



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

<b>Report Number:</b>	015/10-11
<b>Date:</b>	July 12, 2011
<b>Subject:</b>	Approval of the Renewal of the Charter for Crescendo Charter Conservatory
<b>Responsible Staff:</b>	
Name	José J. Cole-Gutiérrez, Director, Charter Schools
Office/Division	Innovation and Charter Schools Division
Telephone No.	(213) 241-2487

### BOARD REPORT

**Action Proposed:** Staff recommends the following action:

Approve the renewal of the charter term for Crescendo Charter Conservatory for five (5) years, until June 30, 2016, with benchmarks related to 2009-2010 CST adult test preparation irregularities at this and all Crescendo Charter school sites.

This approval is contingent upon the charter school's provision of proof to LAUSD that all material access compliance findings set forth in the January 6, 2011, Facilities Access Compliance Unit (FACU), LAUSD, Accessibility Survey to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act have been resolved by September 30, 2011. This school is outside the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety (LADBS). Our District's Facilities Access Compliance Unit is working collaboratively with Crescendo Charter Conservatory which is located in the City of Hawthorne.

**Background:** Crescendo Charter Conservatory has met criteria set forth in Education Code sections 47605 and 47607, including:

- Confirmation that the charter school's performance has met the standard criteria under Education Code section 47607(b), also referred to as AB 1137;
- Review of the charter petition to assess the soundness of the educational program; ensure it contains the required affirmations and number of signatures; ensure it contains reasonably comprehensive descriptions of the 16 elements;
- Assessment that the petitioners are *likely* to successfully implement the program;
- Confirmation of the academic, operational, and fiscal soundness of the charter school based on the Charter Schools Division oversight.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

The proposed charter will serve a final total of approximately 260 in grades K-5 during the five-year term. Crescendo Charter Conservatory was originally approved by the Board of Education in May 2006. In 2006, it was approved for 200 seats in grades K-5. The school currently serves approximately 200 students. Crescendo Charter Conservatory is located in Board District 1, Local District 8, at 2506 W. Imperial Highway, Hawthorne, CA 90250.

In spite of the adult testing irregularities and the CDE findings invalidating Crescendo Charter Conservatory's 2010 API scores, the school has met the academic performance criteria for renewal required under Education Code section 47607(b). Crescendo Charter Conservatory has met criteria one and two of the minimum statutory requirement as evidenced below in the Summary of School Performance. Staff of the ICSD continues to monitor the Expectations for Educational Excellence's plan to remedy 2010 adult START CST testing irregularities.

Regarding these test preparation irregularities, the California Department of Education (CDE) determined that adult testing irregularities caused by then-Executive Director, Principals, and teachers at each Crescendo school resulted in violations of California Education code and CST testing procedures. The CDE further determined that these irregularities affected 5 percent or more of pupils tested. Therefore, this school, and all other Crescendo charter schools, does not have a valid API for 2010.

Based on the STAR testing irregularities, breach of material provisions of the charter, concerns regarding Crescendo board's governance, and violation of law, revocation proceedings were initiated when the LAUSD Board of Education issued the Notice of Violations on March 1, 2011. On June 7, 2011, the LAUSD Board voted to continue the revocation process as is legally and procedurally required by approving the issuance of the Notice of Intent to Revoke and Notice of Facts in Support of Revocation. The Superintendent noted that the organization has taken strong steps towards correcting the violations and indicated that the District will review further developments and information from Crescendo. Based on the additional steps taken by Crescendo's Board of Directors to remedy the violations, on June 21, 2011, the Superintendent withdrew the six revocation agenda items for further disposition and indicated the Crescendo Board would need to resolve its structure/plan for day-to-day management and operations.

