



Compton Unified School District

Executive Summary

Comprehensive Review
August 2005

Administrative Agent
Larry E. Reider
Office of Kern County
Superintendent of Schools

Chief Executive Officer
Thomas E. Henry

SERNA v EASTIN CONSENT DECREE

Introduction

This report dated August 2005 is the thirteenth in a series of continuing six-month progress reports assessing the efforts made by the Compton Unified School District to continually improve the district's operations. FCMAT has been involved in the Compton Unified School District from 1998 through the end of 2001 through Assembly Bill 52 legislation, and from February 2000 to the present through the Serna v Eastin Consent Decree. Both the AB 52 legislation and the Consent Decree required FCMAT to monitor and report on the district's progress at six-month intervals.

As a requirement of AB 52, FCMAT conducted a comprehensive assessment of the district in 1998 in five major areas of school district operations and developed a recovery plan for the district to implement. The Compton Unified School District Assessment and Recovery Plan was distributed to the district in February 1999. FCMAT has issued six-month progress reports beginning in August 1999 on the district's efforts to meet the criteria for the return of governing board authority developed through the AB 52 legislation. In addition, beginning with the August 2000 six-month progress report, the FCMAT progress reports also monitored and reported on the district's efforts to comply with the stipulations of the Serna v Eastin Consent Decree. As the criteria for the return of powers to the governing board under AB 52 were fully met in December 2001, this is the eighth six-month progress report that addresses only the district's progress in fulfilling the stipulations of the Consent Decree.

The district has complied with all but one of the requirements for termination of the Serna v Eastin Consent Decree. The full implementation of the district's Facilities Master Plan, the only Consent Decree stipulation not yet fully met, requires additional time to complete as the Facilities Plan identifies numerous facilities modernization and construction projects the district plans to address. As all other Consent Decree stipulations were met some time ago, the six-month progress reports are repetitive, continuing to report that the district has met, and continues to comply with, the requirements of the Consent Decree.

Continuing Concerns

Although the district has made significant progress over the seven years that FCMAT has monitored and reported on the district's improvement efforts, FCMAT has concerns about two areas of the district's operations. The first relates to board governance and the behaviors of a few board members, and the second relates to the continuity of effective leadership in the district.

Several board members are relatively new to their positions. A Board election in November 2003 filled six of the seven board seats with three new board members and three returning members. Of the three returning members, one was an incumbent and two were members of previous Compton USD boards. The August 2004 FCMAT report indicated that some members of the new board did not demonstrate the same commitment toward addressing the stipulations of the Consent Decree as members of previous boards. Some board members also did not demonstrate behaviors consistent with effective boardsmanship. The August 2004 report indicated that a board member berated staff at public meetings.

The August 2004 progress report identified examples of board behaviors that were not supportive of the district's efforts to comply with the Consent Decree, such as declining to act in a timely manner on facilities issues that could affect state funding. The district Board approved the Facilities Master Plan in July 1999 and the Facilities Implementation Plan in August 2001. A few current board members, however, do not demonstrate the same commitment to implementing the Facilities Master Plan as required by the Consent Decree.

The board approved a Project Labor Agreement (PLA) in January 2005 that will affect the scope of the district's planned and future modernization projects. All board members may not recognize the long-term impact of this decision. No public forum was conducted on this issue to consider public information or to assess the district's ability to fund the costs of this decision before the decision was finalized.

The August 2004 report indicated that a board member made disparaging comments to several cabinet members that they were going to lose their jobs. Although such comments are no longer being made publicly, the make-up of the superintendent's cabinet has since been significantly affected. The board in July 2004 terminated the employment of the Assistant Superintendent of Administrative Services. Comments were made by some board members then that contract extensions for other cabinet members would not be approved when their current contracts were due for renewal in June 2005. Most recently, the board refused to support the superintendent's recommendation to extend the employment contract in June 2005 for the Deputy Superintendent. The superintendent thus has not been supported in his efforts to acquire and retain the most competent individuals for his cabinet.

The loss of talented individuals in these leadership positions makes it difficult for the superintendent to maintain the district's continued improvement. The progress made by the district to return to local governance, repay the state loan, and to meet all but one of the stipulations of the Consent Decree is the direct result of the efforts of the superintendent, his previous cabinet and members of the district staff.

The concerns raised by FCMAT in the August 2004 report have not been allayed in the year since the report was issued. Despite training workshops provided, a few board members continue to perceive their role as administering the district, instead of providing policy direction. Eliminating competent leadership can be a perilous course for the future of the district.

Background

In July 1997, the ACLU and the attorneys for the Plaintiffs filed a class action lawsuit against the State Department of Education in the Los Angeles Superior Court. This lawsuit (*Serna v Eastin*, Case No. BC 174282) claimed that the children attending public schools in the Compton Unified School District were deprived of basic educational opportunities that are available to children elsewhere in California.

The judgment approving the Consent Decree in the above-entitled action was entered on February 7, 2000. The Consent Decree requires continued improvement in the district's school facilities/sites and the classroom environment. Some of the specific areas of concern that require attention under the Consent Decree include the availability of certificated teachers in every classroom, the availability of appropriate textbooks and instructional materials for students to take home, the condition of student restrooms, the timely removal of litter and graffiti, and the repair/replacement of any faulty electrical wiring.

FCMAT was appointed by the parties to the lawsuit to oversee compliance with the stipulations of the Consent Decree. The parties were aware that FCMAT was engaged in monitoring the progress of the Compton Unified School District in the implementation of five recovery plans in the areas of Pupil Achievement, Financial Management, Personnel Management, Facilities Management and Community Relations as part of the requirements of Assembly Bill 52. The parties agreed to make parts of the Compton USD recovery plans developed by FCMAT a part of the Consent Decree and subject to the compliance requirements of the Consent Decree.

The Consent Decree identified specific standards among the legal and professional standards developed by FCMAT in the operational areas of Pupil Achievement and Facilities Management that required additional attention by the district. These identified standards were required by the Consent Decree to meet a rating of 8 or better (on a scale of 1 to 10) in order for the standard to be determined to be implemented and sustained. These specific standards have been reviewed and their implementation progress reported during each of FCMAT's monitoring visits and six-month progress reports since August 2000. The court's action placed FCMAT in a monitoring role and required FCMAT to prepare semiannual reports on the defendants' progress in complying with the requirements of the decree.

FCMAT's third, fourth and fifth six-month progress reports in August 2000, February 2001, and August 2001 responded to the monitoring requirements of both AB 52 and the Consent Decree. In the August 2001 progress report, the Compton Unified School District met the requirements for return of governing authority to the CUSD Governing Board under AB 52. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction formally returned governing authority to the CUSD board in an executive order dated September 11, 2001, and effective December 11, 2001.

