide to schools. The responses are color coded as follows:

**Exhibit 8-2** shows the responses to the 2020, 2021 and 2022 principal surveys about district department services with items for the Research, Assessment and Data department.
The proportion of principals who agree or strongly agree that “The support I receive from the Assessment department makes administration of the state assessments smooth and efficient” has grown from 41.3% in 2020 to 59.4% in 2022. But when asked to respond to the statement “The support I receive from the RAD department helps me navigate student data to drive instruction and achievement” the proportion who agree or strongly agree dropped slightly from 54% in 2020 to 49% in 2022.

Public Works LLC conducted a central office and school-level survey in February 2023. *(Please see Appendix A & B for the complete survey results).* Survey completers had a mixed view of RAD’s efficacy with 45% rating RAD’s services as high or very high, 22% rating RAD at the moderate level and 33% rating RAD as low or very low. Of the 323 surveys completed, 79 respondents had no opinion of RAD.

Public Works LLC conducted focus groups of parents; their comments about RAD services in OUSD included the following:

- RAD does a good job of collecting data and putting up Dashboard;
- Lack of more training at school sites to understand data;
- Good behind the screen; but not showing us how to use it; and,
- Why can’t RDA help schools know how to use the data?
The quantity and quality of the data that RAD produces that is publicly accessible is simply without parallel. Few other districts provide the breadth and depth of data to the public as the OUSD RAD department. RAD provides real time public data that is not available in most other school districts.

**Exhibit 8-3** is an example of the English Language Proficiency Assessment for California (ELPAC).

On the website, data is displayed by school, by groups of schools, by network, by grade level, by home language, newcomer status, or special education, by attendance status (satisfactory, at risk, chronically absent), and by home language (all 55 of them). Each dashboard includes a “report guide” that provides explanations for what the data are and how to use the dashboard to select data.

**EXHIBIT 8-3**

**ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE OF SUMMATIVE ELPAC TESTING**

The public dashboards allow all partners and observers to understand and evaluate the progress that OUSD is making in achieving LCAP goals as well as providing basic services and information.

**Exhibit 8-4** shows the public dashboards including the following categories and number of dashboards.
EXHIBIT 8-4
TYPE OF OUSD DASHBOARDS AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Dashboard Category</th>
<th>Number of Dashboards</th>
<th>LCAP Goals District Strategic Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Goals 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance &amp; Discipline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goal 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19 Response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Goal 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment &amp; Maps</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>District Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Goal 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goal 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Transparency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>District Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Facts &amp; Infographics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital Analytics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Goal 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Secondary Readiness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Goal 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Health, Culture and Climate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goal 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning, Accountability</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled by Public Works LLC, 2023.

Not all of the dashboards contain current data. In some cases, the schools or the district have decided not to continue to gather certain data elements. In other cases, the RAD department has reduced staff from when the dashboard was created and that has precluded continuing to populate certain dashboards. In consultation with users and executive level staff, RAD continues to display those dashboards to provide historical context. OUSD staff need additional information and student specific data to make decisions that will improve student learning and achieve all the LCAP goals. The RAD Department has an additional 99 dashboards complete with department, schools and student level data.

Exhibit 8-5 provides the categories and number of dashboards that are accessible only to OUSD staff.
## EXHIBIT 8-5
### INTERNAL DATA DASHBOARD CATEGORIES/LINK TO LCAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Dashboard Category</th>
<th>Number of Dashboards</th>
<th>LCAP Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessments &amp; Grades</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Goals 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance &amp; Discipline</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Goal 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Quality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment &amp; Maps</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goal 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Goal 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Transparency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Facts &amp; Infographics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital Analytics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Goal 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Secondary Readiness</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Goal 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goal 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Goals 1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Health, Culture and Climate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goal 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning, Accountability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness, Culture &amp; Climate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Goals 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled by Public Works LLC, 2023.

**Exhibit 8-6** shows the most frequently accessed dashboards as reported by the RAD Department.
### EXHIBIT 8-6
MOST FREQUENTLY ACCESSED DATA DASHBOARDS

| **Elementary Assessment Calendar** | Provides teachers with information about when assessments are given, with drilldowns that allow teachers / administrators to get specific information about which students need to take which assessments. |
| **SIPPS Suites** | *Used in all English-only elementary schools and as English support in Dual Language Program elementary schools.*
SIPPS (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words) is a research-based, systematic, explicit, and sequential program for instruction in this essential area for reading instruction. |
| **Interim Assessment Blocks** | Part of the Smarter Balanced Assessment system that focus on smaller sets of targets than the comprehensive assessment. They are intended to provide educators the ability to check where students are at that moment in time, and use results to determine next steps for instruction. |
| **Elementary Assessment Results** | Assessments include: English Letter ID, DIBELS, I-Ready ELA & Math, SIPPS, Gold Opens, IGDI, CAA Science, ELPAC Initial-Alternative-Summative, SBAC – ELA & Math, CAA-ELA & Math, CAST, and PFT |
| **Chronic Absence** | Students who are absent more than 10% of school calendar days |
| **Enrollment** | Students enrolled by school, network, pathway |
| **Attendance** | Up-to-date data on student attendance |

*Source: RAD Department, 2023.*
FINDING

The Research, Assessment and Data Department does not cross-train staff in key applications so there can be coverage in the event of an unanticipated or extended absence of staff working with unique programs. On January 11, 2023 when the Board of Education made a decision to rescind the school closures for the 2023-24 school year, the Mapping Analytics Specialist had to redesign the attendance boundaries for the schools that were slated for closure as well as the attendance boundaries for the schools that had been designated to accept the students from those schools. Because the open enrollment process in OUSD was about to begin, this work had to be completed in a very short time period. Had the Mapping Analytics Specialist not been able to complete these processes for any reason, there is no one on the RAD staff trained to complete critical and time-sensitive mapping work.

This vulnerability extends well beyond Mapping Analytics. There are at least two other positions in a staff of just over 11 full-time equivalents that would be similarly disabled if the positions were suddenly vacated. Only one staff member has the training / skill to do the graphics that are essential to the dashboards that the RAD staff maintains. Another staff member is alone in possessing the advanced skills in SQL to pull sophisticated data reports.

According to Cross-training staff: A guide to effective implementation and Benefits To Cross-Training Employees by Jessica Perkins, in addition to providing for a continuously productive workplace, cross-training has a number of other essential advantages:

- Produces more collaborative employees
- Brings significant return on investment
- Creates workforce sustainability
- Increases employee engagement
- Improves productivity and efficiency
- Makes departments more agile
- Establishes scheduling flexibility
- Facilitates succession planning

Any organization without backups for key roles can grind to a halt if key personnel are unavailable. Cross-trained staff can provide safeguards for these contingencies.

Recommendation 8-1

Develop a plan to cross-train a minimum of one additional staff member for each key role within the Research, Assessment and Data Department.

Steps the district may use to implement this recommendation include:

- Identify key skill sets in a role or roles
- Identify the tasks within these roles that could be performed by other employees
- Identifying which team members are responsible for each task
- Have team members create standard operating procedures (SOPs) for each task
- Share these SOPs across a team
• Provide people with an opportunity to job shadow or observe
• Have the trainee perform the new function with support
• Negotiate into the appropriate contracts an incentive program to reward employees willing to take part in cross-training

Source: International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology (IJEAT) ISSN: 2249-8958 (Online), Volume-8 Issue-6, August, 2019

Cross training may not result in the cross-trained staff member being able to perform all of the duties of a staff member with highly specialized skill sets and years of training and experience. To reduce the risk of possible system failure in a mission critical role, OUSD should identify vendors that would be able to support the function in the event of an emergency. OUSD should also consider establishing a network of staff members from other school districts that could assist in an emergency.

FINDING

The Research, Assessment and Data Department should assess the efficacy in directly contributing to the improvement of student learning and meeting the LCAP goals and develop a plan to reduce the number of dashboards to those that have the greatest impact.

Given the financial challenges that California school districts (other than basic aid districts) are facing and the especially critical financial predicament that OUSD must address, the District must consider making reductions in all areas.

Recommendation 8-2

Reduce the Research, Assessment and Data Department’s deliverables to enable the reduction of one analyst position.

Reductions in staff are the most difficult decisions that managers have when making recommendations to the superintendent and for the superintendent to make to the Board of Education. Yet not all services are equally valuable to the public and inside OUSD.

Some implementation steps to achieve this recommendation may include:

• Determine which customers of the RAD department are using which services and how frequently they are used. This step goes far beyond counting the number of times each dashboard is used. Some dashboards have few users but are crucial to the planning and delivery of educational services. Others may have many users but little impact on the LCAP Goals.
• Develop an initial plan to reduce specific services and then test that plan with key partners of the department.
• Use the feedback to finalize a plan for the reduction in services and implement that plan over the 2023-24 school year.
• Allow workforce attrition to allow for the necessary reduction for the 2024-25 school year.
• If there is no attrition, make a recommendation within the employees bargaining unit contract.
FINDING

The Research, Assessment and Data Department provides an exemplary set of data dashboards for the general public and internal OUSD users including teachers, administrators, and support staff. The OUSD internal dashboards provide real-time access to data for district and school staff that is essential for basing decisions on information and data rather than intuition, past practice and tradition.

There are 59 public facing dashboards and 99 dashboards for school and district staff use. These allow the user to examine the data from a variety of data sorts such as by grade in school, ethnicity, level (elementary, middle or high), home language, individual student, teacher, English proficiency, newcomer status, disability and others depending on the dashboard.

In most school districts, the data available to school and district staff are for the prior school year. In OUSD, many of the dashboards provide real-time data in areas that are critical to intervening with students such as attendance, performance on recent interim assessments, and discipline. For example, the data dashboard on student suspensions allows the user to compare the number of suspensions from the prior to current year based on the number of student attendance days in the current year.

Commendation 8-A

OUSD is commended for developing and implementing an extensive set of data dashboards that staff can use to make decisions in their professional work and that the public can use to gain detailed information about a variety of topics.

FINDING

From surveys and interviews, it is apparent that the Research, Assessment and Data Department is exemplary in meeting one of the department goals: Goal 3 “Thought Partnership for Data Process”. RAD staff are eager and responsive to requests to gather, manage and report data.

The requirements for data reporting to maintain compliance with state and federal standards has been and continues to be a changing landscape for civil rights such as discipline for pre-school students or reports to law enforcement or career technical programs, services and outcomes. RAD staff are active partners with school and district staff in figuring out how to collect data that has not been previously gathered. RAD then sets up systems so that the data can be gathered for the required annual reports.

The English Language Learning and Multilingual Achievement Department’s (ELLMA) partnership with RAD has yielded a profusion of dashboards and data tools to support teachers and school leaders with monitoring student progress and making informed decisions to improve instruction and programming. A highlight from the last three years is the teacher English Language Learners (ELL) progress monitoring dashboard, which provides all OUSD teachers a list of all ELL students in their classes and quick reference data on their progress towards reclassification.

Building Collective Responsibility: ELLMA’s work on central systems is intended to support the needs of ELLs being held and addressed collectively across all levels and parts of the system rather than exclusively in the ELLMA office. The past three years have shown strong evidence of critical gains in this area. Great strides have been made in integrating newcomer projections into the general projection and budgeting process, as well as the integration of bilingual assessment and data-reporting into broader systems (2024 Roadmap to ELL Achievement, pg. 32).
**Commendation 8-B**

OUSD and the Research, Assessment and Data department are commended for the commitment and actualization of focusing on using their skill in data gathering and management to serve the needs of the schools.

**Exhibit 8-7** provides the proposed organization chart for the Research, Assessment and Data Department.

Please refer to Section 2 for the rationale to move the Instructional Technology unit to RAD.

SECTION 9

Office of Equity

Overview of Office of Equity

In 2016, Oakland Unified School District launched the Office of Equity to focus on improving systemic culture, conditions, and competencies across the district in order to better serve children and families situated furthest from opportunity. According to the district’s website, in OUSD, equity means providing each student with the academic, social and emotional support they need to prepare for college, career, and community success in the future.

The Office of Equity was established to:

- eliminate the correlation between social and cultural factors and probability of success;
- examine biases, interrupt and eliminate inequitable practices, and create inclusive and just conditions for all students; and
- discover and cultivate the unique gifts, talents, and interests that every student possesses.

Exhibit 9-1 shows the current organization of the Office of Equity.

As shown, the Executive Director of the Office of Equity has eight direct reports. Currently, the Office of Equity has a total of 36.5 FTE.
EXHIBIT 9-1
CURRENT ORGANIZATION CHART OF THE OFFICE OF EQUITY

EXHIBIT 9-2 shows a graphic of OUSD's Theory of Action which is used as a foundation for the Office of Equity's work.

Source: OUSD, Office of Equity, 2023.
Public Works LLC conducted a central office and school-level survey in February 2023. Please see Appendix A and B for the full survey results.

**Exhibit 9-3** shows an excerpt from the survey.

In response to the question asking staff to evaluate CSI’s success rate providing specific supports to achieve Equity among students:

- Over 30% indicated Academic Supports are good or very good, while over 57% indicated Academic Supports are fair or poor.
- Over 29% indicated Social Supports are good or very good, while over 55% indicated Social Supports are fair or poor.
- Over 26% indicated Emotional Supports were good or very good, while over 59% indicated Emotional Supports are fair or poor.
OUSD describes equity as "providing each student with the academic, social and emotional supports they need in school to prepare for college, career, and community success in the future."

How would you evaluate CSI's success rate in providing the following supports to achieve EQUITY among students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Supports</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
<td>12.77%</td>
<td>17.33%</td>
<td>28.27%</td>
<td>28.88%</td>
<td>9.42%</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Supports</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
<td>9.73%</td>
<td>18.76%</td>
<td>22.19%</td>
<td>33.74%</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Supports</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
<td>9.73%</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
<td>22.48%</td>
<td>37.69%</td>
<td>10.03%</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Exhibit 9-4** shows additional survey findings.

As shown, over 56% percent of respondents indicated that receiving and/or requesting services from the Office of Equity as Somewhat Helpful or Not So Helpful. Nearly equal percentages of responses indicated Extremely or Very Helpful (21%) and Not At All Helpful (19%).

**EXHIBIT 9-4**

How helpful have you found receiving and/or requesting services from the CSI Office of Equity?

The survey provided an opportunity for respondents to include open-ended comments. In the sample of survey comments regarding the Office of Equity shown below, most of the respondents are not familiar with the Office of Equity and its programs, except for Translation Services and the Family Engagement (FE) Specialists. Those who are aware of the Targeted Student Achievement programs or interface with the FE Specialists view them favorably.

- What does the Office of Equity do and how are the services aligned to the school site level? What evidence/data validates this office improves students’ outcomes?
- Waste of a department
- What services?
- Not sure what services/support Office of Equity provide.
- I have no experience with this function
- I have not received and or requested services from the CSI Office of Equity or are unaware of what services they provide/ how they can help me.
- N/A, I cannot name an instance when the services were offered to my school that were named as being from the CSI Office of Equity. It might be an umbrella for other groups that have provided services, but CSI Office of Equity was not named specifically. Some arms of the Office of Equity, such as Translation services, have been really helpful. Other areas have been less helpful.
- To be clear, it is not the Office of Equity, but the Family Engagement specialist who has been extremely helpful.
- In my opinion the SHINING STAR district department is FAMILY ENGAGEMENT!!!! If all the Family Engagement leaders are like Network 2 then the district has a team of people that need to be honored, exalted and consulted with to know how they get “stuff” done in this district- all for the benefit of our students!
- The only department we get support from is Family Engagement. Specialist is excellent, and has set up regular meetings and provides comprehensive support needed so we meet our goals.
- Our school has early literacy tutors and support has been a game changer in providing support for students with equity.
- The African American Female Excellence (AAFE) has provided excellent support to provide students with academic, social and emotional elevation at my site.

