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Overview of PreK-12 Program and Schools at UCLA

August 15, 2022

Dear Faculty Welfare Committee,

In response to your June 6 request for information regarding the PreK-12 Programs and Schools at UCLA, I am sharing the compiled responses from each school with you. The PreK-12 Programs and Schools represent a network of child care and K-12 schools united by the fact that they serve children on the UCLA campus. All of the sites serve faculty families. Each site is unique in its mission and purpose. As you will see from the responses, some of the schools exist for research explicitly while others are aspiring to fulfill this purpose. All of the schools aspire to be sites of learning for the field of education and also to fulfill the university’s mission of education, research and service.

The PreK-12 Programs and Schools at full capacity, maximum enrollment serve 1,433 children ages 3 months to 18 years old in classrooms leveled infant through grade 12. The size of this network of schools is comparable to many small school districts within the state of California. Additionally, we partner with two partnership childcare centers, Bright Horizons and University Parent Nursery School. If we include the spaces in these programs, the total maximum enrollment is 1,631 children. The allocation of these spaces is illustrated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Number of Available Spaces at Full Capacity</th>
<th>Grades/Ages Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geffen Academy</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>Grades 6-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA Lab School</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>PreK-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Care and Education</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>3 months-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Development Program</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3 months- 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright Horizons at UCLA</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3 months-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Parent Nursery</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,631</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the on campus programs and schools, UCLA School of Education and Information Studies has established partnerships with LAUSD with the TIE-INS (Together in Education in Neighborhood Schools).

The responses that follow seek to address the questions you have asked within the limits of what we are able to share legally. Thank you for the opportunity to share more about the educational opportunities at UCLA for our youngest Bruins.

In Partnership,

Devin Dillon, Ph.D.
Superintendent, PreK-12 Operations
UCLA Early Care and Education

Enrollment: 341 maximum spaces across three child care centers, 3 mos-5 years old.

Overview:

UCLA Early Care and Education operates three accredited child care centers. We serve the diverse population of UCLA’s student, staff and faculty families. Krieger is our largest center with nine classrooms. It is located on campus at Sunset and Bellagio, near Sunset Recreation Center. Fernald is our smallest center with four classrooms. It is located next to the UCLA Lab School. University Village has six classrooms and is located just south of campus at the University Village Student Housing complex. All of our centers welcome faculty, staff and student families.

In addition to our UCLA operated child care centers, ECE at UCLA includes two partnership sites, Bright Horizons at UCLA Westwood and University Parent Nursery School (UPNS). Bright Horizons currently serves 136 children. 74% of these children at UCLA affiliated. UPNS serves 37 children. UPNS is co-located at the University Village site. While these are independently operated programs, they are part of the portfolio of child care offerings for UCLA families and we maintain oversight of their programs and facilities.

Vision Statement

UCLA Early Care and Education inspires the next generation of life-long learners by providing:

• High-quality, developmentally-appropriate education and care for young children;
• A program focused on diversity, equity, and inclusion for families and staff;
• A work environment that nurtures, values and inspires our professional staff;
• Service to families and the University community;
• Research-focused sites of learning for the field of education.

UCLA ECE provides care and education for children and an essential service to families by focusing on research and quality.

Mission Statement

The UCLA Early Care and Education programs provide quality child care, support families and share information and resources with the community to make a positive difference in the lives of children, in support of the teaching, research and community service mission of the University.

Philosophy Statement

We believe that early learning is relationship-based. Our fundamental goal is to establish trusting relationships among children, teachers and parents. Carefully constructed early education experiences promote exploration, critical thinking, cooperative play and the development of mutual respect.
Early Care and Education

Faculty Welfare Committee Data Request

1. **Is the cost of enrollment the same for UCLA faculty families vs non-UCLA affiliated families? If not, what is the cost differential?**

Early Care and Education (ECE) charges the same fees for all UCLA affiliated families. Community fees are slightly higher than affiliated fees.

https://ece.ucla.edu/enrollment-fee/applicant-pool-forms-fee-assistance

2. **How is the priority for financial aid determined? Do UCLA faculty families receive higher priority, or greater financial assistance, than families who are not affiliated with UCLA, if they have identical financial profiles?**

ECE offers a small amount of fee support for low-income staff families. Staff families are required to submit financial data, including tax returns to a third-party verification company, School and Student Services (SSS). Based on the recommendations from SSS and the funds available, awards are made to low-income staff families. ECE contracts with California Department of Education and the Department of Social Services to provide fee support to low income student families. The verification of income for student families is handled through CDE and CDSS.

Currently no fee support is offered for faculty families in ECE.

3. **How much is the spread for your institution? Does UCLA cover any amount towards the spread, e.g., a Dean’s tuition assistance for each faculty child? If the spread grows, do each school's governing documents allow any course of action other than raising tuition across the board and/or trying to increase fundraising?**

Deans provide an annual subsidy of $2,000 for each child of an Academic Senate Faculty member (or the dean's designee) from their school/division who is enrolled annually on October 1 in the ECE program. The deans are responsible for the $2,000 annual subsidy for every space filled by a school/division’s Academic Senate member (or dean’s designee), whether or not the dean has prioritized that faculty member.

ECE monitors market rate fees for childcare within the state of California and within the region of West LA annually and makes adjustment to fees based on market conditions and the needs to cover mandatory staff cost of living adjustments and increases to benefits and salaries negotiated by labor agreements. ECE strives to limit fee increases, but typically has increased 3% each year. Additional actions include grant applications and streamlining staffing and costs in order to minimize escalating costs of the program.
FINANCIAL RELATIONSHIP WITH UCLA

1. How much support does UCLA contribute annually to each institution, where “support” is broadly defined to include provision of space, utilities, etc. at below-market rates?

All PreK-12 sites pay recharge fees for utilization of space, utilities and so on in the same way schools and other departments do. These fees include IT services, custodial and space utilization fees. ECE also historically has received financial support from SFAC, although that is less this year than in previous years and is likely to be discontinued.

2. How does that support break down into benefits that target UCLA-affiliated families (e.g., tuition subsidies) versus those that target all families or the institution as a whole?

ECE provides limited fee support to parenting student families and low-income UCLA staff families.

PRIORITIZATION OF ADMISSION

1. How are admission slots allocated to UCLA-faculty families? In particular, how is priority decided between a) UCLA-faculty vs non-affiliated families, and b) UCLA-faculty families affiliated with the different Schools (as listed below). We encourage the other institutions to review ECE’s comprehensive and clear prioritization policy, which is attached as appendix C. Please also include information on waitlists if they are used: how many UCLA-faculty children are on each waitlist, and how long on average does a child spend on the waitlist before being admitted?

Early Care and Education

Enrollment Policy

Waitlist- How many faculty children in wait pool?  117

How long on average does a child spend on waitlist before being admitted?

This is a very difficult question to answer since it depends on the spaces available, the age of the child, and if the family is open to placement at any of our three centers or is interested in only one. On average, wait pool time for infants is longer than older children, because we have fewer spaces

Average wait time for families in ECE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Wait Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infants</td>
<td>1 – 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toddlers</td>
<td>6 months – 1.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>6 months – 1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Among the faculty families, what proportion are drawn from each of the University’s Schools, i.e., Medicine, Law, Management, SEIS, Public Affairs, Nursing, Arts and Architecture, Engineering, Music, Dentistry, Theater, Film & Television (TFT), Public Health, and the College? To what extent, if any, are these proportions restricted as part of the admissions process? This breakdown is needed to understand whether the institutions are predominantly serving the higher-paid sectors of our faculty. We understand that there will be families with mixed status (e.g., parents in different schools, or where one parent is a faculty member, one is not)—we assume these will be counted as 0.5 in each category.

Early Care and Education

We strive to maintain enrollment targets in line with our enrollment policy as it relates to faculty. The table below reflects our targets for Faculty enrollment when ECE is at full capacity. These targets are monitored carefully and offers are made for available spaces with these targets in mind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
<th>Proportion of Academic Senate Members (n=2,469)</th>
<th>Proportion of Child Care Spaces Allocated (n=177)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Schools</td>
<td>29.85%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College</td>
<td>35.16%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>34.99%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These numbers are approximations and updated annually.

**NOTE:** ECE will always offer spaces based on these allocations. Multiple instances of Senate Faculty families declining an offered space will result in total enrollment that varies from these numbers.

The table below reflects current ECE enrollment, which has been impacted by COVID-19. ECE is currently working to bring enrollment back up to pre-pandemic numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
<th>Proportion of Academic Senate Members (n=2,469)</th>
<th>Proportion of Child Care Spaces Allocated (n=122)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Schools</td>
<td>27.87%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College</td>
<td>27.05%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>45.08%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Megan E. Daly Infant Development Program

Enrollment: Maximum 25 children from 3 months to 3 years of age

Overview:
The Infant Development Program (IDP) is a teaching and research facility, operated by the Department of Psychology, that accommodates both cross-sectional and longitudinal investigation of infants, toddlers, their parents and caregivers.

Mission:

- To offer high quality, developmentally appropriate group care for infants and toddlers of the students, staff, and faculty in the Psychology Department and other departments on the UCLA campus.
- To serve as a teaching and research facility for the Psychology Department and the UCLA community.
- To provide a program focused on diversity, equity, and inclusion for all families and staff.
- To offer a work environment that values and inspires our professional staff as they strive to offer best practices in the classroom.
- To train undergraduate students in the field of Early Childhood Education through the Applied Developmental Psychology (ADP) minor.

Applied Developmental Psychology Minor

IDP works closely with the ADP Minor for the training of undergraduate students in the field of early childhood education. The ADP Minor is a unique program that creates the opportunity for students at the undergraduate level to learn about the development of young children. ADP students gain a better understanding of the knowledge they learn inside the classroom by applying it through fieldwork with a hands-on internship opportunity at UCLA. They thus enhance their own education while providing a valuable service to children, families, and communities.
Infant Development Program

Faculty Welfare Committee Data Request

COSTS

1. Is the cost of enrollment the same for UCLA faculty families vs non-UCLA affiliated families? If not, what is the cost differential?

