

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
Taft High School
and
Los Angeles Unified School District

Parties

Taft High School (THS) is a public high school that is part of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). The LAUSD's I-Design Division, in collaboration with THS, is transitioning the school into an Expanded School-based Management Model (ESBMM) school. This will provide THS with greater local governance and decision-making authority, with added school and classroom level accountabilities and will result in improved learning outcomes.

Objectives

The primary goal of THS is to increase student achievement. We believe this can be accomplished best in an environment where decisions are made at the school level. ESBMM provides the best paradigm for us to do this. Our objectives as an ESBMM school are as follows:

- To provide THS with charter-like flexibility with the LAUSD
- To provide THS the opportunity to fully implement an Expanded School-Based Management Model that is consistent with applicable laws and with the terms of collective bargaining agreement
- To increase the ability of THS to control its budget
- To increase the school budget as a result of changes involving ADA
- To provide the school with the ability to plan its professional development activities tailored to the needs of the school
- To provide the school with the ability to make purchases outside of LAUSD by using vendors of its choice resulting in savings to the school and a more timely response to immediate needs. This will improve student learning and support our innovative educational programs.
- To increase the flexibility of the school in its hiring practices; not tied to norm charts and not tied to hiring displaced or must place teachers
- To provide the school with the opportunity to apply for grants in an unlimited capacity
- To increase the choices in determining the standards-based curriculum that includes the tight alignment of professional development, formative and summative assessments, and teaching strategies
- To provide THS with the ability to determine its own school calendar, bell schedules, and enrichment programs
- To provide THS the opportunity to build a management team that is collaborative and one that allows for the participation of all stakeholders

LAUSD Commitment

The I-Design Division will work closely with THS to transition the school into an ESBMM school while still remaining under the jurisdiction of LAUSD.

Term of Agreement

The term of this agreement shall be five (5) years commencing with the 2011-2012 school year and shall be renewed providing that school has met the conditions of the agreement with the LAUSD.

Finances

Beginning with the school year 2011-2012, THS shall have the option to receive per pupil funding. The I-Design Division will provide training for THS and assist in overseeing the proper handling and expenditures of allocations made to the school.

Philosophical Basis of Expanded School-based Management Model

The Taft High School Expanded School-based Management Model will be based on the Six Elements of School-based Management. These six elements are the belief that a school-based management program will thrive in the I-Design Division because the school will have:

- Increased funding to the local school site based on the State ADA and categorical funding framework
- Absolute control over its financial resources (per pupil funding)
- Absolute control over the hiring of administrative, certificated, and classified employees, with no must placements
- Absolute control over curriculum
- Absolute control over professional development
- Absolute control over bell schedules and school calendars

THS will utilize its authority over curriculum and scheduling to make changes that better address the educational needs of our uniquely diverse population. In order to achieve this goal, we need the authority to hire staff that is open to innovative educational programs. We need to design professional development that trains our staff on these new programs. Finally, we need the freedom to pursue other funding options in order to finance these programs.

In keeping with these elements and with California Education Code provisions encouraging school-based management, our school-based management proposal seeks to facilitate improved staffing practices, budget management, parent involvement, and scheduling of time. THS will implement all aspects of expanded school-based management consistent with applicable laws and the terms of existing and future collective bargaining agreements. THS will honor all collective bargaining agreements as identified by the District.

We at THS propose to allocate our financial and staffing resources to create a school where all students are actively engaged, instructional programs are supported, and parents are informed and involved in the learning environment of students with varying abilities, cultures, and socio-economic backgrounds. One of THS's financial goals is to create the ability to reinvest excess funds back into the instructional program and/or the school's infrastructure. Administrators, department chairs, lead teachers, and the chapter chair shall receive training to be developed by the school site in collaboration with I-Design Division that will create a team of school leaders prepared to carry out the function of running a school in the most effective, efficient manner that meets all applicable laws.

Governance Structure

The Taft Board of Education will be the mechanism for expanded school-based management in order to ensure that a more collaborative decision-making process will result in more effective teaching and pupil learning. To this end, the Board shall be exempt from all LAUSD Board rules and District policies.

The Board will be the primary decision-making body for Taft High School. It will take on all of the functions and responsibilities of the School Site Council (SSC) as outlined in District Bulletin BUL-1231 and in federal and state law, including the approval and monitoring of the Single Plan for Student Achievement. All election and composition rules that currently apply to the SSC will apply to the Board. To provide for a smooth transition, the new Board shall adopt all current SSC By-Laws until new By-Laws are written. Current SSC membership will transition to the new Board will all members having been specifically elected to the Board by the 2012-2013 school year.

