

CPA

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS

Please check review type below:

LEA Self-Review CDE Validation Other _____

CCS Code	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	County	SAN FRANCISCO
LEA Name:	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED							Cooperative:	
SELPA	SAN FRANCISCO UN							Migrant Region:	1
CCR Coordinator:	Mary Welsh-Byrd				Phone:	(415) 750-8555		Review dates:	05/11-05/22/98

Forms CTS-1a through CTS-1h represent the official report of findings of the LEA's self-review or the California Department of Education's (CDE) validation review regarding the compliance status of the district or agency.

Signatures and Distribution. Forms CTS-1a through CTS-1h must be completed by the LEA CCR Coordinator or the CDE team leader. Copies will be distributed as follows: original and one copy to the CDE, one copy to the district LEA representative, and one to each applicable regional LEA administrator (i.e., cooperative, migrant region, SELPA, county). For LEA self-reviews: These forms are to be completed and submitted at least 30 days prior to the CDE validation review. Mail the original and one copy to:

California Department of Education
CCR Teams Management Unit
P.O. Box 944272
Sacramento, CA 94244-2720

Required Response. For noncompliance findings identified by the CDE review team, the LEA is required to resolve each finding within 45 calendar days of the exit date of the review. In those cases when certain issues cannot be resolved within the required 45-calendar-day period, the LEA must submit a proposed compliance agreement. In either case the LEA must respond by submitting a completed "Proposed Resolution of Noncompliance Findings," Form CTS-4 or CTS-4m in Section IV of the Coordinated Compliance Review Training Guide.

For noncompliant validation review results only: The date by which your agency must submit its "Proposed Resolution of Noncompliance Findings" is: 07/06/98

Assurance. I certify that a complete Coordinated Compliance Review has been conducted. Each applicable program compliance instrument has been applied. The findings in this report are complete and accurate and identify all items found to be noncompliant.

Signatures:

LEA CCR Coordinator:

Mary Welsh-Byrd
Signature

Mary Welsh-Byrd

Typed name

May 22, 1998

Date

CDE CCR Team Leader:

V. Burton
Signature

V. Burton

Typed name

May 22, 1998

Date

For CDE use only:	
Log:	_____
CTS:	6-9-98
Route:	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
 NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

CDS Code	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------	-----------------------

Assurance for self-review only: I have completed a review of the programs listed below using the appropriate Coordinated Compliance Review instrument(s); I applied all compliance items and tests and the findings in this report are complete and accurate and identify all items found to be noncompliant.

Programs reviewed and CDE program phone numbers	Names of reviewer(s)	Signature of reviewer(s)
Integrated programs items (916) 657-2754	V. Burton, D. Carlson	<i>V. Burton</i>
Uniform complaint procedures (916) 657-4674	V. Burton	<i>V. Burton</i>
Adult education (916) 322-5013		
CalServe (916) 657-5442	M. Brugh	<i>M. Brugh</i>
Child development (916) 322-6233	E. Garcia	<i>E. Garcia</i>
Consolidated programs (916) 657-2973	R. Thomas, W. Misquez	<i>R. Thomas</i>
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities/Tobacco Use Prevention Education (916) 657-2810	G. Duck, D. J. Peterson	<i>G. Duck</i>
Eisenhower program (916) 657-4865	E. D'Souza	<i>E. D'Souza</i>
Gender equity (916) 657-2813	A. Hetman, G. Johnson, J. Cohen	<i>Alicia Hetman</i>
Early Start (916) 657-3532	Barbara Mahn	<i>Barbara Mahn</i>
Special education (916) 445-4741	G. Rezvani, C. Conrado, T. Hawthorne, S. Westaby	<i>G. Rezvani, C. Conrado, T. Hawthorne, S. Westaby</i>
Vocational education (916) 657-2532	R. Tardif	<i>Robert F. Tardif, Ph.D.</i>
Vocational education civil rights (916) 657-2532	R. Tardif	<i>Robert F. Tardif, Ph.D.</i>
Other reviewer(s)	S. Gilman-Ponce, L. Burnham-Massey, N. Gold	<i>S. Gilman-Ponce, L. Burnham-Massey, N. Gold</i>

Assurance for LEAs that receive a Document Review (for self-review only): I have participated in the self-review for this district; compliance items and tests have been applied.

Consolidated Programs Cooperative Director or Designee (if applicable)	
Grant Region Director (if applicable)	
LEA Director (if applicable)	
Other	

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

CDS Code	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------	-----------------------

List the school sites included in the LEA self-review or CDE validation review and check the program(s) that were reviewed at each site.

Site Name	IP:	UCP	Adult Ed	Col Serve	Child Dev	C.E Pre- Inchl	Con Prog	S&DF SC/TUPE	Eisenhower	Gndr Eqty	Hig Ed	Spec Ed	VocEd /CR	Early Start
WELLS (IDA B.)										X		X	X	
DOWNTOWN HIGH ¹										X		X	X	
BURTON (PHILLIP)	X			X			X	X		X		X	X	
BALBOA HIGH	X						X	X		X		X	X	
MISSION HIGH							X							
PRESIDIO CHILD CARE														X
FAMILY DEV. CENTER					X									
LAFAYETTE					X									
REDDING					X									
SAN MIGUEL					X									
HARTE (BRET) EL				X								X		
GOLDEN GATE ELE	X						X	X		X		X		
HILLCREST ELEME												X		
SWETT (JOHN) EL	X			X			X	X		X		X		
SANCHEZ ELEMENT	X						X	X		X		X		
STARR KING ELEM	X						X	X		X		X		
TREASURE ISLAND	X						X	X		X		X		
JAMES LICK MIDD	X			X			X	X		X		X		
OUR LADY OF THE VISI							X							
WOODSIDE LEARNING CENTER (JUVENILE HALL)							X	X				X		

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code:	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5)	(Col6)	(Col7)
(Col1)	(Col2)	(Col3)	(Col4)			
Numerical & Program	Item	Test Letter	Subprg.	Site Name	CR or CA	Description of noncompliance
						<p>CONSOLIDATED PROGRAMS</p> <p><u>Commendations</u></p> <p>The district and school sites are commended for ensuring that categorically funded students access core instruction through the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Success For All - Reading Recovery/Literacy - Tutorial Programs, before and after school - Linkages with the community for provision of tutorial support - Technology throughout the curriculum - After school science program <p>The staff, students and parents are commended for establishing a positive school environment for all students. The district and school communicate with the community through written and recorded information regarding school programs and activities in the language best understood by the parents or guardians of the students.</p> <p>The Burton H.S., staff, parents, and students are commended for the implementation of the Before/After School and Saturday Enrichment and Reading/Writing/Math Labs that are staffed with certificated teachers and student aides.</p> <p>The school staff is commended for their participation in many staff development activities (e.g. portfolios, state standard and guidelines, inservice across curriculum areas, readers workshops). Members attend conferences and workshops as participants and return to share information with their collegue.</p> <p>The Starr King staff and parents are commended for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the Daily School-wide Reading Program "Drop Everything and Read" (DEAR), that has been very successful • Implementation of a strong parent support and active participation by providing parent programs, based on the assessed needs of the students and community.