Crescendo's governing board approved and entered into a management contract with Celerity Educational Group ("CEG") for a term of three years. CEG will be responsible for the day-to-day operations of the



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

Crescendo charter schools under the oversight of the Crescendo governing board. Crescendo assures the District that neither Mr. John Allen nor any of the six Crescendo principals involved in the testing violations will ever be hired or have any association with Crescendo Charter Schools *or* Celerity Charter Schools. Crescendo provided the District with documentation of its outreach to parents and members of the public, per the Brown Act, as it considered the services agreement contract with CEG. Furthermore, Crescendo has confirmed that CEG will comply with the terms of the bargaining agreement negotiated and executed between Crescendo Charter Schools and United Teachers Los Angeles, and manage staff (represented or non-represented) in accordance with said agreement.

Prior to the Board approval of the charter renewal, the school must have resolved any pending issues in the charter review process and submitted any requested materials including a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for Special Education and a signed MOU related to the Crescendo Board's governance plan for day-to-day management and operation of the sites and to adhere to its procedures for improved test preparation, monitoring and implementation. The District will also require Crescendo to submit monthly status reports outlining its adherence to the corrective actions.

Should Crescendo Charter Conservatory not comply with these requirements, this board item will be withdrawn from the agenda.

The charter school has provided to the Innovation and Charter Schools Division a certificate of occupancy for use of the facility as a charter school. Crescendo Charter Conservatory is not located within the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety's ("LADBS") jurisdiction. The District's Facilities Access Compliance Unit has worked collaboratively with Crescendo Charter Conservatory to provide a survey of items requiring immediate correction in order for the site to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act. In order to comply with the Modified Consent Decree, FACU has coordinated with Crescendo Charter Conservatory and has conducted a re-inspection on January 5, 2011. It has asked Crescendo Charter Conservatory to notify FACU once any repairs have been made in order for FACU to confirm that repairs were made in a complaint manner. A re-inspection(s) will be made once repairs are completed and Crescendo Charter Conservatory has notified FACU. FACU issued an Accessibility Survey to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act on January 6, 2011. Crescendo Charter Conservatory is required to provide proof to the District that all material access compliance findings set forth in the accessibility survey have been resolved by September 30, 2011.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

Petitioners of the charter school completed questionnaires regarding conflicts of interest. A due diligence review performed by the Office of the Inspector General of chief Crescendo Charter Schools' executives revealed no significant material negative findings.

The renewal petition is available for perusal in the Innovation and Charter Schools Division.

**Expected Outcomes:** Crescendo Charter Conservatory is expected to operate its charter school in a manner consistent with local, state, and federal ordinances, laws and regulations and with the terms and conditions set forth in its petition. The benchmarks for achievement are set forth in the petition.

**Board Options and Consequences:** "Yes" – The contingent approval of the renewal of the charter term for five (5) years would grant Crescendo Charter Conservatory the right to continue to operate as a charter school under the terms of the renewal petition for a five (5) year period, retroactively beginning July 1, 2011.

"No" – The denial of the renewal of the charter term would cause the charter to expire effective June 30, 2011, unless Crescendo Charter Conservatory appeals the denial and the appeal is granted by the Los Angeles County Board of Education or California State Board of Education.

**Policy Implications:** The Policy for Charter Schools adopted in 2010.

**Budget Impact:** State Revenue Limit income and various other income sources to the District are reduced when current District students enroll at a charter school, and comparable or offsetting expenditure savings may not occur in such cases. Under Education Code section 47604(c), a school district that grants a charter to or operates a charter school that is formed as a non-profit public benefit corporation is not held liable for the charter school's debts or obligations as long as the school district complies with all oversight responsibilities. The District will continue to have monitoring and supervisory responsibility for charter school finances, as specified in the Charter Schools Act. Any modifications to the charter school's petition or operations with significant financial implications would require District approval prior to implementation. Petition approval is also contingent upon adequate liability insurance coverage.

Under the current Special Education MOU, independent charter schools receive their equitable share of the LAUSD SELPA special education revenue and contribute a percentage of this revenue to cover District special education encroachment costs.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

Should this school join an alternative SELPA, the district will receive neither the special education revenue from the State for this school nor receive the encroachment contribution.