Consistent with Article XXVII, Section 2.4 of the LAUSD-UTLA collective bargaining agreement, and the current authority of the School Site Council, the Taft Board of Education will assume the following responsibilities:

- Personnel
 - The Board shall have authority over the selection of all school personnel including teachers, administrators, and classified employees. The Board shall have the authority to determine the roles and functions of teachers, administrators, and classified employees, as well as determining the need for additional teachers, administrators, and classified employees. The Board shall have the power to create, approve, and monitor personnel evaluation tools for all THS employees. These tools will be used only to improve performance and will not be used in any official evaluation or in any disciplinary proceedings. The Board shall not have the authority to fire personnel and must abide by all LAUSD-union bargaining agreements and all state and federal laws. Appropriate waivers must be obtained if there is any expansion of this authority over Article XXVII, Section 2.4 of the LAUSD-UTLA collective bargaining agreement.
- Instruction, Curriculum, and Assessment
 - The Board shall have the authority over curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
- Budgets

- The Board shall have authority over all budgets allowable by state or federal law.
- Professional Development
- The Board shall have authority over the scheduling, content, and design of professional development. It shall also have the authority to allocate funding to support professional development programs.
- Student Discipline
- The Board shall have the authority to make policies and procedures in regards to student discipline.
- Scheduling
- The Board shall have the authority to set the yearly calendar and the school day schedule.
- Campus Environment
- The Board shall have the authority over any additions, improvements, or changes to the physical campus and shall have the power to authorize and fund campus improvement projects. The Board shall also review safety procedures for the school.
- Use of School Equipment
- The Board shall have the authority to make policies and procedures concerning the use and allocation of school equipment.

In order to carry out these responsibilities the Board shall have the power to create committees. These committees shall be charged with making recommendations to the Board with regard to the Board's stated authority. Every attempt should be made to have all stakeholders represented on each committee. All committee meetings shall be open to the public. The Board shall have the following standing committees:

- Leadership Team
 - Leadership Team shall be composed of department chairpersons, coordinators, and administrators. Leadership Team will advise the Board on areas concerning academics, curriculum, professional development, assessment, campus environment, and student discipline.
- Budget
 - The Budget Committee shall advise the Board on all categorical budgets except EL, Title I, and GATE, or any other budgets not allowable by state or federal law.
- English Learners Advisory Council (ELAC)
 - ELAC will follow all appropriate state and federal guidelines and will advise the Board on EL education and budget
- Compensatory Education Advisory Council (CEAC)
 - CEAC will follow all appropriate state and federal guidelines and will advise the Board on Title I education and budget.
- Gifted and Talented Education (GATE)

- GATE will follow all appropriate state and federal guidelines and will advise the Board on GATE education and budget.
- Personnel
 - The Personnel Committee will advise the Board on the hiring of teachers, administrators, and classified employees as well as the hiring of independent contractors. The committee shall also make recommendations on the need for fewer or additional teachers, administrators, and/or classified employees. In addition, the committee will advise the Board on employee evaluation tools.
 - The Board shall have the authority to create any ad hoc committees or new standing committees as it sees fit.
 - THS is entitled to and shall receive full per pupil funding in State-approved ADA funding. All categorical funding (including, but not limited to Title I, school improvement, GATE, and block grants) received by the District and targeted for THS shall go directly to the school. To the extent revenues exceed expenditures, THS shall have the right to reinvest it in the physical school site and in Board approved programs.

Renewal

Both parties must agree in writing for the renewal or extension of this MOU. The relationship of the I-Design Division to the school will be further defined as the school year continues with the objective being that by the end of the 2010-2011 school year the specific conditions of the agreement have been full decided upon.

LAUSD's Responsibilities

Since THS is part of the LAUSD, the District shall retain all legal, financial, and operational responsibility for the management, operations, maintenance, repair, and improvement of the school. THS shall receive its fair share of any bond monies that become available. For the school year 2011-2012, THS will partner with the Local District 1 with the expectation that the local district will work to assist the school in raising funds, providing improvements to the physical plant, and allowing THS to participate in local professional development.

Funding

LAUSD will continue to provide THS with the funds necessary to properly and efficiently operate the school with the intent to increase the funding base for the school until per pupil funding becomes available at the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year.

Vision and Mission Statements

THS will be a safe and supportive environment that encourages academic success, personal growth, social maturity, and responsible citizenship. The school believes in the equal value and dignity of all students and is committed to the education of all students to their maximum potential.

Personal growth is defined as the identification of one's goals and the development of the skills and talents needed to obtain those goals. Personal growth will be measured not only by improved academic achievement, but also by more active participation in campus activities such as clubs, extracurricular programs (for example, the spring musical), and volunteer work both within the school setting and in the greater community. Social maturity and responsible citizenship are defined as the ability to interact in a social environment in a way that promotes the welfare of the group as a whole while at the same time respecting the rights and feelings of individuals. Our success in this area will be measured by a decrease in the number of student disciplinary actions (for example, fewer suspensions) and by an increase in student involvement in school activities.

Our belief in the "equal value and dignity of all students" means that every student, regardless of their ethnic background, religious belief, sexual orientation, or handicap, will be treated fairly and with respect, and that our school's efforts to develop students' abilities shall not favor one group over another. In addition, Taft will provide all students with a culturally relevant and responsive curriculum.

All students that graduate from Taft will have the ability to successfully pursue their goals at the next level, be it college, in the work force, or in the military. Students will have a strong educational foundation, a desire to learn, and the self-discipline necessary to achieve their aims. They will have developed strong study skills, an inquisitive mind and the ability to delay gratification in order to obtain long-term goals.