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code:	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5) Site Name	(Col6) CR C CA	(Col7) Description of noncompliance
(Col1) Numeral & Program	(Col2) Item	(Col3) Test Letter	(Col4) Subprg.			
CONSOLIDATED PROGRAMS						
<u>Noncompliance</u>						
I CON	1			District	CA	While the district has instituted a system-wide assessment program, explicit and measurable criteria have not been established by the governing board to determine that the district and each school's consolidated programs are effective.
V CON	27			Starr King	CR	There is no school-parent compact.
VI CON	34			Burton H.S.	CR	Since there is not a functioning SSC, the following requirements have not been met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership Requirements • Rules and responsibilities regarding the budget and school level plan. (V Con 25)
VII CON	37	a		District Burton H.S. Balboa H.S. Mission H.S. James Lick	NOW	The evidence provided does not verify that staff (teachers and aides) paid with consolidated program funds supplement and do not supplant the basic education program.
VII CON	37	b		James Lick M.S.	NOW	Multifunded instructional aides do not maintain written evidence that the duties performed and the proportion of time spent for those duties are appropriate to the funding sources used.
VII CON	40	k		Balboa H.S. Burton H.S. Starr King	CA	The educational program, as described in the plan, does not provide specific supplementary instructional and auxiliary services for the following student populations: Limited-English-Proficient, Educationally Disadvantaged, Gifted and Talented, and Special Education Students/Students with Special Needs. If Special Education is included in the SBCP, the school site Plan must describe the services provided by the special education personnel to identified and non identified students.

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District Code	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name SAN FRANCISCO UNIFED
----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------------------

This form is a summary. Complete only one for each district. For a cooperative, complete a separate form for each member district.

Column 1 - Items: The number of items/tests in each program's compliance instrument is displayed.

Column 2 - Noncompliant: If a program has any noncompliance findings, enter the number below and describe the specific findings on form CTS-1e (forms CTS-1f, and 1g, and 1h for IPI). If a program is totally compliant, enter a "0".

Code	Program	(Col 1) Total Items	(Col 2) # Non- compliant	Code	Program	(Col 1) Total Items	(Col 2) # Non- compliant
IP	Integrated programs	[4]	<u>1</u>	<u>Child Development (C)</u>			
UCP	Uniform complaint	[1]	<u>1</u>	APP	Alternative payment	[19]	<u> </u>
A	Adult education	[35]	<u> </u>	ARP	At-Risk program	[35]	<u> </u>
CPS	Comp. ed. preschool	[23]	<u> </u>	FBG	Federal block grant	[37]	<u> </u>
CS	CalServe	[12]	<u>0</u>	FCC	Family child care	[22]	<u> </u>
CON	Consolidated programs	[53]	<u>6</u>	GEN	General child	[25]	<u>0</u>
	LEP Program		<u>6</u>	MFB	Migrant federal based	[26]	<u> </u>
G	Gender equity	[24]	<u>13</u>	MGB	Migrant state based	[25]	<u> </u>
IKE	Eisenhower	[7]	<u>1</u>	R&R	Resource & referral	[14]	<u> </u>
M	Migrant education	[24]	<u> </u>	SAC	School-age c	[25]	<u>0</u>
S	Special education	[77]	<u>30</u>	SH	Severely handicapped	[20]	<u> </u>
SEEI	Special ed. early start	[23]	<u>4</u>	SPD	School-age parenting	[25]	<u>0</u>
S&D/F&C	Safe & drug-free	[16]	<u>0</u>	SPS	State preschool	[23]	<u>0</u>
TUPÉ	Tobacco-use prevention	[12]	<u>1</u>				
V	Vocational education	[30]	<u>0</u>				
VCR	Voc. ed. civil rights	[36]	<u>1</u>				

**1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)**

County/District code:	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5) Site Name	(Col6) CR or CA	(Col7) Description of noncompliance
(Col1) Numeral & Program	(Col2) Item	(Col3) Test Letter	(Col4) Subprg.			
						<p align="center">CALSERVE</p> <p><u>Commendation</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The San Francisco Unified School District is commended for the progress it has made in achieving goal of providing opportunities for all students to learn the content standards through establishing district-wide policy for service-learning. The district is also commended for including service learning as one of the required elements in the school site portfolio. A wide variety of instructional designs for service-learning were found at each of the schools visited and there is evidence of strong district level administrative support through the Department of Curriculum Improvement and Professional Development and the Department of State and Federal Funded Projects. A special commendation is in order for the Linking San Francisco Program. Through their efforts, San Francisco Unified has become a recognized leader in service-learning within the state and nationally.

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5) Site Name	(Col6) CR or CA	(Col7) Description of noncompliance
(Col1) Numeral & Program	(Col2) Item	(Col3) Test Letter	(Col4) Subprg.			
						<p style="text-align: center;">CHILD DEVELOPMENT</p> <p><u>Commendations</u></p> <p>The child development program site-directors and their staff are commended for their passionate issuance of guidance, supervision, and instruction for enrolled children and their families.</p> <p>All child development program administrators are commended for establishing an exemplary professional development program and a wonderful parent handbook.</p> <p>All child development staff are commended for the excellent manner they used to organize information and documentation for this review.</p> <p>The site directors and their staff are commended for their passion to support children and their families.</p> <p><u>Noncompliance</u></p> <p>Issues of noncompliance were not evident in the school age community child care, state preschool, school age parenting and Infant Development Program, and General Child Development programs.</p>

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code:	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5)	(Col6)	(Col7)
(Col1)	(Col2)	(Col3)	(Col4)			
Numeral & Program	Item	Test Letter	Subprg.	Site Name	CR or CA	Description of noncompliance
						<p>STATE PROGRAM FOR LIMITED ENGLISH-PROFICIENCY STUDENTS</p> <p>Commendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district is commended for the significant progress in providing appropriate services to LEP students that has been made since the last Coordinated Compliance Review. The Language Academy Schools are commended for their commitment to develop quality language programs using the 10 Academic Master Principles. Further, the district's two way programs go beyond minimal compliance and enrich students with the benefit of additive bilingualism. These programs are being implemented in Cantonese, Korean and Spanish for Limited-English-proficient and native English speaking students. The district is commended for providing students opportunity to participate in the Language Olympics which give recognition and value for superior academic work in many of the district's languages. The Fook Yum Parent Institute, a partnership between the Chinese community and the school district and the Latino Parent Center are commended for providing seminars and leadership training for parents as well as enrichment classes and tutoring for children. In addition, The Latino Parent Leadership program prepared a cadre of thirty parents to take more active roles in improving their schools. The districtwide "Maximizing Potential" professional development program presents knowledge and skills in current approaches to teaching the academic curriculum through both the first and second language.

