Telephone: 415.984.8700		
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO		
ELIEZER WILLIAMS, et al., )	Case No. 312	236
Plaintiffs, )	Hearing Date:	August 25, 2003
vs. )	Time:	3:30 p.m.
EASTIN, State Superintendent ) Of Public Instruction, STATE )	Judge:	
Defendants. )		
)		
AND RELATED CROSS-ACTION.	 	
)	1	
DECLARATION OF ROZLYNN WORRALI	L IN SUPPORT OF	DEFENDANT STATE OF
i		OTION FOR SUMMARY
ADJU	DICATION	
LA2:680799.1		
DECLARATION OF ROZLYMN WORALL IN SUPPORT OF DEPENDANT STATE OF CALIFORNIA'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIPPS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY ADJUDICATION		
	FRAMROZE M. VIRJEE (SB #120401) DAVID L. HERRON (SB #158891) O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP Embarcadero Center West 275 Battery Street San Francisco, California 9411 Telephone: 415.984.8700 Attorneys for Defendant State of  SUPERIOR COURT OF TO  CITY AND COUNT  ELIEZER WILLIAMS, et al.,  Plaintiffs,  vs.  STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DELAINE EASTIN, State Superintendent Of Public Instruction, STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,  DEFENDANTO OF EDUCATION,  Defendants.  AND RELATED CROSS-ACTION.  DECLARATION OF ROZLYNN WORALL CALIFORNIA'S OPPOSITION TO  ADJU-  LAZ:680799.1  DECLARATION OF ROZLYNN WORALL IN SUPPORT	FRAMROZE M. VIRJEE (SB #120401) DAVID L. HERRON (SB #158891) O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP Embarcadero Center West 275 Battery Street San Francisco, California 94111-3305 Telephone: 415.984.8700 Attorneys for Defendant State of California  SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CA  CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCE  ELIEZER WILLIAMS, et al., Case No. 312.  Plaintiffs, Hearing Date:  Vs. Time:  Vs. Time:  STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DELAINE Department: EASTIN, State Superintendent Department: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, Defendants.  Defendants.  Defendants.  Defendants.  DECLARATION OF ROZLYNN WORRALL IN SUPPORT OF CALIFORNIA'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MC ADJUDICATION  LAZ:680799.1  DECLARATION OF ROZLYNN WORRALL IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT STATE OF

declaration in support of the opposition by Defendant State of

of the Scholastic Audit Teams of the School Improvement Division

with the California Department of Education. Pursuant to the

1116(d)6) (B), California established the Scholastic Audit in

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Title I, Section

September 2001. The purpose of the Scholastic Audit process was

to conduct an in depth investigation of specific dimensions of

schools and to determine the strategies that these schools and

conditions necessary for academic achievement in English language

arts and mathematics. A Joint Intervention Agreement ("JIA") for

actions and benchmarks of progress, the specific responsibilities

the school was negotiated, which addressed through corrective

those schools that had consistently failed to make academic

progress, generally referred to as Program Improvement (PI)

their respective districts needed to take to improve the

of the district and the state in improving the school.

California to Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Adjudication.

the facts set forth in this declaration are known to me

personally and, if called as a witness, I could testify

Education of the State of California (CDE).

I am currently employed by the Department of

Since September 2001, I have been the lead of one

I make this

2

1

3

1.

competently thereto.

2.

**4** 5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

2,

26

27

28

LA2:680799,1

'

4.

3. The first group of schools that participated in the Scholastic Audit and Targeted Intervention Process were the Title I schools that had consistently failed to make academic progress since first identified in 1996-97. These Program Improvement Cohort I schools were identified by school districts as not having met locally adopted standards of performance. The PI Cohort I schools subject to the process in 2001-2002 were those that met the following criteria: (1) Schools that failed to make adequate yearly progress for four years, including review of their 2001 Stanford-9 and API data in mid-September of that year, and (2) Schools that were not participating in the Immediate Intervention/Under-performing Schools Program (II/USP), or the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Program.

of the schools included in PI Cohort I. In September 2001, I led the Scholastic Audit Team that reviewed Gompers, a school with approximately 2000 students. During this five-day audit, our team, which consisted of seven members total, intensely reviewed

Samuel Gompers Middle School ("Gompers") was one

school operations in these audit areas: 1) curriculum, 2)

instruction, 3) classroom and school level assessments, 4)

evaluation and accountability, 5) professional development, 6) leadership and administration, 7) school organization and

resources, 8) school culture and environment, and 9) family and

community engagement. The team interviewed administrative staff members, teachers, and students, observed classroom sessions, met

with parents and other community members, and reviewed various

documents collected from the site. The audit resulted in a

5. Subsequent to the audit, the California Department of Education negotiated with the district and school personnel a specific time-line by which the various items for improvement would be met, the specific steps that the district and school would take to meet the items, and the appropriate parties responsible for each item. The product of these negotiations was a Joint Intervention Agreement ("JIA") between the CDE and the district. Both the Scholastic Audit Review Team Report and the JIA were shared with the LAUSD school board, school staff, and the community. The audited district and school had approximately 18 months from January 2002 to implement the corrective actions specified in the JIA.