Educational Philosophy

We the faculty of William Howard Taft High School agree to the following educational principles that will underlie all of the instructional strategies and curriculum that will be used in classrooms throughout the school. The intent will be to create a model school that will ultimately serve students, making them into self-initiated and life-long learners.

We believe that self-initiated learners are inspired by a love of learning and by the content they are learning. This can best take place where there is a strong connection between teachers and students. To that end, we will create more personalized and individualized instruction. We believe that nontraditional methods of instruction (i.e. small learning communities, interdisciplinary differentiated instruction, vertical teaming in departments) are necessary to reach all students, but especially our underperforming students. Innovative presentation of content has the potential to reach students who have found traditional methods boring, unrelated to their life experiences, and uninspiring. Self-initiated learners eventually become more inquisitive, more creative, and better critical thinkers

because they are less concerned with regurgitating rote answers and more concerned with actually learning content. Self-initiated learners, because they have developed a love for the subject material, carry their learning past the school experience and into their adult lives.

It is our expectation that these changes will improve student achievement for all students resulting in higher standardized test scores, a higher graduation rate, and more students meeting the requirements for college. Our Leadership Team and our Taft Governance Council will monitor progress to be sure that achievement is occurring for all our students, and in particular that we are closing the achievement gap. In keeping with our commitment to “the education of all students to their maximum potential,” our educational beliefs will address the needs of each and every student. We will work together with our EL coordinator, our Title I coordinator, our GATE coordinator, counselors, teachers, parents, and our special education department to ensure that the following goals are met (as stated in our Proposed Outcomes section):

- Personalized instruction is essential so that corps of teachers work with the same students for a prescribed period of time. There is a large body of research spanning several decades that support this approach. Kathleen Cotton’s New Small Learning Communities: Findings From Recent Literature as well as Thomas C. Taveggia’s Personalized instruction: A summary of comparative research, 1967–1974 both point to increased student achievement in more personalized learning environments. This goal can be accomplished through small learning communities (as suggested by Cotton’s research) or other such configurations that meet the needs of our particular student body. For example, our SAS and IH programs, while not strictly small learning communities, serve the same function of more personalized instruction. Whatever models are used, the goal is to put in place vertical teaching so that there is continuity and personalization in classes of consecutive grades. This vertical model may exist only from the freshman year to the sophomore year, or it may extend for all four years as occurs in some of our Humanitas and VAPA classes. We look to create a not only a seamless transition between grades, but also, through better articulation, between middle school and high school. This will be especially true between Woodland Hills Academy and Taft. As two ESBMM schools, we can work to create programs that help students acclimate more quickly to the high school environment and to be better prepared academically to succeed.
- Individualized instruction is essential so that teachers can meet the needs of their students. According to Educational Research Associates’ recommendations, when properly implemented individualized instruction has been found to improve student accomplishment substantially even while reducing cost dramatically. This is critical at Taft where, due to our large open enrollment population and our SAS and IH programs, students of widely differing abilities and needs are often in the same class. Even within classes with students of similar abilities, the need for individualization is imperative. Students do not progress at the same rate of learning. Teachers must give additional practice to those students requiring more time on task as well as provide opportunities for those students who are ready to progress to the next level of instruction. Individualized instruction would focus less on lectures (where research shows a very low retention rate) and more on alternative teaching

methods such as computer aided instruction, problem-based learning and reciprocal teaching, peer tutoring, cooperative learning, hands-on learning, journaling, projects, role play, simulation, and inquiry

- Innovative instruction is essential so that teachers can continue to experiment with new approaches to instruction and curriculum while continuing to use what has proven to be successful as measured by both objective and subjective assessments. Students today enter school with vastly different experiences than students of just a few years ago - cell phones, social networks, and high quality video games to name a few. Because of this, teachers must constantly find new and more meaningful ways of presenting material to their pupils. Innovative instruction, therefore, cannot be predefined. Instead it is a willingness within the school to try new approaches that address the ever-changing needs of our students. It is this spirit of experimentation that is critical, because what once worked may not work in the future. These changes may include: offering courses in different instructional modes so that students have the opportunity to learn in an educational environment other than the self-contained classroom, using social networking to create study groups that students could join, offering courses at times other than the traditional school day such as early classes beginning before 8:00 A.M. and other classes beginning after 3:00 P.M, distance learning, or having students or teachers create online learning modules that can be accessed by other students. Through this willingness to experiment, teachers remain engaged, the content stays fresh, and students are challenged by exciting new ways of learning. These qualities are critical to our goal of creating self-initiated, life-long learners.
- Cost-Effective Instruction is essential so that teachers are held accountable to programs that can be created and maintained by the funds that will be available from the state and district. Cost-effective instruction requires that the Leadership Team, CEAC, ELA subcommittee and the Taft Governing Council constantly monitor and evaluate programs to determine if the school is receiving the highest yield on our dollar. All funded programs must show results in areas such as higher CST scores, improved attendance rate, a higher graduation rate, a narrower achievement gap, higher GPA averages, and fewer disciplinary actions. For example, we may want to evaluate the cost effectiveness of afterschool tutoring as opposed to funding a math coach, or summer intensive programs versus lower class size. We especially want to evaluate new programs to determine if they are cost effective. Whatever changes are instituted at the school must be done without losing sight of fiscal limitations.