The six-month progress reports, beginning with the February 2002 report, provided FCMAT's review only of those standards and stipulations identified in the Consent Decree. The subsequent reports issued in August 2002, February 2003, August 2003, February 2004, August 2004, February 2005, and this August 2005 report continue to provide a review of only those standards and stipulations identified in the Consent Decree.

FCMAT meets with the counsel for the plaintiffs and defendants every 60 days as required by the Consent Decree. The following is a record of these meetings.

- Three meetings were held prior to the third six-month progress report in August 2000 to discuss process, responsibilities, and progress relative to the Consent Decree. The August 2000 progress report represented the first FCMAT document addressing the stipulations of the Consent Decree.
- Two meetings and two random school site visitations were conducted between September and February, prior to the fourth six-month progress report in February 2001.
- Four meetings and a random school site visitation were conducted between March and August, prior to the fifth six-month progress report in August 2001.
- Three meetings and a random school site visitation were conducted between September and February, prior to the sixth six-month progress report in February 2002.
- Three meetings and a random school site visitation were conducted between March and August, prior to the seventh six-month progress report in August 2002.
- Two meetings and a random site visitation were conducted between September and February, prior to the eighth six-month progress report in February 2003.
- Three meetings and a random site visitation were conducted between March and August, prior to the ninth six-month progress report in August 2003.
- Three meetings and a random site visitation were conducted between September and February, prior to the tenth six-month progress report in February 2004.
- Three meetings and a random site visitation were conducted between March and August, prior to the eleventh six-month progress report in August 2004.
- Two meetings and a random site visitation were conducted between September and February, prior to the twelfth six-month progress report in February 2005.
- Three meetings and a random site visitation were conducted between March and August, prior to the thirteenth six-month progress report in August 2005.

The Compton Unified School District has made significant progress under the Consent Decree. All Consent Decree stipulations but one have been met.

Meeting Consent Decree Compliance Requirements

Section 50 of Part VII. Termination of Consent Decree indicates the following:

50. *This Consent Decree shall terminate upon the certification by FCMAT of each of the following:*
 - a. *Defendants have complied with Sections 1-24 of this Consent Decree.*
 - b. *Defendants have implemented the facilities plan required by Section 25(a).*
 - c. *Defendants have met the scaled scores for the Pupil Achievement recovery plan and Facilities recovery plan as required by paragraph 25(b)(i).*

Section 50 (a):

The Consent Decree delineates 18 sections of stipulations (Sections 7-24) that the district must address to reach compliance. Sections 1-6 of the Consent Decree refer to definitions and general provisions. The district is fully complying with the required stipulations of the 18 sections (Sections 7-24) of the Consent Decree. A summary of the district's efforts to comply with each of these stipulations follows on the next several pages of this report.

FCMAT certifies that the district has complied with Sections 1-24 of the Consent Decree.

Section 50 (b):

To implement the facilities plan required in Section 25(a), the district continues to use all available resources to address the district's facilities needs identified in the Facilities Master Plan. All facilities projects undertaken by the district are based on the needs identified in the district's comprehensive Facilities Master Plan.

The district approved a Certificate of Participation (COP) in June 2002 to obtain the necessary funds to build a new K-5 elementary school. The William Jefferson Clinton Elementary School was opened to students on January 27, 2003 as scheduled.

The district successfully passed a local \$80 million General Obligation Bond (GOB) in November 2002 with a voter approval rate of 83 percent. The GOB Measure I enables the district to implement the projects identified in the Facilities Master Plan and provides funds to retire the COP for Clinton Elementary School. The project priorities for the GOB funds were based on the projects identified in the district's comprehensive Facilities Master Plan. A general obligation bond oversight committee has been established to oversee the appropriate use of Measure I funds for the district's modernization and construction projects.

The district instituted an aggressive facilities modernization effort to fully implement the district's comprehensive facilities plan. Full implementation will require more time to complete. The monitoring of the district's progress in implementing the Facilities Master plan will continue.

Section 50 (c):

Section 25 (b)(i) of the Consent Decree identifies 30 standards of the 104 FCMAT legal and professional standards for Facilities Management, and 14 standards of the 38 FCMAT legal and professional standards for Pupil Achievement that must reach a rating of 8, on a scale of 1-10, to attain compliance. Also, all Facilities Management and all Pupil Achievement standards must reach an average rating of 7.5. The Consent Decree reads in part as follows:

Section 25.b.: The standards of the Pupil Achievement recovery plan and Facilities recovery plan are made a part of this Consent Decree and shall be subject to the compliance requirements of this Consent Decree.

25.b.i.: A list of standards for the Pupil Achievement recovery plan and Facilities recovery plan, including the current scaled scores is set forth in Exhibit 'A' attached hereto and incorporated by reference. Any standard that has a scaled score of 8, 9, or 10 shall be deemed to have been implemented. Any standard that has a scaled score of less than 8 shall be addressed and improved by defendants. Compliance with a recovery plan's standards shall be deemed satisfied when FCMAT certifies that defendants have achieved an average scaled score for all such standards of 7.5 and no standard has received a scaled score of less than 4. In addition, compliance shall not be deemed achieved unless the following standards have received a score of at least 8:

- 1) Pupil Achievement: 1.2; 1.4; 1.5; 1.10; 1.11; 1.16; 1.20; 1.21; 1.23; 1.25; 2.3; 2.6; 2.9; 2.10*
- 2) Facilities: 1.3; 1.6; 1.7; 1.8; 1.9; 1.12; 1.14; 1.17; 2.1; 2.3; 2.4; 2.5; 2.6; 3.4; 3.8; 3.10; 6.2; 6.3; 8.5; 8.6; 8.8; 8.9; 8.10; 8.12; 9.3; 9.4; 9.7; 9.8; 9.10; 9.11.*

In Pupil Achievement, the current average rating of all Pupil Achievement standards at this six-month reporting period is **8.47**, exceeding the 7.5 required average rating stipulated by the Consent Decree. No standards have a scaled score of less than 4. All of the 14 identified Pupil Achievement standards have reached a rating of 8 or better as required. Full compliance has been reached in the operational area of Pupil Achievement.

In Facilities Management, the current average rating of all Facilities Management standards at this six-month reporting period is **9.14**, exceeding the 7.5 required average rating stipulated by the Consent Decree. No standards have a scaled score of less than 4. All thirty identified Facilities Management standards have reached a rating of 8 or better as required. Full compliance has been reached in the operational area of Facilities Management.