**FINDING**

The Office of Equity’s Family Engagement (FE) Specialists are assigned across all five Network Superintendents (NS) and perform a myriad of duties; however, they currently report to the Executive Director of the Office of Equity; the relationship with their respective NSs varies between weekly meetings & specific guidance to no relationship.

FE Specialists also work with their respective Community School Managers (CSM). Those relationships also vary between formal weekly meetings to very little interaction. An FE Specialist must manage 13-18 schools. They meet with Tier 1 schools on average once-a-month; Tier 2 once-a-week; and Tier 3 as needed or directed by the NS. In some cases, the NS asks them to concentrate on 2-3 schools. The relationships with principals vary with some very engaged to no relationship with others. FE Specialists receive significant guidance and support from the Office of Equity, with the Office filling in for them when they are absent. Targeted Specialists are also assigned to Networks. Family Engagement Specialists work together as a team
with Targeted Specialists to serve the 13-18 schools in their assigned Network. This is a new structure and workflow this 2022-23 school year, as provided to the review team.

The FEs enjoy a good relationship with parents based on our Parents Focus Group session. Parents said the FEs were very helpful/responsive and proactive.

**Recommendation 9-1**

Transfer the Family Engagement Specialists from the Office of Equity to the Network Superintendents.

**Exhibit 9-5** shows the proposed redesign of the Office of Equity. There would be a dotted line between administrative and technical support and the FE Specialists and the Office of Equity to express an effective communication network.

*Note: that there is a dotted line from this position to the proposed Operations Specialist*

**Source:** Created by Public Works LLC Team 2023.
The relationship between the Network FE Specialists and Network Superintendents and their respective principals must be formalized. Some FE Specialists indicated they had limited to no relationships with their NS. While the NS clearly has the prerogative to assign duties and responsibilities to their respective FE Specialists, given the mix of tiered schools, percentage of Title I families, and the priorities of the respective principals, formalizing that relationship should resolve needed engagement issue(s). The CSMs must work with the FE Specialists in coordinating the resources for families. Some FE Specialists have a good relationship with their CSMs. However, some CSMs are new and thus must be given an orientation on the roles and responsibilities of the FE Specialist to help them solidify their relationship.

In Section 1 of this report, the Public Works LLC team recommended for the Continuous School Improvement (CSI) redesign that the Office of Equity and the Community Schools and Student Support Services (CSSS) better align and support the NSs. Thus, the NSs must leverage this support to coordinate with Community Schools to ensure that their respective CSMs are supporting their FE Specialists & their initiatives, i.e., engaged at the School Site Council (SSC) level, providing support & resources to ensure that the federally mandated School Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) goals within their purview are achieved; and, ultimately providing services to the families in coordination with the FE Specialists.

The Public Works LLC team is recommending reducing the number of Network Superintendents from five to four (See Section 1) if some elementary schools are closed. The Network Superintendents should determine the distribution of FE's among all the schools based on school needs.

**FINDING**

The Systemic Instructional Review (2020-21) noted that OUSD is recognized for its excellence by districts within and outside of California for programs such as the African American Male Achievement (AAMA) initiative, English Learner programs, Linked Learning, Community Schools, etc. Through its Targeted Student Achievement Programs (TSA), the Office of Equity is a voice for the underrepresented communities within the district and highly regarded by many partners. The OUSD system can learn from these communities, which could help integrate equity throughout instructional priorities. Yet, OUSD has failed to scale up these proven programs.

The AAMA Background by the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) 2019 Study presented the following:

“The factors that preceded the creation and sustained operations of the AAMA are notable in that they appear to reflect unique determinants both within Oakland and at the federal level. Specifically, the AAMA program grew out of Oakland’s long-standing position at the forefront of national and local efforts to reverse negative trends as they pertain to this group of youths” (Ginwright, Chatmon, & Hodge, 2019).

In spite of repeated efforts to change schooling experiences and outcomes for Black students, educational advocates argued OUSD was failing to serve Black students well and brought a lawsuit against the district. In 1998, the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights (OCR) agreed, finding the district out of compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1965. A subsequent court order required the district to provide Black students equal access to educational resources.

However, a district review found that “past initiatives had done little to transform the experiences, access, or educational attainment” of Black males (The Black Sonrise – Oakland Unified School District’s Commitment to Address & Eliminate Institutionalized Racism, Watson, Vajra M., 2014).
For example, despite being 16% of the student population, Black males represented 42% of suspensions annually and 75% of arrested students on campus (Ginwright, Chatmon, & Hodge, 2019). Roughly 20% of Black male students were chronically absent across all grade levels, and in spite of accountability mandates, just 28% of Black males met state standards in English and 30% did so in math (Watson, 2018). Moreover, 55% of Black males were off-course from graduating on-time or were at-risk of doing so compared with 37.5% of students in the district overall (Lin, 2012; Marxer et al., 2012). Students often fell off track very early in high school and never recovered. These struggles mirrored national challenges in meeting the needs of Black male students (Ginwright, 2010; Noguera, 2008).

The previous OUSD Superintendent collaborated with community leaders, parents, educators, and local philanthropists to launch the AAMA Taskforce and to explore new approaches to supporting OUSD’s Black male students. Crucially, the prior ruling on the lack of compliance with Title VI enabled the district to focus resources specifically on Black male students (Ginwright, Chatmon, & Hodge, 2019). The AAMA Taskforce sought to create a program grounded in recognizing the educational potential of Black males (Ginwright, Chatmon, & Hodge, 2019; Givens & Nasir, 2018). The overarching goal for AAMA was to improve academic and life outcomes for Black male students, by reducing the number of high-school dropouts, decreasing exclusionary discipline, increasing attendance, decreasing incarceration rates, and increasing academic achievement and attainment (Ginwright, Chatmon, & Hodge, 2019). The district partnered with Chris Chatmon who designed and continues to lead the AAMA program, now in its 10th year of operations under five different OUSD superintendents.

“We find that access to the AAMA significantly reduced the number of Black male dropouts, particularly in 9th grade. Our main estimates imply that, in the average pre-AAMA school-grade cohort of 61.3 Black males, AAMA access reduced the number who dropped out over the next year from 5.2 to 3.0 (i.e., a 43 percent reduction). This implies that AAMA access increased the one-year school-persistence rate of Black males by 3.6 percentage points (i.e., from 91.5 percent to 95.1 percent). We also find evidence of smaller but statistically significant reductions in the dropout counts of Black females.” (The Black Sunrise, Watson V. M., 2014)

**Recommendation 9-2**

Replicate existing effective African American Male Achievement (AAMA) Programs across additional schools in OUSD.

**FINDING**

In 2010, the Office of African American Male Achievement initiated the Manhood Development Program (MDP), a unique academic mentoring model designed and implemented by African American males. Instructors for the program were carefully chosen based upon cultural competency, understanding of youth development, and past experience teaching. The Manhood Development Program revolved around three central goals:

1. Decrease suspensions and increase attendance.
2. Decrease incarceration and increase graduation rates.
3. Decrease the opportunity/achievement gap and increase literacy. One of the first steps at achieving these goals is getting a commitment from the students to standards of the Office of African-American Male Achievement (Watson, 2014).
In the classroom, the curriculum is structured around studying black history, building self-esteem, and learning professionalism. It’s much more than just academics. Students are also learning life readiness skills. Younger students learn about the narratives and images of historically significant black people. The high school students go even deeper, covering everything from ancient African civilizations to the Civil Rights movement to current issues like Black Lives Matter. Students learn skills like how to tie a necktie, dress professionally, or how to present themselves in public. They talk about the struggles that they face on a day-to-day basis as black men, with issues ranging from gun violence in their communities to how to deal with police brutality (Lee, 14). These are issues that most black male students are not often afforded the opportunity to openly discuss, whether it be amongst peers or structured in a classroom. By having an older black male that has experienced similar situations, Manhood Development Program teachers are able to facilitate dialogue that stimulates emotional and mental growth out of black male students that other instructors just would not be able to achieve. (The Black Sunrise, Watson V. M., 2014)

**Commendation 9-A**

Linked Learning Pathway enrollment increased significantly for African American male students.

Career pathways are a key lever for achieving the District’s goal of graduating every student college, career and community ready. Career pathways create smaller learning environments, which increases student connectedness. Additionally, pathways use an integrated curriculum that is relevant to students’ interests and goals, which improves student engagement in learning. In 2018, only 69.6% of African American male 10th through 12th grade students were enrolled in a Linked Learning Pathway. In 2018-19, 74.2% of all African American male 10th through 12th grade students were enrolled in a Linked Learning pathway, which is a 4.6% increase in African American male pathway enrollment within one year.

**Commendation 9-B**

The African American Male Achievement (AAMA) Program has implemented an effective Student Leadership Council.

AAMA launched its Student Leadership Council consisting of African American males from middle and high school across the district in September 2014. Members of the Student Leadership Council are:

- creating a network of African American male students in positions of leadership who support each other at their school sites.
- acting as role models and leaders for each other as well as for other African American males in our schools.
- participating in school site councils in assessing and creating school site interventions and programming for African American males.
- regularly present for Oakland’s AAMA Program at local and national conferences. To date, the Student Leadership Council has traveled to Atlanta, Louisville, Memphis, New Orleans, New York City, Seattle, and Washington, DC.
The data in **Exhibit 9-6** shows graduation rate results for the AAMA Program students have outpaced the overall OUSD African American graduation rates and those of a peer Title I school district.

### EXHIBIT 9-6
AFRICAN AMERICAN MALE GRADUATION RATES IN OUSD, IN OUSD’S AAMA PROGRAM, AND IN PEER DISTRICT SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
<th>2021-22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified (72.4 % Title I)</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified (66.1 % Title I) Peer District</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUSD AAMA*</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11**</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COVID Enrollment Impact**

*Source: OUSD RAD Department and the California Dept of Education, 2023.*


### FINDING

The number of Latino Student Achievement (LSA) students is inadequate to provide a statistically relevant cohort so that OUSD can better evaluate the program’s efficacy, although LSA program results are very encouraging.

**Latino Student Achievement (LSA) Overview**

The Latino Student Achievement (LSA) Office launched in July 2017, with guidance from diverse Latino youth serving agencies, community leaders, student leaders, and advocates participating in our Latino Student Achievement Community Task Force. The Task Force identified six key areas to advance Latino student achievement:

1. Recruiting and retaining Latino educators
2. Affirming Latino identity, history and culture through student leadership and classroom engagement
3. Strengthening Latino family engagement linked to student learning
4. Increasing Latino preschool enrollment
5. Increasing Latino student literacy (added in 2019)
In 2022-23, out of 15,771 Latino students enrolled in OUSD, 270 are enrolled in daily or weekly LSA, Young Hawks, Latino Men & Boys, and Latina Mentoring classes across 12 secondary and alternative education schools. Latino male and female mentors and facilitators engage students with Latino history and culture, nurture positive cultural and gender identity, mental/physical health, social-emotional resilience, positive peer relationships, and connection to school. The programs significantly increase attendance, safety, and graduation rates for Latino students enrolled in the programs.

**Latino Men & Boys (LMB) and Latinx Mentoring and Achievement (LMA): The Unity Council Partnership**

In 2010, OUSD partnered with the Unity Council to establish the Latino Men & Boys (LMB), Joven Noble classes taught by Latino male mentors. Students are connected to their cultural heritage and indigenous roots as a source of strength, and are encouraged, celebrated and affirmed for their success daily with palabra circles, and through an annual rites of passage ceremony. Throughout the school year, mentors provide academic, health, career planning, and social-emotional support.

In 2019, the Unity Council expanded the LMB Program to include female-identified youth and non-binary youth. The expansion of the program implemented an extended curriculum rooted in restorative justice and social-emotional learning (SEL), students are taught to challenge gender roles and stereotypes, participate in career exploration opportunities, and strengthen their relationship with their community.

**Young Hawks - Bay Area Community Resources (BACR) Partnership**

In 2018, LSA partnered with BACR to hire Latino Safety Specialists at three high school/alternative sites, to support and help high risk Central American newcomer/unaccompanied minors stay safe, come to school, build healthy peer relationships, reduce incidents of campus violence, and graduate from high school. The Safety Specialists are mentors, instructors, and case managers for the students in their classes. Since its incepion, students in the program graduate at higher rates than students not enrolled in the LSA programs/classes, and principals have seen significant reductions (or total elimination of) fights on their campuses.

**LSA Boys & Girls Groups**

In 2019, LSA Specialists launched additional boys and girls classes at three secondary sites, modeled after the LMB and Young Hawks program and curriculum elements: Cultural pride and empowerment, positive gender identity development, academic and social emotional wrap around support, family engagement, mental/physical health, and rites of passage rituals.

**Raza Studies, Chicano/Latino Studies Courses & Latino Student Affinity Clubs**

LSA Specialists collaborate and provide support to Raza Studies teachers, and Latino Club teacher advisors, to organize site-based celebrations of Latino heritage and culture, and districtwide Latino student leadership field trips and activities.

**Maestros: Latino Teacher Pathway**

LSA Specialists collaborate with the Talent department to recruit and retain Latino educators through:

- recruitment efforts
- connection to scholarships
- on-going support to complete the steps necessary in obtaining the clear credential
- community building and staff recognition events.
- quarterly “Encuentros”, a space where educators receive and share support related to the challenges faced by Latino teachers
**Latino Parent Advisory**

LSA Specialists convene quarterly sessions with parents of non-English Learner students, to build parent to parent connections, share learning about Latino student experiences, and gather feedback to inform on-going district level improvement efforts.

**Districtwide Latino Student Honor Roll**

LSA Specialists convene the OUSD Latino Community Task Force to support planning of OUSD’s signature Latino Honor Roll celebration, where Latino students and their families in grades 6-12 are recognized for their cumulative GPA of 3.0-3.74 and 3.75 and above. Since its inception in 2000, there have been year to year increases in students on the list, according to the OUSD. The graduation rates of LSA students are much higher than Latino non-LSA students, and the suspension rates of LSA students are much lower than Latino non-LSA students.

Latino males across all LSA classes:

**GRADUATION**
- 12th grade male LSA students had 90% graduation rate in 2021-22, compared to district average of 58.3% for Latino male graduation rate in 2021-22

**SUSPENSION**
- In total, male LSA students have experienced two out of school suspension incidents, (mid-year on Feb 8th), compared to 260 district total incidents for Latino males at this time
- For the Young Hawks program specifically at Rudsdale and Castlemont, no incidents of fights/violence have occurred on campus involving our students since 2018

Latino females across all LSA classes:

**GRADUATION**
- 12th grade female LSA students had 90% graduation rate in 2021-22, compared to district average of 69.9% for Latino female graduation rate in 2021-22

**SUSPENSION**
- In total, female LSA students have experienced two out of school suspension incidents, (mid-year on Feb 8th), compared to 91 district total incidents for Latino females
- For the Young Hawks program specifically at Rudsdale and Castlemont, no incidents of fights/violence have occurred on campus involving our students since 2018

*Source: OUSD Office of Equity, 2023.*
**Recommendation 9-3**

Increase the number of Latino Student Achievement (LSA) students to provide a statistically relevant cohort to better evaluate the program's efficacy.

Currently, the number of LSA students is too small to provide significant analysis. The Office of Equity is working with the Research, Assessment & Data department on coding enough LSA students to provide statistically relevant graduation rates, suspensions, and attendance data.