6. After the initial September 2001 audit and the execution of the JIA, I continued to work with LAUSD and Gompers for the following eighteen months. Beginning in March 2002, LAUSD provided me quarterly written reports prior to monitoring visits that addressed Gompers' progress of the corrective actions in the JIA. In addition to reviewing these reports, I also conducted quarterly on-site visits of Gompers to verify the report, to observe classrooms, and interview staff, students, and parents. At the conclusion of each monitoring visit, a report of progress was sent to Roy Romer, Superintendent of LAUSD, from the LAU:680799.1

1	California Department of Education. My final visit to Gompers		
2	was in June 2003. At that time, I verified that Gompers had met		
3	most of its benchmarks that were set forth in the JIA.		
4			
5	7. I am familiar with the Williams v. State of		
6	California case, and have reviewed the allegations Plaintiffs set		
7	forth in their motion for summary adjudication pertaining to the		
8	lack of instructional materials at Gompers. In particular,		
9	plaintiffs cite the 2001-2002 Gompers Scholastic Audit Report,		
10	discussed above, which notes that:		
11			
12	"[f]our weeks into the 2001-02 school year, texts		
13	have not been signed out to students." (Plaintiffs'		
14	Motion,p. 14; Audit Report, finding 3.1)		
15			
16	Plaintiffs also cite Audit Report recommendation		
17	3.D.2.:		
18			
19	"Each teacher will have [a] complete classroom set of		
20	adopted course texts for use by students in class. In		
21	addition to books that are checked out to students for their		
22	use at home, after school tutorials or study hall, core		
23	teachers must have a stationary set of state-board approved		
24	standards-based, text books and a class set of age-		
25	appropriate dictionaries for student use."		
26			
27	These items listed in Gompers' Scholastic Audit		
28	Report have been resolved.		
	LA2:680799.1 -4-		

1	8. When my audit team conducted its initial on-site
2	review in September 2001, we observed that classes at Gompers
3	were over-enrolled and crowded. There had been an unexpected
4	influx of student enrollments during the first couple weeks of
5	school. Students were being assigned and reassigned to classes
6	in addition to physically leaving the school for others. The
7	master schedule was being balanced and additional teachers and
8	classrooms were being organized. Teachers indicated that serious
9	teaching and learning were stalled until "norm day," which was
10	still a couple of weeks off. (Norm day is the day that the
11	official attendance count is taken for state reporting) In the
12	meantime, until classrooms and master schedule were stabilized,
13	textbook distribution had been delayed. Students did not possess
14	these textbooks at the time of our investigation, but there was
15	evidence of a textbook room and students completing checkout
16	documents for the books. Teachers were using overhead
17	transparencies, photocopied materials, and dictionaries (classes
18	were sharing sets) as materials for student learning.

9. Corrective action "3D" of the JIA specifically
addressed this issue. LAUSD and Gompers agreed to acquire and

22 distribute textbooks, agendas, and necessary learning material

23

24

25

26

2728

LA2:680799.1

and supplies to students the first week of school 2002-03. Each

Pursuant to this benchmark, textbook staff at Gompers distributed

textbooks within the first two weeks of the school year 2002-03

student was to receive everything he/she needed to complete

grade-level, standards-based assignments. (See JIA, p.9)

 $\cdot 12$ 

students were in possession of textbooks. Gompers' administrators planned throughout the 2001-02 school year how they could become more efficient procedurally to stabilize the master schedule and student enrollments so that textbook distribution could occur at the beginning of school. By the October 2002 monitoring visit (1 month after the opening of school), Gompers had met its benchmark of distributing textbooks in the core subject areas in accordance with the corrective action and with LAUSD policy. In the September 2002 report from District I on behalf of Gompers, it was reported that:

"The school has reviewed and revised the textbook accountability system so as to reduce loss of textbooks. The textbook clerk has been trained in the textbook accountability system to minimize loss of textbooks. Students have received necessary materials, including textbooks. Classroom sets of texts were distributed during the first week of school. Individual students were issued textbooks and a record is kept and recorded in the textbook room computer system."

Through a survey sent out to teachers by the Audit Team concurrent with our October 2002 visit, teachers validated

District I's report that:

1	* Gompers and the principal can assure that students
2	are issued textbooks in the core subject areas in
3	accordance with LAUSD policy. Classroom sets of
4	dictionaries are also available for each classroom."
5	
6	In all monitoring visits subsequent to the original
7	audit, textbooks and materials were never again a significant
8	issue.
9	
10	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of
11	the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
12	
13	Executed this eighteenth day of July 2003, at
14	Sacramento, California.
15	Le Mithause
16	Rozlynn Worrall
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	