**Issues and Analysis:** If all pending issues, including but not limited to, special education requirements, special education local planning area (SELPA) requirements, benchmarks that address the 2009-2010 CST Test preparation adult irregularities at Crescendo Charter Conservatory, and facilities compliance findings, are not resolved at the time of the Board meeting, the Office of General Counsel will recommend the denial of the renewal petition.

**Attachments:**

**Informative**

**Desegregation  
Impact Statement**



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

### **BENCHMARKS**

The following are related to concerns that address the 2009-2010 CST adult test preparation irregularities at Crescendo Charter Conservatory:

- Throughout the five (5) year term of the proposed charter petition, Crescendo Charter Conservatory **shall not** violate Education Code section 47605(c)(1) in the preparation, administration or any other aspect of CST State STAR mandated testing.
- Throughout the five (5) year term of the proposed charter petition, Crescendo Charter Conservatory shall meet all statewide standards and conduct the pupil assessments required pursuant to sections 60605 and 60851 and any other statewide standards authorized in this statute or pupil assessment applicable to non-charter public schools.
- Throughout the five (5) year term of the proposed charter petition, Crescendo Charter Conservatory shall adhere to the following: *Except for materials provided by the CDE or its agents, no program or materials shall be used by any district or any employee of any school district that are specifically formulated or intended to prepare pupils for the designated achievement tests, standards-based achievement tests, or the designated primary language test. No administration or use of an alternate or parallel form of the designated achievement test or the designated primary language test shall be used as practice for any pupils in grades 2-11, inclusive.*

### **A. SUMMARY OF SCHOOL PERFORMANCE**

The Innovation and Charter Schools Division has analyzed the performance of the charter school using established criteria in the following four areas:

- I. Student Achievement and Educational Performance
- II. Governance and Organizational Management
- III. Fiscal Operations
- IV. Fulfillment of the Charter

#### **I. Student Achievement and Educational Performance**

First, the Innovation and Charter Schools Division has confirmed whether or not the charter school has met at least one of the following minimum criteria set forth in Education Code 47607(b) for schools in operation at least four years:

1. Attained its Academic Performance Index (API) growth target in the prior year or in two of the last three years, or in the aggregate for the prior three years; *or*
2. Ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API in the prior year or in two of the last three years; *or*
3. Ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API for a demographically comparable school in the prior year or in two of the last three years; *or*



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

4. (A) The entity that granted the charter determines that the academic performance of the charter school is at least equal to the academic performance of the public schools that the charter school pupils would otherwise have been required to attend, as well as the academic performance of the schools in the school district in which the charter school is located, taking into account the composition of the pupil population that is served at the charter school.

(B) The determination made pursuant to this paragraph shall be based upon all of the following:

- (i) Documented and clear and convincing data.
- (ii) Pupil achievement data from assessments, including, but not limited to, the Standardized Testing and Reporting Program established by Article 4 (commencing with Section 60640) for demographically similar pupil populations in the comparison schools.
- (iii) Information submitted by the charter school.

Note: If a charter school has not been in operation for at least four years, this section of Education Code serves as reference. The Innovation and Charter Schools Division will present findings based on its performance analysis of the school’s data to date, and of the academic, operational, and fiscal soundness of the charter school based on the Innovation and Charter Schools Division oversight.

Crescendo Charter Conservatory has met the minimum statutory requirement as evidenced below.

*1. § 47607 (b)(1)* Attained its Academic Performance Index (API) growth target in the prior year or in two of the last three years, or in the aggregate for the prior three years.

Crescendo Charter Conservatory met this criterion.