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5) Site Name	(Col6) CR or CA	(Col7) Description of noncompliance
(Col1) Numeral & Program	(Col2) Item	(Col3) Test/ Letter	(Col4) Subprg.			
CON 12				District	CA	<p>Noncompliant</p> <p>Not all LEP students receive ELD instruction appropriate to their English proficiency level. The district's ELD program is not yet clearly articulated. However, actions are underway to resolve this issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft ELD Standards (K-12) are being piloted at some schools. • An assessment rubric is being developed and piloted to go with the standards. • ELD core curriculum guides are being developed. • ELD textbooks and related materials will be adopted by fall 1998.
CON 13				Treasure Island	CA	<p>Not all LEP students whose diagnosis makes academic instruction in the primary language necessary receive such instruction. Cantonese and Spanish speaking LEP students in grades K-1 do receive primary language instruction when necessary in bilingual classes. However, LEP students at the beginning levels of English language proficiency in grades 2-7 do not receive primary language instruction or support as appropriate. A review of student grades indicate that many of these students are not fully accessing the district's core curriculum.</p>
CON 24				Burton	CA	<p>Adequate inservice training has not been provided to qualify personnel in the teaching skills necessary to serve each LEP student. Specific additional training is needed for ELD teachers to guide them toward greater consistency in the use of a common ELD curriculum and materials. Only 8% of EIA funds are currently spent for training or instructional materials. Additional professional development is needed for administrators, counselors, teachers of .6 (SDAIE) classes and regular content classes to accomplish the following:</p>

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code:	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5) Site Name	(Col6) CR or CA	(Col7) Description of noncompliance
(Col1) Numeral & Program	(Col2) Item	(Col3) Test Letter	(Col4) Subprg.			
CON 32	a			Burton James Lick	CA	<p>1. Ensure a clear understanding of how LEP students are to be placed and served at the high school level, and</p> <p>2. Build on the skills of CLAD teachers and teachers-in training so that they can improve the systematic implementation of ELD curriculum and use of materials.</p> <p>There is not a functioning site Bilingual Advisory Committee that has met legal requirements.</p>
CON 35				Burton	CA	The 1998 R-30 Language Census does not accurately report the number LEP of students, how those students are served, or the numbers of staff serving them.
CON 39	b			Mission James Lick	CA	The evidence provided does not verify that teachers paid with EIA/LEP and EIA/SCE funds supplement, and do not supplant the district general funds. Several core curriculum classroom teachers are funded out of EIA/LEP and EIA/SCE funds.

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code.	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------	-----------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5) Site Name	(Col6) CR or CA	(Col7) Description of noncompliance
(Col1) Numeral & Program	(Col2) Item	(Col3) Test Letter	(Col4) Subprg.			
						GENDER EQUITY
						<p><u>Commendations</u></p> <p>Balboa High School is commended for the Women's History Month activities.</p> <p>Sanchez Elementary School is commended for children's projects and art work demonstrating awareness of Women's History Month</p> <p><u>Noncompliance</u></p>
III-G	3			Districtwide	CA	<p>Evidence was unavailable at the sites to determine if necessary steps are taken to correct gender disproportions in all course sections possible through recruitment, course description changes, course content changes, master schedules and/or individual schedule changes. The computer system used (Hemlock) has not provided site staff with ready access to the necessary reports to make it possible to examine gender balance, and site staff have not adequately addressed this issue.</p>
III-G	6			Burton HS Balboa HS	CA	<p>The locker rooms at Burton High School do not appear to be comparable and there is no evidence to indicate the outcomes of a comparability study of the existing locker rooms.</p> <p>The locker rooms at Balboa High School are not comparable; the boys locker room has fewer completed lockers and the restroom has not been adequately upgraded.</p> <p>Sites with locker rooms built prior to 1975 need to assure comparability and to determine whether the needs are met for each gender in the existing spaces.</p>
III-G	7			Districtwide	CA	<p>Evidence was not available to verify compliance with equal opportunity in athletics (noon intramurals, after-school sports -- all levels, elementary, middle and high school): Evidence is required to support compliance with one of the following three tests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Substantially proportional participation in athletic opportunities by both genders. 2) Selection of sports and levels of competition offered effectively accommodate the interest and abilities of the under-represented gender, (G-R), or evidence of a history and continuing practice to increase athletic opportunities for the under-represented gender

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------	-----------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5)	(Col6)	(Col7)
(Col1)	(Col2)	(Col3)	(Col4)			
Numeral & Program	Item	Test Letter	Subprg.	Site Name	CR or CA	Description of noncompliance
IV-G	10			Districtwide	CA	Insufficient evidence was available to verify that the professional development activities conducted by the district include specific strategies for identifying and eliminating gender bias.
IV-G	11			District	CA	The district's adopted board policies on non-discrimination for students and for employees are not adequately disseminated, on an annual basis, to all students and employees. The district does provide notification to parents.
IV-G	14			District	CA	The district's sexual harassment policies for students and for employees do not include information on pursuing available local remedies outside of the district process. The student policy is not board adopted and does not contain specific information for obtaining the rules and procedures for reporting charges of sexual harassment.
IV-G	16			Districtwide	CA	Evidence available indicates that the student sexual harassment policy is not posted in a prominent location at all sites.
IV-G	17			Districtwide	CA	Evidence available verified that not all new students (all grades with an age-appropriate presentation) receive a written copy of the district's adopted sexual harassment policy during an orientation session during the student's first quarter, semester, or summer session at each site. The district's "Student and Parent Handbook", used for some orientation sessions, incorrectly states that the policy only pertains to grades 4-12.
IV-G	18			District	CA	Evidence provided did not verify that all employees annually receive a copy of the district's adopted sexual harassment policy.
IV-G	19			Districtwide	CA	The district's board adopted sexual harassment policies do not appear in all site and district publications that set forth the rules, regulations, and standards of conduct. (Teacher handbooks, special education parent handbook, student handbooks, etc.)

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code:	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------	-----------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5) Site Name	(Col6) CR or CA	(Col7) Description of noncompliance
(Col1) Numeral & Program	(Col2) Item	(Col3) Test Letter	(Col4) Subprg.			
IV-G	20			Districtwide	CA	The district has not established a systematic plan to ensure that sites maintain complete and current records of all sexual harassment complaints brought forward by students and employees. The record keeping system varies at each site and none of the systems employed allowed for ready access to all sexual harassment complaints. Complaints/incident reports are kept in discipline files, with no cross-reference to victim, and sometimes only reported as vulgarity or spreading rumors rather than sexual harassment.
IV-G	22			Districtwide	CA	The non-discrimination complaint procedures and the sexual harassment complaint procedures are not published in all of the appropriate informational materials of the sites and the district. (Student handbooks, employee handbooks, special education parent handbook, adult education program guides, substitute teacher handbooks, etc.)
IV-G	24			Districtwide	CA	Evidence provided indicates that all employees and all students do not annually receive written notification of the identify of district's Title IX Coordinator.

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code:	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5) Site Name	(Col6) CR or CA	(Col7) Description of noncompliance
(Col1) Numeral & Program	(Col2) Item	(Col3) Test Letter	(Col4) Suborg.			
IKE	3			District	CR	<p style="text-align: center;">EISENHOWER</p> <p><u>Commendation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a well formulated professional development plan in Mathematics and Science. This plan has empowered teachers on special assignment, mentor teachers, site level principals and has assisted site level teachers with quality professional development. The plan has made a difference in student achievement in mathematics. It has also met the superintendent's goal of improving the mathematics achievement of low performing African-American, Latino and English Language Learners as reflected by the CTBS Math Scores. <p><u>Noncompliance</u></p> <p>There is no evidence that private non-profit school officials have been contacted and consulted about the needs of their students and teachers.</p>