**FINDING**

The African American Female Excellence (AAFE) Program was started in 2017, and due to staff transitions in 2018, was relaunched in 2019, and continued operating during COVID. The first graduation data for AAFE students will be available in 2023. The relaunch components are:

- Think Tank
- Curriculum Design Team
- Program Design Team
- An AAFE Advisory Council

According to the OUSD website, AAFE is the first districtwide initiative in the nation of its kind. The program makes OUSD the first school district ever to focus on the specific upliftment and support of Black girls as a city-wide strategy. Part of OUSD’s Office of Equity, AAFE currently serves over 300 girls in multiple Elementary, Middle & High Schools across Oakland.

Prior to relaunch, the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) study noted, “We also find evidence of smaller but statistically significant reductions in the dropout counts of Black females.” “…our finding that the AAMA had positive effects on Black males (and the suggestive evidence of its spillover benefits for Black females) provides novel evidence consistent with the promise of “targeted universalism” as a broader policy-design and political strategy.” (NBER Study 2019)

“Targeted universalism means setting universal goals pursued by targeted processes to achieve those goals. Within a targeted universalism framework, universal goals are established for all groups concerned. The strategies developed to achieve those goals are targeted, based upon how different groups are situated within structures, culture, and across geographies to obtain the universal goal. Targeted universalism is goal oriented, and the processes are directed in service of the explicit, universal goal.” (Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society at UC Berkeley May 2019).

The study suggests that the AAMA’s role models and African American boys’ success have a positive impact on African American female students. This success model has also been demonstrated in some 100 Black Men programs, many of whom now have African American female students. The premise is African American female students also need positive adult role models.
Commendation 9-C

OUSD is commended for relaunching the African American Female Excellence (AAFE) initiative.

Recommendation 9-4

Continue to expand the African American Female Excellence (AAFE) program and increase the student cohort to a statistically relevant number so the efficacy of the program can be better evaluated.

FINDING

The Early Literacy Kings (ELK) program pairs African American men with African American preschool boys in an early learning literacy program. In the 2020-21 school year, the Office of Equity and the Early Childhood Education Department launched a three-year pilot project to design and implement the Men of Color Early Education Teaching Kings Pilot. Students at ELK sites have experienced particularly strong growth in letter names and vocabulary.

Taji Brown, the creator of the ELK program, says “The power of Early Literacy Kings in the classroom goes beyond optics. Their impact extends to language, culture, and academic progress, and also reaches outside of the school building to families.” ELK facilitators are also responding positively to the program. Their retention is 90%. Cohort preschool African American boys are responding positively to the ELKs. Their confidence, interest in learning, academic outcomes, etc., have increased significantly, as compared to African American preschool boys who are not in the ELK program.

Key tenets of the ELK program include:

Opportunity for Transitional Kindergarten students to learn from and be mentored by a man of color early in their educational career. Multiple studies have demonstrated the strong positive impact for students to be able to see themselves in their educators. When students share the same racial, gender, and/or cultural identity with their educators they experience important academic and personal benefits. The Early Literacy Kings were able to provide this experience to many OUSD Transitional Kindergarten students in 2020-21.

Student literacy skill growth. Transitional Kindergarten students who attended a classroom with an Early Literacy King grew skills at a faster rate than TK students in other classrooms on three out of five important measures of early literacy achievement.

Early Literacy Kings uses SEEDS of Learning, a relationship-based professional development program that provides educators, parents, and caregivers with strategies to build social, emotional, language, and literacy skills in young children. SEEDS of Learning is run and managed by FluentSeeds. The Foundation began funding SEEDS of Learning in Oakland in 2014, and it’s delivered years of promising student outcomes. Recent research conducted in Oakland shows that just one year of SEEDS of Learning has a statistically significant, positive impact on student early reading skills and on teacher knowledge.

Collaboration between teachers and kings. The Early Literacy Kings worked closely with their classroom teachers to ensure that the support they provided students aligned with the overall goals of the classroom. This collaboration was particularly important during distance learning as the Kings were able to provide important technology and instructional support to teachers.
Early Literacy Kings Overview

In the 2020-21 school year, the Office of Equity and the Early Childhood Education Department launched a three-year plan to design and implement the Men of Color Early Education Teaching Kings Pilot. During the first year, the design committee recruited and hired a Project Coordinator to lead and manage the design and implementation process, meanwhile the design committee continued their investigation of models of similar work across the nation, convened partners in Oakland, and designed a pilot program to be launched in 2020-21. The initial goal for 2020-21 was to recruit at least 10 men of color to work as Early Literacy Kings, with the goal to increase recruitment by at least 10 men annually, with a total of 30 to 40 men of color participating in the program by the 2021-22 school year.

During the 2020-21 school year, the Early Literacy King (ELK) Pilot recruited six men of color to serve at five elementary schools in Transitional Kindergarten classrooms. Overall, the kings served 61 students. In the spring, students at ELK sites continued much of this positive growth. Students at ELK sites grew more from fall to spring on three of the five subtests than students who attended other sites, as shown below. Students at ELK sites had particularly strong growth in letter names and vocabulary. At ELK sites, students grew an average of 3.4 points on the vocabulary assessment whereas students at other sites grew .3 points on average - a difference of 3.1 points. On the letter names assessment, students at ELK sites grew an average of 2.9 points more than students at other sites.

Interestingly, students at ELK sites did not seem to continue their strong growth in alliteration and rhyming in spring that was apparent in the winter. One possible explanation for this discrepancy between the winter and spring is that the spring version of ProMoT was very different from the winter version (Note: ELK no longer uses the ProMoT measurement). The spring version of the test focused on student fluency of skills during a one-minute timed test whereas in the winter version students had more time to process each question. Students at ELK sites may have scored better on the winter version of the test because they had a strong initial understanding of rhyming and alliteration when they had enough time to process each question. However, the spring version of the test may have been more challenging for these students because they needed to quickly and accurately answer each question.

Exhibit 9-7 shows the growth of the Early Literacy Kings.
Under the Public Works LLC realignment, the ELK Director will be working in tandem with the Early Childhood Department for early literacy but will retain his position in the Office of Equity for his Targeted Student Achievement Early Literacy Kings program. He is responsible for hiring, training, and assigning the Kings.

**Recommendation 9-5**

Expand the highly effective Early Literacy Kings (ELK) Program.

**FINDING**

Arabic, Asian, and Pacific Islander students in OUSD confront multiple issues, bullying to literacy. The Office of Equity launched the Arabic Asian and Pacific Islander Student Achievement initiative (AAPISA) to support those students. In 2019, there were no Pacific Islander teachers and only one Arabic teacher in OUSD.

There are approximately 6,000 students that identify as AAPISA: Arabic (approximately 1,300); Asian (approximately 4,000); and Pacific Islander (approximately 600). Students come from the Arabic nations, Asian Continent to include Southwest and Central Asia, South Asia, Southeast Asia, East Asia and the Pacific Islands that encompass Melanesian, Micronesian and Polynesian peoples. The Office of Equity states that since its creation AAPISA has made a significant impact in lifting up the voices of our Arab and Pacific Islander historically silent student voices. AAPISA programs currently serve K-12 students across the district in the form of literacy, A-G requirements, high school graduation, and college enrollment. The program also supports
students in social, emotional and physical health, special education, and family engagement. Programs are integrated into the school day, during after school hours and community events throughout the year.

AYPAL (Oakland) started in 1998 in response to increasing gang activity, truancy, and substance abuse issues among low-income Asian and Pacific Islander (API) youth. AYPAL is a leadership development, community organizing and coalition building organization that seeks to create healthy, safe, and thriving communities.

**Bullying**
Since the COVID-19 pandemic, anti-Asian violence has increased in the U.S. According to a recent student survey conducted by AYPAL, 58% of Asian and Pacific Islander students do not feel safe while they are at school. Arabic and Cambodian language students report the highest levels of bullying at 67% and 63% respectively.

The OUSD Board issued a policy in accordance with Education Code 234.1 and provided parents with a list of resources to identify signs of bullying in their children and how to report and prevent it. Superintendent Johnson-Trammell issued a “This Needs to Stop” anti-bullying letter.

The invisibility of anti-Asian racism is a reflection of the invisibility of Asians in the American imagination: 58% of Americans cannot name a single prominent Asian American, and 42% cannot think of a historical experience or policy related to Asian Americans.

Asian Americans also remain invisible in our school curricula: last year, Illinois became the first state to require that Asian American history be taught in public schools, and this year, New Jersey became the second. *Confronting the invisibility of anti-Asian racism*, Jennifer Lee, Wednesday, May 18, 2022 Brookings Institute.

**Literacy Pilot Projects**
The AAPISA program is conducting a pilot project to target the achievement of Arab, Asian and Pacific Islander students who have some of the lowest rates of literacy in the school district, aligning with OUSD’s strategic focus on literacy to improve academic and life outcomes.

In the fall of 2018-19, Arab and Pashto speaking students and Pacific Islanders were the lowest performing student groups in OUSD on the Scholastic Reading Inventory with 82% and 76% of the populations, respectively, reading one or multiple years below grade level.

AAPISA has contracted with community partners who can work with these populations to bring culturally-relevant stories and asset-based practices using a dual-outcome approach model that brings secondary school students to work with elementary schools to read books and work on literacy projects together.

Two of the literacy projects are the Fananga (Pacific Islander students) and Ta’alam (Arabic students) Literacy Projects, which were presented June 2020 at the Rise Up for Equity Conference, highlighting best practices and lessons learned from Year 1 of their pilot projects. The programs entail: Family Engagement with ECE & Literacy; Staff Engagement & Culturally Responsive Practices; Targeted Intervention Mentoring; Student Children’s Books; & Cultural Stories Assemblies. Additionally, the programs provide culturally relevant orientation to teachers.
Another project is partnering with the American Association of Yemeni Students & Professionals (AAYSP).

1. Empower Yemeni high school students by giving them the opportunity to enhance their experience and build their self-esteem by contributing to their community.
2. Providing younger elementary school and high school students the opportunity to interact and meet role models from within the community who share the same background and culture.
3. Collaborate closely with the Office of Equity and Yemeni Student Associations at different universities to design a program that will pair students with Arab American College students who can pave the way for college and financial success.
4. Building Bridges between the schools and the parents by leveraging AAYSP’s larger volunteer base that focuses on community outreach and parents’ awareness.
5. Providing support for parents to understand the U.S. schooling system and providing better language access where possible. Conducting a number of parent workshops across the city and leveraging community centers. Flyers and other documents will be translated into Arabic for our non-English-speaking families.
6. Program at three OUSD schools:
   - Total of 27 students at Hoover Elementary
   - Total of 43 students at Lockwood STEAM Elementary
   - Total of 14 students at Allendale Elementary

**Commendation 9-D**

OUSD is commended for literacy projects to support Arabic, Asian, and Pacific Islander students.

**Recommendation 9-6**

Leverage the Culture and Climate Ambassadors and Culture Keepers at school sites to identify signs of bullying and respond quickly to intervene.

**Recommendation 9-7**

Expand the Fananga and Ta’alam literacy project and strategies, and leverage them for other Arabic, Asian, and Pacific Islander students, and remain aggressive in promoting awareness programs, such as including Asian-American history in the curriculum.

**Recommendation 9-8**

Hire Arabic, Asian, & Pacific Islander teachers and staff, and leverage the Arabic, Asian, and Pacific Islander community to augment mentoring programs.
FINDING

As noted in the aforementioned Targeted Student Achievement findings, with the exception of the African American Male Achievement (AAMA) program, the cohorts are too small to provide statistically relevant results. However, the results to date are very encouraging.

Leveraging the OUSD CSI reorganization proposed by Public Works LLC, the Office of Equity can scale up programs via their direct relationship with the Network Superintendents and principals. This matrix reorganization facilitates direct communications and coordination with Networks and will ensure that each principal is fully aware of the efficacy of these programs. Interviews have indicated that once principals are fully aware of these programs, they ask for them. According to the AAMA office, there are a minimum of five principals currently asking for their programs. As noted in the NBER study (2019), “The fact that the impact we document occurred as the program dramatically increased its operations across OUSD schools suggests that scalability is practical.”

Recommendation 9-9

Replicate and increase the cohort of the Office of Equity Targeted Student Achievement programs to ensure more OUSD schools benefit from their successful and impactful strategies.

Using proven scale-up models, such as Dr. Chris Dede, Professor of Learning Technologies at Harvard’s Graduate School of Education, 5-Dimensional Scale Model for Implementing Proven Education Programs, OUSD should start to scale up these programs.

The Five dimensions include:

- **Depth**: To understand why an innovation works well, it helps to discover the causes of its effectiveness. Then it is important to establish what aspects are crucial and which parts can be altered without reducing impact. Improving depth can make an innovation more desirable to others by increasing its power.

- **Sustainability**: If adopters find that they lack some of the conditions for success in the original program, they can develop variations of the innovations that better fit their own situation. Their adaptation may produce lesser, but worthwhile gains for their population. The effective use of antibiotics illustrates this concept: Antibiotics are a powerful “design,” but worshiping the vial that holds them or taking all the pills at once are ineffective strategies for usage -- only administering pills at specified intervals works as an implementation strategy.

- **Spread**: It may be necessary -- and desirable -- to modify a program to reduce the expense and level of resources needed while retaining effectiveness. For example, a highly effective innovation may scale best when a somewhat less powerful, but still effective version requires a smaller and more affordable amount of professional development.

- **Shift**: In adapting an innovation, it makes sense for those who have evaluated, interpreted and redesigned that innovation to claim ownership of their adaptation of the program and assume responsibility for its success.

- **Evolution**: Once a program or innovation is adapted and moved into a different classroom, school, district or state, it will inevitably be adapted further by the new community of users. It is important to scrutinize this process to gain insights that can further improve the scalability and impact of the program.