Year	API Base	Growth Target	API Growth	Actual Growth
2007-08	683	6	907	224
2008-09	907	A	827	-80
2009-10	827	A	Invalid	
Aggregate Growth		6		144

***NOTE: This school (or the district on behalf of the school) has concluded and reported to the California Department of Education that during the 2010 Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) testing an adult irregularity in testing procedure occurred at the school affecting 5 percent or more of pupils tested. Therefore, this school does not have a valid API for 2010.***

*2. § 47607 (b)(2)* Ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API in the prior year or in two of the last three years.

Crescendo Charter Conservatory met this criterion.





## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

Crescendo Charter Conservatory's State API ranking is:

Year	API State Rank	API Similar Schools Rank
2007	2	N/A
2008	10	N/A
2009	7	N/A
2010	invalid	invalid

***NOTE: This school (or the district on behalf of the school) has concluded and reported to the California Department of Education that during the 2010 Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) testing an adult irregularity in testing procedure occurred at the school affecting 5 percent or more of pupils tested. Therefore, this school does not have a valid API for 2010.***

*3. § 47607 (b)(3) Ranked in deciles 4 to 10, inclusive, on the API for a demographically similar school in the prior year or in two of the last three years.*

Crescendo Charter Conservatory does not have data to establish if this criterion has been met.

Crescendo Charter Conservatory's Similar Schools API ranking is:

Year	API State Rank	API Similar Schools Rank
2007	2	N/A
2008	10	N/A
2009	7	N/A
2010	invalid	invalid

***NOTE: The CDE states that Special education schools, schools in the ASAM, and small schools with between 11 to 99 valid STAR Program scores do not receive similar schools ranks. Additionally, this school (or the district on behalf of the school) has concluded and reported to the California Department of Education that during the 2010 Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) testing an adult irregularity in testing procedure occurred at the school affecting 5 percent or more of pupils tested. Therefore, this school does not have a valid API for 2010.***

### Additional Data

#### 2009-2010 Annual Yearly Progress

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)		
# Criteria	# Met	% Met
5	4	80%





## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

### Median API

	2010 API Growth	2009 API Base
CRESCENDO CHRTR CONS	Invalid	827
Median LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	N/A	N/A
Median Resident Schools	737	727
Median Comparison Schools in Charter	660	650

### 2009-10 CST Comparison

	English Language Arts		Mathematics	
	Basic, Below Basic & Far Below Basic	Proficient & Advanced	Basic, Below Basic & Far Below Basic	Proficient & Advanced
CRESCENDO CHRTR CONS	54%	46%	54%	46%
Median LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Median of Resident Schools	62%	42%	52%	48%
Median of Comparison Schools in Charter	75%	25%	65%	35%

**NOTE: *Aggregated performance levels of median percentages may not equal 100%.***

Notwithstanding the testing violations that the District investigated, a comprehensive analysis of student achievement data provided by the Office of Data and Accountability suggests these positive trends:

- A comparison of 2009 API Base data reveals that Crescendo Charter Conservatory outperforms Resident Schools and Comparison Schools in Charter. Crescendo Charter Conservatory had a 2009 API Base of 827; the Median Resident Schools API was 727, while the Median Comparison Schools in Charter API was 650.
- Crescendo Charter Conservatory's 2009-10 CST percentages of students scoring Proficient/Advanced in English Language Arts (46%) and math (46%) were significantly higher than the Median of Comparison Schools in Charter, 25% in English Language Arts and 35% in math (35%) and slightly higher than the Median of Resident Schools in English Language Arts (42%).

Upon determining that the charter school has met the minimum student achievement requirements, the Innovation and Charter Schools Division analyzes the school's performance obtained through multiple measures, including, but not limited to, the data set and a comprehensive school visit.

Following are definitions of the School Performance Evaluation ratings:

An evaluation of ***accomplished*** applies to operations characterized, overall, by strengths. There are very few weaknesses and any that do exist do not diminish the students' experience. While an evaluation of ***accomplished*** represents a high standard of operating, it is a standard that should be achievable in all schools. It implies that it is fully appropriate for a school to continue its operations without significant



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

adjustment. The school would always be expected to continue to take advantage of opportunities to improve, however.