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code:	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------	-----------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5)	(Col6)	(Col7)
(Col1)	(Col2)	(Col3)	(Col4)			
Numerical & Program	Item	Test Letter	Subprg	Site Name	CR or CA	Description of noncompliance
						<p style="text-align: center;">SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES (S& DFSC) TOBACCO USE PREVENTION EDUCATION (TUPE)</p> <p><u>Commendations</u></p> <p>The district and school health programs staff are commended for establishing a system of Health Education Teacher Leaders during the 1997-1998 school year. The Health Education Teacher Leaders (HTL's) are exemplary teachers that have shown a commitment to promoting health education at their school sites. HTLs were trained to assist in the design and presentation of professional development as well as support teachers by coaching, modeling, and assisting with health-related policy and health education curriculum implementation. By June, 1998 HTLs will have trained approximately 450 elementary school teachers (K-5), 60 middle school and 60 high school teachers including special education and bilingual teachers.</p> <p>The district and school health program staff are commended for establishing and supporting health advocates (elementary level) and Healthy School Teams (secondary level) at each site. The advocates and Healthy School Teams are offered staff development. Also, information and guidance services are provided to coordinate activities, resource information, and encourage implementation of health activities and newly adopted curriculum materials.</p> <p>The district and school health program staff are commended for assisting all school sites in assessing school safety. School sites were provided with the state safety surveys which were administered to students and staff. The results were tabulated and disseminated to school sites in order to develop Safe School Plans. The Safe School Plans are included in each school sites School Site Plan portfolio.</p>

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5) Site Name	(Col6) CR or CA	(Col7) Description of noncompliance
(Col1) Numeral & Program	(Col2) Item	(Col3) Test Letter	(Col4) Subprog.			
III- TUPE	4			District	CA	<p>S & DFSC and TUPE Commendations (Continued)</p> <p>The district school health program staff and sites are commended for the collaboration and use of community based organizations and resources. CBO's have been trained to better understand the needs of the school district. This collaboration has created an array of health-related resources for school sites. Examples are the variety of supplemental program activities for students at many sites such as Red Ribbon Week activities, Great American Smoke-Out poster contests, and other no-use pledge programs. The district and school health program staff are commended for providing the middle schools with positive alternatives to tobacco and drug use. The activities include ropes/backpacking trips, sailing trips, and before-school, lunch-time and after-school physical activities. These activities provide students with opportunities to participate in healthy behaviors rather than risky situations. The GRIP program, "voices of violence play", Saturday activities, "I search", "Project Respect", and Gang Intervention programs are commendable.</p> <p>The administration and staff at the Juvenile Hall are commended for their efforts to provide an environment in which students can learn and teachers can teach. Their commitment to students achieving the core curriculum, making maximum use of time in the Hall, and developing acceptable daily living skills are commendable. The computer center is on par with most schools in the state and supports core instruction for Title I eligible students.</p> <p><u>Noncompliance</u></p> <p>Adequate intervention services for tobacco-use such as counseling, peer counseling, cessation programs, and a system of referral to these programs are not available for students in grades 6-12 at most sites.</p>

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5) Site Name	(Col6) CR or CA	(Col7) Description of noncompliance
(Col1) Numera & Program	(Col2) Item	(Col3) Test Letter	(Col4) Subprg.			
I-ES	6			Presidio Early Intervention Program	CR	<p align="center">SPECIAL EDUCATION EARLY START</p> <p><u>Commendations</u></p> <p>The Early Start Program is commended for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strong family involvement component which includes parent at every step of the process. Parental concerns are addressed as a part of developing the Individualized Family Service Plan for each child. There are opportunities for participation in the classroom, and a variety of activities to help parents understand the needs of their child. Parents expressed a high level of satisfaction with the Early Start program. • An experienced well-trained instructional staff who provide a variety of program options for infants and toddlers. Both home based services and a center-based program are provided to meet the needs of children and families. A parent facilitator assists parents in understanding the program and conducts a weekly parent support group. A bilingual instructional aide also provides information and services for Spanish speaking families. • The provision of a wide range of staff development activities which include monthly meetings, site level meetings, district in-service training, and attendance at conferences. Staff members expressed appreciation for the opportunity to further develop their skills and knowledge and were unanimous in their praise for the support of the Early Start program administrator in providing these opportunities. • Location of the Early Start program at a Child Care Center which provides opportunities for interaction with non-handicapped peers and instruction in a natural environment. Children participate in joint activities at the Child Care Center, where opportunities for inclusion and social skill development are enhanced. <p><u>Non-Compliance Items</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation that a variety of evaluation and assessment instruments and procedures, as well as clinical judgment, was used to determine eligibility, was not present.

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code:	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5) Site Name	(Col6) CR or CA	(Col7) Description of noncompliance
(Col1) Numeral & Program	(Col2) Item	(Col3) Test Letter	(Col4) Suborg.			
I-ES	3			Presidio Early Intervention Program	CR	• Evaluations and assessments do not include the infant/ toddlers level of vision and hearing
II-ES	11			Presidio Early Intervention Program	CR	• A complete transition plan, which includes steps and procedures to support the transition of the child to pre-school is not included in the IFSP.
VI-ES	36			Presidio Early Intervention Program and Golden Gate Regional Center	CA	• Service coordination for students dually-served by the regional center is not an effective, on-going process. Timelines are often not met for assessment and reports are not sent to the school district in a timely manner. There was little evidence of joint IFSP meetings and program planning opportunities

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code.	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5) Site Name	(Col6) CR or CA	(Col7) Description of noncompliance
(Col1) Numeral & Program	(Col2) Item	(Col3) Test Letter	(Col4) Subprg.			
						<p style="text-align: center;">SPECIAL EDUCATION</p> <p><u>Commendations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SFUSD is commended for developing a comprehensive in-service training plan that lists a variety of topics which can be beneficial to staff and parents; however, the district is encouraged to coordinate its efforts with the school sites to ensure participation by staff and provide inservice to parents. 2. Balboa High School is commended for their role in placing a health center at their site, staffed by a doctor and nurse practitioner to meet the health needs of students and staff. 3. Site staffs are commended for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Collaboration efforts between general and special education that are in evidence to provide modifications and the best program and services to all students including those without IEPs. Examples of these collaborative activities could be found at all sites visited. However, it was especially noted at Hillcrest Elementary and Bret Harte where many special education students exit their services by grades 4 & 5; the science lab and garden at Bret Harte Elementary; and at Treasure Island 100% of 7th graders and 70% of 4th graders passed the district wide writing assessment. b. Administrative staff being directly involved in student progress and services at Ida B. Wells, Balboa High, Hillcrest Elementary, Starr King Elementary, and James Lick Middle School. c. Their efforts to provide inclusion services, main streaming and extra-curricular activities for individuals with exceptional needs. These efforts were especially noted at James Lick, Ida B. Wells High School, Starr King Elementary, Burton and Balboa High Schools d. Examples of excellent multidisciplinary assessment reports at Burton High, Golden Gate Elementary and James Lick Middle School.