FCMAT certifies that the district has met the required scaled scores in all of the standards for the Pupil Achievement and Facilities recovery plans as required by paragraph 25(b)(i).

Compliance Summary

The district has met all of the requirements for termination of Sections 50 (a) and (c) of the Consent Decree. The implementation of the Comprehensive Facilities Plan, as required in Section 50 (b) for termination of the Consent Decree, continues to require additional time to complete.

The state passed a General Obligation Bond, Proposition 47, in November 2002. The district also passed a local \$80 million General Obligation Bond, Measure I, in November 2002 to support its share of the facilities projects. The state and local bond funds have enabled the district to implement the Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan as required in Section 50 (b). The district initiated an aggressive construction program to complete the 28 modernization and 3 new construction projects that had long been state-approved and awaiting available funding. The district used general funds and deferred maintenance funds to address the district's most pressing facilities issues prior to the successful passage of the state and local bonds. All of the district's modernization projects are scheduled to be completed in December 2005.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations Related to the Consent Decree

FCMAT was appointed by the parties to oversee compliance with the Serna v Eastin Consent Decree. This section provides the reader with FCMAT's summary of the findings and recommendations related to Sections 7-25 of the Consent Decree. Many of the FCMAT standards for Pupil Achievement and Facilities Management address the concerns raised in Sections 7-25 of the Consent Decree. A more detailed review of these standards can be found elsewhere in this report.

Consent Decree Stipulations Related to Pupil Achievement

There are several stipulations within the Consent Decree that relate to and affect pupil achievement. These stipulations include: Availability of Textbooks, Presence of Certificated Teachers, Employee Absenteeism, Established Homework Policy, Retention and Promotion Policy, Passing of CBEST, and Race Relations. Several FCMAT standards in the Pupil Achievement operational area are also affected by an additional compliance requirement of needing to reach a rating of 8 (on a scale of 1-10) to be deemed compliant. These specific standards are listed in the chart of standards in the Pupil Achievement section of this report.

Consent Decree Section 8 (Textbooks)

The requirements of Section 8 have been met by the district. The district is implementing the Williams protocols for 2005-06 and has ordered sufficient quantities of textbooks in the core areas of English, Mathematics, History/Social Science, and Science to issue a textbook from each core subject to each student. Standards based textbooks are adopted following the state adoption schedule and several adoption cycles have occurred since monitoring was initiated. Standards-based Curriculum Guides have been developed for the core subject areas. The district annually prepares an inventory of all existing textbooks, monitors textbook returns and losses, seeks restitution for lost textbooks, and replaces lost copies annually. *(See related Pupil Achievement Standard 1.25 – Current Rating: 9. Standard 1.25 was required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 11 (Presence of Certificated Teachers)

The requirements of Section 11 have been met by the district. The district works to ensure that certificated teachers are present in each classroom each day. Efforts continue to be made by the district to increase the substitute list. The district attempts to maintain a list of certificated substitutes in sufficient numbers to meet teacher absences. The principal has assumed responsibility for ensuring that children receive appropriate instruction from a certificated teacher on staff. Other certificated site staff (counselor, resource teacher, administrator) must substitute if qualified substitutes are not available at the site. *(See related Personnel Management Standard 8.2 – Current Rating: 10. Standard 8.2 was not required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 12 (Absenteeism)

The requirements of Section 12 have been met by the district. The district assigns non-instructional certificated staff to substitute when regular substitutes are not available for teacher absences. The district requires each site to address ways to reduce employee absenteeism in their school site plans. Staff absentee reports are provided to the sites for administrators to review. The superintendent has set an annual goal of increasing teacher attendance to 97 percent. *(See related Personnel Management Standard 8.2 – Current Rating: 10. Standard 8.2 was not required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 13 (Homework)

The requirements of Section 13 have been met by the district. The district developed and implemented a district wide homework policy in 2000. A monthly certification by the site principals that a homework policy is being implemented is submitted to the district office. Parent notifications regarding the homework policy are sent home at the beginning of each semester. The *Student and Parent/Guardian Handbook* contains the district's homework policy. The handbook is updated annually and distributed to parents. Schools keep the signed acknowledgement of receipt forms from parents. *(See related Pupil Achievement Standards 1.2 – Current Rating: 10, and 1.11 – Current Rating: 10. Standards 1.2 and 1.11 were required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 19 (Student Promotion)

The requirements of Section 19 have been met by the district. The district developed a promotion/acceleration/retention policy, Policy No. 5123. The board adopted this policy on April 11, 2000. Information on the policy is distributed to parents through the *Student and Parent/Guardian Handbook*. Plaintiffs' counsel was invited to provide written comments on the draft policy as it was developed. A copy of the policy was sent to Plaintiffs' counsel for written comment. No response was received. *(See related Pupil Achievement Standards 1.5 – Current Rating: 9, and 1.16 – Current Rating: 9. Standards 1.5 and 1.16 were required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 20 (CBEST)

The requirements of Section 20 have been met by the district. The district identifies teachers without clear credentials and their length of employment. The district accepts CBEST waivers only when credentialed teachers are not available for the hard-to-fill special education positions. Four teachers of special education in spring 2005 had a CBEST waiver. An annual report of the number of teachers who do not have a clear credential and the length of their employment is provided to the board. The percent of teaching staff with clear credentials continues to increase. 78 percent of regular education teachers and 44 percent of special education teachers are currently credentialed. The salary schedule is differentiated (less compensation for teachers without full credentials) to motivate teachers to speedily obtain a clear teaching credential. *(See related Personnel Management Standard 3.10 – Current Rating: 10. Standard 3.10 was not required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 24 (Race Relations)

The requirements of Section 24 have been met by the district. The district parent advisory council works to promote positive race relations among the various ethnic groups in the community. Most schools have Peer Mediation and/or Conflict Resolution student groups to work with other students on resolving student concerns. Secondary school sites have established student-directed Human Relations clubs to assist in planning and implementing the activities in observation of various cultural events. The district has purchased instructional materials on the Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander and the African-American cultural experiences. Curriculum staff has worked to incorporate these materials into the Social Science curriculum. Activities recognizing Black History month, Spanish Heritage month, and the birthdays of Cesar Chavez and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. take place annually. An annual districtwide Cultural Diversity Celebration was held in April 2005. The district has received a Teaching American History grant to teach inclusion of the contributions of various racial and ethnic groups. *(See related Pupil Achievement Standard 1.10 – Current Rating: 9. Standard 1.10 was required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Stipulations Related to Facilities Management

There are several stipulations within the Consent Decree that relate to and affect school facilities. These stipulations include: Condition of Bathrooms, Broken Windows, Electrical, Security Plan, Emergency Drills, Litter, Drinking Water, Site Committees, Food Service, Parent Volunteer Strategies, and Central Telephone Number for Facilities Complaints. Several FCMAT standards in the Facilities Management operational area are also affected by an additional compliance requirement of needing to reach a rating of 8 (on a scale of 1-10) to be deemed compliant. These specific standards are listed in the chart of Facilities Management standards in the Facilities Management section of this report.

