

This document is an extract of a larger publication.

civilgrandjury.org is a project of UnGovr.org, a US-based 501(c)(3) nonprofit dedicated to government transparency and public accountability.



**Finding 3.6:** According to staff interviews, this 20-30% of BVHP students often come from the most troubled and dysfunctional families. A number of parents are incarcerated or are drug users. These children do not have the family support structure that allows for "a signed parental participation contract". Hence, most of these children will not be attending the newly converted Dream School but will, in fact, be assigned or reassigned to other unenriched schools. The CGJ could find no specific plan for relocation of these children.

***Response to Finding***

**Arlene Ackerman  
Superintendent of Schools  
San Francisco Unified School District  
August 30, 2004**

The District disagrees with the statement that the 20-30% of BVHP students who allegedly do not return paperwork come from troubled and dysfunctional families, have parents that are incarcerated or drug users, and do not have a family support structure. These assumptions are purportedly based on "staff interviews," and could be interpreted to be stereotypical generalizations about an entire neighborhood. As noted above, a signed parental participation contract is not a prerequisite for enrolling in a Dream School. In fact, any student that attended a school that is being converted into a Dream School has been assigned to remain at the newly converted Dream School, unless they affirmatively requested reassignment to a new site.

**Finding 3.7:** While the CGJ finds that Dream Schools offer a marked improvement over existing programs in present BVHP schools, the CGJ has great concern about the estimated 20-30% of children that will not be able to attend even their current schools. The CGJ realizes that it is most likely that test scores for these schools will greatly improve, but accomplishing improvement by replacing lower performing students only improves the SFUSD's overall test scores and fails to address the needs of children most in want.

***Response to Finding***

**Arlene Ackerman  
Superintendent of Schools  
San Francisco Unified School District  
August 30, 2004**

Disagree. As noted above, a signed parental participation contract is not a prerequisite for enrolling in a Dream School. In fact, any student that attended a school that is being converted into a Dream School has been assigned to remain at the newly converted Dream School, unless they affirmatively requested reassignment to a new site.

**Finding 3.8:** Staff interviews in BVHP schools found that there is little outreach, via mail, telephone or home visits, to insure that students' caretakers understand Dream Schools and can make enlightened decisions as to whether or not to enroll their children. Being transferred out of their schools due to a lack of custodial response is hardly fair to the children.

### ***Response to Finding***

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

Disagree. In order to inform parents, guardians and community members about the Dream School Initiative, SFUSD did the following outreach:

- The Educational Placement Center mailed home letters to students who attended the schools that would be converted into Dream Schools. These letters described the Dream School Initiative, and permitted parents to opt out of assignment to a Dream School. If the District did not receive any response to the letter, the student was assigned to the Dream School;
- Teachers in the schools that would be converted into Dream Schools wrote and called the students in their classrooms to discuss Dream Schools;
- Parent liaisons went out on home visits to inform parents and guardians about the Dream Schools;
- Each reorganized school held an assembly that provided information about Dream Schools;
- Between January 2004 and May 2004, SFUSD held 10 parent and community meetings and fairs in BVHP schools and locations (such as Bayview Opera House) to publicize the Dream School Initiative, with an estimated attendance of 400 people;
- SFUSD held parent orientation meetings on August 21, 2004;
- SFUSD created an Advisory Board with BVHP community members to discuss the Dream Schools Initiative. Between 12/03 and 7/04, SFUSD held 9 Community Advisory meetings with a total attendance of 70 people.
- Between December 2003 & June 2004, 8-12 letters and flyers were mailed to parents and the community regarding Dream School meetings & events.
- In February and March 2004, over 100 parents & community members attended biweekly SFUSD board meetings to publicly speak in favor of the Dream Schools initiative.

As noted above, any student that attended a school that is being converted into a Dream School has been assigned to remain at the newly converted Dream School, unless they affirmatively requested reassignment to a new site.

**Finding 3.9:** The CGJ holds the opinion that repurposing an existing BVHP school into a Dream School has little effect on the lack of educational resources in the BVHP region. The Dream Schools plan does not change the fact that Bayview Hunters Point will continue to have the lowest ratio of school seats to student population of any San Francisco school district.

### ***Response to Finding***

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

Disagree. The Dream Schools Initiative will bring a wealth of new resources to improve the quality of education provided in BVHP, as described on pages 6-7 above. Moreover, this statement does not acknowledge that pursuant to the SFUSD Consent Decree, students in the BVHP region (as well as students in the rest of the city) have access to seats in any school within

the District through the student assignment process. Students are not limited to the available school seats within their own neighborhood or “region.” Therefore, the number of “seats” available in BVHP is not relevant in determining the quality of education that is accessible to students in BVHP.

**Recommendation 3: Undertake Greater Outreach to Ensure Eligible Students Are Enrolled in Dream Schools.**

SFUSD should undertake greater outreach in order to insure that eligible students get enrolled in Dream Schools and that students not eligible are given every opportunity to attend their current school next year with equal or improved resources.