OUSD should research and explore other models, given their fiscal constraints and impending staff reductions. Thus, leveraging outside funding may be an imperative.
List of Commendations

The Public Works LLC team discovered many noteworthy commendable findings and accomplishments in the Oakland Unified School District Division of Continuous School Improvement (CSI) departments. The commendations are listed below by each report section. Detailed findings for each commendation for exemplary practices are found in the full report in Sections 1 through 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENDATION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>COMMENDATION TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION 1: OVERALL CSI REDESIGN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION 2: ACADEMICS AND INSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-A</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>OUSD is commended for placing a high priority on reinventing its MTSS process and for ensuring it is in alignment with the California DOE MTSS model and in alignment with OUSD’s Local Control and Accountability Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-B</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>OUSD is commended for creating a research-based TK-5 literacy framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-C</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>The Visual and Performing Arts (VAPA) Department is commended for producing a regular newsletter to publicize the talent, programs, and successes of the district’s VAPA programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-D</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>CSI is commended for creating and implementing a research-based walk-through instrument to guide improved instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-E</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>The Instructional Technology Department is commended for the development, coordination, and maintenance of the Teacher Central and Family Central websites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION 3: NETWORK SUPERINTENDENTS TEAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-A</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>OUSD is commended for the long-term commitment and successes generated through Linked Learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-B</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>OUSD is commended for the work of Elementary Network 3 in developing and implementing extensive planning and tracking system that is exemplary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION 4: SPECIAL EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-A</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>OUSD is commended for the quality of the curricula for special education students who are not able to be included in general education classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-B</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>OUSD is commended for the quality of the Special Education Department’s Site Leader Toolkit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-C</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>OUSD Special Education Department is commended for using the FCMAT Special Education Efficiency Tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENDATION</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>COMMENDATION TEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION 5: COMMUNITY SCHOOLS AND STUDENT SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-A</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>OUSD is commended for transitioning to an intervention and prevention organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION 6: ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS &amp; MULTILINGUAL ACHIEVEMENT (ELLMA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-A</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>ELLMA is commended for their ongoing passion and commitment in providing exemplary services for ELLs and their continued dedication to targeting equity-based resource allocations for essential services and programs needed to meet the diverse ELL student population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-B</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>ELLMA is commended for their efforts in meeting the needs of the Whole Child. These efforts are evident in the design of support services and programs and the allocation of resources to address the physical, social, and emotional needs of students and families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION 7: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-A</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>The ECE Department is commended for developing intentional strategies that provide optimal opportunity for inclusion-based practices and inclusive learning environments that support all learners, including dual language learners and children with special needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-B</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>The Early Learning Central site provides educators access to important information, with a multitude of tools and resources. The professional development calendar offers a variety of learning opportunities identified by staff as priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-C</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>The Early Learning Department is commended for using a Whole Child approach that prioritizes the development of the whole child including their emotional and social well-being, in addition to their academic progress. They embrace the philosophy with the belief that this approach will develop self-confidence, emotional resilience, a love for learning and respect of self and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION 8: RESEARCH, ASSESSMENT AND DATA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-A</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>OUSD is commended for developing and implementing an extensive set of data dashboards that staff can use to make decisions in their professional work and that the public can use to gain detailed information about a variety of topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-B</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>OUSD and the Research, Assessment and Data department are commended for the commitment and actualization of focusing on using their skill in data gathering and management to serve the needs of the schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION 9: OFFICE OF EQUITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-A</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Linked Learning Pathway enrollment increased significantly for African American male students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-B</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>The African American Male Achievement (AAMA) Program has implemented an effective Student Leadership Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-C</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>OUSD is commended for relaunching the African American Female Excellence (AAFE) initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-D</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>OUSD is commended for literacy projects to support Arabic, Asian, and Pacific Islander students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION 11**

**List of Recommendations**

The Public Works LLC team discovered many opportunities for the Oakland Unified School District Division of Continuous School Improvement (CSI) departments to improve service and delivery. These are expressed as Recommendations, listed below by report section. All recommendations are in alignment and in support of the LCAP goals and the district's mission, vision, and values. The detailed findings for each recommendation are found in the full report in Sections 1 through 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION 1: OVERALL CSI REDESIGN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Restructure the CSI Division for the 2024-25 school year to reduce silos, ensure stronger collaboration between Academics &amp; Instruction, and reduce the number of direct reports to the CAO from 15 to 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Charge the proposed four Network Superintendents with the development of a coordinated professional development plan based on data analysis and input from school staff and together with the proposed Executive Director of Academics/Instruction/Early Childhood, Literacy PK-5 and the Executive Director of Academics/Instruction/ Literacy 6-12, Executive Director of ELL/ Multilingual, and the Executive Director of Special Education develop and implement well-coordinated professional development offerings for CSI and school-based staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Charge the CAO with forming a task force to collect all of the various frameworks being used by central office and school-level staff, synthesize existing ones, and adopt fewer frameworks to ensure alignment to the district's strategic plan and LCAP plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Update Board Policy 6005 to ensure a clear definition of site-based autonomy and delineate non-negotiables that all schools should be required to implement to ensure a strong and consistent implementation of the district's instructional vision and plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Assign all CSI staff space in schools beginning July 1, 2023 until the new central office building is opened and require staff to contribute two hours a week in assisting the school leadership with various teaching and learning initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Hold OUSD Departments accountable for collecting, codifying, and updating important OUSD staffing data and organizational charts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Require that any data shared externally by OUSD staff be vetted appropriately by the Research, Data, and Assessment Department to ensure its accuracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION 2: ACADEMICS AND INSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Reorganize and streamline the Department of Academics and Instruction in order to better facilitate the growth of teachers in content area and pedagogy, design innovative curricula, and develop more meaningful partnerships with school sites and other CSI units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Ensure all staff responsible for leading literacy initiatives and instruction use OUSD’s research-based TK-5 Literacy Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>RECOMMENDATION TEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Ensure the workplan for the Director of Visual and Performing Arts includes providing more visual and performing arts support to secondary schools and to assist principals with tasks such as grant paperwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Dissolve the OUSD Board Curriculum and Instruction Committee and replace it with a districtwide Curriculum and Instruction Advisory Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 3: NETWORK SUPERINTENDENTS TEAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Develop a research-based strategy to increase the longevity of principals in schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Reduce the number of elementary schools for the school year 2024-25 and reduce from three elementary networks to two elementary networks and Network Superintendents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Reassign the responsibility for the alternative schools and adult education to the middle school network superintendent and reduce one administrative position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Eliminate the position of Executive Director of Alternative Education when those responsibilities are assigned to the Middle School Network Superintendent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Consolidate the four alternative schools into two schools in 2024-25 and implement a plan based on best practices in other schools to improve student performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Develop and implement a systematic professional development program for assistant principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Develop and implement a plan to better integrate, include, and involve special education district level staff in the work on the networks and provide training for and accountability of principals who have special education programs in their schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Ensure all OUSD networks develop and implement the planning and tracking system as used in Network 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 4: SPECIAL EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Assign the supervision and evaluation of the speech therapists to the principals and the psychologists to special education network directors and combine the remaining functions of the two positions into one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Take action to eliminate the backlog of pending assessments and establish procedures to complete initial assessments within the California Ed Code parameters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Initiate a multi-year plan to reduce the local contribution to special education services as well as enhance state special education revenue by improving student attendance with a target adjusting the local contribution to special education to the state average.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SECTION 5: COMMUNITY SCHOOLS AND STUDENT SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Create and fill four Director of Community Schools positions (internally) that report jointly to the Executive Director of Community Schools and to the Network Superintendents for the 2024-25 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Redesign the existing Community School Manager (CSM) mentoring program to include key performance indicators (KPI) to track and monitor the outcomes of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-3</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Finalize OUSDs school safety response protocols and organizational model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-4</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Immediately hire a Director of Behavioral Health and conduct an analysis of mental health personnel needs at the school level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SECTION 6: ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS & MULTILINGUAL ACHIEVEMENT (ELLMA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Reorganize the English Language Learner &amp; Multilingual Achievement Department to facilitate greater alignment of instructional programs and services for ELLs and Multilingual students and to build stronger collaboration with the Academics &amp; Instruction Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Ensure adequate staffing for the delivery of base and supplemental instructional programs and services for ELLs, specifically Newcomers, as identified in OUSD’s EL Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Support for effective implementation of services for newcomer students must be staffed to ensure that the identified best practices can be effectively utilized. The formula for providing direct supports is written in the teachers’ contract. Best practices have been identified and included in OUSD’s EL Master Plan and ELLMA’s English Language Learner Road Map which include guiding principles, goals, accountability metrics, and list of priorities for ELLs advancement and achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Realign the 13 elementary schools with Newcomer Programs and all the Multilingual schools under one Elementary Network Superintendent for effective implementation of best practices for ELLs and to support improved communication to sites impacted with high numbers of ELLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-4</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Develop a long-term fiscal sustainability plan to ensure the viability of providing Newcomer Wellness Initiative and Refugee/Asylee and Unaccompanied Immigrant Youth services when grant and outside funding sources have expired.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SECTION 7: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION TEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Reorganize the Early Learning Department (PK-2) and establish a developmental pathway for early elementary grades that continues to build on what children learn in preschool/transitional kindergarten, building connections in curriculum, pedagogy, and assessments between early childhood programs and elementary education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Align the roles and responsibilities of a minimum of two Teachers on Special Assignment in the Early Learning Department to serve preschool teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-3</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Develop a long-term sustainability plan to ensure the viability for funding the Kinder Readiness administrators, Early Literacy Coaches and the Family Navigators whose positions are grant funded and at risk when outside funding sources have expired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-4</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Build on the existing PK-TK learning environment structure in the expansion of K-2nd grade to ensure learning environments are culturally inclusive, have strong supportive relationships, and are structured to meet the needs of diverse learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-5</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Continue the Whole Child approach in the development of the PK-2 continuum for teaching and learning to support young children to develop the skills they need to become successful academically, confident and capable young scholars.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 8: RESEARCH, ASSESSMENT AND DATA**

| 8-1 | 182 | Develop a plan to cross-train a minimum of one additional staff member for each key role within the Research, Assessment and Data Department. |
| 8-2 | 183 | Reduce the Research, Assessment and Data Department’s deliverables to enable the reduction of one analyst position. |

**SECTION 9: OFFICE OF EQUITY**

| 9-1 | 191 | Transfer the Family Engagement Specialists from the Office of Equity to the Network Superintendents. |
| 9-2 | 193 | Replicate existing effective African American Male Achievement (AAMA) Programs across additional schools in OUSD. |
| 9-3 | 198 | Increase the number of Latino Student Achievement (LSA) students to provide a statistically relevant cohort to better evaluate the program’s efficacy. |
| 9-4 | 199 | Continue to expand the African American Female Excellence (AAFE) program and increase the student cohort to a statistically relevant number so the efficacy of the program can be better evaluated. |
| 9-5 | 201 | Expand the highly effective Early Literacy Kings (ELK) Program. |
| 9-6 | 203 | Leverage the Culture and Climate Ambassadors and Culture Keepers at school sites to identify signs of bullying and respond quickly to intervene. |
| 9-7 | 203 | Expand the Fananga and Ta’alam literacy project and strategies, and leverage them for other Arabic, Asian, and Pacific Islander students, and remain aggressive in promoting awareness programs, such as including Asian-American history in the curriculum. |
| 9-8 | 203 | Hire Arabic, Asian, & Pacific Islander teachers and staff, and leverage the Arabic, Asian, and Pacific Islander community to augment mentoring programs. |
| 9-9 | 204 | Replicate and increase the cohort of the Office of Equity Targeted Student Achievement programs to ensure more OUSD schools benefit from their successful and impactful strategies. |
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Oakland United School District
Districtwide Survey Results
Good Morning!
The Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) has commissioned Public Works LLC, a public policy consulting firm, to conduct an analysis of the Central Office’s Division of Continuous School Improvement (CSI).

The analysis focuses on resources and staffing of the CSI Division impacting their capacity for providing school leadership, staff, and students with the tools, resources, supports and technical assistance needed to ensure that every school is on a path towards excellence.

Your insights are very valuable to informing our analysis. The survey is completely anonymous as no names are collected nor IP addresses identified. We appreciate you taking the survey as soon as possible since it will close at 5:00 p.m. on Friday, March 3, 2023.

If you have any concerns, questions, or difficulty accessing this survey, please contact Dr. JoAnn Cox at jcox@public-works.org.

Thank You for Your Participation!

What is your role at OUSD?

An e-survey invite was sent to 2,460 OUSD staff upon which responses were gathered over a ten-day period during Feb 22-March 4, 2023. There were 329 respondents yielding a 13.4% response rate.
How long have you worked at OUSD?

Which Central Office Network serves your school?

How many years have you worked at OUSD? (Round to the whole year)

If you hold a School Level Staff position, please tell us which Central Office Network serves your school?

Answered: 323  Skipped: 7
Major Overall Take Aways among agree or disagree responses: (District-wide)

52% Disagree that budget is well managed by administration.

43% Disagree Central Office staff prioritize needs of students in decisions.

58% Rate Social, Emotional & Academic Supports as Fair/Poor.

57% Agree Office of Equity is Helpful.

40% Disagree that administrative practices are effective. (One-third No Opinion)

30% Disagree that CSI provides consistent info to schools. (46% No Opinion)

32% Agree that needs of English Language Learners being met. (One-third No Opinion)

74% Agree work practices to attract/retain staff is high priority.

Q. 3 How much do the following reflect your view re: the Central Office?

How much do the following statements reflect your view re: the Central Office?

Answered: 329

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff collaborate &amp; coordinate with each other.</td>
<td>10,04%</td>
<td>25,53%</td>
<td>36,17%</td>
<td>16,11%</td>
<td>11,55%</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adequate staff to carry out Central Office operations.</td>
<td>17,38%</td>
<td>20,12%</td>
<td>29,88%</td>
<td>21,04%</td>
<td>11,89%</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff prioritizes student needs when making decisions.</td>
<td>11,85%</td>
<td>23,71%</td>
<td>21,58%</td>
<td>26,14%</td>
<td>16,72%</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff has the technology needed to support their work.</td>
<td>13,72%</td>
<td>37,20%</td>
<td>35,37%</td>
<td>7,62%</td>
<td>6,10%</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The budget is well managed by the administration.</td>
<td>5,45%</td>
<td>12,30%</td>
<td>30,18%</td>
<td>21,65%</td>
<td>29,88%</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators &amp; staff provide quality services to schools.</td>
<td>10,23%</td>
<td>28,37%</td>
<td>20,44%</td>
<td>20,00%</td>
<td>14,26%</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: 114
Q. 4 Central Office (CO) Comments Overview

(n = 114)

- There’s a lack of communication coupled with long response time. Rarely get a live person.
- The CO works in silos, we’re forced to navigate multiple departments and duplicative requests among their offices.
- Staff are out of touch as they haven’t worked in the field for a long time - especially not knowing what schools are like post-COVID.
- There are far too many administrative staff with high salaries vs. investing in direct staff serving students. Strong sentiment of inequity that management receives more resources than students.
- Strong repetitive theme of, “I don’t know what CO does or the services they offer?”
- Resentment towards CO salary vs. teachers and limited funds for schools.
- Areas cited with poorest response rate: Fiscal and Human Resources. Don’t know what they do. Quality of staff questionable. No clear plan/direction.

Central Office Comments Overview (con’t)

- Areas cited with poorest response rate: Fiscal and Human Resources. Don’t know what they do.
- Quality of staff questionable. No clear plan/direction.
- CSI has a lack of visibility in schools and a lack of responsiveness to schools’ needs.
- CSI services do not make our work in schools easier; many are untrained to provide assistance.
- There is a lack of central office accountability and transparency.
- Central office is overstaffed.
- Lack of communication and collaboration across all CSI departments.
- Lack of school-based staff understanding who CSI is and what they can offer schools.
Central Office Comments Overview (con’t)

• There is a severe lack of behavioral, mental health, and Social-Emotional Supports in CSI.
• CSI is appropriately staffed, but the quality of staff is lacking; need better evaluations of existing staff.
• There is a lack of quality professional development in OUSD. It is a one size-fits all model.
• Special Education Services need improvement mostly due to lack of resources.
• Departments receiving positive mention: Family Engagement, Technology,

Central Office Comments: Quotes

“The central office is staffed at the expense of classrooms. The central office staff seem to forget what it is like to be in the classroom based on the decisions they make—especially in regarding testing and how much curriculum needs to be covered in a day.”

“There are too many staff in middle management overall, and yet we have departments with almost zero staffing (like our Behavioral Health department) which are vital to supporting students (and staff who work directly with students).”

“There is no collaboration across departments in Central office. There is no reason that Academics, Operations, and Talent couldn’t work more closely together to support leaders and teachers.”

“As a district we just seem to miss the “unified” portion of OUSD. Nothing seems coordinated from site to site including the internal development of talent.”
How would you evaluate CSI's success rate in providing the following supports to achieve EQUITY among students?

OUSD describes equity as "providing each student with the academic, social and emotional supports they need in school to prepare for college, career, and community success in the future.' How would you evaluate CSI’s success rate in providing the following supports to achieve EQUITY among students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Type</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Supports</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Supports</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How helpful have you found receiving and/or requesting services from the CSI Office of Equity?