An evaluation of *proficient* applies to operations characterized by a number of strengths. There are weaknesses, but neither singly nor collectively do these have a significant adverse impact on the student experience. An evaluation of *proficient* may be arrived at in a number of circumstances. The school may provide a productive student experience, but it may not provide consistent challenge for students. Typically operations will be characterized by strengths, but one or more weaknesses reduce the overall quality of the student experience.

An evaluation of *developing* applies to operations characterized by weaknesses which require remedial action by the school. Some, if not all, staff responsible for the operation evaluated as inadequate require support from senior managers in planning and carrying out the necessary actions to effect improvement. There may be some strengths, but these are overshadowed by the impact of the weaknesses.

An evaluation of *unsatisfactory* applies when there are major weaknesses in operation that require immediate remedial action on the part of the school. The student experience is at risk in significant respects. In almost all cases, staff responsible for operations evaluated *unsatisfactory* will require support from senior managers in planning and carrying out the necessary actions to effect improvement. This may involve working alongside effective peers in or beyond the school.

### **Innovation and Charter Schools Division oversight deemed Student Achievement and Educational Performance at the school to be *proficient*.**

Areas of particular strength include:

- Based on data provided by the Office of Data and Accountability, this school's reclassification rate exceeds the District's average. Crescendo Charter Conservatory reclassified 66.7% of English Learners in 2010. (Note: This percentage is based on small numbers of students: 6 for 2010.)
- The principal reported that she observes classroom instruction on a weekly basis; she is well received by teachers who expressed that she is supportive.

Areas recommended for improvement include:

- Based on data provided by the Office of Data and Accountability, this school did not meet AYP criteria. It met 4 of 5 criteria. Crescendo Charter Conservatory should meet 100% of its AYP criteria.
- The school needs to examine its instructional practices to strengthen it, so that all subgroups meet or exceed proficiency targets.
- According to the 2009 CBEDS demographics data, 4% of the school's students were English Learners. The school should continue to implement its diversity plan so that greater numbers of English Learners are enrolled at Crescendo Charter Conservatory.
- The percentage of students identified as students with disabilities is significantly low (1%) and below the District average, based on the 2009 CBEDS demographics data provided by the Office of Data and Accountability. The school needs to strengthen its outreach to the special needs population.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

- The organization's leadership needs to ensure all new testing procedures are followed.

### **II. Governance and Organizational Management**

**Innovation and Charter Schools Division oversight deemed Governance and Organizational Management at the school to be *developing*.**

Areas of particular strength include:

- The NCLB compliance was strong for this school.

Areas recommended for improvement include:

- The Governing Board must provide Brown Act training in a timely manner, especially in light of new membership, and as they implement their transition plan.
- The Governing Board should explore strategies for encouraging more teachers, parents and staff to attend Governing Board meetings.
- The Governing Board needs to adhere to all commitments and timelines particularly as they relate to their responses in their plan to remedy the adult testing irregularities.
- Based on evidence obtained from its investigation the CDE determined that the Crescendo schools' governing board, Expectations of Educational Excellence, needs to exercise increased vigilance of its fiduciary responsibilities over the management and operations of Crescendo Charter Conservatory. Therefore, the governing board of the Crescendo Charter Conservatory will provide assurances and allow these assurances to be monitored on a yearly basis, regarding the exercising of its fiduciary responsibilities over the management and operations of Crescendo Charter Conservatory in all areas, but particularly pursuant to student state mandated assessments.

### **III. Fiscal Operations**

**Innovation and Charter Schools Division oversight deemed Fiscal Operations at the school to be *proficient*.**

Areas of particular strength include:

- The school has positive net assets based on the 2009/2010 audit of \$1,258,790. The first interim report for 2010/2011 shows projected net assets of \$1,630,000.
- The first interim report for 2010/2011 projects positive net income of \$370,000.
- The 2009/2010 audit contained no findings or deficiencies.