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code:	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5) Site Name	(Col6) CR or CA	(Col7) Description of noncompliance
(Col1) Numeral & Program	(Col2) Item	(Col3) Test Letter	(Col4) Subprg			
						<p><u>Commendations, Cont.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition, other practices were noted, i.e. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transition plans coupled with good record keeping at Burton High <p><u>Noncompliance</u></p>
*II-S	2			District Downtown High James Lick Middle	CR	Some meetings are not held in a timely manner to review and revise individualized education program (IEP). In some cases there were no current IEPs in student files.
*II-S	3	a		District Ida B. Wells Downtown Hillcrest Woodside	CR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some present levels of performance statements included test scores only. Objective statements in IEPs were not written incrementally. Only one objective was listed for each goal statement. In one student folder speech had been assessed and provided but were not included in the IEP.
*II-S	3	b		District Sanchez John Swett	CR	There was a lack of indication of general education participation in some student IEPs.
				Woodside Bret Harte Ida B. Wells Downtown Hillcrest Downtown Hillcrest	CR	Goals and objectives were not evaluated for progress or completion.
				District Hillcrest	CR	Goals & objectives were not curriculum based.
				District	CR	The schedule for evaluation and method for evaluation of IEP goals and objectives was not consistently evident in the IEP.
II-S	3	c		District	CR	Transition plans lacked completion and in some cases were absent in some student folders.

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5) Site Name	(Col6) CR or CA	(Col7) Description of noncompliance
(Col1) Numeral & Program	(Col2) Item	(Col3) Test Letter	(Col4) Subprg.			
*II-S	4			Bret Harte Downtown Ida B. Wells Hillcrest	CR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some IEPs did not include LEP assessment and linguistically appropriate goals and objectives for LEP students in special education. Interviews indicated that behavior plans are developed by the psychologists but they are too busy to assist with implementation.
				District Sanchez	CR	
II-S	8			District	CR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A full continuum of services are not available at some sites (RS & Speech) including DIS counseling. Students at Sanchez are missing a large portion of instructional time when they are bussed for OT services. Counseling services are not available as necessary students at Burton High and Woodside Learning Center.
				Sanchez	CR	
				Burton Woodside	CR	
II-S	9			District Star King Golden Gate Balboa John Swett James Lick Treasure Island	CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most school site plans (SBCP) do not include a complete description of services available to students with IEPs and do not include services to general education students where appropriate.
II-S	12			District	CR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is limited evidence of coordination between the central office, special education, curriculum instruction and professional development Bilingual offices and school operations. Coordination between general and special education at some site levels is also missing.
				Sanchez Balboa	CR	
II-S	15			District	CR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff interviews revealed that all potential special education students are not consistently referred.

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code.	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5) Site Name	(Col6) CR or CA	(Col7) Description of noncompliance
(Col1) Numeral & Program	(Col2) Item	(Col3) Test Letter/	(Col4) Subprg.			
*III-S	16			District	CR	• While several different types of assessment plans are used, staff does not consistently indicate who will conduct the assessment.
*III-S	19			District James Lick Ida B. Wells Sanchez Bret Harte Preschool	CR	• Some students do not consistently receive a vision and hearing screening within one year of their initial or three-year reassessments.
*III-S	20			District	CR	• Interviews and records reviews indicate that some psychologists do not attend IEP meetings and often those who are left to interpret test results are either not qualified or do not feel that their interpretation is adequate.
*III-S	22			District	CR	• Some students are not assessed in their primary language for beginning or continued special education services. • Staff reported that they are not allowed to recommend that students are to be assessed in all areas related to their suspected disability.
*III-S	27			District Golden Gate Burton Bret Harte Balboa	CR	• Assessment reports for speech and language services could not be located at some sites. • Assessment reports do not consistently contain statements indicating whether assessment results are valid.
*III-S	28			District	CR	• There is a backlog of students in need of 3 year reassessments, including students needing assessments in languages other than English.
III-S	30			District	CR	• Children are not reassessed prior to their transition from pre school to kindergarten/first grade.

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code:	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5)	(Col6)	(Col7)
(Col1)	(Col2)	(Col3)	(Col4)			
Numerical & Program	Item	Test Letter	Subprg.	Site Name	CR or CA	Description of noncompliance
*III-S	33			District	CR	<u>Noncompliance, Cont.</u> • There was no evidence that the IEP team develops a report to determine that students meet eligibility criteria for learning disability services.
*III-S	34			District Burton	CR	• Speech services are not provided in accordance with the IEP.
				Starr King James Lick	CR	• There are not current IEPs for some students.
				Sanchez Golden Gate John Swett	CR	• IEPs at some sites reviewed indicated that services would be provided by the Resource Specialist, yet paraprofessionals are providing these services 2-3 days per week.
				Balboa	CR	• The lack of professional and proper interaction between teachers and paras takes away from the implementation of IEP goals and objectives for students. It is important that focus on meeting students' needs according to their individual IEPs. A lack of attention to this matter may create a legal problem for the school and district.
*II-S	38			District	CR	• The reason for student placement in other than his/her home school is not indicated on IEPs.
*III-S	41			District	CR	• There is an over-representation of African American students in special education.
*IV-S	43			District	CR	• The speech and language caseload exceed 55 across the district.
				Treasure Island	CR	• At one school, the resource specialist caseload exceeded 28 students.
IV-S	44			District	CA	• There is a lack of ongoing coordinated inservice training for special education staff, and paraprofessionals.

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5)	(Col6)	(Col7)
(Col1)	(Col2)	(Col3)	(Col4)			
Numeral & Program	Item	Test Letter	Subprg	Site Name	CR or CA	Description of noncompliance
*V-S	49			District Sanchez Golden Gate Treasure Island	CR	• There was not documentation that parents are provided a written notice of proposal to evaluate their child.
V-S	50a			District Treasure Island Woodside	CR	• There was not consistent documentation that parents are notified of IEP meetings.
V-S	50b			District	CR	• The notice of the IEP meeting sent to parents does not indicate whether transition is to be considered and does not include the student.
V-S	52			District Bret Harte James Lick Downtown Hillcrest	CA	• There is no evidence of a procedure to monitor the 50 day timeline for the development of the IEP, consequently a number of IEPs are overdue.
VI-S	65			District	CR	• The parents rights document has not been updated in accordance with the parents rights checklist distributed by the state and therefore not distributed to parents.
VI-S	66			District	CR	• Notices to parents are not consistently provided in the primary language.
VI-S	72			District	CR	• Policies and procedures are not clearly defined and consistently implemented through the District. Ex. what information goes in assessment reports, out of date procedures, etc.
VII-S	77			District Burton	CR	• The special education department head is teaching general education classes thus supplanting general education.

* Put an asterisk next to any finding that was also noncompliant during the last CCR.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------	-----------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5) Site Name	(Col6) CR or CA	(Col7) Description of noncompliance
(Col1) Numeral & Program	(Col2) Item	(Col3) Test Letter	(Col4) Subprog.			
VI-UCP	I			District	CA	<p>UNIFORM COMPLAINT PROCEDURES</p> <p><u>Noncompliance</u></p> <p>The Uniform Complaint Procedures do not contain all required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Identity of the designated staff member responsible for receiving complaints. -A statement of assurance that annual dissemination of procedures to the client system takes place. -A statement of assurance that when 15 percent or more of the students at a site speak a primary language other than English, all notices to parents are in English and the student's primary language. -A statement which advises of available local civil law remedies. -Assurance that the report of findings is written in English and the language of the complainant. -Assurance that the written report contains information regarding the complainant's right of appeal to the California Department of Education and the procedures for initiating an appeal to the Department. <p>Evidence provided at the sites did not verify annual written notification to all parents, employees, students, and other interested parties of the Uniform Complaint Procedures. The Procedures (UCP) are not included in the Student and Parent Annual Notification Booklet. The annual notice must contain the following required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -identity of responsible staff person -available civil law remedies -appeal and review procedures -timelines for filing a discrimination complaint that do not exceed six months from the alleged occurrence or when knowledge was first obtained.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------	-----------------------

See back of form for instructions.