How helpful have you found receiving and/or requesting services from the CSI Office of Equity?

Answered: 296   Skipped: 54
Equity Comments Overview (n = 167)

- Mental health needs cited as high need and significantly under-resourced.
- Social & Emotional Learning (SEL), Behavioral Health and Crisis Response repeatedly cited as a high need on school premises. Significantly understaffed.
- High need for Translators repeatedly cited leaving English Language Learners behind.
- BIPOC and historically marginalized groups remain underperforming because of lack of resources.
- High need for Instructional Coaches
- Lack of communication with CO. Few knew there was an Office on Equity.

“There are not enough therapists or SEL staff at the three OUSD elementary schools I’ve worked at. There needs to be more money for staff at schools, not central office, to provide students with more restorative justice, SEL and trauma informed therapy services to achieve equity.”

“Students need much more presence for emotional health and wellness. There is little to no support from central in hiring and retaining paras for inclusion students so many sites are out of compliance with no support.”

The ethnic studies cohort has been very insightful and the office of equity PDs, though a lot of what is recommended in those PDs is nearly impossible to implement without more staff and lower teacher to student ratios at schools.
How much do the following statements reflect your view re: CSI Division?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>NO OPINION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative practices are effective.</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
<td>24.00%</td>
<td>20.82%</td>
<td>19.38%</td>
<td>32.71%</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments of CSI operate collaboratively.</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
<td>23.38%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>17.54%</td>
<td>40.62%</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate staff carry out CSI’s operations.</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>23.22%</td>
<td>18.89%</td>
<td>9.81%</td>
<td>31.30%</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality professional development for principals is provided.</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>15.62%</td>
<td>11.69%</td>
<td>24.77%</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality professional development for teachers is provided.</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>27.47%</td>
<td>20.06%</td>
<td>20.56%</td>
<td>25.63%</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality professional development for schools is provided.</td>
<td>5.31%</td>
<td>22.81%</td>
<td>21.50%</td>
<td>19.68%</td>
<td>30.63%</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assists schools via data-based decision making.</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
<td>20.74%</td>
<td>17.03%</td>
<td>17.34%</td>
<td>40.52%</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI adopts innovative curricula aligned to state standards.</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
<td>31.46%</td>
<td>12.35%</td>
<td>13.27%</td>
<td>38.68%</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much do the following statements reflect your view of the CSI Division?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department staff communicate with Central Office staff.</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>20.55%</td>
<td>58.38%</td>
<td>18.64%</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff communicate with principals in schools.</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
<td>29.80%</td>
<td>49.83%</td>
<td>19.30%</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff communicate with teachers in schools.</td>
<td>5.99%</td>
<td>28.07%</td>
<td>32.30%</td>
<td>18.84%</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff communicate with parents and community members.</td>
<td>5.69%</td>
<td>22.19%</td>
<td>46.89%</td>
<td>14.37%</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI departments provide consistent information to schools.</td>
<td>3.76%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>46.30%</td>
<td>14.37%</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI departments provide data needed for staff &amp; leadership to make decisions.</td>
<td>7.52%</td>
<td>22.89%</td>
<td>42.32%</td>
<td>19.83%</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input on curriculum &amp; instructional initiatives is sought from stakeholders.</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td>18.23%</td>
<td>40.06%</td>
<td>21.77%</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much do the following statements reflect your view of the Division of CSI?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs of exceptional students are met.</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>16.88%</td>
<td>33.44%</td>
<td>26.62%</td>
<td>20.64%</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs of English Language Learners are met.</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
<td>25.62%</td>
<td>32.50%</td>
<td>22.19%</td>
<td>14.06%</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs of children in Early Childhood programs are met.</td>
<td>3.46%</td>
<td>18.01%</td>
<td>60.10%</td>
<td>8.78%</td>
<td>8.78%</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs of students in Adult &amp; Career Education are met.</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>12.03%</td>
<td>67.71%</td>
<td>8.46%</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. 10 Please share any comments you may have on the three previous questions. Did staffing and/or resource needs or issues factor into your answers? (n = 159)

COMMENTS OVERVIEW:

- The most frequent responses centered on staffing issues (e.g. high need for para- ISS positions), and lack of resources for direct services assisting newcomer students, English Language Learners, exceptional children services.
- Lack of communication & collaboration by CO with partners (parents, principals, teachers) to inform policies and practices.
- Repeat of previous themes of lack of awareness as to what CSI does.
- CO staff salaries over-compensated, too many of them, underperforms in delivery of what’s needed.
- CO staff would benefit from working out of schools rather than in a downtown office.
• “It’s more about allocation of staffing and resources. I think we have way too many high-level admin/directors, executive directors, coordinators, etc.—and not enough people providing direct services to teachers, and not enough people handling day-to-day operations like processing orders and making sure teachers get paid.”

• “I honestly have no idea what the division of CSI does, who is part of it, and whether they make an impact on my students.”

• “Your survey: ‘Assists schools via site-based decision making,’ this is a laughable statement. Our staff and families are never consulted in meaningful ways to make decisions.”

How much of a priority would you rate the following for CSI to implement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW MUCH OF A PRIORITY</th>
<th>VERY HIGH</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>NOT A PRIORITY AT ALL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \textit{How the number of central office administrators.} )</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
<td>22.18%</td>
<td>54.02%</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \textit{Restructure the staff reporting structure.} )</td>
<td>10.78%</td>
<td>31.67%</td>
<td>33.23%</td>
<td>16.01%</td>
<td>18.50%</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \textit{Outsource some functions.} )</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
<td>16.44%</td>
<td>28.37%</td>
<td>20.29%</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \textit{Work Remotely.} )</td>
<td>9.71%</td>
<td>8.41%</td>
<td>22.83%</td>
<td>20.39%</td>
<td>30.63%</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \textit{Identify technologies, apps, platforms to enhance workflow and collaboration.} )</td>
<td>13.46%</td>
<td>20.31%</td>
<td>27.24%</td>
<td>18.21%</td>
<td>20.31%</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \textit{Working together in one central location.} )</td>
<td>12.78%</td>
<td>17.07%</td>
<td>27.16%</td>
<td>15.81%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \textit{Sharing services with other school systems.} )</td>
<td>10.49%</td>
<td>24.92%</td>
<td>30.82%</td>
<td>15.72%</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \textit{Identify workplace practices &amp; benefits that attract and retain staff.} )</td>
<td>44.13%</td>
<td>29.50%</td>
<td>15.24%</td>
<td>3.49%</td>
<td>7.62%</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priority Comments Overview (n=58)

- A repeated priority cited is to reduce Central Office Staff and redirect to fund positions that work directly with students & provide para-staff and direct service staff living wages, fill vacancies.
- Need to be in-person to do the job. Working remotely given very low priority rating.
- CSI staff would benefit from being stationed in schools rather than in a downtown office removed from the realities of day-to-day school life. It would better inform their policy recommendations and increases opportunities for collaboration.
- Too many apps, and software are required for adaption at the ground level.

Priority Comments Quotes

- “Cross functional collaboration and alignment on priorities is highly lacking. Another thought- if we get rid of some of these central positions we should absolutely re-deploy folks to school sites.”
- “Central staff should be decentralized and housed at sites within their networks. For meetings and priorities that require centralization, staff can work remotely and meet online and through online workflow technologies.”
- “We work face-to-face to support families and students IN-PERSON where we can take the time to read into the nuances so we can determine what supports/services/needs they (students and families) need. CSI is at home on a screen inaccessible to OUSD teachers, staff, parents/families.”
What's your level of satisfaction interacting with the following CSI departments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>VERY HIGH</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>VERY LOW</th>
<th>NO OPINION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Innovation/Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>7.28%</td>
<td>13.02%</td>
<td>21.20%</td>
<td>10.44%</td>
<td>12.07%</td>
<td>34.33%</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Teams</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
<td>16.69%</td>
<td>25.16%</td>
<td>10.51%</td>
<td>14.33%</td>
<td>24.00%</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for Exceptional Children (PRES)</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>15.31%</td>
<td>23.42%</td>
<td>13.29%</td>
<td>16.99%</td>
<td>24.00%</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Schools/Student Services</td>
<td>7.59%</td>
<td>16.14%</td>
<td>25.30%</td>
<td>11.08%</td>
<td>10.02%</td>
<td>16.37%</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners (ELLMA)</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
<td>23.10%</td>
<td>24.68%</td>
<td>7.91%</td>
<td>9.18%</td>
<td>31.64%</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Data &amp; Assessment</td>
<td>13.02%</td>
<td>17.46%</td>
<td>18.10%</td>
<td>11.13%</td>
<td>15.24%</td>
<td>25.06%</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Equity</td>
<td>9.87%</td>
<td>17.83%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>14.97%</td>
<td>14.97%</td>
<td>22.25%</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood (ECS)</td>
<td>7.33%</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td>16.61%</td>
<td>15.73%</td>
<td>6.77%</td>
<td>52.40%</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
<td>17.52%</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
<td>36.49%</td>
<td>39.84%</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments Overview: Any other thoughts you'd like to share? (n = 122)

- Many reinforced the need for more direct service staff to assist students and teachers especially in areas of SEL, behavioral health, ELL and exceptional children services.
- Many believe that redirecting the funds for administrative staff of CSI could help defray costs to provide the seriously needed staffing cited above.
- The lack of coordination & collaboration causes wasted resources & duplication of effort.
- Central staff without classroom teaching experience lack the context and understanding to develop relevant recommendations that will work on the ground - especially in a post-COVID environment.
• “Since the pandemic, most central office staff have been working hybrid and we rarely have the chance to engage across departments. So, it’s difficult to know what projects, initiatives or challenges other departments are working on. Many times, we interface during a crisis, but we don’t hear enough about success stories. There is often not enough communication about new department staff or new school leaders or even a department directory with telephone numbers.”

• “The need is great for staffing and resources at my school site so based on that I would say at CSI has not done a good job of managing budget and prioritizing needs.”

• “OUSD needs Behavioral Health, MTSS, and SEL supports. Since those have been “redesigned,” the support is non-existent, and the staff who has been hired in not well versed in the practices to provide the depth of support sites need.”

• “At this time, staffing and resources have multiple staff with the same responsibilities, with different job titles, at two to three different levels above the site level. A multiplicity of emails are sent to the site principals, often for the same subject/information by four to five different people, some within the same CSI department or from other CSI departments.”
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Survey Responses & Analysis
Appendix B

Oakland United School District
Continuous School Improvement
Survey Results
Good Morning!

The Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) has commissioned Public Works LLC, a public policy consulting firm, to conduct an analysis of the Central Office’s Division of Continuous School Improvement (CSI).

The analysis focuses on resources and staffing of the CSI Division impacting their capacity for providing school leadership, staff, and students with the tools, resources, supports and technical assistance needed to ensure that every school is on a path towards excellence.

Your insights are very valuable to informing our analysis. The survey is completely anonymous as no names are collected nor IP addresses identified. We appreciate you taking the survey as soon as possible since it will close at 5:00 p.m. on Friday, March 3, 2023.

If you have any concerns, questions, or difficulty accessing this survey, please contact Dr. JoAnn Cox at jcox@public-works.org.

Thank You for Your Participation!

---

**What is your role at CSI?**

There are twenty-one departments within CSI accounting for 294 persons receiving a survey invite during a ten-day period (Feb 22-March 4, 2023) of which 85 responded yielding a 29% Response Rate.

---

**SURVEY RESPONSE RATES AMONG CSI DEPARTMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELLMA</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSS</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equity</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Less Response</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Response</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How many years have you worked at CSI?

How much do the following statements reflect your view re: the Central Office?

Over three-quarters agree that staff collaborate, they have technology to support their work & administrators & staff provide quality and staff prioritizes student needs. Nearly half (49%) disagree that there is adequate staff to carry out Central Office functions, (29%) disagree that the budget is well managed while (31%) had No Opinion as to the budget.
Comments Overview on Central Office

- The quarter of respondents who disagreed that “Staff has the technology to support their work,” explain that the Surface Pro laptops provided them during the pandemic are difficult to use, don’t interface well with Zoom, and are slow. ESCAPE software is not user-friendly, so many apps and/or software platforms and upgrades are overwhelming.
- Determining among the myriad of CSI Units as to who to talk to in which department to address various issues is very difficult to navigate.
- Staff are well intentioned but the bureaucracy, silos, and lack of capacity, in some instances, causes low response time, if at all.

Comments on Central Office Quotes

- “There are so many dedicated people in our offices, but our systems and structures do not allow these people to do their best work...streamlined systems that are clearly documented and followed is important.”
- “Overall, there are a lot of silos and central staff/administrators who don’t have the skills to bring uniformity and community among the different departments to work together all in service of the students.”
- “Technology has been provided but often the district rushes into purchasing equipment that doesn’t meet the needs of the work that has to be done or adds in tech functions that make it difficult. For example, the Microsoft Surface has a lot of issues and it’s difficult for busy teachers to figure out the problem when the device doesn’t work which happens frequently.”
- “Figuring out who to talk to in order to get support around something often requires multiple emails and follow-ups even to find out WHO can support with something, much less get a response.”
- “At times, it feel like Central Office does not take into account teachers and other school site-based personal when making decisions and giving directives.”
How would you evaluate CSI's success rate in providing the following supports to achieve EQUITY among students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
<th>VERY GOOD</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Supports</strong></td>
<td>12.06%</td>
<td>15.66%</td>
<td>27.71%</td>
<td>27.71%</td>
<td>7.03%</td>
<td>9.64%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Supports</strong></td>
<td>13.10%</td>
<td>14.25%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Supports</strong></td>
<td>11.90%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>23.01%</td>
<td>26.19%</td>
<td>17.86%</td>
<td>9.55%</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emotional Supports received the most Fair/Poor rating (44%), followed by Social Supports (37%) and Academic Supports (35%).

Comments and Quotes Achieving Equity in Academic, Social and Emotional Supports.

**Comments Overview**
- Reduction of behavioral health services having negative impact on emotional and supports.
- The needs of students far exceed the services available to assist students & teachers alike to address them.
- Staff have good intentions, but there’s a need for culturally diverse behavioral health department.

**Quotes**
- “In many cases, the actual supports are insufficient given the high amount of needs our students have within our community.
- “Many of the needs for emotional and social supports have been exacerbated by the pandemic.”
- “Our Emotional Supports has been challenging this year with re-design of Behavioral Health (reducing 5 Network Behavioral Health Leaders to 3).”
How helpful have you found receiving and/or requesting services from the CSI Office of Equity?

Comments Overview (n = 21)

- Over one-third said they were unaware that there was an Office of Equity.
- The majority of “Somewhat, Not So Helpful & Not Helpful At All,” responses due to inadequate translation services run by this department.
- Staff is responsive, and collaborative but need to measure equity outcomes that impact system-wide change. Need to know what works.
- The office is knowledgeable as to the needs of the community and produces high quality offerings.

Quotes

“We do not have an adequate number of translators and interpreters to assist with the number of IEPs we have where their assistance is needed. This results in our department paying an outside agency to meet the need.”

“When I speak with principals about how Office of Equity staff are directly addressing system-wide challenges (e.g. racial disproportionality in discipline), principals do not seem to know how central staff are supposed to target the need.”
Q.6 How much do the following statements reflect your view re: CSI Division?

Majority agree with all areas, however, one-third disagree that CSI acts collaboratively or has adequate staff.