The Infant Development Program (IDP) does not offer admission for community members. Fees and wait priorities can be found here: https://www.psych.ucla.edu/centers-programs/infant-development-program/fees-and-policies/
https://www.psych.ucla.edu/centers-programs/infant-development-program/tours-eligibility-applications/waitlist-priorities/

2. How is the priority for financial aid determined? Do UCLA faculty families receive higher priority, or greater financial assistance, than families who are not affiliated with UCLA, if they have identical financial profiles?

Unfortunately, we do not have the ability to offer any financial assistance to any IDP families. We have a very small scholarship offered by the Daley Family in the amount of $700 per year that can be awarded to one family per year.

3. How much is the spread for your institution? Does UCLA cover any amount towards the spread, e.g., a Dean’s tuition assistance for each faculty child? If the spread grows, do each school’s governing documents allow any course of action other than raising tuition across the board and/or trying to increase fundraising?

IDP is primarily a self-supporting program. IDP has partnerships with two departments, Psychiatry and Department of Medicine. These departments pay an annual subsidy to IDP in the amount of approximately $50-55K for priority on our waitlist. This additional funding allows for our floater teacher which is necessary for ratio compliance during breaks, vacations, etc.

FINANCIAL RELATIONSHIP WITH UCLA

1. How much support does UCLA contribute annually to each institution, where “support” is broadly defined to include provision of space, utilities, etc. at below-market rates?
All PreK-12 sites pay recharge fees for utilization of space, utilities and so on in the same way schools and other departments do. These fees include IT services, custodial and space utilization fees.

IDP is housed in Division of Life Sciences, Department of Psychology. The Department of Psychology provides space and administrative support for the IDP program (HR, financial, operations, etc) given IDP’s relationship to our academic (ADP) and research mission.

2. How does that support break down into benefits that target UCLA-affiliated families (e.g., tuition subsidies) versus those that target all families or the institution as a whole?

This support allows us to keep our fees at market or slightly lower rates for the UCLA community.

PRIORITIZATION OF ADMISSION

1. How are admission slots allocated to UCLA-faculty families? In particular, how is priority decided between a) UCLA-faculty vs non-affiliated families, and b) UCLA-faculty families affiliated with the different Schools (as listed below). We encourage the other institutions to review ECE’s comprehensive and clear prioritization policy, which is attached as appendix C. Please also include information on waitlists if they are used: how many UCLA-faculty children are on each waitlist, and how long on average does a child spend on the waitlist before being admitted?

Our waitlist is ranges from 75-100 children. How long on average a person is on our waitlist is difficult to answer given our priority groups described here: https://www.psych.ucla.edu/centers-programs/infant-development-program/tours-eligibility-applications/waitlist-priorities/

Children of faculty often are offered a spot, especially in priority groups. Of course, there are years were not as many children age out of our program and less spots are available.

2. Among the faculty families, what proportion are drawn from each of the University’s Schools, i.e., Medicine, Law, Management, SEIS, Public Affairs, Nursing, Arts and Architecture, Engineering, Music, Dentistry, Theater, Film & Television (TFT), Public Health, and the College? To what extent, if any, are these proportions restricted as part of the admissions process? This breakdown is needed to understand whether the institutions are predominantly serving the higher-paid sectors of our faculty. We understand that there will be families with mixed status (e.g., parents in different schools, or where one parent is a faculty member, one is not)—we assume these will be counted as 0.5 in each category.
## Infant Development Program

### Historical IDP Parental Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Unit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Campus Units</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson School of Business</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Dentistry</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Affairs</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSBEUS</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50%

Overview:

Part of the UCLA School of Education and Information Studies, UCLA Lab School is an innovative school for children ages 4-12.

The school encourages children’s natural love of learning while also helping them develop a disciplined approach to their work. At the same time, the school’s classrooms and meeting spaces serve as a laboratory for exploring innovative ideas about teaching, learning, and child development. The school shares the results of their studies through collaborations with educators from other schools, through conferences, workshops and site visits, and in print publications and other media. Through this mix of strategies, UCLA Lab School teaching practices and research outcomes have been widely shared with schools across the globe.

Admissions for the school are governed in part by the 1999 United States Court of Appeals ruling HUNTER BRANDT v. THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA. The link to the full court ruling can be found in the Appendices.

Mission:

The mission of UCLA Lab School is to promote innovation and excellence in education through research, outreach, and teaching and learning. We are dedicated to addressing the needs of children from diverse backgrounds. We value teaching and learning environments that honor each child’s natural joy of learning. We encourage creativity and support a disciplined approach to intellectual inquiry. We are a caring community of learners- students, teachers, staff, and families. We are committed to educating the whole child.
UCLA Lab School

Faculty Welfare Committee Data Request

COSTS

1. Is the cost of enrollment the same for UCLA faculty families vs non-UCLA affiliated families? If not, what is the cost differential?

Lab School tuition is the same for faculty families as non-UCLA affiliated families.

2. How is the priority for financial aid determined? Do UCLA faculty families receive higher priority, or greater financial assistance, than families who are not affiliated with UCLA, if they have identical financial profiles?

UCLA Lab School sets aside a percentage of tuition income to support the diversity goals for admissions. Families are required to submit financial data, including tax returns to a third-party verification company, School and Student Services (SSS). Based on the recommendations from SSS and the funds available, awards are made to families who demonstrate the greatest need for financial assistance.

3. How much is the spread for your institution? Does UCLA cover any amount towards the spread, e.g., a Dean’s tuition assistance for each faculty child? If the spread grows, do each school’s governing documents allow any course of action other than raising tuition across the board and/or trying to increase fundraising?

Deans provide an annual subsidy of $4,000 for faculty children who are admitted through the Dean’s List, with a lower annual subsidy of $3,087 for EC1 children (half-day preschool program).

The Dean’s fees have not increased from $4,000 since its inception starting with Fall 2016 Admissions. The lower annual subsidy fee structure agreement included a 5% increase over three years for 2018-2019, 2019-2020, and 2020-2021. The fees have not been raised commensurate with tuition costs.
FINANCIAL RELATIONSHIP WITH UCLA

1. How much support does UCLA contribute annually to each institution, where “support” is broadly defined to include provision of space, utilities, etc. at below-market rates?

All PreK-12 sites pay recharge fees for utilization of space, utilities and so on in the same way schools and other departments do. These fees include IT services, custodial and space utilization fees.

2. How does that support break down into benefits that target UCLA-affiliated families (e.g., tuition subsidies) versus those that target all families or the institution as a whole?

UCLA Lab School – n/a

PRIORITIZATION OF ADMISSION

1. How are admission slots allocated to UCLA-faculty families? In particular, how is priority decided between a) UCLA-faculty vs non-affiliated families, and b) UCLA-faculty families affiliated with the different Schools (as listed below). We encourage the other institutions to review ECE’s comprehensive and clear prioritization policy, which is attached as appendix C. Please also include information on waitlists if they are used: how many UCLA-faculty children are on each waitlist, and how long on average does a child spend on the waitlist before being admitted?

Waitlist- How many faculty children in wait pool?

How long on average does a child spend on waitlist before being admitted?

1a. UCLA Lab School admission policies are designed to support the school's research mission by assembling a student population that reflects the public elementary school population of the state, as nearly as we can. All admission decisions are made blindly from randomized lists of applicants through a lottery based on the following criteria: race, socio-economic status, gender, and age. These decisions are not personal; they are based only on the school's demographic & research needs rather than on any skills, abilities, or other personal attributes of the applicants or their families.

1b. See attached Partnership Agreement.

1c. The number of faculty children in the wait pool varies every year. All applications are active until school begins in September. Late slots are filled randomly from the applicant pool, based on the four demographic criteria, to match the population goals of that open slot.
2. Among the faculty families, what proportion are drawn from each of the University’s Schools, i.e., Medicine, Law, Management, SEIS, Public Affairs, Nursing, Arts and Architecture, Engineering, Music, Dentistry, Theater, Film & Television (TFT), Public Health, and the College? To what extent, if any, are these proportions restricted as part of the admissions process? This breakdown is needed to understand whether the institutions are predominantly serving the higher-paid sectors of our faculty. We understand that there will be families with mixed status (e.g., parents in different schools, or where one parent is a faculty member, one is not)—we assume these will be counted as 0.5 in each category.

See attached worksheet.

3. To what extent, if any, are these proportions restricted as part of the admissions process?

These proportions are not restricted as part of the admissions office.
It is UCLA Policy that admissions to UCLA Lab School be organized to yield a student population that mirrors the California elementary student population's major demographic characteristics. Although UCLA Lab School supports some recruitment and retention of Academic Senate Faculty and, capacity permitting, high-ranking administrative staff at UCLA, according to the Supreme Court order, the school's research and demographic needs prioritize all admissions decisions.

1. The number of spaces for all UCLA affiliates, will fluctuate at approximately one-third of the UCLA Lab School’s enrollment.
   - Partnership spaces for Senate Faculty, UCLA staff, students, and other UCLA families are all included in this percentage.

2. Eligibility for faculty-designated partnership spaces is limited to members of the Academic Senate and, capacity permitting, high-ranking administrative staff; all others are eligible through the general applicant pool.

3. Individual Units agree to pay ED&IS a $4,000.00 annual administrative partnership fee for each student admitted to UCLA Lab School from the Campus Nomination List.
   - Individual units agree to pay the administrative partnership fee every year a nominated student is enrolled at UCLA Lab School.
   - The $4000.00 Partnership Fee is in addition to the total cost of tuition; it is not a reduction in family's tuition payment.
   - All Academic Senate Faculty members with children enrolled at UCLA Lab School through the Campus Nomination List are responsible for paying the total annual tuition for their children and are not eligible for tuition support.
   - The deadline for Campus Nomination List admits to accept or decline enrollment will be determined annually by UCLA Lab School, and will coincide with their general enrollment deadlines; failure to decline enrollment by the published deadline will result in payment of the full administrative fee to ED&IS by the nominating unit.
   - If a space offered from the Campus Nomination List is declined, it reverts to the general pool of applicants.