**Responses**

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

This recommendation has already been implemented, as described in Section 3.8, above. Over 280 new students have been assigned to the Dream Schools, and there is a wait list for the entering kindergarten class. The District will continue its efforts to inform families and students about the Dream Schools Initiative.

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**June 30, 2005**

As noted in the District’s original response, the District took detailed and thorough action to ensure that students were aware of their opportunities and choices within the District, including the opportunity to attend a Dream School. Students who were attending a school that was converted to a Dream School were assigned to remain at that site unless they affirmatively chose to transfer to another school. There were no eligibility requirements to enroll in a Dream School.

---

**Finding 4: Many Students in the Bayview Hunters Point Schools Do Not Receive Available Free or Low-Cost Lunches**

BVHP schools have the highest percentage of children who qualify for free or reduced-fee lunch programs. A large portion of these children-- SFUSD staff estimate up to 30%--do not return the required paperwork, and there is very little outreach to assist them and their families.

*[The Civil Grand Jury Report did not list a finding numbered 4.1]*

**Finding 4.2:** In BVHP's existing elementary and middle schools, as many as 80% of the children qualify for free or reduced-cost lunch programs. For example, 86.8% at Gloria R. Davis qualify, but staff has identified that as many as 20-30% of the eligible students do not return appropriate documentation and, therefore, are denied free or reduced-cost lunches. In most cases, lack of parental support is cited as the root of the problem. These students also are most likely to be low- performing students.

### ***Response to Finding***

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

Disagree. SFUSD does not deny any student a free or reduced price lunch due to their parent's failure to return the appropriate documentation. If a parent fails to return such documentation, the result is that the District will not be reimbursed for the lunch that is provided to the student. The District is unable to agree or disagree with the statement that 20-30% of eligible students do not return appropriate documentation. The report provides no basis for this conclusion that is drawn by an unidentified staff person. The District also does not agree with the generalization that students who do not return the free and reduced lunch documentation are the lowest performing students. The grand jury report provides no basis for this conclusion.

**Finding 4.3:** Staff interviews gave the impression that there is little outreach, via mail, telephone or home visits, to insure that students' caretakers or guardians are returning the very simple forms requesting free or reduced lunches.

### ***Response to Finding***

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

Disagree. SFUSD has undertaken the following steps to encourage parents to return free and reduced price forms:

- SFUSD established a Meal Application Sub-Committee in June that includes the Department of Public Health, SFUSD Student Nutrition, and parent organizations to advocate for the meal application process.
- The Educational Placement Center now hands out these forms when parents come in to enroll their children in the District.
- Parents for Public Schools are partnering with the District to hold fairs and talk to parents about the importance of filling out the forms.
- The Housing Authority is partnering with the District to encourage residents to fill out the forms.
- SFUSD Student Nutrition has presented information about the importance of filling out the meals forms in schools, parent groups, and for all administrators at the Superintendent's Institute.
- Development of a parent letter and FAQ (frequently asked questions) that has been translated into three languages.
- Beginning in November 2004, Student Nutrition will send each school a monthly "no meal application on file" report so that Student Nutrition may conduct a second wave of outreach for these families.
- The Meal Application Sub-Committee has targeted 10 schools for focused outreach to increase the school meal application return rate.

- SFUSD Student Nutrition teamed up with SF Health Plan District Medical Revenue Unit and Bringing Up Healthy Kids Organization to conduct outreach to families regarding health coverage, and have included meal applications with the health coverage forms.
- All students were provided with postage paid envelopes to allow families to return forms directly to Student Nutrition if they were concerned about protecting their privacy.
- Meal forms and the SFUSD nutrition policy are now accessible by website ([www.sfusd\\_foods.tripod.com](http://www.sfusd_foods.tripod.com)).

Moreover, SFUSD does not deny any student a free or reduced price lunch due to their parent's failure to return the appropriate documentation. If a parent fails to return such documentation, the result is that the District will not be reimbursed for the lunch that is provided to the student.

***Recommendation 4: Undertake Greater Outreach to Ensure Eligible Students Receive Free or Low-Cost Lunches.***

SFUSD should undertake greater outreach in order to insure that students who are eligible for free or low-cost lunches are receiving them.

***Responses***

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

This recommendation has already been implemented, as described in Section 4.3, above.

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**June 30, 2005**

As noted in the District's original response, the District took detailed and thorough action to ensure that parents and guardians filled out free and reduced lunch applications. Additionally, the District explained that SFUSD does not deny any student a free or reduced price lunch due to their parent's failure to return the appropriate documentation. If a parent fails to return such documentation, the result is that the District will not be reimbursed for the lunch that is provided to the student. In the fall, the free and reduced cost lunch program application will be included in the August welcome packet sent home to all students. The forms in this packet all must be filled out and returned at the beginning of the school year, and are stapled together to ensure that parents understand that all of the enclosed forms must be filled out and returned.

## **General Responses**

**Dan Kelly, M.D.**  
**President**  
**Board of Education**  
**August 30, 2004**

After receiving the Civil Grand Jury reports on the School District's programs in the Bayview Hunter Point and in the County Community Schools, I requested the Superintendent of Schools and her staff to review the Civil Grand Jury's findings and prepare the required responses. I greatly appreciated the Civil Grand Jury's interest in the education of the children of San Francisco and in particular in these two critical and important areas of our work.