The Research and Development Center

We propose to create a Research and Development Center (RDC) that will have the responsibility to encourage teachers to offer the most effective teaching strategies and curriculum to their students. Our goal is to help focus the school's efforts on creating "a safe and supportive environment that encourages academic success, personal growth, social maturity, and responsible citizenship." The center will help evaluate programs, make suggestions for professional development, and, through researching current educational trends, advise teachers on new teaching strategies. This center will help teachers measure how effective their current practices are through both objective and subjective assessments. The intent of this center would not be to evaluate teachers themselves but to help

teachers make the necessary changes that will increase student learning in their classrooms. Therefore, the center will be collaborative rather than hierarchical in that no changes will be imposed upon teachers. Any changes that do occur will be the result of teachers and staff from the center mutually agreeing to them.

The Leadership Team and the Taft Governing Council will oversee the RDC. The RDC will make recommendations to the Leadership Team that will then approve and implement those recommendations. The RDC will be fully operational by 2013.

In the 2010-11 academic year we have launched “Project Dipstick.” The purpose of the project is to ensure that teachers focus their instruction on the State Standards. Every other week random samples representing the school’s demographics of ninth, tenth, and eleventh grade students are assessed on selected standards. Based upon the results we can predict how all students would have done on these assessments if they had been tested. Individual results are given to each teacher as a way of informing them of the standards to which they need to give added emphasis. Therefore, on a weekly basis we can monitor how our underrepresented minority students are performing as well as all other subgroups.

A few of the reforms that the Research and Development Center may study and implement initially could include the following:

- Ninth-Grade Preparation Course for all in-coming freshman to cover life skills, study skills, and basic skills in grammar and computation.
- Behavioral and Social Standards to include the implementation of an effective tardy and attendance policy as well as a requirement for a modified uniform.
- Various Parental Involvement Programs to help the school recruit parents to be more active in the education of their children.
- Effective Formative Assessment Tools to supplement or replace the present district assessments in English, math, social science, and science.
- Model Lessons developed by the faculty of Taft to replace the design lessons that are now mandated by the district.
- Replacement of the grades of D and F with “No Credit” and/or the requiring of students to earn a grade of C before matriculating to the next level course.
- The reduction of class size—particularly in the departments of mathematics, science, and world languages—without causing an adverse effect on other departments as a result of these reductions.
- Introductory classes for high-risk students to provide them with the basic skills in order to be successful in the A-G required classes.
- Intervention classes to assist students who are unsuccessful in specific classes that will provide them with the skills necessary to succeed in required classes.

- Other types of prerequisite classes to ensure that students will be successful in advanced classes.
- Alternate assessments that will provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate their skills and knowledge in specified courses.
- Diagnostic tests to insure that students are properly placed in the appropriate level so that their chance of success might significantly increase.
- The ability to use state-adopted textbooks selected by respective departments.
- The purchasing of extra state-adopted books so that instructors can have access to classroom sets to allow students to keep their individual textbooks at home.
- The expansion of technology in the classroom including the availability of electronic whiteboards and departmental computer labs.
- The use of college students to serve as tutors.
- Experimentation with various special education models so that increasing numbers of students in special education will be successful.
- Programs in partnership with the Education and Career Center to enlarge the offerings of vocational courses.
- Articulation programs with feeder middle and elementary schools.
- Expansion of programs using team teaching.
- Experimentation with alternate class schedules for English learners as well as students in other departments.
- Professional Development programs to meet the needs of the faculty.
- The inclusion of an information curriculum into all academic subjects.

Proposed Outcomes

In an effort to create “a safe and supportive environment that encourages academic success, personal growth, social maturity, and responsible citizenship” we have identified outcomes that will help us determine the success of our programs.

- Enrollment (Table 1) Taft will increase its enrollment to 3,000 by 2013 while maintaining the diversity of our student body. It is important for us to meet this target so that we can ensure a wide range of course offerings for our students. Taft will accomplish this by working closely with feeder middle and elementary schools to educate parents about the benefits of going to Taft. This will be especially important with Woodland Hills Academy Middle School which is an ESBMM school. We will also promote ourselves through our website, positive press releases, by hosting a New Student Information Night that showcases our various programs, and individual parent contacts.
- API (Table 2) Taft will meet or exceed API target growth goals as set by the State. This will be accomplished by increased tutoring, double block math and English classes (RTI² Model and DRW), pull out programs for at risk students, and the implementation of the AVID program; increased staff development in areas such as teaching to the standards, working with special education, economically disadvantaged and EL students, and best practices; ensuring

that incoming students are prepared through articulation with our feeder middle schools, meetings before the start of school with 9th grade parents explaining student and parent expectations, and summer school "head start" programs; and the integration of core subject material throughout the curriculum by the use of highly coordinated small learning communities.