4. UCLA Lab School will only maintain space priority for siblings of those admitted previously through the Campus Nomination List if the Unit agrees to pay the annual partnership fee for the sibling applicant each year the sibling is a student at UCLA Lab School.
   - Senate Faculty must renew their interest in applying to UCLA Lab School for a sibling with their Dean.
Application and Enrollment Policies – Academic Senate Faculty Members

1. A faculty member must submit an online application with UCLA Lab School by the published deadline during the fall quarter before they notify their unit (e.g., the dean of the school or department chair) of their interest in admissions to UCLA Lab School via the Campus Nomination List.

2. The call for nominations is sent out to the campus in October of each year.

3. Rank ordered nomination lists must be submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel according to the deadline set by the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, typically mid-January of each year.

4. Each individual unit will make its own decisions on ranking according to its institutional needs and priorities.

5. The unit is responsible for ensuring that nominees are aware of the admissions policies and procedures at UCLA Lab School. Applicants may find information on admissions on the school’s website: www.labschool.ucla.edu/admissions/.

6. Academic Senate Faculty, as well as staff and students, are still able to seek enrollment through the regular UCLA Lab School admission procedures.

7. UCLA Lab School does not keep a waiting list. Each year’s enrollment decisions are based on the research and demographic needs for that year.

8. Faculty members must abide by all the policies of UCLA Lab School to maintain their child’s enrollment in the program.

9. The ED&IS Dean will work closely with UCLA Lab School’s Principal to honor the Campus List as best possible, while creating classes of the right size and composition to maintain a balance that reflects the overall California public elementary school population for each grade level at the Lab School and enables the school to carry out its research responsibilities.
### UCLA Affiliated Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>445 Students Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total UCLA affiliate enrollment</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total partnership enrollment</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students of UCLA Lab School employees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other UCLA affiliates</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Students/School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Architecture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab School</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater, Film &amp; Television (TFT)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural &amp; Recreational Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFT Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA Health, Semel, Operation Mend</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling and Psychological Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology and Laboratory Medicine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruin Resource Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Fellow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geffen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HumaniHes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Geffen Academy at UCLA

Enrollment: 620 students in 2022-23 in grades 6-12

Overview:

Geffen Academy at UCLA was founded in part to support the recruitment and retention of UCLA's world-renowned faculty and staff. There are many ways that our partnership plays out at Geffen Academy. For example:

- UCLA undergraduate and graduate students contribute to campus life, as members of BruinCorps, CalTeach, leaders of the school's Classics Club, as teachers’ assistants, on-campus tutors, assistant athletic coaches, and student chaperones.
- Every year we host “UCLA at Geffen Academy Day,” at which professors and staff offer workshops for Geffen Academy students. World-renowned astrophysicists, legal historians, culture makers, literary scholars, and designers of robots visit Geffen Academy to share their learning and accomplishments with our students.
- Our student athletes are exposed to UCLA’s long and impressive athletic legacy. Geffen Academy students who participate in athletics play at the UCLA Student Activities Center, Drake Stadium, the Sunset Canyon tennis courts, and intramural fields.

Mission:

Geffen Academy at UCLA is a university-affiliated school for students in grades 6-12. We value academic depth and inspiration within a humane educational environment. Our community is guided by principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Geffen Academy students are encouraged to be questioners, analysts, and presenters, who are creative, collaborative, and active young adults. Our students practice their skills, competencies, and relationships with deliberation.

Geffen Academy graduates believe that knowledge is beautiful, transformative, and relevant to one’s life and civic responsibility in a global community.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

At Geffen Academy, the principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion are integral to the school’s overall mission, vision, and practice. We strive to be a transformative school that upholds a more just world and challenges systems of oppression that undermine humanity and our ecosystem.

As educators, students, and families, we believe that:

- A transformative educational experience acknowledges and develops the diversity of identities and experiences that individuals and communities bring to institutions;
- Individuals and communities are the agents of change in our institution; and
- Educational institutions must be reflective, allow for critical examination, and be continuously reworked in order to best meet the needs of the communities and individuals they serve.

Geffen Academy at UCLA was partly founded for the recruitment and retention of the University of California Los Angeles’s world-renowned faculty and staff. Geffen Academy is fully accredited by the Accrediting Commission for Schools (ACS), Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).
COSTS – School Tuition and Financial Assistance

1. Is the cost of enrollment the same for UCLA faculty families vs non-UCLA affiliated families? If not, what is the cost differential?

Geffen Academy tuition is the same for faculty families as non-UCLA affiliated families.

2. How is the priority for financial aid determined? Do UCLA faculty families receive higher priority, or greater financial assistance, than families who are not affiliated with UCLA, if they have identical financial profiles?

At Geffen Academy, UCLA faculty families do not receive higher priority, or greater financial assistance, than families who are not affiliated with UCLA, if they have identical financial profiles. Geffen Academy at UCLA uses a program called SmartAid to calculate tuition assistance awards. SmartAid analyzes financial data submitted directly by families, annually, to determine eligibility and amount of tuition assistance awards. Some 30% of families at Geffen Academy receive some level of tuition assistance each year.

3. How much is the spread for your institution? Does UCLA cover any amount towards the spread, e.g., a Dean’s tuition assistance for each faculty child? If the spread grows, do each school’s governing documents allow any course of action other than raising tuition across the board and/or trying to increase fundraising?

Geffen Academy does not collect Dean’s fees for any enrolled students and the school’s revenue consists entirely of tuition and fees and fundraising. Tuition revenue does not cover the cost of operating expenses. Geffen Academy operates a Summer Enrichment program and a summer Wellness Institute for teachers, both of which can be sources of revenue.

FINANCIAL RELATIONSHIP WITH UCLA

How much support does UCLA contribute annually to each institution, where “support” is broadly defined to include provision of space, utilities, etc. at below-market rates?

Geffen Academy pays recharge rates for services from the university such as utilities, custodial services, security, IT services, facilities improvements and maintenance, similar to other campus self-supporting entities.

Geffen Academy’s founding gift funded the renovation of the school building prior to opening.
1. How does that support break down into benefits that target UCLA-affiliated families (e.g., tuition subsidies) versus those that target all families or the institution as a whole?

University financial support benefits all Geffen Academy students and Educators.

PRIORITIZATION OF ADMISSION

1. How are admission slots allocated to UCLA-faculty families? In particular, how is priority decided between a) UCLA-faculty vs non-affiliated families, and b) UCLA-faculty families affiliated with the different Schools (as listed below). We encourage the other institutions to review ECE’s comprehensive and clear prioritization policy, which is attached as appendix C. Please also include information on waitlists if they are used: how many UCLA-faculty children are on each waitlist, and how long on average does a child spend on the waitlist before being admitted?

Geffen Academy at UCLA’s gift agreement with the David Geffen Foundation states that Geffen Academy will have no more than 50% of the student population of the Geffen Academy be children or other relatives of UCLA faculty or staff.

According to information provided by families at the time of their application to Geffen Academy, some 35% of current families are employed by the university.

Geffen Academy engages in strategic efforts to bolster UCLA families' interest and awareness and enrollment in Geffen Academy. Such efforts include the prioritization of UCLA families for access to interviews with an admissions team member. Additionally, the admissions team reviews applications from UCLA affiliated families first and allocates remaining admissions spaces thereafter.

For the 2022-2023 school year, a total of 109 new families have enrolled. Some 40 of these families are affiliated with the university, and 32 of the 40 families have one or more parents who are faculty members. UCLA faculty members can be put forth for admissions consideration by deans from any school that chooses to do so. Sole discretion for admissions decisions resides with Geffen Academy.

Geffen Academy utilizes a waitpool rather than a waitlist. Students in the waitpool are deemed admissible but their admissibility is not ranked. The School turns to the waitpool based on current enrollment needs. Admission from the waitpool reflects enrollment needs. Currently there are 15 faculty children in the waitpool. Movement from the waitpool can happen any time between late March, when admissions decisions are distributed, and late August, when a new school year begins.

2. Among the faculty families, what proportion are drawn from each of the University’s Schools, i.e., Medicine, Law, Management, SEIS, Public Affairs, Nursing, Arts and Architecture, Engineering, Music, Dentistry, Theater, Film & Television (TFT), Public Health, and the College? To what extent, if any, are these proportions restricted as part of the admissions process? This breakdown is needed to understand whether the institutions are predominantly serving the higher-paid sectors of our faculty. We understand that there will be families with mixed status (e.g., parents in different schools, or where one parent is a faculty member, one is not)—we assume these will be counted as 0.5 in each category.
Here is the categorization of UCLA-affiliated enrolled families, faculty and staff, at Geffen Academy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson School of Mngmnt</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geffen Academy at UCLA</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Institute</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luskin School of Public Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIS</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices
Early Care and Education Eligibility and Enrollment Policy

NUMBER: EC 1.1
ISSUER: Devin Dillon, Superintendent PreK-12 Operations
DATE: Original August 4, 2021
Revised May 18, 2022 to include language about pay to hold space and temporary termination options for families.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this policy is to define the eligibility and criteria to be used for enrollment of children in the Early Care and Education programs and centers. The policy also details the enrollment procedures followed in the Early Care and Education department.

BACKGROUND:

UCLA Early Care and Education (ECE) supports the recruitment, retention and success of UCLA faculty, staff and students by providing families with center-based care and education. Priority consideration is given to full-time faculty and staff parents employed by UCLA and to student parents enrolled full-time in undergraduate or graduate programs. Children of current ECE teachers and department staff will be prioritized above other staff positions for spaces available. Faculty and staff applicants employed less than 50% time will remain in the applicant pool until those appointed 100% time have been served.