Noncompliance Finding*				(Col5)	(Col6)	(Col7)
(Col1)	(Col2)	(Col3)	(Col4)			
Numerical & Program	Item	Test Letter	Subprg	Site Name	CR or CA	Description of noncompliance
III-VCR	9			District	CA	<p>CAREER VOCATIONAL EDUCATION & VOCATIONAL CIVIL RIGHTS</p> <p><u>Noncompliance</u></p> <p>Based on interviews of district and school site staff and a review of documentation, it was evident that all schools do not provide clear access to facilities for students with physical handicaps.</p>

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

CDS code	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------	-----------------------

Indicate below the findings for the integrated programs items. Use additional pages as necessary.

IPI.1 Multifunded students receive the district's core curriculum through the district-supported instructional delivery system.

Compliant Noncompliant

Observations:

San Francisco Unified School District's challenging core curriculum was developed with input from teachers, parents, and administrators. The curriculum is designed to promote creative and critical thinking, conceptual development and the construction and application of understanding and knowledge. This is accomplished by engaging students in active and collaborative learning experiences. Curriculum adaptations, including instructional materials and methods are made for students with special instructional needs to ensure their success in learning the district's core curriculum.

State of California curriculum frameworks and the district's mission, supporting goals, and the Superintendent's Priorities help guide curriculum planning, implementation and evaluation. District goals focus on improving teaching and learning, parent and community involvement. Priorities established by the Superintendent in 1997-98 include improvements in achievement, particularly the achievement levels of low performing African American, latino and English language learners.

The San Francisco Unified Board of Education has adopted rigorous new high school graduation requirements, and in 1997-98 content and performance standards for English/language arts, science, and mathematics were adopted. The documentation provided to the team indicates broad-based involvement of educators, parents and community members in the development and refinement of the district's standards. To facilitate the successful implementation of the district's core curriculum and newly adopted standards, the district Professional Development Plan outlines long-range planning and goals for continuous improvement. Content leadership teams, mentors, and resource staff from the Curriculum Improvement and Professional Development Office provide professional and instructional support to school staff. Furthermore, the district had developed a draft "Guide to Standards-- Overview of Pre-Kindergarten to Grade 5" as a tool to keep parents informed and use when helping their children develop the knowledge and skills required for students to succeed. Afterall, the district's philosophy is that all individuals can learn and all students can succeed.

IPI.2 Multifunded students receive the appropriate supplemental program services for which they are eligible. These services support their learning of the district's core curriculum.

Compliant Noncompliant

Observations:

In the district's self-review, IPI 2 is reported noncompliant. The validation review team noted a variety of supplemental programs and services provided to Title I, special education, and Limited-English proficient students in some schools, including instructional aides, before and after school tutorial assistance from parents and paraprofessionals, computer laboratories, and such research based programs as Reading Recovery, Success for All and the OLE Writing Project.

While some schools provide a variety of supplemental program services, a review of documentation and staff interviews confirmed that the district is misexpending consolidated programs funds (economic impact aid and school based coordinated program funds) to implement the core curriculum in some secondary schools. The misexpenditures of these funds reduces the availability of funds to provide supplemental programs and services to eligible secondary school students.

**1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)**

CDS code.	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

Indicate below the findings for the integrated programs items. Use additional pages as necessary

- 3 IPI.3 Multifunded students receive a coherent and coordinated program which enables them to learn the district's core curriculum.
- Compliant Noncompliant

Observations:

Through the district's "One Site Plan" concept, all departments at the district level plan and coordinate all programs to ensure that the district's core curriculum is provided to every student. Weekly meetings between supplemental programs staff and the Curriculum Improvement and Professional Development (CIPD) staff are scheduled to discuss curriculum priority areas and staff development needs. Teachers on Special Assignments (TSAs) provide on-going support to schools implementing supplemental programs. Such support includes assistance in program planning and site plan development, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation, and helping schools to access resources. The team, however, found the need for improvement in collaborated activities between the district office and school sites as it relates to monitoring for program effectiveness, program compliance, provision of inservice training, for students receiving special education support and services.

To promote coherency and coordination of services for multifunded students, schools in the San Francisco Unified School District utilize the student study team and coordinated service team processes as primary vehicles. Teachers, parents and professional support staff are generally represented on SSTs. They meet to discuss student needs, to identify intervention, and to discuss and monitor student progress. The validation review team also noted that some schools use grade-level articulation and department meetings to share information concerning students' progress and educational experiences. The team encourages schools to monitor their practices to assure that students are effectively referred for special education services.

- 4 IPI.4 Data indicate that specially-funded students are learning the district's core curriculum.

Learning Assessment:

San Francisco Unified
CCR, May 1998

IPI-4 Data indicate that specially-funded students are learning the district's core curriculum.

The California Department of Education is committed to a standards-based accountability system, one that focuses on student achievement. The system poses the straightforward question, "Is each student meeting the standards that the district has adopted for his or her grade level?"

San Francisco is in the process of developing a standards-based assessment and accountability system to answer that question. In the meantime, however, the district is not short of evidence about the level of student learning in the district.

In fact, San Francisco Unified has reason to be proud of its accomplishments in this critical area of student learning. It has reduced the percentage of students in the lowest quartile from 34% to 26%, and has increased the percentage in the top quartile as well. More than 90% of its graduates aim for college, and the numbers attending UC have risen sharply. SAT scores have gone up--while more students are taking the test, and more students are taking Advanced Placement courses and passing the tests.

This kind of progress doesn't just happen. The district has a commitment to raise student achievement for all students--and all groups of students. The district's reform program is built on a mission statement, district goals, philosophical tenets, and annually adjusted superintendent's priorities. It is clear from talking with district staff that these underlying principles are not just on paper, but actually guide the work of school and district personnel on a daily basis.

Although the district's commitment to improve student achievement is unquestioned, it could not be done without an effective school reform organizational and leadership structure. Some of the key elements include the following:

- A superintendent who is able to galvanize staff and community support for an ambitious reform agenda
- The district's unusual commitment to data-driven planning and decision making
- Spelling out of the reform goals in concrete terms, and keeping the staff and community focused on them
- A broad focus on all aspects of the school improvement process, and more importantly, a commitment to actually collect information on all those variables, both quantitative and qualitative, and to use the information as part of a school portfolio process--a living document that plays an important role in the revision of annual school site plans

- A system that defines accountability not just at the student level, but also at the school level, the individual administrator level and district office level
- The development of an assessment system and technological infrastructure that allows the collecting and reporting of results in a timely manner
- A willingness to put all potentially valuable programs through a rigorous evaluation process
- Reports that don't just focus on the total student population of a school, but display the progress of all student subgroups in a schools, including school profiles
- The development of award-winning staff development programs--focused squarely on the skills that teachers need to help all students learn

The district's Comprehensive School Improvement Program is a central part of the district's school reform effort, stemming from the Consent Decree of 1982. Under this program, the district has identified 24 low achieving schools. Twelve of them made enough progress to be graduated out of the program, two are showing some progress and are continuing in the program, and 10 have been reconstituted.