- Students with Disabilities (Table 3) Taft will increase the percentage of students with disabilities scoring basic and above on the CST by at least 1% each year. We will accomplish this by presenting PD that helps the special education teachers with best practices and new strategies that help these students master the state standards in core subjects. When needed, we will provide double block math and English classes, pullout programs, and extra tutoring for struggling special education students.
- Gifted (Table 4) Taft will narrow the gap between the number of African American and Latino gifted students and the general gifted population by 1% each year until parity is achieved. This will be accomplished by providing PD to counselors and classroom teachers on how to identify potentially gifted students and on how to encourage them to be classified as gifted. We will raise the awareness of the student body on the advantages of being classified gifted. We will also offer bridge/academically enriched classes as a precursor to honors and AP classes in core subjects.
- English Learners (Table 5) By 2012 Taft will meet its AMAO targets for EL students. Taft will increase its reclassification rate of EL students by 5% each year. Taft will provide PD to EL teachers and regular classroom teachers on addressing the special needs of EL students, provide supplemental materials to help EL students comprehend classroom instruction, and provide special tutoring and pullout programs for students who are struggling.
- CST in ELA and mathematics (Tables 6 and 7) By 2013 Taft will have increased its average yearly growth by 2% for all students and all subgroups. Taft will achieve this by implementing the strategies previously mentioned and by implementing new strategies that address the specific needs of ELA students and mathematics students. In ELA and mathematics Taft will conduct random testing of student to identify areas of need. The Leadership Team will examine the results and suggest strategies for addressing these shortcomings in student performance. The departments will be responsible for implementing the strategies suggested by the Leadership Team who will monitor the progress.
- CST (Table 8) By 2012, Taft will have increased the percentage of proficient and advanced scores by 2% across all subject areas over the current number. Thereafter Taft will increase those scores by a minimum of 1% yearly until the school reaches an API of 800. By 2012 Taft will have decreased the percentage of BB and FBB scores by 2% across all subject areas over the current number. Thereafter Taft will decrease those scores by a minimum of 1% yearly. Taft will accomplish this by using the strategies already mentioned. We will also present PD that helps teachers use technology such as MyData to identify students who are having difficulty and to identify what specific problems those students are having. PD on best practices will focus on what teaching strategies are most effective in helping students improve in areas of weakness.

- College Readiness based on A through G Courses (Table 9) Taft will increase the percentage of 9th, 10th, and 11th grade students taking A-G courses by 2% each year. We will increase the percentage of 12th grade students taking A-G courses by 5% yearly. We will accomplish this by holding grade level meetings to promote A-G coursework. Our AVID program will also work with students to ensure that they are college ready.
 - CAHSEE Pass Rate (Table 10) Taft will increase the pass rate of 10th and 11th grade students by 2% yearly. Taft will raise the 12th grade CAHSEE pass rate to 95% by 2012. We will accomplish this through the strategies mentioned earlier and by focusing on identifying struggling students early and putting them into tutoring and pullout programs (Beyond the Bell) that will help them pass the CAHSEE.
 - High School Completion Rate (Tables 11 and 12) Taft will reduce the 4 year dropout rate by 1% each year over the next five years and lower the 1 year dropout rate by .25% over the same period. We will increase the graduation rate to a minimum of 94% by 2015. Taft will accomplish this by the use of our diploma project counselor who will identify and work with every student in danger of not graduating.
 - Safe Schools (Table 13) Taft will reduce the percentage of suspended African American students in comparison to the school's total percentage by implementing the following programs that help students deal with various emotional issues that cause them to be at risk: Heart to Heart, Peer Mediation, IMPACT, SPIRIT, and a peer mentoring program. We will also provide PD on better classroom management strategies so that potential problems are headed off before the student gets to the deans' office. Finally, we will look at other discipline strategies that are alternatives to suspension.
 - Average Daily Attendance (Table 14) Taft will meet and maintain a minimum 94% daily attendance rate beginning in 2011.
 - Advanced Placement (Tables 15 through 20) Taft will raise the percentage of Black and Hispanic students taking AP classes by 1% percent each year until parity is achieved. This will be accomplished by providing PD to counselors and classroom teachers on how to identify potentially gifted students and on how to encourage them to be classified as gifted. We will raise the awareness of the student body on the advantages of being classified gifted. We will also offer bridge/academically enriched classes as a precursor to honors and AP classes in core subjects.
- Table 16 shows the percent of students receiving a passing score on advanced placement tests during selected years ranging from 1993 to 1997. Table 17 and Table 18 show for their respective year the percent of students who scored from a low of 1 to a high of 5. These two latter tables also contain the national passing rate in addition to that of Taft. In 2008 Taft had surpassed the national passing rate in twelve out of twenty advanced placement courses. In 2009 Taft had surpassed the national passing rate in 16 out of nineteen advanced placement courses. Based upon these outcomes, Taft will continue to surpass the national average in the overwhelming majority of advanced placement courses during the next five years.

The implementation of these programs is dependent upon sufficient levels of funding. Under ESBMM we will target funding to greater areas of need.

District Termination for Cause

LAUSD may terminate, in whole or part, this Memorandum of Understanding for cause prior to the end of the five year term after demonstrating to Taft High School that it has failed to meet its obligations as outlined in this document.

