



# Public School Choice 3.0

## Proposal Review - Site Summary

Augustus Hawkins

### Reviews for: Augustus Hawkins (S. LA Area New HS #3)

	Reviewer	Recomm ended?	Comments
<b>Applicant</b> <b>LD 7</b> <b>Business</b> <b>Careers</b>	Reviewer A	NO	First, this proposal is an exact copy of the other proposals submitted by this design team for this campus. It does not demonstrate a commitment to the specific theme that has been called out by this design team. If all these schools are going to look the same, where is the personalization? There is the unique identity of each school. This is a very traditional, comprehensive school model. Second, the design team rests its laurels on minimal growth over the course of 5 years in school under its jurisdiction. Several of which are identified as FOCUS SCHOOLS by Public School Choice. This new campus should not be a replica of what's already happening in the LD. Third, this plan does not align with the intent of PSC: The Public School Choice motion was designed to tap into the potential wealth of innovative ideas and educational models that will help the LAUSD advance its commitment to provide a quality education for our students. Innovative ideas are scarce in this proposal.
	Reviewer B	NO	I do not recommend the following 4 schools: Technology Careers High School, Business Careers High School, Entertainment Careers High School, Health Careers High School. One plan, completely identical, was submitted for all 4 schools. There was no differentiation. All 4 schools will be doing exactly the same thing. There would be no difference between the Entertainment Careers, or the Health Careers, for example. There was a complete lack of research. Additionally, there were no waivers requested. It will be business as usual. All PD would be done by LD7 with little to no input from teachers, parents, or students. Saying that you will have a culture of high expectations does not tell me how you are going to instill or accomplish that goal.
	Reviewer C	NO	Each of the schools had exactly the same plan minus the name. The themes are not embedded, at all, into the instruction, the culture or any other part of the school design. There is no need for the themes. It is also not clear what curriculum will be used etc. There was nothing new, innovative, or exciting about this plan. This will at best, yield a mediocre school.

	Reviewer	Recomm ended?	Comments
<b>Applicant</b> <b>LD 7</b> <b>Technology</b> <b>Careers</b>	Reviewer A	NO	See Reviewer A comments above.
	Reviewer B	NO	See Reviewer B comments above.
	Reviewer C	NO	See Reviewer C comments above.

	Reviewer	Recomm ended?	Comments
--	----------	---------------	----------

<b>Applicant</b> <b>LD 7</b> <b>Entertainment Careers</b>	Reviewer A	NO	See Reviewer A comments above.
	Reviewer B	NO	See Reviewer B comments above.
	Reviewer C	NO	See Reviewer C comments above.

	Reviewer	Recommended?	Comments
<b>Applicant</b> <b>LD 7</b> <b>Health Careers</b>	Reviewer A	NO	See Reviewer A comments above.
	Reviewer B	NO	See Reviewer B comments above.
	Reviewer C	NO	See Reviewer C comments above.

	Reviewer	Recommended?	Comments
<b>Applicant</b> <b>Schools for Community Action 1: Critical Design &amp; Gaming</b>	Reviewer A	NO	As part of a small network of teams, CDAGS shows high levels of coordination with the other teams. In addition, like the other teams, it relied on a strong approach to connecting with the community as it developed its plan. However, there is a disconnect between the theoretical framework (from which the designers are operating from) and the actual practical curriculum. What curricular focus will this school truly be about? ¿STEAM¿ and ¿video gaming¿ are key words in the description of the school. However, ¿critical space¿ and ¿critical design¿ may be difficult topics for young people (without enough theoretical prior knowledge) to really absorb. The curriculum piece is very inconsistent and difficult to see the focus. In addition, in its analysis and collaboration among other SCA sister schools, much of its potential small school identity is diluted. Sharing of curriculum framework, schedule, out of classroom staff, core values, etc all point to doing SLCs right; not necessarily respecting individual autonomy.
	Reviewer B	YES	This recommendation is to include the following 4 schools: Critical Design and Gaming (C:\DAGS) Community Health Advocates School (CHAS), Responsible Indigenous Social Entrepreneurship (RISE), The School of Urban Sustainability and Environmental Science (USES). These 4 schools did a great deal of research and submitted reports covering all aspects of student life, their ambitious goals, and their creativity. I believe that these people have thoroughly studied the community they will be working in, and have great hopes of bettering not only the students education, but the community. They have worked to create community ties, along with outside educational ties. Very ambitious, progressive schools.
	Reviewer C	YES	These plans have interesting, innovative themes and have for the most part imbedded their themes into the fabric of their schools. Their instructional and culture/climate sections are mission driven. Perhaps most striking about these teams is that they are teacher led and their PD, teacher collaboration, and support sections are very strong and well thought out. However, there are many layers of strategies which causes the individual school plans to lose focus and a few items that may not be realistic given our budget realities. In addition, these teams have not worked with administrators and lack that lens. Finally, none of the curriculum is yet developed and the timeline is short. This site has

			much potential due to the teacher buy in and ownership, but it will need a good deal of support during the first few years of implementation.
--	--	--	---

	Reviewer	Recomm ended?	Comments
<b>Applicant Schools for Community Action 2: Comm Health Advocates</b>	Reviewer A	YES	Team has identified an educational need based on their organic outreach to community. Very community centered in their approach to developing a school for the local community. Innovative approach to organizing curriculum. Big picture vision of community partners opens up great possibilities. Many great elements, however, there is only 2 veteran teachers on the design team. How will this one person realistically lead a staff that may or may not have fully bought into the mission/vision of school. In addition, in its analysis and collaboration among other SCA sister schools, much of its potential small school identity is diluted. Sharing of curriculum framework, schedule, out of classroom staff, core values, etc all point to doing SLCs right; not necessarily respecting individual autonomy.
	Reviewer B	YES	See Reviewer B comments above.
	Reviewer C	YES	See Reviewer C comments above.

	Reviewer	Recomm ended?	Comments
<b>Applicant Schools for Community Action 3: RISE</b>	Reviewer A	YES	Team has identified an educational need based on their organic outreach to community. Very community centered in their approach to developing a school for the local community. Innovative approach to organizing curriculum. Big picture vision of community partners opens up great possibilities. Many great elements, however, there is only 1 veteran teacher on the design team. How will this one person realistically lead a staff that may or may not have fully bought into the mission/vision of school. In addition, in its analysis and collaboration among other SCA sister schools, much of its potential small school identity is diluted. Sharing of curriculum framework, schedule, out of classroom staff, core values, etc all point to doing SLCs right; not necessarily respecting individual autonomy.
	Reviewer B	YES	See Reviewer B comments above.
	Reviewer C	YES	See Reviewer C comments above.

	Reviewer	Recomm ended?	Comments
<b>Applicant Schools for Community Action 4: USES</b>	Reviewer A		<i>Reviewer A did not submit comments for this school.</i>
	Reviewer B	YES	See Reviewer B comments above.
	Reviewer C	YES	See Reviewer C comments above.