Early Care and Education strives to serve campus families in a way that represents the diversity (racial and ethnic, socio-economic, LGBTQ identities) of the campus population. ECE is committed to working towards greater accessibility and access for families on campus as well as promoting greater equity and inclusion in the child care centers and programs it operates. ECE recognizes the importance of providing child care to all members of its community, including faculty, staff and student families, as well as non-affiliated families.

Grandchildren of UCLA faculty, staff, and emeriti, and children of alumni families will be considered only if overflow space is available after current faculty, staff and students have been offered placement. Volunteers are treated as community families. Community families will be considered for enrollment after all University-affiliated families have been offered enrollment.

Oversight

UCLA Early Care and Education is a unit within UCLA Administration, with research connections to the School of Education and Information Studies. Oversight for the operations and finance of ECE is provided by the Superintendent PreK-12 Operations.

The Early Care and Education Advisory Board, representing faculty, staff and student constituencies, provide support and advocate for the child care needs of campus families.
PROCEDURES:

Affiliation Verification

Upon request, a parent/guardian must be able to document their UCLA faculty, staff or student affiliation to join the ECE Applicant Pool, or to continue their child’s ECE enrollment. New faculty or staff must submit an appointment or offer letter; and new UCLA students should submit an acceptance letter to document pending enrollment. Prior to a child’s application to the ECE community program, UCLA alumni families must provide: a. either a copy of a UCLA diploma (undergraduate or graduate, excluding UCLA Extension); or b. a transcript documenting completion of two years’ UCLA enrollment in an academic program.

Sibling Priority – Currently-Affiliated Families

Siblings of currently-affiliated, enrolled children may be offered, but are not guaranteed, priority enrollment. Sibling preference only applies at the same ECE location, and is only a consideration if the sibling who enrolled first continues their enrollment through the coming contract year. There may be exceptions for subsidized student families covered by the California Department of Education (CDE) and the Department of Social Services (CDSS) contract.

Applicant Pool Date

ECE does not assign an applicant pool number or position. An applicant pool date is assigned according to the date ECE receives the applicant pool form and non-refundable fee. ECE allows two offer declinations at any center requested on or after the preferred start date. After that point, if a parent wishes to be considered for future openings, they would have to reapply and be assigned a new applicant pool date. If a parent/guardian terminates services and wishes to re-enroll a child in the program, they must also submit a new application, pay a new non-refundable application fee, and would be assigned a new applicant pool date.

Priority for Families Requesting Tuition Assistance

ECE contracts with the California Departments of Education and Social Services for a limited number of subsidized spaces. Priority is determined based on lowest income and demonstrated need for early learning and care services. These spaces are reserved for UCLA parenting students.

For student families:

Parent 1, the affiliated parent, must be continuously enrolled at UCLA and paying registration fees. Parent 2 must be enrolled in any school, or working, or seeking employment. The ECE Applicant Pool Form must be submitted with a Tuition Assistance Request Form.

For ECE staff families:

Parent 1 must be a full-time staff member employed within the ECE department.

Limited tuition assistance for qualified staff families is available each year. Income verification will be required through a third-party vendor, Student Support Services.

To request tuition assistance, submit an ECE applicant pool form with a fee assistance request form. Visit www.ece.ucla.edu for details.
Community Enrollment

When spaces remain unfilled by affiliated families, ECE may offer enrollment to families unaffiliated with UCLA from the community at large. See Enrollment Priority #5 below for Community Enrollment priorities.

Enrollment priority order by applicant pool date

1. Senate Faculty
2. UCLA Students
3. Early Care and Education Staff
4. Non-Senate Faculty and Staff
5. Community, a.k.a. non-affiliated, families are prioritized in the following order once the Applicant Pool for currently-affiliated families has been exhausted.

**These families will be charged a higher Community rate.**

a. Grandchildren of current faculty
b. Grandchildren of current staff
c. Children and/or grandchildren of emeriti or retired faculty
d. Children and/or grandchildren of alumni or former staff
e. Children of families from the general community

Enrollment Procedures

A space becomes available when a currently-enrolled family submits an official Notice of Termination 45 days in advance. ECE fills that space either by moving a child currently enrolled in the program from a younger to an older age group and enrolling a younger child from the applicant pool, or, by enrolling a same-age child from the applicant pool. University Village residents receive priority enrollment at the University Village Center. The enrollment manager monitors commitments to faculty, staff and student constituencies and extends offers to families according to guidelines outlined in this policy. Of the maximum capacity of 341 spaces, 177 are allocated to Academic Senate Faculty, 82 to students, and 82 to staff (includes postdocs, interns, residents and fellows).

Parents interested in ECE services must complete a separate applicant pool form for each child and pay the non-refundable fee. Applications will be prioritized by applicant pool date only on a first-come, first served basis.

- Once offered a space, the family has 24 hours after touring the classroom to accept or decline. If the family declines or makes no decision by that time the space will be offered to the next age-eligible child in the applicant pool.
- After the first declination the family must provide a new preferred start date.
- After the second declination a new application and fee is required to rejoin the applicant pool for further consideration, and a new applicant pool date is assigned.
- A family may request that a new space offered be held for a (3) three-month maximum as long as the full monthly rate is paid.
- Once enrolled, an absence ranging from a minimum of (3) months to a maximum of (12) months requires an approved Temporary Termination with Intent to Return.
Fees

The Affiliated rates will be charged for children of current UCLA faculty, staff and non-subsidized students according to the approved rates for UCLA families for the duration of enrollment as specified on the Contract for Services Agreement. Fees for children who are not dependents of current UCLA faculty, staff, or student parents will be charged a higher Community rate.

Priority for Faculty Families

Members of the Academic Senate – with specific pay titles – are provided with priority enrollment. Recruitment and retention of Academic Senate Faculty is an institutional priority and is supported by child care spaces allocated for that purpose. The total allocation of spaces for faculty, staff and student constituencies as outlined in this document reflects discussions with the ECE Advisory Board, faculty, the deans, and the Academic Senate Faculty Welfare Committee. This section is specific to the allocation of spaces to Academic Senate Faculty members and includes only the following titles:

Regular Professorial Series (Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty):
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Full Professor

In-Residence Professorial Series
- Assistant Professor-In-Residence
- Associate Professor-In-Residence
- Full Professor-In-Residence

Clinical X Professorial Series
- Assistant Professor of Clinical (X)
- Associate Professor of Clinical (X)
- Full Professor of Clinical (X)

Acting Professorial Series (does not include Assistant)
- Acting Associate Professor
- Acting Full Professor

Lecturer with Security of Employment (SOE)
- Lecturer with Potential of Security of Employment (LecturerPSOE)
- Lecturer with Security of Employment (Lecturer SOE)
- Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment (Sr. Lecturer SOE)

NOTE: Titles other than those listed above may fill designated Academic Senate Faculty spaces by the request of the appropriate Dean. In those cases, the Dean is responsible for the fees of ALL spaces filled by individuals from their school or division as covered by this policy.
Faculty Eligibility

1. As noted above, there are a maximum of 341 spaces available in the ECE program. Each center strives to include representation of faculty, staff and student families. The University Village Center enrolls a higher proportion of student families because of its proximity to student housing.

2. The 177 potential faculty spaces (52% of total enrollment) are allocated by the proportion of faculty who are members of the Academic Senate represented from the Professional Schools, the College, and the School of Medicine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Unit</th>
<th>Proportion of Academic Senate Members (n=2,469)</th>
<th>Proportion of Child Care Spaces Allocated (n=177)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Schools</td>
<td>29.85%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College</td>
<td>35.16%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>34.99%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.00% 177

*These numbers are approximations and updated annually.

NOTE: ECE will always offer spaces based on these allocations. Multiple instances of Senate Faculty families declining an offered space will result in total enrollment that varies from these numbers.

Deans’ Fees

UCLA ECE is a self-supporting service to the campus. In order to maintain its level of outstanding service and to provide reasonable rates to faculty, ECE must continually seek out additional funding sources. Deans provide an annual subsidy of $2,000 for each child of an Academic Senate Faculty member (or the dean’s designee) from their school/division who is enrolled annually on October 1 in the ECE program.

The deans are responsible for the $2,000 annual subsidy for every space filled by a school/division’s Academic Senate member (or dean’s designee), whether or not the dean has prioritized that faculty member.

Priority Enrollment

- All faculty must apply directly to ECE and pay the appropriate fee to be placed in the ECE Applicant Pool.
- Faculty are prioritized by Applicant Pool Date only, on a first-come, first served basis.
- Each dean may request (2) two spaces for priority enrollment in ECE. The dean’s request does not guarantee enrollment. ECE will work to accommodate the dean’s priority requests as spaces are available in the program. Deans should submit their two priority nominations by June 15th each academic year.
- ECE does not rank applications or determine priority for any faculty member.
- ECE does not accept letters of support on behalf of faculty applicants.
- Ranked priorities should be submitted to the ECE enrollment manager each spring by **June 15th**.
- Deans/Schools give priority to Academic Senate Faculty families.

An Academic Unit may request that a space be held for a faculty member for a (3) three-month maximum as long as the full monthly rate is paid by the Academic Unit or the family. For example, a (3) three-month hold will enable a school to hold a space over the summer for a new faculty member or a faculty member on sabbatical. See page 4 for requested leaves of absence over (3) three months.

**DEFINITIONS:**

**Applicant Pool:** The list of applicants who have applied to the Early Care and Education centers. The applicant pool includes faculty, staff, student and non-affiliated, community families.

**Non-affiliated families:** Families not affiliated with UCLA. Otherwise known as community families.

**Preferred Start Date:** The date on or after which a family indicates they prefer to begin child care.

**ASSISTANCE:**  https://www.ece.ucla.edu/
HUNTER BRANDT v. THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit.


No. 97-55920.

Decided: September 09, 1999

Before: PREGERSON, BEEZER, and HAWKINS, Circuit Judges. James K.T. Hunter, Los Angeles, California, and Mark T. Gallagher, Sacramento, California, for the plaintiff-appellant. Dennis M. Perluss, Los Angeles, California, for the defendants-appellees.