Addendum

Table 1
Total Students Enrolled: 2,776

	17%	Special Education	10%
African American			
American Indian	1%	Gifted and Talented	28%
Asian	6%	Economically disadvantaged	45%
Filipino	3%	English Learners	8%
Latino	32%	Reclassified as Fluent English Proficient	26%
Pacific Islander	0%		
White(not Latino)	41%		

Table 2
API

	BASE	GROWTH	PTS	MET ALL	STATEWIDE RANK	SIMILAR SCHOOL RANK
2005-06:	675	689	14	Yes	5	2
2006-07:	694	703	9	Yes	5	4
2007-08:	703	738	35	No	5	3
2008-09:	738	750	12	No	7	5
2009-10:	749	745	-4	No	6	7

Table 3
Students With Disabilities (Swd) - CST

% Scoring Basic and Above	2008-09	2009-10	CHANGE
ELA	33.9%	34.2%	0.3
Math	21.8%	19.8%	-1.9

Table 4
Gifted

	2008-09	2009-10	CHANGE
Identified Gifted - All	28.4%	27.5%	-0.9
Identified Gifted - African Amer	12.2%	9.5%	-2.7
Identified Gifted - Latino	18.7%	20.0%	1.3

Table 5
English Learners

	MET	2009-10 Target	2009-A10 (Prelim)
AMAO 1 - CELDT Annual Growth	No	53.1%	45.0%
AMAO 2 - Attaining Eng Prof: Els less than 5 Yrs	No	17.4%	15.1%
Els 5 yrs or more	No	41.3%	32.7%
AMAO 3 - Proficiency in ELA	No	55.6%	17.3%
Proficiency in MATH	No	54.8%	26.4%
Reclassification Rate Trend:	2007-08 12.5%	2008-09 14.2%	2009-10 11.8%

Table 6
CST Trends ELA

Subgroup	Students Tested						% Proficient & Advanced						1 yr change	5 yr change	Avg per yr						
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2005-06		2006-07					2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2005-06	2006-07				2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
All Students	2,324	2,190	2,086	2,060	1,953	42.0%	47.7%	49.8%	51.8%	52.3%	0.5	10.3	2.6								
African American	374	377	344	342	292	27.8%	28.9%	27.3%	28.7%	36.0%	7.3	8.2	2.0								
Asian	122	128	121	115	115	53.3%	60.2%	59.5%	67.0%	69.6%	2.6	16.3	4.1								
Latino	873	717	658	660	673	23.4%	30.8%	37.4%	40.5%	40.4%	-0.1	17.0	4.2								
White	855	885	887	860	768	63.9%	66.4%	65.4%	66.6%	66.3%	-0.3	2.4	0.6								
English Learner	381	288	221	200	174	3.1%	5.2%	3.2%	3.5%	2.9%	-0.6	-0.2	0.0								
SWD	203	194	179	189	196	8.4%	8.2%	9.5%	13.2%	13.8%	0.6	5.4	1.4								
Socio-Econ Disadv	1,126	996	938	983	965	28.1%	36.0%	37.5%	41.4%	39.6%	-1.8	11.5	2.9								

Table 7
CST Trends in Mathematics

Subgroup	Students Tested						% Proficient & Advanced						1 yr change	5 yr change	Avg per yr						
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2005-06		2006-07					2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2005-06	2006-07				2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
All Students	2,039	1,896	1,716	1,673	1,618	24.5%	24.0%	28.7%	36.2%	29.5%	-6.7	5.0	1.2								
African American	307	317	267	255	220	9.8%	7.6%	7.5%	13.3%	15.9%	2.6	6.1	1.5								
Asian	113	119	108	100	109	51.3%	43.7%	50.9%	61.0%	51.4%	-9.6	0.1	0.0								
Latino	750	594	528	517	536	11.5%	15.0%	20.8%	28.0%	19.2%	-8.8	7.7	1.9								
White	778	793	754	732	665	38.7%	33.7%	38.3%	44.9%	38.5%	-6.4	-0.2	0.0								
English Learner	328	245	174	146	121	4.6%	7.8%	8.6%	9.6%	8.3%	-1.3	3.7	0.9								
SWD	180	167	144	147	141	2.8%	3.6%	2.8%	6.1%	5.0%	-1.1	2.2	0.6								
Socio-Econ Disadv	987	852	754	776	768	17.4%	18.1%	23.2%	30.4%	23.6%	-6.8	6.2	1.6								