Having reviewed the Civil Grand Jury reports and the staffs responses, I am confident that you and the Civil Grand Jury will be reassured about the integrity and quality of the District's services both in the County Community Schools and in the Bayview Hunter's Point programs. As the responses we are submitting indicate, the District shares and even anticipates many of the concerns expressed by the Civil Grand Jury and is taking steps to address those concerns. In other areas, however, the Civil Grand Jury's expressed concerns did not represent accurate portrayals of the District's efforts or the community's desires.

On the whole, the Civil Grand Jury has been a helpful exercise for us and the community in drawing attention to the importance that we place on the education of every child in San Francisco.

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

The issues raised in the Civil Grand Jury Report are subject to active, ongoing federal court jurisdiction in the cases of *SFNAACP v. SFUSD* and *Ho v. SFUSD*. A Consent Decree was entered in the former case in 1983, and was amended as a result of settlements reached in the latter case in 1999 and most recently in 2001. The Consent Decree addresses a wide range of issues related to student assignment and educational equity. The District's current student assignment system is mandated by the Consent Decree, as amended in 2001, and can only be changed by agreement of the parties or by order of the Court. The case is under the active supervision of Judge William Alsup of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

**Adele Destro**  
**Assistant Clerk of the Board**  
**Board of Supervisors**  
**October 25, 2004**

The following is a follow-up report on the 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury Report *The More Things Change, The More They Stay The Same: The City and County of San Francisco and The San Francisco Unified School District Are Failing to Address the Educational Needs of the Bayview Hunters Point Community*.

The Board of Supervisors' City Services Committee held a hearing on Thursday, October 21, 2004 on the Civil Grand Jury Report. The hearing was continued to the call of the Chair to be held at a time to allow for the attendance and participation of Supervisor Maxwell, parents and students.

**Adele Destro**  
**Assistant Clerk of the Board**  
**Board of Supervisors**  
**December 6, 2004**

The following is a follow-up to the 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury Report *The More Things Change, The More They Stay The Same: The City and County of San Francisco and The San Francisco Unified School District Are Failing to Address the Educational Needs of the Bayview Hunters Point Community.*

The Board of Supervisors' City Services Committee held a hearing on Thursday, December 2, 2004 on the Civil Grand Jury Report. Representatives from the San Francisco Unified School District responded to all the recommendations by the Civil Grand Jury. Parents and members of the community were heard during public comment and the matter was filed at the conclusion of the hearing.

**Adele Destro**  
**Assistant Clerk of the Board**  
**Board of Supervisors**  
**June 29, 2005**

The Board of Supervisors' City Services Committee held a hearing on Thursday, December 2, 2004. Representatives from the SFUSD responded to all the recommendations by the Civil Grand Jury. Parents and members of the community were heard during public comment and the matter was filed at the conclusion of the hearing.

**TERMS**

SFUSD -San Francisco Unified School District

BVHP -Bayview Hunters Point

HP -Hunters Point

CGJ -Civil Grand Jury

<b>Civil Grand Jury Recommendations and Department Responses</b>		<b>Board of Education</b>	<b>SFUSD</b>	<b>San Francisco Redevelopment Agency</b>
1	SFUSD should provide the Bayview Hunters Point district with neighborhood schools commensurate to its population of eligible local students.	Students have right to select schools from any neighborhood within the District. (Disagree)		
2	SFUSD and the Redevelopment Agency should forge a plan to build additional schools in the Bayview Hunters Point region in order to address projected needs arising from development of new housing.	The SFUSD Master Facilities Plan projects excess capacity at the District.		Based on consultant data, SFUSD has not determined that additional schools will be required.
3	SFUSD should undertake greater outreach in order to insure that eligible students get enrolled in Dream Schools and that students not eligible are given every opportunity to attend their current school next year with equal or improved resources.	Implemented		
4	SFUSD should undertake greater outreach in order to insure that students who are eligible for free or low-cost lunches are receiving them.	Implemented		

*For each recommendation, the Civil Grand Jury did not require responses from all departments. The table only identifies those departments that responded to specific recommendations.*

---

## CHAPTER 4

# COUNTY COMMUNITY SCHOOLS: POOR STEPCHILDREN OF THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

---

### BACKGROUND

The 2003-04 Civil Grand Jury investigated the San Francisco Unified School District's (SFUSD) administration of the County Community Schools (CCS).<sup>10</sup> The California Education Code mandates that all children, except those who are legally excused, between 6 and 18 attend school full time. When students' special needs are not met by District Schools within a county, it becomes the responsibility of the County Offices of Education to provide educational programs for them. Programs are offered for children with exceptional needs, homeless students, pregnant minors, and youths detained in homes and camps. They include County Community Schools, vocation programs, and Community Day Schools. The funding for San Francisco's County Community Schools is \$93 million.