I.

This case is about an elementary school operated as a research laboratory by UCLA's Graduate School of Education and Information Studies. The Corinne A. Seeds University Elementary School (“UES”), and its research and training mission is to help the State of California meet the needs of a dramatically changing public school population. To this end, UES identifies issues relevant to the education and social development of children in multicultural, urban communities, conducts research on these issues, and develops innovations in teaching based on this research. UES shares its research results with public school teachers throughout the State of California through seminars, workshops, teacher training programs, and published articles.

Each year, UES's Admissions Committee, under the direction of the Dean of the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies and the Director of UES, determines what characteristics are needed in UES's 460-student population to fulfill its research and training mission. UES considers gender, race/ethnicity, and family income in its admissions process to obtain the desired student population. In selecting students, UES also considers other factors that might affect a child's suitability as a research subject, e.g., dominant language, permanence of residence, and parents' willingness to comply with UES's mandatory involvement requirement. Parents of students applying to UES are informed of UES's consideration of race/ethnicity, gender, and family income in admissions.
Richard Hunter and Gina Brandt’s older daughter Cia was admitted into UES through its admissions process. Apparently pleased with Cia’s experience at UES, in 1995, the year after Cia graduated, they sought to enroll their younger daughter, Keeley. Keeley was not selected for admission. When notified that their daughter had not been admitted, Keeley’s parents sued the Regents of the University of California (“Regents”) under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. section 2000d, and Dr. Theodore Mitchell, Dean of the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, under 42 U.S.C. section 1983. The suit challenges the constitutionality of UES’s admissions process.

The district court conducted extensive hearings on the school’s purpose, its research, and its admission process, and ultimately ruled in its favor. The district court found that (1) California had a compelling state interest in operating a research-oriented elementary school dedicated to improving the quality of education in urban public schools, and (2) UES’s consideration of race/ethnicity in its admissions process was narrowly tailored to further that interest. We affirm.

II.

The Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits a state from “deny[ing] to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.” U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1. The Supreme Court has said that “any person, of whatever race, has the right to demand that any governmental actor subject to the Constitution justify any racial classification subjecting that person to unequal treatment under the strictest judicial scrutiny.” Adarand Constructors, Inc., v. Pena, 515 U.S. 200, 224, 115 S.Ct. 2097, 132 L.Ed.2d 158 (1995). To meet the strict scrutiny test, the Regents must demonstrate that UES’s consideration of race/ethnicity is narrowly tailored to serve a compelling governmental interest. See id. at 227, 115 S.Ct. 2097.

The district court’s conclusion that UES’s admissions procedures meet the strict scrutiny test is based on extensive findings of fact which we review for clear error. See National Ass’n of Radiation Survivors v. Derwinski, 994 F.2d 583, 587 (9th Cir.1993). After reviewing the entire record, we conclude that Judge Kenyon’s findings of fact were not clearly erroneous.

The district court’s conclusions regarding the sufficiency of those facts in meeting strict scrutiny is a mixed question of law and fact which we review de novo. See id. We conclude, as did the district court, that the facts demonstrate that the defendants have met the strict scrutiny test.

III.

In applying the strict scrutiny test to UES’s use of race/ethnicity as a factor in its admissions process, we first consider whether California’s interest in the operation of a research-oriented elementary school dedicated to improving the quality of education in urban public schools is a compelling state interest.


The district court heard extensive expert testimony on current problems in public urban education. The challenges posed by California’s increasingly diverse population intensify the state’s interest in improving urban public schools. Cultural and economic differences in the classroom pose special problems for public school teachers. In his decision, Judge Kenyon noted that defendants presented “an unexhaustive list of such issues and challenges [that] includes limited language proficiency, different learning styles, involvement of parents from diverse cultures with different expectations...
and values, and racial and ethnic conflict among families and children.” Dr. Mitchell, who testified as an expert witness, stated that “[t]here is no more pressing problem facing California, or indeed the nation, than urban education; for it is in the urban school system that the majority of California’s future citizens will be educated (either well or poorly), creating the basic fabric for the society of the future.”

UES is dedicated to providing more useful and more accurate information to educators facing these challenges. Dr. Deborah Stipek, director of UES, testified, “[t]he current mission of UES is to do research relevant to urban education and to disseminate that research to promote more effective education for children in urban schools.” As part of its research mission, UES exchanges information with the State Department of Education as well as other California educational policy groups; trains teachers; develops and tests innovative teaching strategies; and disseminates study results nationwide.

Dr. Mitchell also testified that “[t]he dynamic interplay of research, dissemination, professional development, and the training of an ever-expanding cadre of researchers dedicated to finding the answers to the perplexing problems facing urban schools . makes UES a unique and powerful instrument in meeting the State’s fundamental obligations to the children of its cities.”

Given this record, the district court concluded, and we agree, that “the defendants’ interest in operating a research-oriented elementary school is compelling.”

The dissent expresses some concern that, as a result of our decision, “every stratum of a state’s public education system (whether formally designated a ‘laboratory school’ or not) may now in the name of ‘research on effective educational strategies’ implement a racially classified admission system.” Infra at 1075. We do not share this concern.

It is not UES’s designation as a laboratory school that justifies its admission process. UES’s status as a laboratory school with a research mission is not a designation without substance. UES’s research is funded in part through federal and private grants and its students are protected by all federal, state, and university guidelines, rules, and policies pertaining to research involving human subjects. Research results are shared through “a variety of publications, the television and film industries, computer technologies, and other media,” as well as through “seminars, workshops, observation opportunities, and conferences” offered to teachers, administrators, researchers, and educational policy makers. Its research mission and its dissemination of information makes UES “a center for the education and training of teachers and educational leaders.” Through UES, “nationally recognized scholars work together with educators and administrators to foster a better schooling system for California children.”

Nor does UES’s stated mission of “educational research” justify its admissions process. A mere statement from a governmental entity that it is committed to research, without more, would not be sufficient to establish a compelling interest. But research is fundamental to the UES’s charter. The research mission affects the day-to-day experience of its students and requires more resources than those available in most, if not all, other elementary schools. In 1995, UES’s elementary school, with its population of 460 students, had a faculty of twenty-seven professors with doctorates in fields including psychology, education, and medicine. In addition, twenty-one graduate, doctoral, and post-doctoral students, three medical students, thirty-two nursing students, and seventy-five undergraduate student teachers were involved with the elementary school, observing, working with students, and conducting research.

All of these characteristics make UES an exceptional school and a valuable resource to California’s public education system. Consequently, we do not share the dissent’s concerns that this decision will lead to racial classification in “every stratum of a state’s public education system.” Infra at 1075.
To complete our strict scrutiny analysis, we next address the question whether the district court correctly concluded that “[t]he defendants have successfully proven that the use of racial and ethnic identity criteria in UES’s admission policy is narrowly tailored to serve the purpose of a compelling state interest.” (Emphasis added.) In support of this conclusion, the district court pointed to “a parade of experts [who testified] about the necessity of a race-conscious admission policy at UES. Each expert’s testimony was underscored by the belief that the State must `continue to conduct research on issues involving how children learn and how we can do a better job of teaching them.’” (quoting Dr. Harry Handler’s testimony).

Dr. Carollee Howes testified that “[t]here is a simple rule about being a researcher. If you’re trying to find a sample that has some [particular] distribution of race, you use race as the variable to make that. You don’t use an approximation or some variable of it.” Dr. Stipek further testified that “even if the applicant pool in the aggregate [was] sufficiently diverse, an entirely random selection would not yield a population that balances ethnicity with other factors, such as age, gender and family income.” Dr. Handler also testified that “[b]ecause of the small sample size, it is highly unlikely that such a small group, if selected without some explicit consideration of race/ethnicity, would be representative of Los Angeles’ or the State’s urban school population.”

The district court commented on the testimony presented:

The Court simply cannot hope to recount each of the particular innovative educational techniques developed at UES, or each of the specific studies conducted at UES, which rely on the diversity of the laboratory school’s student population. Having examined the testimony of the defendants’ witnesses, the Court is convinced that without a racially and ethnically diverse student population, the benefits to be gained by these innovations and studies would be lost.

Accordingly, the district court concluded that “it would not be possible, nor would it be reasonable, to require the defendants to attempt to obtain an ethnically diverse representative sample of students without the use of specific racial targets and classifications.”

The dissent suggests a number of alternatives to UES’s current admissions process. These alternatives range from locating laboratory schools elsewhere to mandating laboratory conditions in public schools throughout California. See infra at 1077. But both Dr. Stipek and Dr. Handler testified that it was necessary to explicitly consider race/ethnicity in UES’s admissions process to achieve the precise student population required for UES’s research. Therefore, even if California were to establish one or more other lab schools elsewhere, this would not address UES’s need to maintain the representative sample of students UES needs to fulfill its research mission.

Finally, in evaluating whether UES’s use of race/ethnicity in its admissions process is narrowly tailored, we recognize, as did the district court, that courts should defer to researchers’ decisions about what they need for their research. The Supreme Court has stated: “Courts have stressed the importance of avoiding second-guessing of legitimate academic judgments. This Court itself has cautioned that `judges . asked to review the substance of a genuinely academic decision . should show great respect for the faculty’s professional judgment.’” University of Penn. v. EEOC, 493 U.S. 182, 199, 110 S.Ct. 577, 107 L.Ed.2d 571 (1990) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

Based on the evidence in the record, we agree with the district court’s determination that UES’s use of race/ethnicity in its admissions process is narrowly tailored to achieve the necessary laboratory environment.

V.

In short, UES is a research-oriented institution dedicated to developing effective techniques for use in urban public schools—a project that benefits public school children throughout the state. California has a compelling interest in providing effective education to its diverse, multi-ethnic, public school population. UES’s use of race/ethnicity in its
admissions process is narrowly tailored to achieve the necessary laboratory environment to produce research results which can be used to improve the education of California’s ethnically diverse urban public school population.