Nearly one-third had “No Opinion” on professional development for principals or schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative practices are effective</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI Departments operate collaboratively</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate staff carry out CSI’s operations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality professional development for principals is provided</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality professional development for teachers is provided</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuts professional development for schools is provided</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assists schools via site-based decision making</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI adopts innovative curricula aligned to state standards</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.7 How much do the following statements reflect your view of the CSI Division?

Overall, strong agreement that CSI communicates with principals, teachers, staff, parents & community.

1:5 feel CSI could do better reaching parents & community members and provide consistent information to schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department staff communicate with Central Office staff</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff communicate with principals in schools</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff communicate with teachers in schools</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff communicate with parents and community members</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI departments provide consistent information to schools</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI departments provide data needed for staff &amp; leadership to make decisions</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input on curriculum &amp; instructional initiatives is sought from stakeholders</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q. 8 How much do the following statements reflect your view of the CSI Division?

Significant numbers did not render an opinion (37 - 56%).

Thirty-one percent disagree that needs of exceptional students are met. One-fourth felt that English Language Learners’ needs are not being met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE OR DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs of exceptional students are met.</td>
<td>9.52% 8</td>
<td>16.67% 14</td>
<td>42.86% 36</td>
<td>26.19% 22</td>
<td>4.70% 4</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs of English Language Learners are met.</td>
<td>10.71% 9</td>
<td>28.57% 24</td>
<td>36.90% 31</td>
<td>18.69% 14</td>
<td>7.14% 6</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs of children in Early Childhood programs are met.</td>
<td>8.43% 7</td>
<td>34.94% 29</td>
<td>45.78% 39</td>
<td>8.02% 5</td>
<td>4.92% 4</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs of students in Adult &amp; Career Education are met.</td>
<td>7.32% 6</td>
<td>17.07% 14</td>
<td>56.10% 46</td>
<td>8.54% 7</td>
<td>10.98% 9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q. 9 Please share any comments you may have on the three previous questions. Did staffing and/or resource needs or issues factor into your answers?

Comments Overview: (n = 41)

- Many explained that they didn’t have enough data to render an opinion on whether students’ needs are being met.
- Overall consensus that the needs are very high among students and their families. There is a significant lack of resources to meet the demand - especially post COVID.
- The services and staff are good, it’s just that there aren’t enough to go around. For example, there’s not enough translators, the ratio of staff to Newcomer students is 1:100, vacancies in positions impact special education and exacerbate gaps.
Quotes from Comments on Questions 7, 8, and 9.

“Staffing gaps have absolutely impacted the implementation of services for students and supports for schools.”

“My main point of contact/reference is the ELLMA office, which I find highly functional and supportive to the day-to-day operations of schools.”

“The data shows that our students with IEPs and our ELLs are our most struggling subgroups. Therefore, I cannot say their needs are being met.”

“If we had more alignment across the district in terms of site staffing responsibilities and program components, I could more effectively support the programs I serve.”

“We are often playing catch up instead of being proactive. I also feel like ECE has to fight for the developmental needs of children for curriculum within OUSD. I wish our district would look at the data and brain research about how our students are doing when we don’t address their developmental needs.”

How much of a priority do you rate the following?

Three out of four see outsourcing functions as a low/no priority.

Nearly 70% say reducing CO administrators is a low/no priority.

80% see identifying workplace practices & benefits that attract & retain staff as a high priority.
Comments and Quotes re: Priorities for CSI.

Comments Overview (n = 16)

• More efficiencies could be gained by using tools that support collaboration and sharing services among schools.
• Working in a hybrid manner is best allowing remote work with in-person sessions that foster team-building, problem-solving.
• Resources & services are distributed inequitably across the district.

Quotes

“We may need more staff, but more staff without having clearer structures and systems, as well as a clear and coordinated strategy, is not going to help anything.”

“CSI needs dedicated support with eliminating silos and being able to move from talking about a problem to doing active work to address it.”

“Can we have a real discussion about what responsive education looks like post-pandemic?”

Level of satisfaction of CSI services

Overall, CSI staff are satisfied with the work they are doing. Levels that ranked highest are ELL (65%), Research, Data, Assessment (60%), and ECS (58%).

The Office of Equity received (16%) “low” rating most of which is due to lack of translation services.
Comments and Quotes re: Satisfaction Levels for CSI.

Comments Overview (n = 12)

• Most interaction with various departments is positive, well-intentioned and data-informed.

• Where interaction is less satisfactory, teams don’t seem to have the bandwidth to address the issues demanding attention.

• The new MTSS department holds a good deal of promise, so far, they’ve been very collaborative and good listeners. Right now, they’re building the framework for coordination and collaboration.

Quotes

“I love the people I interact with in the different departments, but departments are stretched very thin. I feel like there are lots of tasks to get done that do not address the real issues and the data and brain research that is out there.”

“Issues stem from the leaders of teams. There are some super high functioning folks on the Academic Innovation team, but some leaders don’t always make the best use of our time.”

How much do the following reflect your view of the CSI Division?

Overall, agreement is shown on all indicators. Nine of ten agree that their supervisors appreciate them, and nearly 70% state their job description reflects what they do and receive support to do it.

Half don’t believe their salaries reflect market rates. Nearly one-third don’t believe they get the training they need and report that morale is not high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>NO OPINION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSI has a strategic plan that guides the Division’s decision-making process.</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>24.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job description accurately reflects what I do.</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUSD salary for my position is competitive with similar ones in the job market.</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my work is appreciated by my supervisor(s).</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The morale of CSI staff is high.</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive adequate training to do my job.</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive adequate support to do my job.</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much do the following reflect your view of the CSI Division?

Nearly half (46%) disagree that OUSD Central Office is appropriately staffed while 39% don’t believe CSI’s Central Office is staffed appropriately.

Nearly one-quarter disagree that stakeholders are involved in teaching & learning projects or that the CSI budget adequately supports the division’s goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>NO OPINION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The OUSD Central Office is appropriately staffed to carry out its operations.</td>
<td>6.06% 5</td>
<td>36.14% 30</td>
<td>31.33% 26</td>
<td>14.46% 12</td>
<td>12.65% 10</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CSI Division Central Office is appropriately staffed to carry out its operations.</td>
<td>7.23% 6</td>
<td>34.94% 29</td>
<td>37.71% 32</td>
<td>10.64% 9</td>
<td>10.28% 9</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI Departments successfully involve stakeholders in new teaching &amp; learning projects.</td>
<td>4.02% 4</td>
<td>20.79% 18</td>
<td>10.07% 9</td>
<td>4.92% 4</td>
<td>32.53% 29</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI’s budget adequately supports the division’s goals.</td>
<td>4.02% 4</td>
<td>33.73% 26</td>
<td>19.28% 16</td>
<td>3.61% 3</td>
<td>38.55% 32</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI’s website is a useful tool for staff, parents, &amp; students.</td>
<td>4.70% 4</td>
<td>22.62% 19</td>
<td>19.05% 16</td>
<td>10.71% 9</td>
<td>42.66% 35</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Alameda County Office of Education provides services to support CSI’s Instructional Initiatives.</td>
<td>2.44% 2</td>
<td>18.19% 15</td>
<td>14.63% 12</td>
<td>12.00% 10</td>
<td>50.44% 43</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments Overview and Quotes re: “Any other thoughts you’d like to share?.”

**Comments Overview (n = 23)**

- It is difficult to rate CSI overall as it includes many departments and many staff while some remain unknown.
- Some departments have more staff than needed, while others are under-resourced. Seems to be a lack of alignment among departments.
- Repeated sentiment that Central Office is “top heavy” with administrators to the detriment of placing more resources “on the ground,” especially among support services.
- Central Office staff would benefit from being at school sites and in classrooms working collaboratively with teachers and staff.

**Quotes**

“ I answered that CSI has sufficient staffing, but I do not believe we prioritize essential compliance functions in budgeting (e.g. completing ELPAC, Williams Audit, etc.).”

“OUSD Behavioral Department is suffering and without appropriate staff to be able to provide SEL or mental health wellness to students at all grade levels.”

“We have a continual challenge of taking on more work than we have staff and resources to do well. We either need to increase staff or decrease the projects we’re trying to undertake. We need to figure out how to sustainably manage this work and how to set Board and community expectations realistically.”
### Appendix C: Local Control and Accountability Plan Peer Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>OAKLAND AND COMPARISON DISTRICT LCAP GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1:</strong> All students graduate college, career, and community ready.</td>
<td><strong>Goal 1:</strong> College and Career Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New early literacy initiatives to ensure that all students are strong readers by third grade</td>
<td>• Establish college and career readiness labs at middle schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategies to increase access to quality instruction, especially for our students farthest from opportunity: unhoused students, foster youth, English Language Learners, African American students, Pacific Islander students, Latino students, and students with disabilities.</td>
<td>• All students will graduate with multiple postsecondary choices from a wide array of options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sustain and expand CTE paths and programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide funding for AP/IB/SAT exam fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accelerate progress to graduation through Credit Recovery Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 2:</strong> Focal student groups demonstrate accelerated growth to close our equity gap.</td>
<td><strong>Goal 2:</strong> Foundational Educational Experience with Equitable Opportunities for ALL Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continued investment in targeted student achievement strategies to address the specific and unique needs of our Black students, Latino students, Asian students, Arab students, and Pacific Islander students.</td>
<td>• Provide every student an educational program with standards-aligned instruction, fidelity to district programs and practices, and robust, rigorous learning experiences inside and outside the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expanded support for transitional students and families, including our unhoused students, migrant students, foster youth, and refugee/asylee youth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expanded English Language Learner and newcomer instructional and social emotional support and services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 3: Students and families are welcomed, safe, healthy, and engaged.
- Continued focus on building Community Schools throughout the city.
- Renewed investments in Restorative Justice staff and training.
- Expansion of our Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) services to implement MTSS plans at more schools across the district.
- Expanded support for student and family engagement, including additional interpretation and translation for families who speak languages other than English.

Goal 3: Integrated Supports
- Provide every student the specific academic, behavioral, social-emotional, and mental and physical health supports to meet their individual needs, especially the high needs student groups whose outcomes indicate the greatest need.
- Expand services specific to Foster and Homeless Youth
- Provide instructional assistants to students with disabilities
- Provide intervention and supports for English Learners
- Address the unique needs of American Indian and Alaska Native students
- Provide direct health services through school nurses
- Provide a range of integrated supports to students and families through site-based Student Support Centers and the central Connect Center

Goal 3: Students will have access to multiple ways of developing college and career readiness for global competencies and will demonstrate college and career readiness upon high school.
- College, Career, and Economic Development Support & Operations
- Career Technical Education
- Action 304: Career Technical Education Additional Support
- Action 307: College, Career, and Economic Development Program
- College Application Support
- Advanced Placement & International Baccalaureate Programs Support & Resources
- College and Career Exam Support
- Innovation, Technology & Online Learning Supports and Services

Goal 4: Our staff are high quality, stable, and reflective of Oakland’s rich diversity.
- A continued focus on staff recruitment and retention, with an emphasis on new teacher support and attracting, developing and retaining teachers and administrators of color.
- Expanded foundational professional development for our teachers and other District staff, with an emphasis on anti-racist and anti-bias training.
- Intensive new teacher support to ensure that new teachers receive the mentorship, training, and credentials assistance necessary to be successful and remain in the district.

Goal 4: Culture and Climate – Dismantling Systems
- Focuses on improving the district’s culture and climate, acknowledges the need to dismantle (confront and interrupt) inequitable and discriminatory systems.
- School and classroom environments will become safer, more inclusive, and more culturally competent through the active dismantling of inequitable and discriminatory systems affecting BIPOC students, students with disabilities, English Learners, Foster Youth, Homeless Youth, and LGBTQ+ Youth.

Goal 4: Students will demonstrate increased engagement as a result of programs and services that provide relevant experiences for students and promote family and community programs.
- Provide workshops and training opportunities, above and beyond DELAC and ELAC, to involve and engage parents/guardians of English Learners, Foster Youth, and Low Income students that are enrolled in multilingual programs as part of their educational career
- Additional Supports for the Implementation of Translation and Interpretation Services
- Family childcare at meetings

Goal 4 is an efficient system that asks and answers the questions “why” and “what if?” It is supported primarily by staff in the Superintendent’s Office and in the Fiscal Services, Procurement, and Maintenance, Grounds, and Operations departments. This goal area centers around overseeing construction, keeping facilities well-maintained, delivering resources to school sites, paying the bills, and keeping work aligned and purposeful across departments and schools – in other words, the often-behind-the-scenes activities that ensure school operations run smoothly and can provide the best possible experience for students.
**Goal 5:** Students, families, and staff have the resources and support necessary to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- Critical staffing and support to ensure that the OUSD community is positioned to respond to the continuing COVID-19 pandemic and its long-term effects on students, families, and staff.

**Goal 5: Engagement and Empowerment**
- Parents, families, educational partners, and students will be engaged and empowered as partners in teaching and learning through effective communication, capacity building, and collaborative decision-making.
- Develop and offer capacity-building opportunities through the District Parent Resource Center.
- Provide information to parents in home languages through translation and interpretation services.
- Build relationships through Parent Teacher Home Visits.
- Engage family members as partners.
- Promote student voice, advocacy, and action through the Student Advisory Council.

**Goal 5:** Students will be provided facilities, resources, and services that improve school climate and promote a sense of school safety and connectedness.
- Wellness Champion Support.
- Transportation Support.
- Social, Emotional & Mental Health Supports.
- Enrichment Offerings Supporting Academics, Equity, Student Engagement and School.

**Goal 5** is enhanced resources that make the extraordinary ordinary ("Enhanced Resources"). It is supported primarily by staff in the Student Services and Technology departments. This goal area centers around providing tiered systems of supports for students' social and emotional wellbeing, making medical support available to all students, and offering individualized technology support to students, families, and staff – in other words, resources and services available in San José Unified that go above and beyond schools' basic function.

**Goal 6:** Implementation of MTSS/DBDM
- Expanding effective MTSS implementation to all schools.
- Provide all school sites three years of training, coaching, and ongoing support, with training completed and all sites conducting business and serving students using an MTSS framework by 2024-25.
- Comprehensive MTSS will unify curriculum, professional development, and tiered interventions.
- Implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) practices as key pillar of the core program in all classrooms is critical to ensure differentiated support and intervention for the highest need students is provided in all general education settings.

**Goal 7:** Update the District Graduate Profile
- Revise the District Graduate profile so it accurately reflects current priorities of educational partners.
- Provide school site support to align instructional priorities and goals to the revised Graduate Profile to demonstrate alignment by 2023-24.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OAKLAND</th>
<th>SACRAMENTO CITY</th>
<th>FONTANA</th>
<th>SAN JOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Goal 8:** Basic Services and Districtwide Operations/Supports  
• Identifies the core services necessary for maintaining basic learning conditions including highly qualified staff, instructional materials, and safe and clean facilities.  
• Develop employee pipelines to support current staff and community members to acquire credentials and certifications.  
• Increased recruitment and retention efforts.  
**Goals 9, 10, and 11** further define the district's local efforts to support these student groups. These goals are foundational to the ability to achieve all other LCAP goals, with focus for that student group that will have a positive impact on student outcomes in multiple areas.  
**Goal 9:** Focus on Students with Disabilities  
• Preschool district capacity assessment  
• Educational technology for students with disabilities  
• Expanded special education staffing  
• Team engagement and professional learning specific to the needs of students with disabilities  
**Goal 10:** Focus on Students with Disabilities  
• Respectfully, efficiently, and effectively identify all eligible homeless youth so they can be connected to/provided with appropriate family, academic social/emotional, behavioral, health, and other services.  
**Goal 11:** Focus on Foster Youth  
• All Foster Youth demonstrating below-grade level academic proficiency will be provided 1-on-1 and/or small group tutoring services.  
• Provide individualized case management for Foster Youth. |
Table 1 shows that three of the four districts identify college and career readiness as a goal (Fontana Goal 3, Oakland Goal 1, and Sacramento City Goal 1).