Table 8
California Standards Test 2009-10

	Tested	%Adv	%Pro	%Basic	%BB	%FBB	Change in Prof/Adv			Change in BB/FBB		
							2008-09	2009-10	Change	2008-09	2009-10	Change
ELA Gr 9	656	25.5%	32.0%	21.5%	13.0%	8.1%	55.0%	57.5%	2.5	19.9%	21.1%	1.2
ELA Gr 10	728	24.0%	24.7%	27.2%	14.3%	9.8%	52.5%	48.8%	-3.7	22.0%	24.1%	2.1
ELA Gr 11	569	25.1%	25.8%	23.9%	11.1%	14.1%	47.3%	51.0%	3.7	27.9%	25.2%	-2.7
General Math	144	0.7%	11.8%	29.9%	36.8%	20.8%	18.5%	12.5%	-6.0	49.8%	57.6%	7.8
Algebra I	421	1.2%	17.3%	32.8%	35.6%	13.1%	28.3%	18.5%	-9.8	46.6%	48.7%	2.1
Geometry	508	5.5%	22.8%	26.6%	34.8%	10.2%	38.5%	28.3%	-10.2	36.8%	45.0%	8.2
Algebra II	363	10.5%	23.1%	31.7%	24.5%	10.2%	39.8%	33.6%	-6.2	32.7%	34.7%	2.0
HS Math	182	21.4%	42.3%	21.4%	12.6%	2.2%	58.7%	63.7%	5.0	15.8%	14.8%	-1.0
World History	692	23.6%	26.4%	25.0%	10.3%	14.7%	45.8%	50.0%	4.2	27.2%	25.0%	-2.2
US History	567	19.9%	24.9%	23.5%	13.8%	18.0%	40.6%	44.8%	4.2	33.2%	31.8%	-1.4
Life Science	727	27.6%	24.2%	25.6%	12.1%	10.5%	54.3%	51.9%	-2.4	20.3%	22.6%	2.3
Biology	684	29.2%	25.6%	26.5%	9.4%	9.4%	55.3%	54.8%	-0.5	18.3%	18.8%	0.5
Chemistry	517	12.2%	26.1%	34.2%	13.0%	14.5%	30.5%	38.3%	7.8	36.1%	27.5%	-8.6
Earth Science	68	5.9%	17.6%	22.1%	23.5%	30.9%	29.9%	23.5%	-6.4	43.7%	54.4%	10.7
Physics	100	47.0%	27.0%	25.0%	1.0%	0.0%	77.1%	74.0%	-3.1	1.2%	1.0%	-0.2
Int Science	248	0.0%	7.3%	42.7%	20.6%	29.4%	10.6%	7.3%	-3.3	43.6%	50.0%	6.4

Table 9
College Readiness Based on A through G Courses

Grade in 2009-10	% Taking A-G Courses	% A-G with C or Above
9th Grade	68.2%	41.3%
10th Grade	56.7%	34.2%
11th Grade	46.9%	30.2%
12th Grade	13.0%	6.9%

Table 10
CAHSEE Pass Rate

CAHSEE Pass Rate(as of May)	2008-09	2009-10	Chg
10th grade:	78.7%	73.8%	-4.9
11th grade:	88.2%	88.8%	0.7
12th grade:	94.7%	92.4%	-2.2

Table 11
High School Completion Rate

High School Completion	2008-09	2009-10	Chg
Dropout 4 Year Rate:	13.3%	10.0%	-3.3
Dropout 1 Year Rate:	3.1%	2.4%	-0.7
Graduation Rate:	82.2%	90.3%	8.1

Table12
Percent of Students Graduating Between 2002-2008

YEAR	GRADUATION PERCENT
2002	83.0
2003	77.8
2004	60.8
2005	74.9
2006	75.7
2007	82.2
2008	90.3

Table 13
Safe Schools

	2008-09	2009-10	Change
Discipline			
Students Suspended			
All:	7.0%	8.2%	1.2
African American:	17.4%	17.6%	0.2
Latino:	5.9%	7.0%	1.1
Attendance			
Staff	93.7%	93.2%	-0.5
Student	93.6%	92.9%	-0.7
Student transiency	22.3%	20.0%	-2.4
Student Survey			
% of Students that Responded	0.0%	78.6%	78.6
% Agree or Strong Agree			
Feel safe in their school		90.4%	

Table 14

Average Daily Attendance

2004-2005	90.0%
2005-2006	90.1%
2006-2007	92.3%
2007-2008	93.0%
2008-2009	94.7%
2009-2010	94.7%
2010 to date	96.2%

Table 15

Advanced Placement 2009-10

Students taking at least one AP course	14.4%
Students passing at least one AP course with a C or above	14.0%

Table 16
 Percent of Students Receiving a Passing Score on
 Advanced Placement Tests During Selected Years

AP COURSE	2007	2005	2003	2002	2001	2000	1998	1996	1995	1994	1993
ART 3D DESIGN	89		33								
BIOLOGY	90	82	29	32	52	55	48	43	54	75	36
CALCULUS AB	72	54	87	91	44	17	92	67	54	58	62
CALCULUS BC	86	45	77	56	89	85	87	93	66	48	78
CHEMISTRY	63	54	68	45	35	51	54	30	44	70	68
ENGLISH LANGUAGE	94	52	48	61	60	57	75	85			25
ENGLISH LITERATURE		84	80		94	100	70	72	77	84	92
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE	67	58	43	19	45	55					
EUROPEAN HISTORY	39	67	61	75	90	81	34	50	63	67	59
FRENCH LANGUAGE				17							
PHYSICS B	73	49	65	42	59	59	55	53	75		
PSYCHOLOGY	67	62	50	56	32	65	63				
SPANISH LANGUAGE	100	100	100	100	98	94	95	96	95	100	91
STATISTICS											
STUDIO ART DRAWING	55			67	42	25					
US GOVERNMENT	57	58	63	57	60	58	56	60	57	81	90
US HISTORY	83	69	49	53	41	56	45	64	70	64	77
WORLD HISTORY	69										
TOTAL NUMBER STUDENTS	384	381	522	452	454	334	411	379	288	252	224