Consent Decree Section 7 (Bathrooms)

The requirements of Section 7 have been met by the district. Generally, bathrooms are safe, supplied and operable. All site bathrooms continue to be inspected a minimum of three times daily by the principal and/or other staff. Records of this monitoring process are maintained at the site for inspection. The bathrooms are also monitored during periodic, unannounced site visits to school campuses. A FCMAT checklist is used to monitor compliance with Consent Decree stipulations. All written documents and logs are reviewed and any needed follow-up discussed with the site administrator. The passage of a local general obligation bond has enabled the modernization of many restrooms in the district's schools. Four bathroom monitors have been hired at each high school. *(See related Facilities Management Standard 9.4 – Current Rating: 10. Standard 9.4 was required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 9 (Broken Windows)

The requirements of Section 9 have been met by the district. Identified boarded windows are replaced with clear glass, plexiglass or other clear permanent material. Certain windows are allowed to be boarded for safety and property protection. Broken windows are replaced as soon as possible. Materials used to temporarily secure broken windows require that a date and time be affixed on the temporary material that is placed on the window. Sites are monitored regularly to ensure compliance. *(See related Facilities Management Standard 1.12 – Current Rating: 10. Standard 1.12 was required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 10 (Electrical)

The requirements of Section 10 have been met by the district. Plant managers have been directed to daily inspect for electrical problems, report emergency conditions for immediate repair, and to submit a monthly report to the Facilities Division. These monthly reports have been documented. A Facilities Compliance Coordinator visits all school sites on a regular basis to check for any hazardous conditions, including broken or loose wiring. Reports of conditions needing attention are reported to the Facilities Division. The district has established an emergency hot line for use, and has designated any electrical hazard as an emergency condition. The district and plaintiffs' counsel selected a licensed electrician to conduct site inspections of specific identified sites in the 2000-2001 school year. *(See related Facilities Management Standard 9.8 – Current Rating: 10. Standard 9.8 was required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 14 (Security Plan)

The requirements of Section 14 have been met by the district. There is a districtwide security plan. School sites have established school site safety committees to continually determine site safety concerns and recommend remedial action to the district office. The district security committee referenced in the Consent Decree has been established. The committee has input into updates of the district wide security plan. Parents have been encouraged to participate in school security patrols. Monitored intrusion alarm systems have been installed in the district's schools. The district's police force continues to work with site safety committees. The district, in collaboration with the city, has established an Emergency Operations Center in the district police services department to respond to more widespread community disasters. *(See related Facilities Management Standard 1.3 – Current Rating: 10. Standard 1.3 was required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 15 (Emergency Drills)

The requirements of Section 15 have been met by the district. Written emergency plans are available at the school sites. Every school site has a fire warning system required by Education Code Section 32001. Several schools have strobe fire alarm systems besides the bell alarms. The required fire and earthquake drills are practiced according to the pertinent Education Code sections and recorded. These records are monitored by the district Facilities Compliance Coordinator. The district also implemented Code Yellow procedures and drills to respond to school emergencies. *(See related Facilities Management Standard 1.9 – Current Rating: 10. Standard 1.9 was required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 16 (Litter)

The requirements of Section 16 have been met by the district. The district has a graffiti abatement program in place, which is one of immediate removal. School campuses are inspected regularly and graffiti is removed immediately. Litter is picked up daily. Unusable playground equipment has been repaired or removed. The community service program in which all children are encouraged to perform five hours of community service per semester for litter removal is implemented at a few schools. A recycling program is in place at several schools. The high school graduation requirements have been modified to require 2.5 credits in community service. The course requirement is the equivalent of 45 hours, or one quarter of a year's credits. All students, beginning with the freshman class of 2002-03, will be required to meet this requirement for graduation. *(See related Facilities Management Standard 1.8 – Current Rating: 10, and 1.14 – Current Rating: 10. Standards 1.8 and 1.14 were required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 17 (Drinking Water)

The requirement of Section 17 has been met by the district. Drinking water is readily available to all children at all school sites. School sites are inspected regularly and water fountains checked for operability. *(See related Facilities Management Standard 8.10 – Current Rating: 10. Standard 8.10 was required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 18 (Site Committees)

The requirements of Section 18 have been met by the district. The district established a representative community committee to assist in the development of the district's Facilities Master Plan. An assessment of the facilities needs at all district sites was conducted and a facilities inventory and priority criteria developed. School site safety committees and/or site advisory councils, established at all school sites, continue to conduct site inspections and monitor

site safety needs. The district monitors the sites to ensure that site committees are operational. *(See related Facilities Management Standards 1.12 – Current Rating: 10, 1.14 – Current Rating: 10, and 9.11 – Current Rating: 10. Standards 1.12, 1.14 and 9.11 were required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 21 (Food Service)

The requirement of Section 21 has been met by the district. The Los Angeles County Health Department indicates that inspections of school cafeterias are usually conducted only in response to a complaint. The inspections conducted by the County Health Department of the site cafeterias during the 2000-2001 school year were shared with the school site committees. There were no inspections conducted during the 2001-2002 school year. In 2002-03 the Health Department visited a site cafeteria in response to a parent complaint and found that the complaint was unsubstantiated. A visit occurred at a school in summer 2003, and a report of that complaint was shared with the site administration and site council. One inspection was conducted during the second semester of the 2003-2004 school year in response to a complaint that was determined to be unfounded. An inspection was conducted in January 2005 concerning the lack of hot water at an individual site. Hot water was immediately restored and food preparation was not affected. No complaints or inspections occurred through June 2005. All district cafeteria managers and cooks participate in the Serve-Safe national certification program. The district has three food services employees who are trainers in this certification program. *(See related Facilities Management Standard 9.3 – Current Rating: 10. Standard 9.3 was required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 22 (Central Telephone Number for Facilities Complaints)