- Oakland (Goal 2) and Sacramento City (Goals 9, 10, 11) specify the focal student groups in their goals.
- Oakland (Goal 3) and Sacramento City (Goal 6) identify implementation/expansion of MTSS services as a goal.
- All four districts include academic improvement, achievement, and growth among their goals (Fontana Goals 1 and 2, Oakland Goal 2, Sacramento City Goal 2, San Jose Goal 1).
- Other common goals include systems of support, student, community and family engagement, and climate and safety.
- Oakland is the only district that directly addresses staffing in the goals (Goals 4 and 5).

### TABLE 1
OAKLAND AND COMPARISON DISTRICT LCAP GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>2021-2024 LCAP Goals</th>
<th>Success/Need</th>
<th>LCAP Highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td><strong>Goal 1</strong>: All students graduate college, career, and community ready.</td>
<td><strong>Area of Success:</strong></td>
<td>This year’s LCAP emphasizes themes of districtwide alignment of academic priorities, actions, and services and systems for monitoring implementation and progress—from central leadership to schools. A key goal over the next three years is to ensure that our multiple District planning initiatives are aligned around a shared vision that elevates our equity framework. The LCAP is intended to serve as the guiding academic plan to improve student outcomes on state and local priorities, while our District Strategic Plan focuses on a narrow set of strategic actions centered on quality community schools, fiscal vitality, and organizational wellness. Our Instructional Focus Plan provides an organizational framework for our instructional practices at the school level. While the Systemic Instructional Review (SIR) conducted by the California Collaborative for Educational Excellence is not included at length in the LCAP, the LCAP serves as the organizing frame through which we will progress monitor the 58 actions identified in the SIR. The 2021-2024 LCAP includes fewer actions overall but focuses on consistent implementation and clear progress monitoring both annually and throughout the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Goal 2</strong>: Focal student groups demonstrate accelerated growth to close our equity gap.</td>
<td><strong>Area of Need:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Goal 3</strong>: Students and families are welcomed, safe, healthy, and engaged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Goal 4</strong>: Our staff are high quality, stable, and reflective of Oakland’s rich diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Goal 5</strong>: Students, families, and staff have the resources and support necessary to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>2021-2024 LCAP Goals</td>
<td>Success/Need</td>
<td>LCAP Highlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City</td>
<td><strong>Goal 1</strong>: College and Career Readiness&lt;br&gt;<strong>Goal 2</strong>: Foundational Educational Experience with Equitable Opportunities for ALL Students&lt;br&gt;<strong>Goal 3</strong>: Integrated Supports&lt;br&gt;<strong>Goal 4</strong>: Culture and Climate – Dismantling Systems&lt;br&gt;<strong>Goal 5</strong>: Engagement and Empowerment&lt;br&gt;<strong>Goal 6</strong>: Implementation of MTSS/DBDM&lt;br&gt;<strong>Goal 7</strong>: Update the District Graduate Profile&lt;br&gt;<strong>Goal 8</strong>: Basic Services and Districtwide Operations/Supports&lt;br&gt;<strong>Goal 9</strong>: Focus on Students with Disabilities&lt;br&gt;<strong>Goal 10</strong>: Focus on Homeless Youth&lt;br&gt;<strong>Goal 11</strong>: Focus on Foster Youth</td>
<td><strong>Successes</strong>:&lt;br&gt;• MTSS (Universal Design for Learning UDL)&lt;br&gt;• College and Career Readiness Outcomes&lt;br&gt;• English Learner Master Plan&lt;br&gt;• Program Expansions&lt;br&gt;• Facilities Master Plan&lt;br&gt;• Suspension Rates&lt;br&gt;• ELA Performance&lt;br&gt;• Chronic Absenteeism&lt;br&gt;<strong>Identified Need</strong>:&lt;br&gt;• Implementation of UDL in all classrooms&lt;br&gt;• Assessment of Students Needs&lt;br&gt;• Intersectionality of Students across Student Groups&lt;br&gt;• Mathematics and ELA&lt;br&gt;• Chronic Absenteeism&lt;br&gt;• Graduation Rate&lt;br&gt;• Suspension</td>
<td>SCUSD’s LCAP is grounded in the district’s core value and overarching Equity, Access, and Social Justice Guiding Principle. The recognition of the fundamental inequities in our system and the need to confront and interrupt inequities to level the playing field are key elements of multiple LCAP goals.&lt;br&gt;SCUSD Guiding Principle: All students are given an equal opportunity to graduate with the greatest number of postsecondary choices from the widest array of options.&lt;br&gt;This LCAP acknowledges that the system as it is currently structured has failed to meet the needs of many students and the district has a long way to go before it realizes the vision set forth in the guiding principle. It is important that this acknowledgement guides goal setting and strategic planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana</td>
<td><strong>Goal 1</strong>: Students will demonstrate improved academic growth and achievement.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Goal 2</strong>: Students will demonstrate grade level literacy skills by the end of 3rd grade.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Goal 3</strong>: Students will have access to multiple ways of developing college and career readiness.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Goal 4</strong>: Students will demonstrate increased engagement.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Goal 5</strong>: Students will be provided facilities, resources, and services that improve school climate and promote a sense of school safety and connectedness.</td>
<td><strong>Successes</strong>:&lt;br&gt;• Every Student Successful: Schools demonstrate a relentless focus on preparing students for success in college, career, and life.&lt;br&gt;• Engaging Schools: Schools have the high-quality resources, leaders, and teachers to provide the comprehensive learning environment required for a world-class education.&lt;br&gt;• Empowered Communities: Schools cultivate healthy environments and meaningful partnerships with families and communities to support student achievement in and out of school.</td>
<td><strong>Identified Need</strong>:&lt;br&gt;• Chronic Absenteeism&lt;br&gt;• Suspension Rate: American Indian&lt;br&gt;• Graduation Rate: African American, Foster Youth, Students with Disabilities&lt;br&gt;• College and Career Indicator: Homeless</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 shows the districts share common successes such as college and career readiness. The districts also have common needs regarding chronic absenteeism, suspensions, and graduation rates, although Sacramento City also reports chronic absenteeism and suspension rates among their successes.

While Oakland is the only district to explicitly indicate teacher retention as an identified need, each of the districts addressed staffing in the LCAP highlights. For example, Fontana will hire additional resident teachers, elementary counselors, elementary school site aides, technical support specialists for students, social emotional support coaches, social emotional support specialists, and custodial staff. San Jose identifies investment in innovative workforce (staff) as the core overarching theme rather than a goal in and of itself.
Appendix D: OUSD and Peer District Comparisons

Oakland Unified School District Peer Districts Report

Three districts were selected in consultation with Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) as peers for a comparative peer analysis. These include:

- Sacramento City Unified School District (SCUSD), Sacramento County
- Fontana Unified School District (FUSD), San Bernadino County
- San Jose Unified School District (SJUSD), Santa Clara County

Data for the comparative peer analysis were obtained from several sources, including: district/school system website and dashboards, California Department of Education including SACS 2021, Data Quest and Ed-Data. Data were also collected from each of the district’s websites as well as United States census data. Data collected consists of student enrollment and educational programs and services, financial information, surveys and staffing information. The data are disaggregated by race/ethnicity, and limited English proficiency. The data used in the peer analysis are the most recent comparative data available.

Some of the data that was available for Oakland Unified, Sacramento City Unified and Fontana Unified were not available for San Jose Unified. In a small number of comparisons, data from West Contra Costa Unified were used to provide a third comparison district.

This comparative peer data provides an additional context for assessing OUSD organizational structure, resources and operations. However, it is important to be cognizant that differences in organizational structure, resources, and operations of the peer school districts may have an impact on the comparisons.

The Peer Districts Report presents data on:

- Student Enrollment
- Enrollment Trends 2014-15 to 2021-22
- Student Demographics
- Number of Schools
- Charter and Private Enrollment
- Academic Progress
- College Going Rates
- Graduation rates
- Attendance
- Suspensions
- District Budget Information
- District Expenditures
- Teacher Salary / Experience & Student Learning
- Teacher Credentials
PEER COMPARISON HIGHLIGHTS

Student Demographics and Socioeconomic Status
OUSD, SCUSD, and FUSD have similar student enrollments with SCUSD 8% larger than Fontana and 10% larger than Oakland. SJUSD is 1/3 the size of SCUSD. All four districts are highly diverse with large differences among them in the percentage of African American, White, Hispanic/Latino, Asian students and students of more than two races. OUSD has the greatest number of African American students while FUSD has the largest number of Hispanic/Latino students. SCUSD has the greatest percentage of Asian students while San Jose has the largest percentage of White students. OUSD has the largest percentage of English Language Learners. SCUSD and Oakland have a similar percentage of children in poverty with SJUSD having the smallest proportion of children in poverty.

Academic Performance and Progress
All public schools, (non-charter and charter), are required to participate in the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP). The CAASPP system uses the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments for English language arts/literacy (ELA) and mathematics in grades three through eight and grade eleven. The California Department of Education reports the percentage of students who meet or exceed the state standards.

English Language Arts
- Overall, OUSD student performed about as well as two of the three comparison districts and significantly below SJUSD.
- OUSD and SCUSD African American students performed not nearly as well as those from FUSD and SJUSD.
- Fewer than a quarter of OUSD Latino students met or exceeded standards, significantly underperforming the comparison districts.
- OUSD White students outperformed White students in the comparison districts.

Mathematics
- Overall, OUSD students performed about as well as two of the three comparison districts and significantly below SJUSD.
- Just over a quarter of OUSD met or exceeded standards in mathematics ranking third of the four districts in the study.
- Only one in ten OUSD African American students met math standards, outperforming only SCUSD.
- None of the districts reached the 20% mark for Latino students.
- OUSD White students outperformed White students in the comparison districts.

English Learners
- English Language Learners performed similarly in each of the district with success in meeting or exceeding the standards ranging in ELA from 8.3% to 10.4%. In mathematics, the rates ranged from 5.3% to 8.0%.
Graduation
- OUSD had the lowest overall graduation among the comparison districts with only three-fourths of the students graduating in four years of high school.
- OUSD Latino students’ graduation rate was far below the comparison districts with 63% graduating compared to 85% in SCUSD, 92% in FUSD and 96% in SJUSD.

College-Going Rate
- OUSD had the lowest college going rate of the four comparison districts with just under half of the students enrolling in post-secondary education.
- OUSD lagged significantly behind the other districts in the proportion of Latino students going to college.

Attendance and Suspensions
- OUSD has the highest proportion of chronically absent students among the comparison districts with nearly 48% missing more than 10% of the school year.
- OUSD African American, Asian and Hispanic/Latino students had the highest percentage of chronically absent students in the comparison group.
- OUSD White students had the second lowest percentage of chronically absent students at just under 22% compared to SJUSD White students at 17%.
- SCUSD had the highest suspension rate compared to the size of the population for African American students with 1,184 suspensions out of total African American population of 5,550 students, whereas OUSD had 1,213 suspensions of African American students out of a population of 7,992 students.

Financial Resources
Oakland Unified is in a significantly more favorable financial position than any of the comparison districts. OUSD spends more per pupil than the other districts: $3,436 more than SCUSD, $3,365 more than FUSD, and $4,807 more than SJUSD.
- OUSD spends more per pupil on classified salaries than the others, including $1,250 more per pupil than SCUSD, $838 more than FUSD, and $885 more than SJUSD.
- Voters in OUSD have approved three parcel taxes totaling $435 per parcel which generates more than $44 million in revenue per year. Neither SCUSD nor FUSD generate any parcel tax funds. SJUSD has a single parcel tax of $72 per parcel which generates $4.8 million.
- Average teacher salaries in OUSD trail each of the comparison districts with an average teacher salary that is $14,259 less than SCUSD, $20,378 less than FUSD, and $11,756 less than SJUSD.

Student Enrollment
The four school districts range in size from 25,677 students for SJUSD to SCUSD with 38,045 students. At 34,428 students, OUSD is slightly smaller than FUSD with 35,101 students.
All of the comparison districts have experienced a decline in enrollment with the steepest drops following the return to school during the COVID-19 pandemic.

**ENROLLMENT 2014-15 THROUGH 2021-22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>37,096</td>
<td>37,124</td>
<td>36,814</td>
<td>37,096</td>
<td>36,524</td>
<td>36,154</td>
<td>35,489</td>
<td>34,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>41,026</td>
<td>41,028</td>
<td>41,085</td>
<td>40,854</td>
<td>40,660</td>
<td>40,409</td>
<td>39,003</td>
<td>38,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>39,470</td>
<td>38,742</td>
<td>38,014</td>
<td>37,176</td>
<td>36,335</td>
<td>36,160</td>
<td>35,461</td>
<td>35,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>31,692</td>
<td>31,056</td>
<td>30,227</td>
<td>29,738</td>
<td>29,762</td>
<td>28,830</td>
<td>27,430</td>
<td>25,677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education Data Quest 2022.
Student Demographics

All peer districts had ethnically and racially diverse student population. There were large differences among the peers in the percentage of African American, White, Hispanic and Asian students. OUSD has the largest percentage of African American students (21%) and SJUSD has the smallest (2.4%). FUSD has the largest percentage of Hispanic/Latino students (87%) with OUSD a distant third in the group (45%). SCUSD has the largest proportion of Asian students (18%) compared to OUSD (11%). SJUSD has largest White population at 23% with OUSD at 11% and SCUSD at 17%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
<th>All Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>7,368</td>
<td>3,802</td>
<td>15,503</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>1,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City</td>
<td>4,682</td>
<td>6,852</td>
<td>15,439</td>
<td>6,390</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>1,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>30,461</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>13,290</td>
<td>5,820</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education Data Quest 2022.
OUSD and SCUSD have the highest proportion of children living in poverty. OUSD has highest percentage of English Language Learners, followed by FUSD. FUSD has the highest percentage of socio-economically disadvantaged students followed by OUSD.

**SES, ELL, CHILDREN IN POVERTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Socio-economically Disadvantaged</th>
<th>English Language Learners</th>
<th>Children in Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Sources: California Department of Education Data Quest 2022, U.S Census 2020._
Number of Schools

OUSD has the largest number of schools among the comparison districts with 77 and an average number of students in each school of 447. SCUSD which has 3,500 more students, has 68 schools and an average school size of 559 students. FUSD with a student population of about 500 more students than OUSD has 46 schools with an average school size of 763 students. While SJUSD has fewer than 26,000 students, it has 41 schools with an average school size of 626.

Three of the comparison school districts have charter schools in their attendance areas. Oakland has the most with 28 followed by SCUSD with 15 and SJUSD with five. There are no charter schools in FUSD.

All of the districts include private schools which are significant because the public school district, under Federal law, is required to provide some services. Again, OUSD has the most with 37, followed by SCUSD with 27, SJUSD with 24, and FUSD with six.

### CHARTER SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PRIVATE SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6,969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education Data Quest 2022.
**Academic Progress**

Students in Grades 3-8 and 11 are required to take the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP). CAASPP is a system intended to provide information that can be used to monitor student progress and ensure that all students leave high school ready for college and career. The Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments, which are delivered by computer, consist of two sections: a computer adaptive test and a performance task (PT) based on the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for ELA and mathematics. The computer adaptive section includes a range of item types, such as selected response, constructed response, table, fill-in, graphing, and so forth. The PTs are extended activities that measure a student's ability to integrate knowledge and skills across multiple standards—a key component of college and career readiness.