San Francisco's County Community Schools have the same oversight as the SFUSD schools, though technically, they are separate systems. The Superintendent and School Board of SFUSD are also the administrators of the county schools. The Civil Grand Jury found the duality of jurisdiction can be confusing, especially in the sorting out of budgetary allotments. The Civil Grand Jury found it nearly impossible to determine exactly how the CCS funds are allotted and why there appears to be a significant discrepancy in the per student amounts apportioned for CCS students and the amounts actually used. The Civil Grand Jury also discovered that San Francisco County could apply for a more rigorous alternative, Community Day Schools, a state program that requires a longer school day, has more classes, gives vocational training, and offers more services.

### RESULTS

The Civil Grand Jury made 14 recommendations and required responses from the following:

Superintendent of Schools  
Board of Supervisors  
Board of Education  
Mayor

The table at the end of this chapter lists all the recommendations made by the Civil Grand Jury and summarizes department responses. The table only identifies those departments that specifically addressed a recommendation.

---

<sup>10</sup> The terms and abbreviations used by the Civil Grand Jury appear at the end of the chapter.

## **Finding 1: The San Francisco Unified School District Does Not Provide Safe Learning Environments for all of the County Community Schools**

**Finding 1.1:** When the Grand Jury arrived at 1950 Mission Street, the County Community Schools' Phoenix Campus, for its first interview, committee members were disconcerted by what they saw. The neighborhood, with a crime rate second only to San Francisco's Tenderloin, is disreputable. It is obvious to even the most unenlightened observer that drug use and prostitution are thriving here with impunity. In addition to an apparent lack of safety, the twelve outdated and obsolete brown bungalows, the asphalt schoolyard, and the one broken basketball backstop loom as an indication of the District's lack of interest in the CCS students' welfare. The school is surrounded by a very necessary chain-link fence, which promotes safety, but hardly a positive learning environment. It does not help that the school day ends at 1:30 PM, when "business" is brisk. A police officer told committee members that, at the local police station, this school has the nickname of "Heroin High."

### ***Response to Finding***

**Arlene Ackerman  
Superintendent of Schools  
San Francisco Unified School District  
August 30, 2004**

Agree that the Phoenix campus is located at 1950 Mission Street.

**Finding 1.2:** On another school visit, CGJ interviewers noted that one of the one-room county schools (Community Youth Center) is located on the second floor of a building that houses a strip joint on the first floor. While the school's access is on a different street, the area would be deemed unsuitable for a city public school, as it should also be for CCS. As in the case of the Phoenix campus, SFUSD again ignores one of its stated goals (<http://portal.sfusd.edu>): "Maintain school environments that are *safe, secure and attractive*." (Emphasis added.)

### ***Response to Finding***

**Arlene Ackerman  
Superintendent of Schools  
San Francisco Unified School District  
August 30, 2004**

Agree that the Community Youth Center is located at 1693 Polk Street.

**Finding 1.3:** One-room schools may soon become unfeasible-due to the change in the state's credentialing of new teachers.

### ***Response to Finding***

**Arlene Ackerman  
Superintendent of Schools  
San Francisco Unified School District  
August 30, 2004**

Agree.

***Recommendation 1a: Study the Availability of Other Suitable School Sites to Relocate the Phoenix Campus***

SFUSD owns properties that are not presently being used for city schools. The Board and Administration should study the availability of suitable sites for relocation of Phoenix.

***Responses***

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

This recommendation requires further analysis. Within the next six months, SFUSD will analyze whether there are other available and appropriate sites for Phoenix High School. However, it should be noted that SFUSD attempted to relocate Phoenix High School to a new location on Evans Street during the 2002-2003 school year, and the students and staff from the school vigorously opposed the move before the Board. Therefore, the Board opted to retain the school's location at 1950 Mission in recognition of the articulated wishes of Phoenix High School students and staff.

In addition to going through SFUSD's Program Placement Committee, any program or site change must comply with Board Resolution 46-8A10 ("Resolution to Increase Public Input in Program and School Placement"), which requires opportunities for community input into proposed site changes.

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**June 30, 2005**

In February 2005, the Director of County Community Schools re-evaluated whether an SFUSD facility located on Evans Street in San Francisco would be a suitable location to relocate Phoenix High School. The location was found to be unsuitable because the facility's classrooms are located around a machine shop that is operated by a Junior College during the school day. The noise generated from the machine shop would be distracting and would interfere with classroom instruction.

District staff also investigated whether it would be possible to relocate Phoenix High to one of the school sites that were closed during the school year to help address the District's budget deficit. One of the main criteria for school closures was the underutilization of the school site due to low enrollment numbers. In order to fully utilize facility space and to satisfy legal obligations to the District's charter schools under Proposition 39, these sites will house a combination of several District and/or charter schools. It is not feasible for Phoenix High to share space in this manner, because it would require the District to commingle students in comprehensive programs with students who have been expelled for a serious violation of District rules.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> In the context of Community Day Schools (which also serve students who have been expelled), the Education Code acknowledges the problem of commingling students in comprehensive schools with students who have been expelled. Cal. Educ. Code Section 48661(a).

### ***Recommendation 1b: Relocate Immediately the Phoenix Campus***

SFUSD should move immediately to relocate the CCS Phoenix School campus.