Areas recommended for improvement include:

- The cash reserve is \$500. This is far below the 5% recommended. The reserve should be \$94,000.
- The fiscal results reported in the interim reports and the unaudited actuals should be closer to the audit report on the fiscal results.
- The 2009/2010 audit reported negative net income of \$222,000. Outcomes should be close to the budget submitted.



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

## IV. Fulfillment of the Charter

**Innovation and Charter Schools Division oversight deemed Fulfillment of the Charter at the school to be *developing*.**

Areas of particular strength include:

- The parents interviewed expressed strong positive feelings about the principal and the teachers and strongly felt that their children benefited from attendance at this school.
- Students expressed positive feelings regarding the care and attention received from their teachers.
- A community of learners, as described in the charter, was evident in many classrooms.

Areas recommended for improvement include:

- Throughout the five (5) year term of the proposed charter petition, Crescendo Charter Conservatory shall meet all statewide standards and conduct the pupil assessments required pursuant to sections 60605 and 60851 and any other statewide standards authorized in this statute or pupil assessment applicable to non-charter public schools as described in the commitments of the school’s charter petition.
- Evidence indicated that students had begun the Mind Institute program; however, teachers should be encouraged to emphasize this in daily instructional activities and in the classroom environments, as indicated in the school’s approved charter petition.

### Student Discipline

	Suspensions	Expulsions
2010-11	2	0
2009-10	0	0

Source: Office of Data and Accountability

The data reveal that Crescendo Charter Conservatory had no expulsions in the past two years and has experienced a slight increase in its suspension rate from 2009-10 due to enhanced efforts to support its *no bullying* priority.

### Special Education

According to 2009 CBEDS data, Crescendo Charter Conservatory enrolled students with disabilities at a rate significantly lower than the District average. The data also reveal that Crescendo Charter Conservatory has a population of Students with Disabilities significantly lower than comparable schools. This school has an enrollment rate of 1% which was lower than the Median Resident Schools rate (11%) and Median Comparison schools in the Charter (9%). The categories of disabilities served at the school are Speech or Language Impairment, Specific Learning Disability, and Other Health Impairment. Most students served at the school are in the mild to moderate category of Specific Learning Disability.



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

School/Eligibilities	OHI	SLD	SLI	Total
Crescendo Charter Conservatory	2	4	2	8

Source: Welligent, Active IEPs

The school explains that they offer various interventions through their SST process prior to potentially identifying students as having a disability. These include classroom interventions, after school programs, and tutoring. In addition, the rate of initial IEPs convened is on an upward trend from 2009-10 to 2010-11 from 0 to 5, thus far, with 5 additional IEPs pending. If these additional IEPs result in eligibility, this school's SWD rate will be 6.5% unofficially. The school is aware of the District's expectation to diversify its student population and provide appropriate support services and has communicated these objectives to its school community through the 2010-11 Crescendo wide staff development activities in the area of special education that will continue throughout the term of its charter.

### English Learners

	EL (%)
CRESCENDO CHARTER CONSERVATORY	4
Median LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	n/a
Median Resident Schools	10
Median Comparison Schools in Charter	45

Source: 2009 CBEDS Demographics with Comparison Schools

### Reclassification Rate Comparison:

2010	# EL Reclassified	# EL (Prior Year)	Percent Reclassified	Change from Prior Year
CRESCENDO CHRTR CONS	4	6	66.7%	-58.3%
Median LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Median Resident Schools	10	58	17.2%	5.6%
Median Comparison Schools in Charter	39	341	11.3%	2.8%

Source: Data Set from the Office of Data and Accountability

2009	# EL Reclassified	# EL (Prior Year)	Percent Reclassified
CRESCENDO CHRTR CONS	5	4	125.0%
Median LAUSD Similar Schools from CDE	0	0	0.0%
Median Resident Schools	8	69	11.6%
Median Comparison Schools in Charter	32	372	8.5%