AFFIRMED.

Keeley Tatsuyo Hunter appeals the district court’s determination that the use of a racially classified admissions procedure at the Corrine A. Seeds University Elementary School (“UES”) does not violate the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

I write separately to express my fundamental disagreement with the court’s opinion. It contravenes the central purpose of the Equal Protection Clause: to purge racial classifications from public life. The opinion strays from our precedent and fails to take heed of the Supreme Court’s repeated warnings against allowing the use of racial classifications in non-remedial contexts. More generally, the opinion reflects a disquieting renewed tolerance for the use of race in governmental decisionmaking.

UES is a laboratory elementary school operated by the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies (“GSE & IS”) at the University of California, Los Angeles (“UCLA”). Students at UES are research subjects.1 - UES’s stated mission is to conduct research relevant to an urban educational experience, to work with teachers, communities and schools to disseminate that research and to foster a more effective education system primarily for urban elementary students. More specifically, as described in appellees’ brief, UES is devoted to “[s]tudying how children learn and how their backgrounds and family experiences—including their racial and ethnic identities—impact on their educational experience.”

UES has a student population of approximately 460 children, ages 4 to 12, who attend pre-kindergarten through sixth grade classes.

The UES admissions committee is comprised of three UES teachers and two GSE & IS faculty members. In selecting students for each year’s incoming class, the UES admissions committee does not use pre-selection interviews, achievement/ability testing or any other type of competitive criteria. However, the UES admissions committee explicitly considers, inter alia, every applicant’s racial/ethnic identity.2 - It does so in an attempt to obtain what it considers an adequate cross-sample of the general student population, thus maintaining the scientific credibility of its educational studies.3-

In December 1994 Hunter, who is now eight years old, applied for admission into UES’s 1995-1996 entering class for four-year-olds (the so-called Early Childhood, or “EC-1,” Program). Six racial/ethnic categories were used for the 1995-1996 admissions cycle: African-American, Asian-American, Native American, Latino(a), Caucasian and Multi-Ethnic. In the section of the admissions application entitled “Child’s Ethnic Identity,” Hunter identified herself as “Asian-American (specify): Japanese” and “Caucasian.”4 - Hunter was one of 215 applicants for admission to UES’s EC-1 program, 46 of whom were admitted. On March 11, 1995, Hunter was notified that she had been denied admission.

The UES admissions procedure for the 1995-1996 school year operated as follows:

First, the 20 siblings of current UES students who applied for admission were identified and admitted;

Second, the UES admissions committee determined a specific number of each racial/ethnic group to be admitted;

Third, dominant Spanish-speaking applicants were identified and a number of them were admitted;

Fourth, applicants from each self-identified racial/ethnic group were chosen at random to create a shorter list of potential admittees;
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between individuals on the basis of race.” Shaw I, 509 U.S. at 642, 113 S.Ct. 2816. It is meant to ensure that all persons

will be treated “as individuals, not simply as components of a racial class.” Miller v. Johnson, 515 U.S. 900, 911, 115


unequally because of his or her race, that person has suffered an injury that falls squarely within the language and spirit of


“[R]egardless of [the] purported motivation,” Coalition for Economic Equity v. Wilson, 122 F.3d 692, 702 (9th Cir.1997), “all racial classifications, imposed by whatever federal, state, or local governmental actor, must be analyzed by a reviewing court under strict scrutiny.” Adarand, 515 U.S. at 227, 115 S.Ct. 2097; see Coalition for Economic Equity, 122 F.3d at 702 (“[a]ny governmental action that classifies persons by race is presumptively unconstitutional and subject to the most exacting judicial scrutiny”). “[S]uch classifications are constitutional only if they are narrowly tailored measures that further compelling governmental interests.” Adarand, 515 U.S. at 227, 115 S.Ct. 2097. It is the government’s burden to satisfy the demands of this “extraordinary justification,” Coalition for Economic Equity, 122 F.3d at 702. See Adarand, 515 U.S. at 224, 115 S.Ct. 2097 (“any person, of whatever race, has the right to demand that any governmental actor subject to the Constitution justify any racial classification subjecting that person to unequal treatment under the strictest judicial scrutiny”).

III

It is uncontroversial that the racially classified admissions procedure at UES treats individuals unequally. Cf. Coalition For Economic Equity v. Wilson, 122 F.3d 692, 707 (9th Cir.1997). The only issues on appeal are whether appellees have asserted a sufficiently compelling interest to do so, and whether their chosen means are narrowly tailored to serve that interest.
Appellees assert two separate, but related, compelling governmental interests: (1) California’s “interest in research on effective urban educational strategies and dissemination of new knowledge about educational practices” and (2) California’s “interest in promoting freedom of inquiry at the University of California.” Appellees’ Brief at 18, 41. Neither interest, whether considered singly or together, is sufficiently compelling to withstand strict scrutiny.

As the First Circuit recently noted in Wessmann v. Gittens, 160 F.3d 790, 795 (1st Cir.1998), “[t]he question of precisely what interests government may legitimately invoke to justify race-based classifications is largely unsettled.” A few things, however, are certain. “A State’s interest in remedying the effects of past or present racial discrimination may in the proper case justify a government’s use of racial distinctions.” Shaw v. Hunt, 517 U.S. 899, 909, 116 S.Ct. 1894, 135 L.Ed.2d 207 (1996) (“Shaw II”). For that interest to constitute a compelling governmental interest, it must satisfy two conditions. First, the discrimination must be specific, identified discrimination. See id. Second, “the institution that makes the racial distinction must have had a ‘strong basis in evidence’ to conclude that remedial action was necessary.” Id. at 910, 116 S.Ct. 1894.

It is also certain that “a generalized assertion of past discrimination in a particular industry or region is not adequate” to justify a race-conscious remedial scheme. See Shaw II, 517 U.S. at 909, 116 S.Ct. 1894. Such a broadbrush justification “provides no guidance for a legislative body to determine the precise scope of the injury it seeks to remedy.” Id. (internal quotation marks omitted). For like reasons, the “role model” theory is unacceptable as a compelling governmental interest. Not only does such a theory lack any connection to “the kind of prior discrimination that would justify race-based relief,” but also it “could be used to justify race-based decisionmaking essentially limitless in scope and duration.” Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co., 488 U.S. 469, 497-98, 109 S.Ct. 706, 102 L.Ed.2d 854 (1989) (plurality opinion) (internal quotation marks omitted). Unlike a race-based remedy that is specifically tied to the eradication of identified past discrimination, the role model theory “has no logical stopping point.” Wygant, 476 U.S. at 275, 106 S.Ct. 1842 (plurality opinion). It would allow the government “to engage in discriminatory practices long past the point required by any legitimate remedial purpose.” Id.

Beyond those few certainties, the caselaw is more opaque. In Croson, a plurality of the Supreme Court held that racial classifications are justified only when used to remedy the effects of racial discrimination. See Croson, 488 U.S. at 493, 109 S.Ct. 706 (O’Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and White and Kennedy, JJ.) (“Classifications based on race carry a danger of stigmatic harm. Unless they are strictly reserved for remedial settings, they may in fact promote notions of racial inferiority and lead to a politics of racial hostility.”). One year later, four members of the current Supreme Court reiterated this view: “We subject even racial classifications claimed to be remedial to strict scrutiny. To ensure that the Government in fact employs any race-conscious measures to further this remedial interest in redressing the effects of identified race discrimination[ ] and employs them only when, and no more broadly than, the interest demands.” Metro Broadcasting, Inc. v. FCC, 497 U.S. 547, 611, 110 S.Ct. 2997, 111 L.Ed.2d 445 (1990) (O’Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and Scalia and Kennedy, J.J., dissenting) (citing Croson, 488 U.S. at 493-95, 498-502, 109 S.Ct. 706 and Wygant, 476 U.S. 267, 106 S.Ct. 1842, 90 L.Ed.2d 260 (plurality opinion)).

Six of our sister circuits have adopted this view and have definitively held that racial classifications may only be used for the purpose of remedying racial discrimination. See Hopwood v. State of Texas, 78 F.3d 932, 944 (5th Cir.1996); Contractors Ass’n v. City of Philadelphia, 91 F.3d 586, 596 (3d Cir.1996); Aiken v. City of Memphis, 37 F.3d 1155, 1162-63 (6th Cir.1994); In re Birmingham Reverse Discrimination Employment Litig., 20 F.3d 1525, 1544 (11th Cir.1994); O’Donnell Construction Co. v. District of Columbia, 963 F.2d 420, 424 (D.C.Cir.1992); Podberesky v. Kirwan, 956 F.2d 52, 56 (4th Cir.1992).
Cir. 1992). But see Wittmer v. Peters, 87 F.3d 916, 919 (7th Cir. 1996) (holding that effective operation of prison boot camps is compelling governmental interest). We have also clearly held that “[r]ace-based classifications must be reserved strictly for remedial settings.” Coral Constr. Co. v. King County, 941 F.2d 910, 920 (9th Cir. 1991) (citing Croson, 488 U.S. at 493, 524, 109 S.Ct. 706); see also Monterey Mechanical Co. v. Wilson, 125 F.3d 702, 714 (9th Cir. 1997). But cf. Coalition for Economic Equity v. Wilson, 122 F.3d 692, 708 (9th Cir. 1997) (“The Equal Protection Clause . prohibits [racial classifications] in all but the most compelling circumstances. [Racial classifications are] in most circumstances irrelevant and therefore prohibited [and] should be subject to detailed judicial inquiry to ensure that the personal right to that equal protection of the laws has not been infringed.”).