Table 17
Percent of Students Who Scored from a Low of 1 to a High of 5 - 2008

AP COURSE	INSTRUCTOR	5	4	3	2	1	PERCENT PASSING (TAFT)	PERCENT PASSING (US)	CLASS SIZE
ART 3D DESIGN	LARA	0%	18%	55%	27%	0%	73%	63.9	11
BIOLOGY	ROVERUD	17%	12%	22%	19%	29%	51%	60.8	58
CALCULUS AB	FERRERIA	9%	22%	22%	16%	31%	53%	58.8	32
CALCULUS BC	KIM	27%	30%	30%	8%	5%	87%	80.1	37
CHEMISTRY	SOLOVY	0%	18%	27%	32%	23%	45%	56.2	22
COMPUTER SCIENCE	HASSON	0%	0%	9%	9%	82%	9%	56.6	11
ENGLISH LANGUAGE	BARBER	0%	55%	36%	9%	0%	91%	58.8	11
ENGLISH LITERATURE	DURHAM	8%	20%	48%	24%	0%	76%	61.1	25
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE	KWAN	0%	21%	21%	29%	29%	42%	51.8	14
EUROPEAN HISTORY	TAPPER	5%	5%	32%	15%	44%	42%	65.9	62
FRENCH LANGUAGE	TABATABAI	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	100%	60.1	3
PHYSICS B	BLUMFIELD	9%	13%	31%	29%	19%	53%	60.3	70
PHYSICS C	BLUMFIELD	20%	0%	50%	10%	20%	70%	71.5	10
PSYCHOLOGY	ROVERUD	13%	28%	20%	20%	20%	61%	65.5	76
SPANISH LANGUAGE	SASSON	55%	30%	15%	0%	0%	100%	64.5	20
STATISTICS	FERRERIA	11%	11%	26%	16%	37%	46%	58.8	19
STUDIO ART DRAWING	FLOOD	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	60%	67.8	10
US GOVERNMENT	GIBBONS	10%	12%	35%	30%	13%	57%	51.8	60
US HISTORY	KODAMA	3%	22%	42%	25%	8%	68%	53.2	36
US HISTORY	WOODARD	12%	27%	34%	15%	12%	73%	53.2	41
WORLD HISTORY	STEPHENS	0%	40%	50%	5%	5%	90%	54.2	20

Table 18
Percent of Students Who Scored from a Low of 1 to a High of 5 - 2009

AP COURSE	INSTRUCTOR	5 %	4 %	3 %	2 %	1 %	PERCENT PASSING		PERCENT DIFFERENCE (TAFT & US)	CLASS SIZE
							(TAFT)	(US)		
ART 3D DESIGN	LARA	0	11	56	33	0	67	62	+5	9
BIOLOGY	ROVERRUD	13	20	13	17	37	46	50	-4	30
CALCULUS AB	VALERIO	9	18	38	24	12	65	61	+4	34
CALCULUS BC	FERRERIA	20	29	36	2	13	85	80	+5	45
CHEMISTRY	KWAN	0	12	18	29	41	30	56	-26	17
ENGLISH LITERATURE	BERCHIN	10	47	40	3	0	97	60	+37	30
ENGLISH LITERATURE	DURHAM	6	17	63	14	0	86	60	+26	35
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE	MORENO	22	17	17	26	17	56	54	+2	23
EUROPEAN HISTORY	TAPPER	7	13	37	7	37	57	61	-4	30
FRENCH LANGUAGE	TABATABAI	0	17	67	17	0	84	58	+26	6
PHYSICS B	BLUMFIELD	12	20	40	17	11	72	61	+11	65
PSYCHOLOGY	ROVERUD	16	32	24	17	11	72	67	+5	82
SPANISH LANGUAGE	SASSON	61	22	17	0	0	100	69	+31	18
STATISTICS	FERRERIA	0	22	39	33	6	61	59	+2	18
STUDIO ART DRAWING	FLOOD	0	25	56	19	0	81	68	+13	16
US GOVERNMENT	GIBBONS	17	28	28	23	4	73	51	+22	47
US HISTORY	KODAMA	15	25	27	24	9	67	48	+19	55
US HISTORY	WOODARD	0	41	38	19	3	79	48	+31	37
WORLD HISTORY	STEPHENS	16	16	48	20	0	80	48	+32	25

Table 19
 Number and Percent of Students Who Were Enrolled in
 Advanced Placement Courses in 2006-2007
 by Ethnicity

ETHNICITY	NUM BER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF ENROLLMENT
	ENROLLED IN AP COURSES	ENROLLED IN AP COURSES	IN SCHOOL
ASIAN	94	13.2	5.2
BLACK	26	3.6	18
HISPANIC	89	12.5	33.3
WHITE	470	65.8	39.1

Table 20
 Number and Percent of Students Who Were Enrolled in
 Advanced Placement Courses in 2007-2008
 by Ethnicity

ETHNICITY	NUM BER OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF STUDENTS	PERCENT OF ENROLLMENT
	ENROLLED IN AP COURSES	ENROLLED IN AP COURSES	IN SCHOOL
ASIAN	98	14.5	5.9
BLACK	26	3.8	16.1
HISPANIC	101	14.9	32.4
WHITE	430	63.5	40.8