#### ***Responses***

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

This recommendation requires further analysis, as described above.

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**June 30, 2005**

As noted above, the District determined that relocation of the Phoenix High School site is not currently feasible. However, the Director of County Community Schools has taken action to improve the physical quality of the facility located at 1950 Mission. The entire facility has been cleaned, reorganized and enhanced to increase the physical resources available to Phoenix High School students.

The facility has been updated to include a computer lab with an LCD screen that is used for classroom instruction, online courses (such as Drivers Education) and Cooperative Vocational Education. The site also has a new library, and a multipurpose room that houses health and wellness information, as well as information about community resources for students, parents and guardians. This room is also used to house a social worker that works directly with students and also refers them to outside community resources. The room is used to hold girls counseling groups, and will be used as a recreational area with a ping pong table and other games for students. The site also includes space that is used for parent group meetings.

The site includes offices for a secretary, counselors, and an office for a parent liaison assigned to county community schools. Two curriculum specialists will be hired for the 2005-2006 school year to support teachers in the county community schools, a Program Administrator to oversee English Language Learner programs in county schools, and an English Language Development teacher will be hired as well. As part of the reorganization, the Director distributed new textbooks that were located at this site to all county community schools, and created a textbook room to store extra copies of these resources.

The external areas of the facility have been improved to provide a tented eating and gathering area, a basketball court and a volleyball court, and flower boxes have been added around classrooms. During the summer of 2005, the entire outdoor area of the school will be re-surfaced. The Director has also worked with San Francisco Police Department Captain Goldberg to arrange for officers to closely patrol the areas surrounding the schools, and the school has posted prominent signs that warn of enhanced penalties for drug activity within a school zone.

***Recommendation 1c: The New Phoenix Campus Should Be Ready by the 2004-2005 school year.***

Ideally, a new Phoenix School campus would be ready for the 2004-2005 school year.

***Responses***

**Arlene Ackerman  
Superintendent of Schools  
San Francisco Unified School District  
August 30, 2004**

This recommendation requires further analysis, as described above.

**Arlene Ackerman  
Superintendent of Schools  
San Francisco Unified School District  
June 30, 2005**

As noted above, the District determined that relocation of the Phoenix High School site is not currently feasible. The physical improvements made to the Phoenix High School site are described above.

***Recommendation 1d: Relocate the Community Youth Center From Polk Street***

A secondary priority is the relocation of the Community Youth Center's one- room school from its location on Polk Street, above a strip joint.

***Responses***

**Arlene Ackerman  
Superintendent of Schools  
San Francisco Unified School District  
August 30, 2004**

This recommendation is in the process of implementation. CYC is currently in the process of negotiating a new lease for their site to be relocated to Van Ness and Sutter.

**Arlene Ackerman  
Superintendent of Schools  
San Francisco Unified School District  
June 30, 2005**

The Community Youth Center one-room school that was located on Polk Street has been closed, and in the 2004-2005 school year students were relocated to a new site.

***Recommendation 1e: Prepare to Replace All One-Room Schools in the County System***

The five-year plan should include preparations to replace all one-room schools in the county system.

## **Responses**

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

This recommendation is currently in the process of implementation. The District agrees that single site classes should be eliminated and is in the process of evaluating those sites for relocation. In addition to taking steps to move CYC to a new location, the Potrero Hill Neighborhood Center school site has been moved to the Principal's Center Collaborative Campus.

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**June 30, 2005**

The District has closed all county community single room schools, and has consolidated these small schools into four main campuses that are able to provide more comprehensive support and resources. The single room schools that were closed include Community Youth Center, Potrero Hill Neighborhood Center, and Ella Hill Hutch. Under this new reorganization, each campus delivers comprehensive core curriculum with a strong academic focus. The four campuses are listed below:

- Phoenix Campus: Provides core 9-12 curriculum, Special Day Class, Resource Specialist, English Language Learner support, and a middle school component.
- Principal Center Collaborative: This collaboration between SFUSD and Juvenile Probation provides core 9-12 curriculum, Special Day Class, Resource Specialist, and English Language Learner support. The campus holds three programs including: Project Impact, Youth Treatment Education Court (education and youth substance abuse treatment), SF Girls and Boys Group Home (Bay High). The site also holds a new Youth Guidance Transition Center, which provides a transition program for students who are re-entering the District after being confined to the Youth Guidance Center for a short period of time.
- Community Scholars of Success: Provides core 9-12 curriculum, Resource Specialist, English Language Learner support.
- Sunshine Campus: Provides core 9-12 curriculum, Special Day Class (Hilltop), Resource Specialist, English Language Learner support. This site houses the Real Alternatives High School and the Hilltop School (for pregnant minors).

The county programs have partnered with Pupil Services to develop an Intake Center located at the School of the Arts. This three week program offers assessment, counseling, school review, case management and enrollment options. This program was created to support appropriate academic placement, and to ease the student's return to school after being referred to Pupil Services due to habitual truancy or behavioral issues. Students obtain 5 credits for successful completion of the Intake program.