Developing a standards-based accountability system is a complex undertaking, requiring the support of administrators, teachers, parents and the community. It will take most districts several years to fully implement such a system. One of the hallmarks of standards-based accountability systems is that each student's performance is judged on the basis of multiple measures. Although San Francisco uses a variety of assessments, the spotlight is on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. The district even made the difficult decision to administer it this year in order to monitor the effects of their reform efforts, although they were also required to administer the SAT-9.

The local board first adopted content standards in language arts, and now has also adopted standards in math and science. San Francisco can then move from what is essentially a test-based approach to a standards-based approach. Given what the district has accomplished with the test-centered approach, there is reason to be optimistic about what will be accomplished when all the resources and all the elements of San Francisco's reform approach are focused on the standards themselves--and when the full scope of the standards are assessed, not just those aspects that can be measured with machine-scored tests. The new approach will probably also mean higher standards for student achievement, higher than "merely" matching national averages, as challenging a goal as that is.

Overall Student Achievement

Districtwide results are encouraging: the district average is above the national average (although it must be noted that the test upon which these results are based was nationally normed in 1989!). Furthermore, the amount of progress made in the last school year exceeded what would be necessary to maintain the status quo, that is, the students made more than a year's progress for their year in school. Generally

speaking, more progress has been registered at the elementary levels than in middle or high schools.

This pattern of results was confirmed by an extensive three-year longitudinal study at three grade levels. More progress was noted in the elementary grades and greater progress for Latino and other Limited English Proficient students than for African-American students--especially at the high school level.

Title I

More than 20,000 students are served by Title I. During 1996-97 they generally made more than a year's progress, although as one goes up the grade levels, the picture deteriorates, with high school students making less than a year's progress.

All ethnic groups made solid progress except for African-American students who failed to make a year's progress in either reading or math, and Latino students who did not make expected progress in reading. Overall, about 14% of the students scored well enough to be exited out of the program, making room for more needy students.

Special Education

Overall, students receiving special education students were making more than expected progress, although this was less true for high school students. This level of progress was also found for students receiving different types of services, and was true for most ethnic groups as well. African-American students made less progress, and were also the most over-represented ethnic group in special education programs. About 8% of the students were able to be graduated out of the program.

LEP Program

Overall, students receiving LEP services also made more than the expected year-for-a-year progress, but only in mathematics. Elementary students, however, made progress in both areas, but students in middle and high school programs only made better than expected progress in math. Longitudinal results on the SABE also shows a strong and consistently upward trend. Finally, the district redesignated only about 4 percent of all LEP students to fluent proficiency status last year, but the staff reports that that figure will be up to about 12% for 1997-98. Furthermore, a special study showed that these redesignated students not only scored higher on the CTBS, but also have better grades and attend school more regularly.

The review team was impressed with what they found in San Francisco Unified and appreciated the efforts of the staff to provide specific assessment information. We look forward to seeing how the district's accountability system continues to adapt and evolve, as it provides more comprehensive, timely, and useful information to the administration, staff and parents. This can only lead to even higher quality educational programs for the students in San Francisco Unified School District.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County District code	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

Use the space below to write summary statements for the identified topics. Instructions for completing this form are on the reverse.

Compliance trends summarize successes and areas of problems that may exist. Past compliance history indicate that the San Francisco Unified School District had 103 noncompliance during the 1994 year. The district's 1997 self-review identified a total of 140 noncompliance items. The 1997-98 validation review team identified 64 items of 404 items reviewed that are noncompliance. (Please note that some programs were reviewed for the first time in 1997-98 -- Gender Equity and the Eisenhower programs). The percentage of items found noncompliance was 16, thus the district is 84 percent compliant on program issues

In the area of **Standards, Assessment, and Accountability**, two programs, Early Start and Consolidated Programs issue are noncompliant.

To resolve the Consolidated Programs issue, the governing board will need to establish explicit and measurable criteria that will determine the effectiveness of district and school consolidated programs.

For the Early Start program, the district will need to:

- Provide documentation in assessment reports that a variety of assessment instruments were used to determine eligibility
- Ensure that reports of vision and hearing testing are included in all infant/toddler assessment results, and that testing is done prior to the Individual Family Service Plan (IPSP) meeting.

In the area of **Teaching and Learning**, four programs, Early Start, Special Education, Consolidated Programs and LEP program are noncompliant.

- To clear the noncompliance for Early Start, the district will need to develop a transition plan that includes steps and procedures to support the transition of the child to special education preschool or other services.

To clear the noncompliance for Special Education, the district will need to:

- Establish and implement a procedure to assure that IEPs are held in a timely manner and monitor IEPs for quality, timeliness, and accuracy.
- Provide appropriate coordination with school site councils to revise school site plans to fully include auxiliary services that are provided to special education students and a complete description of those services provided non-identified students by special education staff.
- Provide necessary coordination between the various district level programs and services and encourage coordination at the site levels.
- Provide notice to staff, the coordinated service team and SST that able potential students will be referred for special education services when appropriate.

To clear the noncompliance for Consolidated Programs, the district will need to submit the appropriate pages from school based coordinated plans that identify the unique supplementary instructional and auxiliary services that are being provided beyond the Core Program to the following student population. Limited English Proficient, educational Disadvantaged, Gifted and talented students, and special education students/students with special needs.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code.	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name. SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

Use the space below to write summary statements for the identified topics. Instructions for completing this form are on the reverse.

To clear the noncompliance for LEP, the district will need to address the noncomplaint issues for ELD the district will need to:

- finalize ELD standards (K-12) and assessment tools,
- complete development of ELD curriculum,
- adopt ELD materials,
- provide adequate professional development for teachers and principals on implementation of the district's ELD program,
- ensure that LEP students are appropriately grouped for ELD at each school site,
- verify that all LEP students are receiving ELD appropriate to their English language proficiency level.
- evaluate and report student progress in acquiring English language proficiency.

Continuation High Schools which enroll LEP students must provide their students with

- English language development and
- access to the core curriculum through primary language instruction, specially design academic instruction in English and/or mainstream English, based on each student's diagnosed need.

In the Area of Opportunity (equal educational access), four programs, Gender Equity, Vocational Civil Rights, and Tobacco Use Prevention Education and Special Education are noncompliant.

Compliance in Gender Equity can be achieved in the following ways:

Site administrators should participate in training sessions on the intent of Federal and State discrimination laws and then,

- ensure that necessary steps are taken to address and wherever possible correct gender disproportions in all classes through recruitment, course content changes, scheduling changes, etc.
- document and maintain records to verify efforts to comply with Title IX's equal opportunity in athletics requirements for all grades offering sport opportunities outside of the physical education program.
- conduct comparability studies of all existing locker rooms built prior to 1995 and to take corrective action to create comparability were it does not currently exist.

To achieve compliance in Vocational Civil Rights, either the San Francisco District should seek alternate facilities for those of its vocational education programs that present barriers to access for physically handicapped students or it should modify the facilities it does use so that barriers to access are eliminated.

To be compliant in the Tobacco Use Prevention Education (TUPE) program, the district will need to develop and implement a formal procedure to provide students, who smoke or use tobacco products, with readiness for cessation program, cessation program and follow-up intervention opportunities,

1. Planning with District and school site teams to adopt a procedure to identify students who use tobacco, and referral process for students to participate in intervention programs
2. Adopt and implement "readiness for cessation" program (such as in the Los Gatos School District), and refer students to a cessation programs. An application for funds for middle schools and high Schools will be available in 1998-99.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code:	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

Use the space below to write summary statements for the identified topics. Instructions for completing this form are on the reverse.