The requirements of Section 22 have been met by the district. Communication with the community about facilities issues is ongoing and continual. The district has established a facilities emergency hot line for school sites to utilize. The types of emergencies reported are being tabulated. The Facilities Division can be reached by the public through the district's central voice messaging system. The district is participating in the WE-TIP program, which provides a phone number for community members to make anonymous tips to the district concerning facilities and safety issues. Posters on the WE-TIP program have been disseminated to all school sites. Tabulation of the number and nature of the calls received and the disposition of the complaints need to be provided in a quarterly report that is available to counsel for the plaintiffs and the public. *(See related Facilities Management Standard 11.2 – Current Rating: 10. Standard 11.2 was not required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 23 (Volunteerism)

The requirements of Section 23 have been met by the district. The district continues to work to ensure parents and community members feel welcome in the schools. The Volunteers in Public Schools (VIPS) handbook was developed and approved by the board in the 1999-2000 school year and was updated in June 2005. This document provides direction to volunteers about becoming involved in their schools. Parents are actively recruited to volunteer, and the district does an excellent job providing recognition programs. Year-end recognition dinners have been held annually since spring 2001 to recognize outstanding volunteers from each school in the district. The number of volunteer hours at each school site is recorded and tabulated. Parents and community members are more involved in educational decision-making. Four parent forums were held in 2002-2003, five in 2003-2004 and four in 2004-05. In the 2001-2002 school year,

parents and community members were involved in the superintendent search process, and in the decision to implement a full-day kindergarten program in the district. Parent volunteers were involved in helping to pass the district's general obligation bond in November 2002. *(See related Facilities Management Standard 10.1 – Current Rating: 10. Standard 10.1 was not required to reach an 8.)*

Consent Decree Section 25 (Additional Compliance Requirements)

The requirements of Section 25 have largely been met by the district. A comprehensive Facilities Master Plan was developed by the district and was approved by the Advisory Board in July 1999. A Facilities Implementation Plan, providing a time line for implementing the recommendations within the Facilities Master Plan, and identifying possible sources of state and district funds to support the implementation was approved by FCMAT on August 10, 2001, and adopted by the Advisory Board in August 2001. Several Pupil Achievement and Facilities standards were identified in the Consent Decree as needing to reach a rating of 8 to be deemed implemented. All identified standards in the Facilities Management and Pupil Achievement operational areas have reached a rating of 8 or better. *(See related Facilities Management Standards 2.1 – Current Rating: 10, and 3.10 – Current Rating: 10. Standards 2.1 and 3.10 were required to reach an 8.)*

The district has met the consent decree stipulations of Sections 1 through 24. The only remaining Consent Decree stipulation to be completed in Section 25 is implementing the district's Facilities Master Plan.

Status of Facilities Master Plan Implementation

As the implementation of the district's Facilities Master Plan remains the only Consent Decree stipulation not yet completed, this section summarizes the district's efforts to implement its Facilities Master Plan and fully comply with all stipulations of the Consent Decree.

Background

The Compton Unified School District developed a long-range Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan in July 1999. The Facilities Master Plan was developed by Fields and Devereaux, Architects and Engineers, with input provided by a district facilities master plan committee that included parents and community representatives. A facilities assessment was made of every school site and district property and all facilities deficiencies were noted. Facilities needs at each site were identified as either a life/safety concern, a facilities need that could be addressed as a deferred maintenance project, a facilities need that should be addressed through modernization of the facilities, or as a capital improvement project. The Facilities Master Plan was approved by the Compton USD Advisory Board on July 13, 1999.

A Facilities Implementation Plan was developed by the district in June 2001 and submitted to FCMAT for approval. FCMAT solicited comments from the plaintiffs' counsel prior to approval as required in the Serna v Eastin Consent Decree, and approved the Implementation Plan effective August 10, 2001. The Advisory Board adopted the Implementation Plan in August 2001. The plan provided a timeline to address the district's most pressing facilities needs and provided a priority for the modernization and new construction projects to be completed by the district as state funds became available. Project priorities were made based on the following: Priorities 1) and 2) Life/Safety and Deferred Maintenance Projects, Priority 3) Modernization Projects, and Priority 4) Capital Improvement Projects.

The Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan and the priorities established in the Facilities Implementation Plan have provided the basis for addressing the district's facilities needs since 1999. The district planned to commit \$2 million to \$2.6 million in general funds annually for capital improvement projects and \$835,000 as the district's annual match for deferred maintenance projects. The district actually expended approximately \$5 million in 1999-2000 and \$10 million in 2000-2001 on facilities projects and continued to allocate healthy subsequent annual budgets to the facilities division. General funds allocated to the facilities budget and deferred maintenance funds were used to address the district's facilities priorities, as state and local general obligation bond funds were not then available.

The district received approval from the Office of Public School Construction and the Division of the State Architect for 28 modernization projects and three new school construction projects and submitted the projects for state funding. As state funds were not available, the district's projects remained on the list of approved projects awaiting state funding.

The district made three unsuccessful attempts prior to 2002 at passage of a local bond measure to support facilities repairs. These unsuccessful bond measure attempts made the district eligible for financial hardship status, eligible to receive 100 percent of state funding when state funds became available, without the requirement that the district provide its share of matching funds. The district received \$17 million in planning funds in 1999-2000 and became eligible to receive \$135 million for its modernization and new construction projects. However, the state had no funds available to provide to the district to implement its modernization and construction projects.

The District's Building Program Begins

In spring 2002 the district Governing Board approved a \$16 million Certificate of Participation (COP) to build a new elementary school, one of the three new elementary schools identified in the Facilities Master Plan, to alleviate overcrowding in several district elementary schools. Construction on the new school project began in summer 2002 and the William Jefferson Clinton Elementary School was opened to students in January 2003. This was the first school built in the district in thirty years.

The district successfully passed Measure I, an \$80 million local general obligation bond (GOB), in November 2002. The projects identified to be addressed with Measure I funds came from the Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan approved by the Advisory Board in July 1999 and the Facilities Implementation Plan priorities approved in August 2001. Clinton Elementary School and the repayment of the COP was included in the list of planned GOB expenditures. With the successful passage of the district's local GOB, the district lost its hardship eligibility, thus requiring the district to provide local matching funds for any state funds received. The district is required to provide a 20 percent match for modernization projects and a 50 percent match for new construction projects. The district's Measure I funds provide the resource for the district's matching funds.

The state passed a General Obligation Bond, Proposition 47, in November 2002, making state funds available for the district's approved modernization and new construction projects waiting in the "pipeline" of approved projects from districts across the state. With the passage of the district's Measure I General Obligation Bond and the availability of state funds from Proposition 47, the Compton Unified School District initiated an aggressive construction program to meet the last remaining Consent Decree stipulation.