Next year, county teachers will receive more curricular support through the county's newly developed instructional reform model. The model's design has each site administrator assigned to a specific academic department. Each administrator, in conjunction with two new curriculum specialists, is responsible for conducting monthly meetings to align all county programs to standardized instruction. The curriculum will be mapped to core assessments that will be used to measure what students have learned, and to track teaching strategies employed by the teachers. All county teachers have obtained CLAD certification.

---

## **Finding 2: The San Francisco Unified School District Should Ensure That County Community Schools Per-Student Allotments Are Being Used for Intended Purposes**

**Finding 2.1:** It was only after repeated requests to various administrators that this CGJ committee was able to obtain budget print outs for SFUSD. The committee found it almost impossible to sort out the columns of figures in order to determine sources of funding for city schools and funding for county schools. The committee was able to ascertain that the 2003/2004 funding for CCS is approximately \$93 million, and the budget for County Community Schools, not including court schools or locked facilities, is almost \$4.5 million, a discrepancy that is unexplained in documents or by administration. What is of additional interest is per-student allotments:

- In the city of San Francisco's secondary schools, per-student amounts range from a low of \$3976.68 at Lincoln High School to a high of \$6497.53 at Balboa High School.
- The per-student allotment *for* CCS should be approximately \$8,000, but CGJ members could only verify a per capita expenditure of approximately \$1250. (Figures derived from information submitted to CGJ by SFUSD's Chief Business Officer.)

### ***Response to Finding***

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

Disagree. The revenue specifically generated for County / Community Schools totaled approximately \$3.7 million for school year 2003-2004. However, this amount is also supplemented by other funding sources that provide CCS with a total budget of \$7.1 million. CCS students that are on probation or are in the Youth Guidance Center are allocated approximately \$8,049 per average daily attendance (ADA). Pregnant minors are allocated approximately \$7,955 per ADA, and all other county youth are allocated \$4,761 per ADA.

Preliminary average daily attendance reports for these schools show an average attendance of 555 students per day. It is important to note that while as many as 1,200 students may be in County/ Community programs at some point in the year, the average daily attendance – on which revenue is based – is substantially lower due to the interim nature of many of the placements.

The total revenue for the County School Service Fund (CSSF) is approximately \$93 million. While County/ Community Schools are included in the CSSF, the bulk of the CSSF dollars are generated by and dedicated to special education programs.

The District does not have a uniform per-student allotment that is determined by school site. The District uses the Weighted Student Formula in order to allocate funds to each comprehensive

school. Pursuant to the Weighted Student Formula, there is a uniform base amount of funding that is allocated for each high school student. However, this amount is adjusted to address the special needs of each individual student at a particular school. For example, additional funding is added to the base amount if the student receives free and reduced lunch, participates in the Special Education program, or is bilingual. Therefore, students with special needs bring additional funding to their school so that the school can address those needs. Each student will bring the same amount of funding with them (based on special needs or absence thereof) regardless of which site they attend. (CCS does not utilize the Weighted Student Formula, but Lincoln and Balboa High School are allocated funds through WSF).

**Finding 2.2:** Although the Superintendent and the Board of Education members function separately for the city schools and for the county schools, it is not apparent that two separate budgets are maintained. Since the schools function independently and since funding sources are not the same, it would be reasonable to keep separate budgets to insure that each entity gets and uses all the money to which it is entitled.

### ***Response to Finding***

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

Disagree. The District's financial accounting is maintained in accordance with the Standardized Account Code Structure (SACS) as required by California Education Code. As such, the District tracks all revenue, budgets, and expenditures by fund, resource, goal, function, object and organization code. In this structure, County funds are designated as Fund 05. Furthermore, County / Community Schools, Log Cabin, Woodside Learning Center, and the Hilltop Program have separate organization codes that allow for tracking of budgets and expenditures within each organization code.

### ***Recommendation 2a: Make Budgets Available for Authorized Agencies***

SFUSD should make its budget readily available for inspection by authorized agencies, in particular, the Civil Grand Jury.

### ***Responses***

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

The Grand Jury Report acknowledges that the Civil Grand Jury has obtained budget print outs for SFUSD. With regard to other agencies, SFUSD will implement this recommendation through its compliance with the applicable provisions of the Public Records Act, California Government Code Section 6250 et seq.

**Arlene Ackerman  
Superintendent of Schools  
San Francisco Unified School District  
June 30, 2005**

SFUSD continues to comply with the provisions of the Public Records Act, California Government Code Section 6250 et seq.

***Recommendation 2b: Present Clear Budget Information***

Budget information should be presented clearly, if possible, with explanatory summaries.

***Responses***

**Arlene Ackerman  
Superintendent of Schools  
San Francisco Unified School District  
August 30, 2004**

SFUSD will implement this recommendation to the extent that it is consistent with the applicable provisions of the Public Records Act, California Government Code Section 6250 et seq.

**Arlene Ackerman  
Superintendent of Schools  
San Francisco Unified School District  
June 30, 2005**

SFUSD continues to comply with the provisions of the Public Records Act, California Government Code Section 6250 et seq.