Source: Data Set from the Office of Data and Accountability



## LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

Based on these data, Crescendo Charter Conservatory has a population of English Learners significantly lower than the District average. Its English Learner rate is also significantly lower than comparable schools. Currently, the school serves predominantly African American students, but has in place a Crescendo wide diversity plan that includes recruitment to preschools, libraries and local churches and that also includes home-to-home walks that incorporate personal contacts by school staff with local businesses and store owners in an effort to recruit a more linguistically diverse school community and one that includes greater numbers of Latino children. Crescendo's Director of Operations reports that there has been a significant increase in the numbers of Latino children and English Learners enrolled for this program year.

Reclassification data reflect a reclassification rate of 66.7% in 2010 and 125% in 2009 for Crescendo Charter Conservatory. Both of these rates are significantly higher than the District average and comparable schools' rates. However, the reclassification percentages for Crescendo Charter Conservatory are based on a small number of students and the 125% may indicate inadequate data reporting.



# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education Report

Respectfully submitted,

APPROVED BY:

JOHN E. DEASY, PH.D.  
Superintendent of Schools

MICHELLE KING  
Senior Deputy Superintendent  
School Operations

APPROVED & PRESENTED BY:

REVIEWED BY:

JOSÉ J. COLE-GUTIÉRREZ  
Director, Charter Schools  
Innovation and Charter Schools Division

DAVID HOLMQUIST  
General Counsel

Approved as to form.

TONY ATIENZA  
Budget Director (Interim)

Approved as to budget impact statement.





# LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

## Board of Education Report

### DESEGREGATION IMPACT STATEMENT (DIS) CRESCENDO CHARTER CONSERVATORY BOARD OF EDUCATION REPORT 015/11-12 July 12, 2011

#### I. Category of Proposed Action:

The proposed action would renew the charter for Crescendo Charter Conservatory and would provide a final total of approximately 260 in grades K-5 during the five year term. In 2006, it was approved for 200 seats in grades K-5. The school currently serves approximately 200 students.

#### II. Summary Description of Current District Practice:

Charter schools are schools of choice by legislation and are open to any student in the State of California. Charter schools are granted single charter status for a maximum of five (5) years. It should be noted, however, that although State legislation allows students to attend a charter school from any area in the state, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) is under Court Order, Crawford v. LAUSD, which applies to all schools within or chartered through the LAUSD. Any modifications to the Court-Ordered Integration Program must first be approved by Student Integration Services.

#### III. Proposed Change:

The approval of this charter petition would grant the charter of Crescendo Charter Conservatory for five (5) years, beginning July 1, 2011.

#### IV. Effects of This Proposal:

The Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) does not guarantee availability of Court-ordered Integration funding. The charter school will be responsible for maintaining the Court Order and providing information requested by the LAUSD as set forth in the Charter petition. Modifications or school decisions cannot negatively impact or cause additional costs to the Court-ordered Integration budget.

#### V. Analyze the Impact of This Proposal on Integration, Desegregation, Re-segregation and/or Segregation:

If the Charter goals are met, there should be positive results on the five (5) Harms of Racial Isolation which are low academic achievement, low self-esteem, lack of access to post-secondary opportunities, interracial hostility and intolerance, and overcrowded conditions. The Court-ordered Integration Program for participating students will operate under various Court Orders for schools within the Los Angeles Unified School District. Any modification of the Court-ordered Integration Program must first be approved by Student Integration Services.

#### VI. If proposed action affects negatively any desegregation program, list other option(s) identified:

If the District Court-ordered Integration Guidelines are followed, there will not be a negative effect on the District's Court-ordered Integration Program.

PREPARED BY:

APPROVED BY:

CLAUDIA M. LARA, ED. D.  
Specialist  
Innovation and Charter Schools Division

ESTELLE SHEPHERD LUCKETT  
Director  
Student Integration Services