The district established a Bond Oversight Committee in spring 2003 consisting of twelve community members and a representative of FCMAT to monitor the expenditure of Measure I bond funds for the district's construction projects. Individual board members submitted the name of an appointee for board approval. As board members elected in November 2003 had not participated in appointing members to the Oversight Committee, the board acted to increase the membership on the committee, allowing the new members to submit the name of an appointee. On January 25, 2005, the board appointed two additional members to the committee for a total of 15 members. On February 8, 2005, the board appointed another member for a total of 16 members. In March 2005, however, two committee members resigned and one member passed away, returning the committee membership to 13 members. The board agreed to leave the committee membership at 13 members.

The Bond Oversight Committee meets monthly and receives status reports on the district's various projects. The committee members make periodic visits to the sites under construction. The committee completed its first annual report in summer 2004 summarizing its activities for the Compton USD governing board.

The district hired a construction management firm, GKK Corp, and implemented a construction program utilizing \$80 million in Measure I funds and more than \$80 million in Proposition 47 funds. The district had sixteen modernization projects under construction in fall 2003. District projects have generally been on schedule and within budget, with only 2 percent in construction overruns. All of the district's projects are scheduled to be completed in December 2005.

Modernization projects were initiated at the following schools in fall 2003:

1. Centennial High School
2. Roosevelt Middle School
3. Whaley Middle School
4. Willowbrook Middle School
5. Bunche Middle School
6. Anderson Elementary School
7. Mayo Elementary School
8. Emerson Elementary School
9. McNair Elementary School
10. Roosevelt Elementary School
11. Kelly Elementary School
12. Dominguez High School
13. Cesar Chavez Adult School
14. Washington Elementary School
15. Laurel Elementary School
16. Carver Elementary School

Modernization projects were initiated at five schools in spring 2004 at:

17. Lincoln Elementary School
18. Bunche Elementary School
19. Vanguard Middle School
20. Dickison Elementary School
21. Kennedy Elementary School

Modernization projects were initiated at seven schools in June 2004 at:

22. Bursch Elementary School
23. Caldwell Elementary School
24. McKinley Elementary School
25. Tibby Elementary School
26. Davis Middle School
27. Walton Middle School
28. Compton High School

New classroom buildings were added at the following schools in 2003-2004:

1. Foster Elementary School
2. Kelly Elementary School
3. Roosevelt Elementary School
4. Willard Elementary School
5. Roosevelt Middle School
6. Whaley Middle School

The completion of the 28 approved modernization projects with the use of state and local bond funds is anticipated in December 2005. Clinton Elementary School is the first of the district's three approved new school construction projects to be completed.

The district office administrative operations were moved to a temporary site at 500 South Santa Fe Avenue in late fall 2004 and the previous district office site at South Tamarind Avenue is being demolished to construct a second new elementary school. Construction of a second elementary school at Tamarind Avenue will be supported by funds from Measure I and Proposition 47. The district governing board approved a Certificate of Participation (COP) to construct a new district office administrative complex on Santa Fe Avenue. The new location is currently being prepared.

Facilities Summary

The district continues to make significant progress implementing its Facilities Master Plan and meeting the stipulations of the Consent Decree.

On June 6, 2005, the Oversight Committee received the Financial and Performance Audits performed by the audit firm Vicenti, Lloyd and Stutzman for the GOB Measure I funds for the period March 25, 2003 through June 30, 2003 and for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2004. The auditors reported that the district's financial statements fairly presented the Measure I funds in all material respects and conformed with generally accepted accounting principles. There were no audit findings.

The funds available from the state and local bonds have allowed the district to implement the facilities projects identified in its Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan. However, several of the board members elected in November 2003 are relatively new to their role, and not all board members have demonstrated the same level of commitment to fully implement the Facilities Master Plan as the previous board. Some board members have been highly critical of the district's facilities activities and staff, not understanding the commitment made by the previous board to meet the terms of the Serna v Eastin Consent Decree.

The following are examples of some of the complications faced by the district administration in implementing the facilities program during the last year.

- The Proposition 47 state bond funds that were made available to the district were required to be expended or contracts awarded by the district within an 18-month time period. Because board action was delayed, the district barely met the June 18, 2004 timeline to award all its facilities project contracts to receive the state funding.
- A board member expressed her belief that construction funds generated by a local bond measure should be expended by utilizing local, minority construction businesses. Staff explained that the projects are bid following legal processes and awards made to the lowest responsible bidder. The board member contended that local, minority businesses from select zip codes should have been given preferential consideration in the selection process. This is contrary, however, to appropriate bidding practices.

- The district's 2004-05 budget almost did not get timely board approval in June 2004. A few board members wanted to table action on adopting the budget as they did not agree with the district's budget priorities for facilities. The district administration explained that failure to meet budget adoption guidelines could have serious consequences for the district, as the county office could develop the budget for the district. The budget was ultimately adopted and submitted to the county office on time.
- On January 25, 2005, the board approved a Project Labor Agreement (PLA) without conducting a community forum as requested by three board members to consider the impact of the agreement on the community and the district's future construction projects. The district recommended against the action as construction costs under the PLA agreement would increase by approximately 20 percent - 25 percent, curtailing the scope of the district's planned construction projects, or the number of planned projects that might be completed with available funds. The board agreed to a five-year PLA contract by a vote of 4 to 3. This decision will have a long-term impact on the district's future facilities activities.

District facilities staff has provided workshops to the board members on the Facilities Master Plan, the Implementation Plan, and updates on the district's construction projects. It is to be hoped that all board members will embrace the commitment to fully comply with the stipulations of the Consent Decree and implement the Facilities Master Plan as approved by the previous board in 1999. The district must continue to follow all legal requirements to bid its construction projects and board members must refrain from attempting to influence the bid process.

Parent Survey

FCMAT meets with the counsel for the plaintiffs and defendants every 60 days as required by the Consent Decree. District administrators participate in these 60 day meetings, providing FCMAT and the ACLU with regular status reports on the district's compliance with the stipulations of the Consent Decree. Consent Decree issues are discussed in this committee and regular visits to campus sites are conducted by committee members.

Section 31. (d) of the Consent Decree required FCMAT to conduct semi-annual community meetings in which parents and students were invited to comment on the status of compliance with the Consent Decree. FCMAT scheduled, advertised and conducted community forums every six months beginning in September 2000 through May 2003, following the August and February distribution of each of the six-month progress reports. Over time, however, parent/community participation significantly decreased.

In July 2003 the committee discussed the necessity of continuing the semi-annual meetings as participation had steadily declined, and the district itself was conducting several parent forums each year, providing a regular venue for parent/community input on various issues. These district forums were well-attended.