***Recommendation 2c: Keep Separate Budgets for the Two School Systems***

To insure the equitable distribution of funds and to avoid co-mingling of assets, two separate budgets should be kept for the separate school systems of city and county.

***Responses***

**Arlene Ackerman  
Superintendent of Schools  
San Francisco Unified School District  
August 30, 2004**

This recommendation is unnecessary because the District current budget system separately tracks county community funds. The District's financial accounting is maintained in accordance with the Standardized Account Code Structure (SACS) as required by California Education Code. As such, the District tracks all revenue, budgets, and expenditures by fund, resource, goal, function, object and organization code. In this structure, County funds are designated as Fund 05. Furthermore, County / Community Schools, Log Cabin, Woodside Learning Center, and the Hilltop Program have separate organization codes that allow for tracking of budgets and expenditures within each organization code.

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**June 30, 2005**

As noted in the original response, this recommendation is unnecessary because the District current budget system separately tracks county community funds.

---

**Finding 3: The San Francisco Unified School District Does Not Fulfill Its Promise of Excellence for All**

**Finding 3.1:** In spite of its per capita allotment of approximately \$8,000, County Community Schools offer the minimum schooling and services required by California law- a 240-minute instructional day, minimum services, no libraries or librarians, no physical education or coaches, no music or art, no vocational training or community service--"bare bones" services.

***Response to Finding***

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

Partially disagree. The County Community School (CCS) system was not intended to function as a comprehensive school system. Instead, students were intended to enter county community schools for a short period of time, and then return to the comprehensive school system.

Notwithstanding this fact, SFUSD began taking steps two years ago to improve the quality of county community education, and to make CCS more like the comprehensive school system.

In 2004-2005 all county community schools will provide at least 280 minutes of instruction each day. Additionally, SFUSD has added various services to the county school programs, including hiring a parent liaison, a county nurse, a social worker, a truancy officer, establishment of an intake center, and purchase of on-line courses. The four main county community sites will have libraries, and the District has also purchased new computers. SFUSD is working with the YMCA in order to obtain physical education support.

The District is also working with the California Department of Education and has assigned a full time special education content specialist to county community schools to provide professional development and intensive monitoring of all special education programs in our county community schools. The District has increased the Resource Specialist allocation to four .6 Full Time Employment (FTE) teachers as compared to two 1.0 FTE teachers last year.

The District purchased new texts for all county community programs including reading and math interventions, as well as the new middle school language arts adoption. Specific trainings and professional development were provided for all county community teachers for the use of these new academic programs.

The District is working collaboratively with the Juvenile Probation Department to expand Project Impact (a court school) by allocating a special education teacher and paraprofessional. The YTEC

program was also selected by the SFUSD Secondary Redesign Initiative to become a community day school in fall 2004. Finally, the District will open Get Out And Learn (GOAL), a new outdoor experiential county program, in fall 2004.

The District will be continuing this two year process of restructuring its county community schools. During this process, school locations, teacher allocations, and funding will be analyzed. The District is committed to providing excellent education to all public school students.

**Finding 3.2:** The County of San Francisco is eligible to apply to the California Department of Education to become part of the enriched Community Day Schools Program. By so doing, SFUSD would increase funding for county schools, upgrade the curriculum, acquire additional services, and keep at-risk students in the classroom for a full school day.

### ***Response to Finding***

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

This recommendation requires further analysis over the next six months to determine whether the development of more Community Day Schools would be appropriate and effective within the District. However, the District has already increased the school day for county community students, and has increased support to these students, as described above in section 3.1. It is unclear whether the Community Day School system is the most effective way to provide increased service to county community students.

### ***Recommendation 3a: Replace County Community Schools with Community Day Schools***

Replace the minimum-service County Community Schools with the more challenging Community Day Schools.

### ***Responses***

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

This recommendation requires further analysis over the next six months to determine whether the development of more Community Day Schools would be appropriate and effective within the District. However, the District has already increased the school day for county community students, and has increased support to these students, as described above in section 3.1. It is unclear whether the Community Day School system is the most effective way to provide increased service to county community students.

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**June 30, 2005**

The Director of County Community Schools and three of the CCS site administrators attended a conference in Sacramento to learn more about Community Day Schools. In May 2005, the CCS Director and the four CCS administrators made a presentation to the SFUSD Board of Education Curriculum Committee regarding the programs and services provided by county community schools.

Among the topics discussed was the possibility of developing Community Day Schools in the District. Daniel Sackheim, the Community Day Schools consultant for the California Department of Education, made a presentation on this topic and distributed detailed information about the benefits and requirements associated with Community Day Schools.

CCS staff determined that developing Community Day Schools was not necessary, because the District has already taken action to provide many of the enhanced resources available through Community Day Schools. For example, the District has extended the instructional minutes provided in CCS, has provided a low pupil-teacher ratio, school counselors, individualized instruction, and specified services for youth on probation.

The District has also provided enhanced support and resources such as a social worker, parent liaison, and attendance liaison. Additionally, the District is planning to hire two curriculum specialists, a Program Administrator to oversee English Language Learner programs in county schools and an English Language Development teacher for the 2005-2006 school year. Finally, the District already receives enhanced per-student apportionments for students on probation, many of whom are in county community schools.