A majority of the Supreme Court has never accepted a non-remedial justification for a racial classification. See Metro, 497 U.S. at 612, 110 S.Ct. 2997 (O’Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and Scalia and Kennedy, J.J., dissenting) (“Modern equal protection doctrine has recognized only one [compelling governmental] interest [in using racial classifications]: remedying the effects of racial discrimination.”). In fact, four members of the Court, dissenting in Metro, squarely rejected a non-remedial compelling governmental interest in “diversity of broadcast viewpoints.” See id. Two circuit courts have also specifically rejected the “diversity” justification. See Hopwood, 78 F.3d at 948 (“the use of race to achieve a diverse student body . simply cannot be a state interest compelling enough to meet the steep standard of strict scrutiny”); Lutheran Church-Mo. Synod v. FCC, 141 F.3d 344, 354 (D.C.Cir.1998) (noting, in the employment context, that “[w]e do not think diversity can be elevated to the ‘compelling’ level, particularly when the Court has given every indication of wanting to cut back Metro Broadcasting”). Based on its review of the relevant Supreme Court caselaw, the Hopwood court even went so far as to state that “non-remedial state interests will never justify racial classifications.” Hopwood, 78 F.3d at 944.

Justice O’Connor’s dissenting opinion in Metro represented the view of four Justices. The majority opinion in Metro upheld the federal government’s non-remedial interest in “diversity of broadcast viewpoints” only by applying intermediate scrutiny (which the Court believed appropriate for federal racial classifications). Metro has since been overruled, see Adarand, 515 U.S. at 225-27, 115 S.Ct. 2097, in part because its application of intermediate scrutiny to federal racial classifications was inconsistent with the strict scrutiny applied to state racial classifications. In overruling Metro, Adarand did not specifically address the question whether “diversity of broadcast viewpoints” could count as a compelling governmental interest under strict scrutiny. See id. at 258-59, 115 S.Ct. 2097 (Stevens, J., dissenting) (“the question is not remotely presented in this case”). Thus, the Metro dissent’s thorough and thoughtful rejection of an asserted non-remedial governmental interest in “diversity” under strict scrutiny provides significant guidance on the question whether UES’s asserted interests in educational research and academic freedom constitute compelling governmental interests.

The leitmotif of Justice O’Connor’s dissent in Metro is best captured by the following: “Social scientists may debate how peoples’ thoughts and behavior reflect their background, but the Constitution provides that the Government may not allocate benefits and burdens among individuals based on the assumption that race or ethnicity determines how they act or think.” Metro, 497 U.S. at 602, 110 S.Ct. 2997 (O’Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and Scalia and Kennedy, J.J., dissenting). Racial classifications, “whether providing benefits to or burdening particular racial or ethnic groups,” are inherently pernicious because “[t]hey endorse race-based reasoning and the conception of a Nation divided into racial blocs, thus contributing to an escalation of racial hostility and conflict.” Id. at 603-04, 110 S.Ct. 2997. Such policies “may stigmatize those groups singled out for different treatment” and “may embody stereotypes that treat individuals as the product of their race.” Id. at 604, 110 S.Ct. 2997.

The majority in Metro found solace in their argument that “diversity” would only justify “benign” uses of race-conscious measures. See Metro, 497 U.S. at 563-65 & n. 12, 110 S.Ct. 2997. The dissenters found this cold comfort, noting that “[t]he Court’s emphasis on ‘benign racial classifications’ suggests confidence in its ability to distinguish good from
harmful governmental uses of racial criteria. History should teach greater humility.” Id. at 609, 110 S.Ct. 2997
(O'Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and Scalia and Kennedy, J.J., dissenting). “Divorced from any remedial purpose and otherwise undefined, ‘benign’ means only what shifting fashions and changing politics deem acceptable.” Id. at 615, 110 S.Ct. 2997. Thus, “racial distinctions might be directed expressly or in practice at any racial or ethnic group” depending on “the preference of the moment.” Id. at 610, 110 S.Ct. 2997.

It is precisely because racial classifications are “potentially so harmful to the entire body politic,” id. at 604, 110 S.Ct. 2997 (internal quotation marks omitted), that the Supreme Court has only tolerated them in carefully defined remedial contexts.

See id. at 612, 110 S.Ct. 2997; Wygant, 476 U.S. at 275, 106 S.Ct. 1842 (plurality opinion) (noting “the Court’s focus on prior discrimination as the justification for, and the limitation on, a State’s adoption of race-based remedies”). A non-remedial “interest in increasing the diversity of broadcast viewpoints is clearly not a compelling interest.” It is simply too amorphous, too insubstantial, and too unrelated to any legitimate basis for employing racial classifications.” Metro, 497 U.S. at 612, 110 S.Ct. 2997 (O’Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and Scalia and Kennedy, J.J., dissenting).

Justice O’Connor’s dissenting opinion excoriated the majority for “too casually extend[ing] the justifications that might support racial classifications, beyond that of remedying past discrimination.” Id. at 613, 110 S.Ct. 2997. Justice O’Connor’s opinion characterized “diversity” as “certainly insufficiently weighty to justify tolerance” of government-sponsored racial distinctions; indeed, to accept “diversity” as a justification would be to “trivialize[ ] the constitutional command to guard against such discrimination.” Id. Of particular concern was the possibility that, “[i]ke the vague assertion of societal discrimination, a claim of insufficiently diverse broadcasting viewpoints might be used to justify . unconstrained racial preferences . [and] would support indefinite use of racial classifications.” Id. at 614, 110 S.Ct. 2997.

Justice O’Connor’s discussion of “diversity” as a possible compelling governmental interest concluded with a stern admonition:

We should not accept as adequate for equal protection purposes an interest unrelated to race, yet capable of supporting measures so difficult to distinguish from proscribed discrimination. The remedial interest may support race classifications because that interest is necessarily related to past racial discrimination; yet the interest in diversity of viewpoints provides no legitimate, much less important, reason to employ race classifications apart from generalizations impermissibly equating race with thoughts and behavior.

Id. at 615, 110 S.Ct. 2997.

The same fear expressed in Justice O’Connor’s opinion that “diversity” could be used to justify the indefinite use of racial classifications explains the Supreme Court’s requirement that even remedial race-conscious measures be supported by a “specific and verifiable,” id. at 613, 110 S.Ct. 2997, interest in eradicating racial discrimination. See Shaw II, 517 U.S. at 909, 116 S.Ct. 1894. The Court requires such showings to ensure that racial classifications will have “only limited and carefully defined uses.” Metro, 497 U.S. at 613, 110 S.Ct. 2997 (O’Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and Scalia and Kennedy, J.J., dissenting). For example, discussing Justice Powell’s opinion in Bakke, the Court in Croson highlighted the contrast between the “focused” goal of remedying “specific instances of racial discrimination” and the comparatively “amorphous concept of injury” inherent in “societal discrimination” that “may be ageless in its reach into the past.” Croson, 488 U.S. at 496-97, 109 S.Ct. 706 (plurality opinion) (internal quotation marks omitted). The idea of “societal discrimination” “does little to define the scope of any injury . [and] could justify a preference of any size or duration.” Id. at 505, 109 S.Ct. 706. Likewise in Wygant, the Court rejected the asserted interest in providing minority role models to redress societal discrimination because such a rationale would allow remedies “timeless in their ability to affect the future.” Wygant, 476 U.S. at 276, 106 S.Ct. 1842 (plurality opinion).
To prevent such an unbridled use of racial classifications, the Court has imposed rigorous evidentiary safeguards: any governmental entity endeavoring to classify by race must point to specific, identified instances of past or present discrimination, Shaw II, 517 U.S. at 909, 116 S.Ct. 1894, for which that governmental entity has been either actively or passively responsible, Croson, 488 U.S. at 482-84, 490-91, 109 S.Ct. 706; and that governmental entity must come forward with "a strong basis in evidence for its conclusion that remedial action was necessary." Wygant, 476 U.S. at 277, 106 S.Ct. 1842 (plurality opinion); Bakke, 438 U.S. at 308-09, 98 S.Ct. 2733 (Powell, J.) ("findings of constitutional or statutory violations" necessary to justify a racial classification).

Proper findings in this regard are necessary to define both the scope of the injury and the extent of the remedy necessary to cure its effects. Such findings also serve to assure all citizens that the deviation from the norm of equal treatment of all racial and ethnic groups is a temporary matter, a measure taken in the service of the goal of equality itself. Absent such findings, there is a danger that a racial classification is merely the product of unthinking stereotypes or a form of racial politics.

Croson, 488 U.S. at 510, 109 S.Ct. 706 (plurality opinion).
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I recognize that the great majority of equal protection jurisprudence has been formulated in the context of challenges to affirmative action programs of one stripe or another. The case at bar is not an affirmative action program; indeed, as appellees put it, the admissions procedures at UES "are not remedial in purpose and are not intended either to enhance the educational opportunities of disadvantaged children admitted to UES or to improve the general educational experience at UES by promoting classroom diversity." Students are selected in fixed numbers according to race or ethnicity only to serve as subjects for educational research.

Let us not forget, however, the fundamental purpose of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment: "to prevent the States from purposefully discriminating between individuals on the basis of race." Shaw I, 509 U.S. at 642, 113 S.Ct. 2816. In the face of such a powerful constitutional proscription, UES's novel justifications quickly wither. So "noxious," Adarand, 515 U.S. at 241, 115 S.Ct. 2097 (Thomas, J., concurring), so "odious," Hirabayashi, 320 U.S. at 100, 63 S.Ct. 1375, are racial classifications in our constitutional democracy, that four members of the current Supreme Court have held that they have absolutely no place except in the most narrowly defined remedial settings. See Croson, 488 U.S. at 493, 109 S.Ct. 706 (O'Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and White and Kennedy, JJ.); id. at 524, 109 S.Ct. 706 (Scalia, J., concurring). Another member of the Court, Justice Thomas, has written that "government-sponsored racial discrimination based on benign prejudice is just as noxious as discrimination inspired by malicious prejudice."13 Adarand, 515 U.S. at 241, 115 S.Ct. 2097 (Thomas, J., concurring).14 I find these opinions instructive, if not controlling.