Plaintiff's counsel indicated that the purpose of the FCMAT forums was to provide parents an avenue to voice their concerns without fear of retaliation, but was amenable to the use of a questionnaire in-lieu of the semi-annual meetings to solicit comments. A parent survey, printed in English and Spanish, was first conducted by FCMAT in fall 2003. 1,020 parents responded to the following questions. A summary of the responses is provided in italics.

1. Has the school provided you with sufficient opportunities to give input or hear concerns about your child's education? *(792 parents responded yes, 204 no)*
2. Did your child receive textbooks and necessary instructional materials in all core subjects such as English, math, history and science this school year? *(827 yes, 176 no)*
3. Does your child receive sufficient homework on a regular basis? *(948 yes, 63 no)*
4. Please grade the school facilities at your child's school (i.e., bathrooms, classrooms, cafeteria, library, gym). *(198-A, 253-B, 306-C, 132-D, 104-F)*
5. Please grade your overall satisfaction with your child's educational experience. *(377-A, 358-B, 185-C, 43-D, 34-F)*
6. What repairs, if any, are needed at your child's school? *(Responses varied by sites. Restrooms were the most frequently listed item.)*

Survey data was disaggregated by individual school sites and shared with the site administrators and staffs.

In spring 2004, after reviewing the survey data, the committee agreed that the survey information was valuable and that the parent survey should be continued. Over the next several months the survey was revised by the committee members and produced by the ACLU in an attractively formatted colored brochure. 36,000 surveys were printed and distributed to every student household in the district in late January 2005.

The Spring 2005 Parent Survey results were tabulated by FCMAT and the information presented to the committee members in April 2005. Although 1198 surveys were returned, the committee was disappointed that there was little or no survey response from some of the schools: no responses from King Elementary, Thurgood Marshall Independent Study Program and Walton Middle School, and minimal responses from Centennial and Compton High, Willowbrook and Vanguard Middle, and Carver Elementary schools.

The Spring 2005 Parent Survey included the following questions and responses.

1. Has the school district provided you with sufficient opportunities to give input or hear concerns about your child's education? *(900 parents responded yes, 290 no)*
2. Did your child receive textbooks and necessary instructional materials in all core subjects such as English, math, history and science this school year? *(981 yes, 201 no)*
3. Does your child receive sufficient homework on a regular basis? *(947 yes, 122 no)*
4. Do you know how to contact the district to report a facilities problem or emergency? *(714 yes, 407 no)*
5. Are you aware that the WE-TIP hotline to report vandalism or crimes on school property can also be used to report concerns about school facilities such as broken windows, bathroom problems, and excess litter? *(512 yes, 555 no)*
6. Please grade the school facilities at your child's school (i.e., bathrooms, classrooms, cafeteria, library, gym). *(200-A, 335-B, 282-C, 124-D, 71-F)*
7. Please grade your overall satisfaction with your child's educational experience. *(373-A, 365-B, 192-C, 59-D, 28-F)*
8. What repairs, if any, are needed at your child's school? *(Responses were varied depending on the site. 273 parents listed restrooms, 104 listed classrooms, and 103 listed completing the repairs in progress.)*

The survey results of these parent concerns were disaggregated by individual sites and shared with the district to share with the individual school site administrators and staffs. It is hoped that the sites will be responsive to the concerns communicated to them through this survey.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: LEGISLATION AND STATE RECEIVERSHIP OF THE COMPTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

In July 1993, Assembly Bill 657/Murray (Statutes of 1993, Chapter 78) appropriated \$10.5 million in the form of an emergency loan for the Compton Unified School District. This loan required the appointment of a state administrator who would exercise the powers and responsibilities of the Governing Board. In October 1993, Assembly Bill 1708/Murray (Statutes of 1993, Chapter 924) provided a second emergency loan of \$9.45 million. This loan required the district to comply with Education Code Section 41325, which continued the assignment of the state administrator. In September 1993, Assembly Bill 33/Murray (Statutes of 1993, Chapter 455) provided further clarification and conditions regarding the emergency apportionment. This bill stipulated that the state administrator retain authority for the operation of the district until such time as the Superintendent of Public Instruction determined the district had met the fiscal requirements and had made demonstrated academic progress.

The above mentioned legislation required the state emergency loans to be repaid and the academic performance of the district to improve prior to the board being restored its legal rights, duties, and powers. The district made the 6th and final loan payment in June 2001. In the six years following 1996, the district repaid a total of \$24,358,061 in loans and interest.

Through Assembly Bill 52/Washington (Statutes of 1997, Chapter 767), the legislature stated its intent to return the designated legal rights, duties, and powers of governance to the Compton Unified School District Board of Trustees. In addition to the above bills, AB 52 required the assessment of five major operational areas of school district operation: Community Relations, Personnel Management, Pupil Achievement, Financial Management, and Facilities Management. AB 52 required FCMAT and the state administrator, in consultation with other specified entities, to conduct comprehensive assessments and to develop specified recovery plans in the five designated areas.

In addition to a systemic, district-wide assessment and the development of a recovery plan, FCMAT was required to determine whether the school district made substantial and sustained progress in the five designated areas. Where there was substantial and sustained progress, FCMAT recommended to the Superintendent of Public Instruction the operational areas of school operation that should be returned to the Governing Board of the CUSD. As a result of this requirement, an incremental return of the legal rights, duties, and powers to the Governing Board occurred over time. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction formally returned full governing authority of all operational areas to the CUSD Governing Board in an executive order dated September 11, 2001, and effective December 11, 2001. The State Administrator was, at that time, named as State Trustee to continue to provide oversight of fiscal matters.

In a letter dated June 2, 2003, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction terminated oversight of the Compton USD by the State Trustee, who served through June 13, 2003. The Compton Unified School District and its Governing Board became free of state oversight for the first time in more than ten years.

Incremental Return of Legal Rights, Duties and Powers in Designated Operational Areas to CUSD

The return of authority over specific district operational areas occurred over time. FCMAT's third six-month progress report, in August 2000, recommended to the Superintendent of Public Instruction that the designated operational areas of Community Relations and Facilities Management be returned to the Governing Board of the Compton Unified School District. The Superintendent acted to return the two operational areas to the Governing Board in January 2001. The SPI also authorized the Governing Board to select and hire a district superintendent.