***Recommendation 3b: Use All Available Funding to Upgrade to Community Day Schools***

Use all available funding for county schools by upgrading and making the necessary commitment to Community Day Schools.

***Responses***

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

This recommendation requires further analysis over the next six months to determine whether the development of more Community Day Schools would be appropriate and effective within the District. However, the District has already increased the school day for county community students, and has increased support to these students, as described above in section 3.1. It is unclear whether the Community Day School system is the most effective way to provide increased service to county community students.

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**June 30, 2005**

See update to 3a, above.

---

#### **Finding 4: The San Francisco Unified School District Needs to Provide Information on the Success of the County Community Schools**

**Finding 4.1:** On its website, the School District has a section entitled, "About SFUSD." While it is not specifically addressing the County Community Schools, the clear implication is that the article addresses *all schools* under its jurisdiction. These are some points that are made:

- [San Francisco's comprehensive plan for improvement is] a commitment to providing an *excellent* education to all public school students.
- We have established *rigorous* academic standards indicating what all students are expected to know and be able to do.
- If we are to achieve our vision of an excellent education for all students, we must provide more intensive help to struggling schools and students.
- Additional funds are provided to schools for each English Language Learner, each Special Education student, and each student living in poverty. These students are recognized as having greater educational needs.
- Our comprehensive, five-year plan, Excellence for All, identifies several needed task forces to address important issues facing SFUSD, including high school and middle school reorganization. . . . [Emphasis added.]

Notwithstanding its good intentions, SFUSD has made no mention of its dual role as city *and* county administrations. A reasonable inference to be drawn is that this five-year plan applies only to the district's city schools and does not provide for excellence in the CCS.

#### **Response to Finding**

**Arlene Ackerman**  
**Superintendent of Schools**  
**San Francisco Unified School District**  
**August 30, 2004**

Disagree. Excellence for All applies to all SFUSD schools, including both comprehensive and county community schools. County community schools utilize the same curriculum and are expected to meet the same academic standards as comprehensive schools. County community schools also receive additional intensive support such as reading and math interventions, truancy liaisons, parent liaisons, a nurse, and a social worker. Beginning in the 2004-2005 school year, SFUSD teams will provide county community schools with instructional walkthroughs and feedback on their instructional programs. Finally, county community students receive the same additional funding that is provided for students who are English Language Learners, participants in Special Education, or who are low income students.

**Finding 4.2:** Civil Grand Jury members spoke to an assistant administrator of Phoenix. The person did not know that there is no information on the District's website about County Schools. S/he could not recommend any publications with information and said, "Call the district." S/he was even unaware of the handout CGJ members had received on which are listed the eighteen schools and their teachers and/or contacts.

### ***Response to Finding***

**Arlene Ackerman  
Superintendent of Schools  
San Francisco Unified School District  
August 30, 2004**

Unable to agree or disagree. This is a description of a conversation and not a factual finding.

**Finding 4.3:** Several telephone conferences were conducted with teachers and/or directors. Most were followed up with school tours by CGJ members. The results are as follows:

- A representative of RAP/Hilltop Campus and RAP High School, said that there are actually two separate schools—one for pregnant teenagers, designed to meet their special needs; and RAP High School for students who are suspended, expelled or have dropped out. The representative is very enthusiastic about the good job they are doing at RAP with 75-80 students yearly. Approximately 25% of the students graduate with a regular SFUSD diploma. The school day is 8:30 AM-2: 30 PM, and the campus is located in a safe neighborhood. The person encouraged the CGJ to "drop by for a visit" and gave the committee copies of handouts that are distributed to incoming students.
- A representative of Community Scholars of Success Campus has been a part of County Schools since their inception in 1988. This person said that the program began with 18-20 youths in a single location and has grown to over 1300 children at eighteen locations. 72 students are currently enrolled at Community Scholars of Success Campus, and 10-15 earn diplomas each year. Wrap-around services (mental health, social workers, medical care) are available on campus. The representative agreed with CGJ members' impression that the work of these dedicated teachers is pretty much ignored, and the achievements of graduating seniors are not celebrated.
- Community Youth Center has 19-20 students, from grades 6-12. Achievements are a source of pride—especially the graduation of 18 students in 2003. A teacher will be retiring in June of 2004, and worries about whom the District will find as a replacement. Before coming to CYC, the instructor taught at Phoenix High School for two frustrating years, hating the location and the drug trading and prostitution that were carried on openly in the area. This person found the students to be very distracted (and, in some cases, corrupted) by the environs. By comparison, the Chinatown location of CYC "is ideal." The interviewee would like to see the school better supplied, especially since probation students bring more money to the district than do students who are not part of the Juvenile Justice System.
- A Walden House Schools employee discussed the basic difference between locked facility schools and the other County Day Schools. Boys and girls attend separate schools. Almost all of the students have criminal records, and most have serious mental health problems. The school is frustrated in attempting to get appropriate IEPs (Individual Education Plans) for students; the District is dilatory and resistant. The representative described the situation of one student who