The results below represent all students taking the tests in 2022.
**CAASPP-ELA PERCENT OF STUDENTS: STANDARD EXCEEDED OR MET (LEVELS 3 AND 4) 2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>All Grades</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black/ Afr Am</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>35.33</td>
<td>52.25</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>24.76</td>
<td>53.84</td>
<td>73.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>38.19</td>
<td>44.40</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>30.02</td>
<td>52.08</td>
<td>40,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>34.63</td>
<td>50.76</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>33.78</td>
<td>36.52</td>
<td>36,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>51.53</td>
<td>83.95</td>
<td>33.23</td>
<td>31.76</td>
<td>72.95</td>
<td>38.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education Data Quest 2022.

**CAASPP-MATH PERCENT OF STUDENTS: STANDARD EXCEEDED OR MET (LEVELS 3 AND 4) 2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>All Grades</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black/ Afr Am</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>47.52</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>43.19</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>26.93</td>
<td>33.56</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>38.49</td>
<td>48.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>43.02</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>23.02</td>
<td>23.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>38.56</td>
<td>81.12</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>60.33</td>
<td>58.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education Data Quest 2022.
**English Language Learners**

ELA students in all of the districts struggle with rigor of the SBAC tests and the low percentage of students meeting the standards in both ELA and math reflect the challenges of learning English.

**CAASPP-ELA / MATH PERCENT OF STUDENTS: STANDARD EXCEEDED OR MET (LEVELS 3 AND 4) 2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: California Department of Education Data Quest 2022.*

**English Learner Data**

These measures show how well students are meeting grade-level standards on the English Language Arts & Mathematics assessments. This measure is based on student performance either on the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessment or the California Alternate Assessment, which is taken annually by students in grades 3–8 and grade 11. The indicators show the distance from meeting the standard for each group. Negative numbers indicate how far from the standard the group performed.
**ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS DISTANCE FROM MEETING STANDARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Current English Learners</th>
<th>Reclassified English Learners</th>
<th>English Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>-115.5</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>-40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>-104.4</td>
<td>-21.1</td>
<td>-24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>-101.0</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
<td>-39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>-108.7</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education Data Quest 2022.

**MATHEMATICS DISTANCE FROM MEETING STANDARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Current English Learners</th>
<th>Reclassified English Learners</th>
<th>English Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>-134.8</td>
<td>-35.7</td>
<td>-73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>-126.7</td>
<td>-20.0</td>
<td>-62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>-135.7</td>
<td>-46.1</td>
<td>-85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>-135.8</td>
<td>-32.5</td>
<td>-16.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education Data Quest 2022.

**College-Going Rate**

The College-Going Rate (CGR) is the percentage of California public high school students who completed high school in a given year and subsequently enrolled in any public or private postsecondary institution (in-state or out-of-state) in the United States within 12 or 16 months of completing high school. Since the pandemic the CGR is declining in most urban areas. Yet, going to college remains important for many reasons, including increased career stability and satisfaction, and the ability to make an impact on the community. With more and more careers requiring advanced education, a college degree can be critical to success in today’s workforce.

**2019-20 COLLEGE-GOING RATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education Data Quest 2020.
Graduation Rate

A key measure of school district success is the graduation rate of students. The data below show the differences in graduation rates by ethnicity in each of the districts.

### GRADUATION RATE 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: California Department of Education Data Quest 2022.*
With OUSD's focus on equity by gender, it is illustrative to show the changes in the graduation rates for African America and Hispanic/Latino students.

### GRADUATION RATES FOR HISPANIC/LATINO STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Hispanic / Latino Grads</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>2314</td>
<td>2231</td>
<td>2320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>1067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MALE HISPANIC/LATINO GRADS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FEMALE HISPANIC/LATINO GRADS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education Data Quest.
Graduation Rate Hispanic/Latino Males

Graduation Rate Hispanic / Latino Females
GRADUATION RATES FOR AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUSD and SCUSD have made the most progress in improving graduation rates for African American males, each with a 14% increase since 2017.

MALE AFRICAN AMERICAN GRADS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FEMALE HISPANIC/LATINO GRADS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education Data Quest.
African American Male Graduates

African American Female Graduates
**Long Term English Learners**

Long term English learners are students who have not been reclassified as fully English proficient after six years in school. OUSD has the smallest proportion of long-term English learners among the four comparison districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>% LTEL</th>
<th>LTEL 6+YRS</th>
<th>Total EL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>2,866</td>
<td>11,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>3,016</td>
<td>7,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>3,995</td>
<td>9,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>5,641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education Data Quest.

![Long Term English Learners 2022](image)

**Attendance**

The primary rationale for high-quality attendance data is the relationship between student attendance and student achievement. Teacher effectiveness is the strongest school-related determinant of student success, but chronic student absence reduces even the best teacher’s ability to provide learning opportunities. Students who attend school regularly have been shown to achieve at higher levels than students who do not have regular attendance. This relationship between attendance and achievement may appear early in a child's school career.

Poor attendance has serious implications for later outcomes as well. High school dropouts have been found to exhibit a history of negative behaviors, including high levels of absenteeism throughout their childhood, at higher rates than high school graduates. These differences in absentee rates were observed as early as kindergarten, and students who eventually dropped out of high school missed significantly more days of school in first grade than their peers who graduated from high school. In eighth grade, this pattern was even more apparent and, by ninth grade, attendance was shown to be a key indicator significantly correlated with high school graduation.

Source: National Center for Educational Statistics 2022
Chronic absenteeism, defined as students who are absent more than 10% of the days for which they are registered in school, has increased dramatically since the COVID-19 pandemic.

**CHRONIC ABSENTEEISM RATE 2018-19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: California Department of Education Data Quest 2019.*

**Suspension**

Student suspension is governed by California Education code and all districts have Board policies that specify the reasons for which a student may be suspended from school.

**SUSPENSIONS 2021-22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: California Department of Education Data Quest 2019.*
District Finances

School districts in California have four major sources of revenue, the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF), Federal, state funds other than LCFF, and local funds. LCFF funds are apportioned according to grade span base grants, grade span adjustments for K-3 and 9-12, supplemental and concentration grants based on the number of targeted disadvantaged students including English language learners, level of family income and foster youth.

The greatest variance among the districts is in the “Other Local” category where Oakland has almost seven times as much funding as the next highest district, San Jose. Oakland has three parcel taxes that annually generate more than $44 m in revenue.

### BUDGET COMPARISON RESTRICTED & UNRESTRICTED FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>LCFF Sources</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Other State</th>
<th>Other Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>$399,252,017</td>
<td>$113,402,751</td>
<td>$107,595,385</td>
<td>$81,358,930</td>
<td>$701,609,083</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>$456,323,702</td>
<td>$91,620,566</td>
<td>$138,686,718</td>
<td>$8,258,945</td>
<td>$692,232,359</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>$450,853,841</td>
<td>$60,736,899</td>
<td>$85,047,007</td>
<td>$2,352,695</td>
<td>$598,990,442</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>$333,533,875</td>
<td>$21,767,775</td>
<td>$67,483,151</td>
<td>$11,905,850</td>
<td>$434,710,561</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Each school district’s approved budget for 2022-23.*
**Budget Comparison Restricted & Unrestricted Funds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCFF Sources</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Other State</th>
<th>Other Local</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Salary and Benefits – Budgeted for 2022-23**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Certificated Salaries</th>
<th>Classified Salaries</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>$237,229,092</td>
<td>$106,537,947</td>
<td>$197,555,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>$242,448,542</td>
<td>$70,186,671</td>
<td>$219,089,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>$243,361,941</td>
<td>$79,200,922</td>
<td>$165,995,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>$167,125,390</td>
<td>$56,721,917</td>
<td>$118,356,773</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Each school district’s approved budget for 2022-23.*
PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES 2021-22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>Per Pupil Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>$18,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>$14,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>$14,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>$13,430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education Data Quest.

To more accurately compare the amounts budgeted for salaries and benefits, it is helpful to create a ratio of salary and benefit budgets per pupil.

PER STUDENT SALARY AND BENEFIT BUDGETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>Certificated Salaries</th>
<th>Classified Salaries</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>$6,891</td>
<td>$3,095</td>
<td>$5,738</td>
<td>$15,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>$6,373</td>
<td>$1,845</td>
<td>$5,759</td>
<td>$13,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>$6,933</td>
<td>$2,256</td>
<td>$4,729</td>
<td>$13,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>$6,509</td>
<td>$2,209</td>
<td>$4,609</td>
<td>$13,327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from each district’s budget data for 2022-23.
### TEACHER SALARIES FOR 2021-22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Highest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>$69,145</td>
<td>$50,639</td>
<td>$95,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>$83,404</td>
<td>$47,335</td>
<td>$102,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>$89,523</td>
<td>$50,645</td>
<td>$109,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>$80,901</td>
<td>$57,426</td>
<td>$106,998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education Ed Data 2022.

![Teacher Salaries 2021-22](image)

### TEACHER CREDENTIALS 2021-22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Teaching FTE</th>
<th>Clear Credentials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>1,703</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Education Ed Data 2022.

An index for student success is shown below from combining the student performance for the proportion of students meeting / exceeding standards for English Language Arts and Math from the SBAC tests with the graduation rate. This allows the comparison of that index to average teacher salaries.
TEACHER SALARIES AND STUDENT LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Avg Salary</th>
<th>Student Learning Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>$68,321</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>$76,459</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>$82,119</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>$89,559</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


An index for student success is shown below from combining the student performance for the proportion of students meeting / exceeding standards for English Language Arts and Math from the SBAC tests with the graduation rate and comparing that index to average teacher experience.

TEACHER EXPERIENCE AND STUDENT LEARNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Avg Years Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Student Learning Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Unified</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento City Unified</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana Unified</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Unified</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Turnover in OUSD

Teacher turnover is a significant factor in improving student learning. As the charts above indicate the higher the teacher turnover the lower student learning.

### Network 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Network</th>
<th>SRA Region</th>
<th>Average Number Teachers</th>
<th>Average Return Next Year</th>
<th>Average Return 3 Years</th>
<th>Years Of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridges Academy</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot Elementary</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocker Highlands Elementary</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Elementary</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esperanza Elementary</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred T. Korematsu Discove..</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Family School</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest School</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Community ..</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzanita Community Sch.</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzanita SEED Elementa.</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melrose Leadership Aca.de..</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair Elementary</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peralta Elementary</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescott School</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sankofa United</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think College Now</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornhill Elementary</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Network 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Network</th>
<th>SRA Region</th>
<th>Average Number Teachers</th>
<th>Average Return Next Year</th>
<th>Average Return 3 Years</th>
<th>Years Of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACORN Woodland Elementary</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella Vista Elementary</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookfield Village Elementary</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burckhalter Elementary</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Munck Elementary</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Elementary</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Oakland PRIDE Elementary</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnCompass Academy</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass Valley Elementary</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenleaf Elementary</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Community</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover Elementary</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace Mann Elementary</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Park Academy TK</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Academy of Know.</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Network 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Network</th>
<th>SRA Region</th>
<th>Average Number Teachers</th>
<th>Average Return Next Year</th>
<th>Average Return 3 Years</th>
<th>Years Of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allendale Elementary</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Elementary</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitvale Elementary</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield Elementary</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Elementary</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joaquin Miller Elementary</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Escuelita Elementary</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Elementary</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Elementary</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockwood STEAM Academy</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham Elementary</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr Elem.</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont Avenue Elementary</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach Academy</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Heights Elementary</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoia Elementary</td>
<td>N4</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Middle School Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Network</th>
<th>SRA Region</th>
<th>Average Number Teachers</th>
<th>Average Return Next Year</th>
<th>Average Return 3 Years</th>
<th>Years Of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bret Harte Middle School</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont Middle School</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna M Brewer Middle Sch.</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmhurst United Middle Sc.</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frick United Academy of L.</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montera Middle School</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Middle School</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United for Success</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Promise Academy</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Oakland Middle Sch.</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westlake Middle School</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# High School Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Network</th>
<th>SRA Region</th>
<th>Average Number Teachers</th>
<th>Average Return Next Year</th>
<th>Average Return 3 Years</th>
<th>Years Of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castlemont High School</td>
<td>HSN</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coliseum College Prep Aca..</td>
<td>HSN</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewey Academy</td>
<td>HSN</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont High School</td>
<td>HSN</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Academy</td>
<td>HSN</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Park Academy 6-..</td>
<td>HSN</td>
<td>Deep East</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClymonds HS</td>
<td>HSN</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MetWest High School</td>
<td>HSN</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland High School</td>
<td>HSN</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland International HS</td>
<td>HSN</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Technical High Sc..</td>
<td>HSN</td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph J Bunche High School</td>
<td>HSN</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudsdale (Newcomer)</td>
<td>HSN</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudsdale Continuation</td>
<td>HSN</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyline High School</td>
<td>HSN</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sojourner Truth 5-12</td>
<td>HSN</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>73.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OUSD Dashboards.
Appendix E: Assistant Superintendent Job Description

SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Position Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE:</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>Non-Represented Management, Certificated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERIES:</th>
<th>FLSA:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB CLASS CODE:</th>
<th>WORK YEAR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9733</td>
<td>12 Months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT:</th>
<th>SALARY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability Office</td>
<td>Range 24 Salary Schedule A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTS TO:</th>
<th>HR APPROVAL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td>06-11-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CABINET REVISION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07-10-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BASIC FUNCTION:**

Plan, organize, support, and provide administrative leadership to the instructional and operational functions of K-12 schools within an assigned area of the school district. Provide instructional and curricular leadership that creates, implements, maintains, and enhances excellence, scholarship, creativity, and achievement for all students.

**REPRESENTATIVE DUTIES:** (Incumbents may perform any combination of the essential functions shown below [E]. This position description is not intended to be an exhaustive list of all duties, knowledge, or abilities associated with this classification, but is intended to accurately reflect the principal job elements.)

Provide leadership, direction, support, and accountability to principals to ensure that instructional and curriculum programs approved by the Board of Education are fully and appropriately implemented in all assigned schools.  

Responsible for the implementation of curriculum aligned with state frameworks, student and teacher performance objectives, curriculum standards, and proficiencies in all subjects; provide leadership in developing plans for instructional research; pilot studies for curriculum, instruction, and technology.  

Supervise, train, and evaluate the performance of principals for all assigned district schools based on campus performance, academic growth, identified school targets, operations management, and family and community engagement.  

Provide professional and leadership development to principals and leadership teams.  

Provide coaching, counseling, and assistance to site administrators with management issues at assigned schools, including those related to the operational functions of building maintenance, finance, human resources, transportation, food services, etc.  

Develop and install systems to increase the frequency and quality of K-12 vertical articulation, collaboration, and sharing best practices.  

Convene regular meetings with principals to share best practices and improve vertical articulation among schools; ensure principals and teams of teachers are meeting by feeder pattern and vertical articulation.  

Provide leadership to ensure district goals, beliefs, and policies are clearly communicated and implemented; be accountable and hold administrators, teachers, and students accountable for increasing student achievement; develop educational indicators that include both input and outcome measures.  

Ensure compliance of assigned schools with all pertinent federal and state regulations and requirements related to school operations; plan and organize methods and procedures for disseminating information on system-wide policies and procedures related to various operational issues.
- End of Report -