To be compliant in the Special Education program, the district will need to:

- Encourage staff to circle the appropriate person by profession on the assessment plan who will conduct the assessment.
- Consistently provide vision and hearing screenings to identified students within one year of their initial and three-year IEPs.
- Provide appropriate personnel on IEP teams to interpret test results.
- Provide sufficient personnel to assess students in their primary language and write assessment report that include all required components.
- Provide the IEP team with sufficient instruction to certify that students meet eligibility for learning disability services
- Provide the necessary resources and speech services.
- Establish procedures that will assure that current IEPs are reviewed and beginning IEPs are monitored for the appropriate assessment and placements.
- Develop a procedure to properly reassess preschool students prior to their transition to kindergarten or first grade

To resolve the Special Education program noncompliance issues, the district will also need to:

- Reduce the speech and Language Case loads to an average of 55 across the district and apply for a waiver for the resource specialist case load or reduce it otherwise.
- Continue to provide inservice training to administrators, staff, including general education, paraprofessionals, parents, and volunteers.

In the area of **Staffing and Professional Growth**, two programs, Gender Equity, and Eisenhower.

To resolve the Gender Equity noncompliance issue, the district will need to include strategies to identify and eliminate gender bias in professional development activities to support equal opportunities for all students.

To resolve the noncompliance issue for Eisenhower the district needs to invite all private schools to participate in developing the Eisenhower plan. Furthermore, these schools need to be informed of all available staff development during the school year.

Documentation needs to be available showing that private non-profit schools have been informed of the above meetings.

In the area of **Parent and Community Involvement** three programs, Consolidated Programs, the State Program for LEP students and Special Education are noncompliant.

To achieve compliance in the Consolidated Programs the district will need to:

Submit a copy of the School Parent Compact and evidence (e.g., agendas, minutes etc.) of the participation of parents in the development of the compact.

To achieve compliance in the LEP program, the district will need to ensure that all Bilingual Advisory Committees have been elected in an election in which all parents of LEP students have an opportunity to vote, that they have received training about their roles and responsibilities, and that they have performed all of their legal responsibilities.

To achieve compliance in the Special Education program, the district will need to:

- Provide timely and proper notices to parents a reasonable time before any action is taken involving their child to include transition requirements. These notices should be provided in the language they understand.
- Update the parents rights document in accordance with the parents rights checklist and provide it to parents.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

Use the space below to write summary statements for the identified topics. Instructions for completing this form are on the reverse.

In the area of **Governance and Administration**, Gender Equity, Uniform Complaint Procedures (UCP), Special Education and Early Start.

To address the issues of noncompliance in the area of Gender Equity, the district will need to:

- Create a dissemination system to ensure that all students and all employees annually receive a copy of the district's adopted nondiscrimination policy and complaint procedures, the sexual harassment policy and complaint procedures, and the name, office address and phone number of the Title IX Coordinator.
- Update the sexual harassment policies for students and for employees to include specific information to file a complaint and for pursuing available remedies outside of the district procedures.
- Create a districtwide system to ensure that all district and site publications contain the sexual harassment policies and complaint procedures.
- Create a districtwide system to ensure that all new students receive a copy of the district's sexual harassment policy during an orientation sessions during their first quarter, semester, summer session at the site.
- Create a districtwide system to ensure that all complaint of sexual harassment are identified and properly maintained to protect the victims. Train site staff in sexual harassment investigations and ensure that complaint procedures are properly followed.

Once the District ensures that the Uniform Complaint Procedures and the Annual Notice contain all for the required components, UCP will be complaint.

To resolve the Consolidated Programs issue the district will need to submit evidence (e.g. membership rosters, bylaws, policies, supporting materials etc). to verify that membership composition of SSC is appropriately constituted and each representative has been properly selected by his or her peer group.

For Special Education, the district will need to assure that special education staff are not teaching general education classes unless they are paid from a different funding source.

For Early Start, the district will need to establish a procedure to facilitate better coordination with the Regional Center to improve service coordination in the areas of evaluations, IFSP development, and program implementation. The services need to be jointly planned and implemented as stated in the interagency agreement, for infants and toddlers dually served by the LEA and Regional Center. Program coordination for solely low incidence students is provided by the district and is working well.

In the area of **Funding**, two programs, Consolidated Programs and the State Program for Limited English Proficient Students are noncomplaint.

To resolve the consolidated Programs funding issue, the district will need to verify compliance immediately by submitting:

- Evidence that the district has deobligated all categorical consolidated programs funds that have been inappropriately expended to implement the district's core curriculum
- Job descriptions and time accounting records to verify how multifunded personnel provide supplemental direct services to students.
- Evidence that all secondary school site councils have approved plan modifications to reflect the appropriate supplementary services and budget expenditures.
- Evidence that the governing board has approved these plan modifications with appropriate budgets.

**1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)**

County/District code:	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

Use the space below to write summary statements for the identified topics. Instructions for completing this form are on the reverse

Full compliance in the area of funding for state and federal consolidated programs can best be achieved when district administrators of categorical consolidated programs monitor and approve expenditures requests, including all district and school personnel paid with consolidated programs funds to ensure that school supplemental program funds provide legally allowable direct supplementary services to students.

Self Reviews and Monitoring

SFUSD submitted self-reviews for only part of the schools by the July 1, 1997 deadline. Subsequently on April 1998, the self-review reports for the remaining schools were submitted. In many cases the self-reviews were not thorough, and did not reflect a consistent understanding of the law. The incomplete submittal and the quality of the self-reviews are areas of concern.

The team acknowledges that some individual schools invested substantial energy in the self-reviews. However, the district should develop additional mechanism (e.g., cross-school teams, district-school teams, etc.) that can ensure that district and site staff are thoroughly trained on the requirements of the various programs, and that there is periodic monitoring of program implementation at the sites.

1997-98 COORDINATED COMPLIANCE REVIEW
NOTIFICATION OF FINDINGS (Continued)

County/District code:	3	8	6	8	4	7	8	LEA Name: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------------

Use the space below to write summary statements for the identified topics. Instructions for completing this form are on the reverse.

Compliance trends. Summarize compliance trends, reflection general patterns of success or problems.

General commendations (for CDE validation reviews only). List general or cross-program commendations related to the coordinated compliance review process. (Commendations related to specific programs should be identified on Form CTS- 1a.)

1. The California Department of Education validation review team commends the San Francisco Unified School District and the administrator and staff in the office of State and Federal Funded Projects for:
 - The careful organization of the district entrance meeting and the validation review.
 - The support provided in transporting team members to and from review sites
2. The district and site administrators and staff are commended for the increase in collaboration, communication with one another and feelings of belonging. In most sites, teachers are discussing students, principals are working together to improve their schools, and the Superintendent's leadership team is assisting in developing a strong, student-focused district.
3. The district is commended for participating in an Equity Collaborative with a project mission to provide a more equitable learning environment to bolster the academic achievement of SFUSD's diverse student population.
4. The district and office of State and Federal Funded Projects are commended for redirecting categorical program funds to school sites to build the capacity for parent involvement in most schools visited. This has resulted in an increase in parent centers, parent education activities, and parent volunteers.