FCMAT's fourth six-month report in February 2001, recommended that the operational area of Pupil Achievement be returned to the Governing Board of the Compton Unified School District. Although academic performance remained below average, academic performance scores continued to increase. The district had focused efforts on improving student performance and had procedures in place to identify and address student deficiencies. However, the Superintendent of Public Instruction did not return governance of Pupil Achievement to the Governing Board as recommended by FCMAT in its fourth six-month progress report. The SPI indicated, in a letter to the district dated March 26, 2001, that the district would benefit from additional time to determine how well the academic processes were being implemented. The SPI also indicated that it would be prudent to evaluate the district's spring testing results to determine the effectiveness of the steps taken by the district in the previous year.

In the fifth six-month progress report in August 2001, FCMAT recommended that the operational areas of Personnel Management and Financial Management be returned to the Governing Board of the Compton Unified School District. Additionally, it was recommended that the operational area of Pupil Achievement be returned to the Governing Board as recommended in the fourth six-month progress report. The district had also selected and hired a district superintendent who assumed the position in August 2001. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction formally returned governing authority for all operational areas to the CUSD board in an executive order dated September 11, 2001, and effective December 11, 2001. The SPI further assigned the State Administrator to serve as the State Trustee in an oversight capacity for two years.

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction on June 2, 2003, formally terminated state oversight of the district by the State Trustee, effective June 13, 2003.

Executive Action on Return of Legal Rights, Duties and Powers in Designated Operational Areas to CUSD

Executive Order, January 2001, Response to Third Six-Month Progress Report:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction, on January 30, 2001, formally notified the Compton USD Governing Board of executive action taken to restore the Board's rights, duties, and obligations in the operational areas of Community Relations and Facilities Management. The Superintendent of Public Instruction, in negotiations with the Compton Governing Board over the process of incremental return of powers, agreed to remove the term 'advisory' from the Compton Governing Board's title, provided the reinstatement of stipends and benefits upon the recommended return of another operational area of governance, and authorized the Board to begin the search process for a permanent superintendent. Upon completion of the search process, the Governing Board would have final authority to select a permanent superintendent from amongst the candidates.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction indicated that the State Administrator would serve as the district's interim superintendent for the areas over which the Compton Board has authority, and would serve as the State Administrator for the areas over which the Compton Board does not have authority. The SPI recognized the Board's desire to hire an interim superintendent for the two areas returned, Community Relations and Facilities Management. However, the Superintendent of Public Instruction determined that "waiting a few months until the permanent superintendent is in place will provide for a smoother transition."

The district, with the assistance of CSBA, completed a superintendent search process and unanimously selected and appointed a superintendent to begin work in the district August 20, 2001.

Executive Order No. 2, March 2001, Response to Fourth Six-Month Progress Report:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction, on March 26, 2001, formally notified the Compton USD Governing Board of executive action to establish the board "stipend authorized under Education Code section 35120, and such health benefits as are authorized under District policy and law. In all other respects, the Superintendent's January 30, 2001, Executive Order remains in effect."

The Superintendent of Public Instruction indicated that the District would benefit by having the management of the operational area of Pupil Achievement remain for additional time under the direct administration of the State Administrator. The SPI indicated that should appropriate progress be demonstrated in the area of Pupil Achievement, the return of local control in this operational area could be returned to the district in the fall.

The SPI also commented on the concerns raised by FCMAT as to whether the Board was embracing the proper exercise of its governing authority. The SPI indicated concern as to the readiness of the Board to effectively fulfill its policymaking role.

Executive Order No. 3, September 2001, Response to Fifth Six-Month Progress Report:

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction issued Executive Order No. 3 which restored full control to the Governing Board effective December 11, 2001. The executive order recognized that the Compton Unified School District showed “substantial and sustained improvement in all remaining areas not presently under local control.” The order further indicated that “the state administrator shall assume the powers of the State Trustee... governing the oversight of the Compton Unified School District.” “Effective September 11, 2001, personnel commission members shall be entitled to the maximum stipend authorized under EC 45250.”

Superintendent of Public Instruction Action, June 2003:

A new Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) was elected in November 2002. The previous Superintendent had completed the maximum two-term limit for the position. The new SPI on June 2, 2003 terminated state oversight of the Compton USD by the State Trustee, effective June 13, 2003, citing the district’s progress in governing itself. The State Trustee was reassigned to another California district effective June 16, 2003.

Standards-Based Assessment Process

For schools and school districts to be successful in program improvement, the evaluation, design and implementation of the recovery plans must be standards-driven. When standards are clearly defined, reachable, and communicated, there is a greater likelihood they will be measured and met.

The Compton Unified School District was measured on a consistent rating format, and every standard was given a scaled score from zero to 10 as to its relative status of completeness. The following represents a definition of terms and scaled scores applied to this process. The single purpose of the scaled score was to establish a baseline of information by which the district's gains and achievement in each of the standard areas could be measured.

- **Not Implemented (Scaled Score of 0)**

There is no significant evidence that the standard is implemented.

- **Partially Implemented (Scaled Score of 1 through 7)**

A partially implemented standard lacks completeness, and it is met in a limited degree.

The degree of completeness varies as defined:

1. Some design or research regarding the standard is in place that supports preliminary development. (Scaled Score of 1)
2. Implementation of the standard is well into the development stage. Appropriate staff is engaged and there is a plan for implementation. (Scaled Score of 2)
3. A plan to address the standard is fully developed, and the standard is in the beginning phase of implementation. (Scaled Score of 3)
4. Staff is engaged in the implementation of most elements of the standard. (Scaled Score of 4)
5. Staff is engaged in the implementation of the standard. All standard elements are developed and are in the implementation phase. (Scaled Score of 5)
6. Elements of the standard are implemented, monitored and becoming systematic. (Scaled Score of 6)
7. All elements of the standard are fully implemented, are being monitored, and appropriate adjustments are taking place. (Scaled Score of 7)

- **Fully Implemented (Scaled Score of 8 through 10)**

A fully implemented standard is complete relative to the following criteria:

8. All elements of the standard are fully and substantially implemented and are sustainable. (Scaled Score of 8)
9. All elements of the standard are fully and substantially implemented and have been sustained for a full school year. (Scaled Score of 9)
10. All elements of the standard are fully implemented, are being sustained with high quality, are being refined, and have a process for ongoing evaluation. (Scaled Score of 10)

By utilizing a standards-based approach, FCMAT was able to incorporate a scaled score to measure progress and to establish an acceptable level for the return of the Board's legal rights, duties and powers. AB 52 expressed the legislative intent that the Board be returned its designated legal rights, duties and powers through an incremental process. To implement this intent, FCMAT established a standard for the return of the legal rights, duties and powers. This standard was based upon the scaled score system. When the average rating in an operational area reached a level of 6.00 and no individual standard was below 4.00, FCMAT recommended to the Superintendent of Public Instruction the incremental return of that operational area to the school district.