Even if UES's asserted interests are examined as possible compelling governmental interests, it is evident that they suffer from the same defects that doomed the "role model" theory in Wygant, the "societal discrimination" justification in Croson and the "diversity" rationale in Metro. As a preliminary matter, I would emphasize that academic freedom, standing alone, is clearly too flimsy an interest to justify racial discrimination. See Bakke, 438 U.S. at 313-14, 98 S.Ct. 2733 (Powell, J.) (although academic freedom constitutes a "countervailing constitutional interest[, . . . constitutional limitations protecting individual rights may not be disregarded]"). If "academic freedom" could justify a racial classification, Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537, 16 S.Ct. 1138, 41 L.Ed. 256 (1896), would still be the law of the land. Thus, "academic freedom" will be considered only as an interest that might buttress UES's alternative claimed interest in educational research.

The district court held that "the defendants' interest in operating a research-oriented elementary school is compelling." I cannot agree. The "Supreme Court's decisions in Croson and Adarand indicate quite plainly that a majority of the Justices are highly skeptical of racial preferences and believe that the Constitution imposes a heavy burden of
justification on their use.”  "Wessmann, 160 F.3d at 808.  "UES’s asserted interest in “research on effective urban educational strategies and dissemination of new knowledge about educational practices,” Appellees’ Brief at 18, 41, cannot bear that burden.

Just like the “role model” theory in Wygant, an “educational research” rationale is “amorphous” and admits of “no logical stopping point.”  "Wygant, 476 U.S. at 275-76, 106 S.Ct. 1842 (plurality opinion).  Just like “the vague assertion of societal discrimination [in Croson, or the] claim of insufficiently diverse broadcasting viewpoints [in Metro],” "Metro, 497 U.S. at 614, 110 S.Ct. 2997 (O’Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and Scalia and Kennedy, J.J., dissenting), a governmental interest in educational research “might be used to justify, unconstrained racial preferences,” id., that are “timeless in their ability to affect the future,” "Wygant, 476 U.S. at 276, 106 S.Ct. 1842 (plurality opinion).  Its inherent “indefiniteness,” id., could easily “justify race-based decisionmaking essentially limitless in scope and duration.”  "Croson, 488 U.S. at 498, 109 S.Ct. 706 (plurality opinion) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Because an “educational research” justification contains “no viable limiting principle,” it “may be expanded beyond any reasonable limits.”  "Hopwood, 78 F.3d at 950-51.  Although this case arises in the unique setting of California’s only publicly supported elementary laboratory school, one shudders at the uses to which an “educational research” justification might be put.  The holding articulated in the opinion filed today provides no principled basis for limiting the use of racial classifications in the service of “educational research,” nor even for restricting the type of state actors who may conduct such research.  Every stratum of a state’s public education system (whether formally designated a “laboratory school” or not) may now, in the name of “research on effective educational strategies,” "\[implement a racially classified admissions system.  The sure result would be “a mosaic of shifting preferences based on inherently unmeasurable claims.”  "\nCroson, 488 U.S. at 506, 109 S.Ct. 706.

For example, the University of California at Davis Medical School might decide that its school would provide a valuable “research laboratory” site to examine whether a class made up of fixed percentages of members of various races and ethnicities would result in improved educational outcomes for those members.  A local school board may determine that all of the elementary and secondary schools within its jurisdiction are now to be educational “laboratories” and that racial quotas in admissions will be utilized in order to guarantee the “research relevance” of its student population.  The court’s opinion betrays a disturbing tolerance for racial classifications, and a historically unjustified confidence in the ability of government to employ them for “benign” purposes.  See Plessy, 163 U.S. 537, 16 S.Ct. 1138, 41 L.Ed. 256; see generally Fullilove v. Klutznick, 448 U.S. 448, 486-87, 100 S.Ct. 2758, 65 L.Ed.2d 902 (1980) (Burger, C.J.) (plurality) (“The history of governmental tolerance of practices using racial or ethnic criteria for the purpose or with the effect of imposing an invidious discrimination must alert us to the deleterious effects of even benign racial or ethnic classifications when they stray from narrow remedial justifications.”).

Appellees proffered governmental interest in educational research, even when considered along with its claimed interest in academic freedom, is “certainly insufficiently weighty.”  "Metro, 497 U.S. at 613, 110 S.Ct. 2997 (O’Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and Scalia and Kennedy, J.J., dissenting), to justify a departure from the constitutional mandate of equal protection.  It is “amorphous” and “indefinite[ ]” and, consequently, “overexpansive.”  "Wygant, 476 U.S. at 275-76, 106 S.Ct. 1842 (plurality opinion).  It also lacks any connection to the kind of past or present racial discrimination that might, under appropriate circumstances, justify a government’s use of racial distinctions.  See Shaw II, 517 U.S. at 909, 116 S.Ct. 1894; Monterey Mechanical, 125 F.3d at 714; cf.  "Metro, 497 U.S. at 613, 110 S.Ct. 2997 (O’Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and Scalia and Kennedy, J.J., dissenting) (accepting non-remedial interest in “diversity” would “too casually extend[ ] the justifications that might support racial classifications, beyond that of remedying past discrimination”).  I would reverse the district court’s holding that appellees claimed “interest in operating a research-oriented elementary school is compelling.”  "Hunter v. Regents of the Univ. of Calif., 971 F.Supp. 1316, 1324 (C.D.Cal.1997).
"Under strict scrutiny the means chosen to accomplish the State's asserted purpose must be specifically and narrowly framed to accomplish that purpose." Wygant, 476 U.S. at 280, 106 S.Ct. 1842 (plurality opinion). This narrow tailoring requirement demands "the most exact connection between justification and classification." Adarand, 515 U.S. at 229, 115 S.Ct. 2097 (internal quotation marks omitted). In part, this serves to ensure "that there is little or no possibility that the motive for the classification was illegitimate racial prejudice or stereotype." Croson, 488 U.S. at 493, 109 S.Ct. 706 (plurality opinion).

We look to a number of factors to gauge whether a racial classification is narrowly tailored: "whether there was any consideration of the use of race-neutral means," Adarand, 515 U.S. at 237-38, 115 S.Ct. 2097, and the "efficacy of [those] alternative[s]." United States v. Paradise, 480 U.S. 149, 171, 107 S.Ct. 1053, 94 L.Ed.2d 203 (1987) (plurality opinion); whether the racial classification was adopted for the sake of "administrative convenience," Croson, 488 U.S. at 508, 109 S.Ct. 706; and whether the chosen means are underinclusive or overinclusive, Metro, 497 U.S. at 621, 110 S.Ct. 2997 (O'Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and Scalia and Kennedy, JJ., dissenting). UES's racially classified admissions procedure is not narrowly tailored.

A

UES's race-based admissions policy lacks the "exact connection between justification and classification," Adarand, 515 U.S. at 229, 115 S.Ct. 2097 (internal quotation marks omitted), that narrow tailoring requires. Appellees appear to believe that a child's race and ethnicity is somehow linked to a distinct "learning style," and that these supposed cognitive differences between the races call for study. However, none of appellees' evidence concretely demonstrates the existence of an ineluctable connection between any particular race/ethnicity and any particular "learning style." Cf. Wessmann, 160 F.3d at 799 ("The School Committee has provided absolutely no competent evidence that the proportional representation promoted by the Policy is in any way tied to the vigorous exchange of ideas."). At best, record evidence shows only a possible connection. For example, Professor Deborah Stipek testified that "children with different ethnic backgrounds often have different learning styles." (emphasis supplied). Professor Geoffrey Saxe testified that "ethnic diversity of targeted populations is particularly important for studies involving intervention and assessment, where we can expect that there may be important differences in the way children make sense of interventions, assessment procedures, and in the nature of mathematics individuals use in their everyday practices." (emphasis supplied).

But strict scrutiny "requires a direct rather than approximate fit of means to ends." Metro, 497 U.S. at 620, 110 S.Ct. 2997 (O'Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and Scalia and Kennedy, JJ., dissenting). For example, the four dissenting Justices in Metro heard, and condemned, the argument that an individual's "race will likely indicate that [that individual] possesses a distinct perspective." Id. at 619, 110 S.Ct. 2997. They warned that "even if the . equation of race and . viewpoint has some empirical basis, equal protection principles prohibit the Government from relying upon that basis to employ racial classifications." Id. at 620, 110 S.Ct. 2997 (emphasis supplied); cf. Los Angeles Dept. of Water and Power v. Manhart, 435 U.S. 702, 709, 98 S.Ct. 1370, 55 L.Ed.2d 657 (1978) ("Practices that classify employees in terms of religion, race, or sex tend to preserve traditional assumptions about groups rather than thoughtful scrutiny of individuals.").

The dissenting opinion in Metro applies with full force in the instant case. Even if "some empirical basis" might support the existence of a causal relationship between race/ethnicity and a distinct "learning style," the Equal Protection Clause forbids relying on that basis to classify by race. "[E]ssential equal protection principles . prohibit racial generalizations." Id. at 619, 110 S.Ct. 2997; see Shaw I, 509 U.S. at 647, 113 S.Ct. 2816 (striking down racial gerrymander because "[i]t
reinforces the perception that members of the same racial group—regardless of their age, education, economic status, or the community in which they live—think alike, share the same political interests, and will prefer the same candidates at the polls.”

B

“Among the various narrow tailoring requirements, there is no doubt that consideration of race-neutral alternatives is among the most important.” Coral Constr., 941 F.2d at 922. Appellees fail to satisfy this requirement. Specifically, appellees neglected to undertake any consideration—let alone “serious, good faith consideration,” id. at 923—of one obvious race-neutral alternative: the establishment of one or more additional laboratory elementary schools in areas of California where the demographic diversity would naturally produce applicant pools with any desired racial/ethnic mix. UES is currently California’s only state-supported laboratory school and is necessarily limited to an applicant pool that is drawn from Westwood and its environs. But nothing limits California to only one laboratory school.11

Appellees only response is to cite Coral Construction for the proposition that they are not required to “exhaust every alternative, however irrational, costly, unreasonable, and unlikely to succeed.” Id. at 923 (alteration omitted). However, Coral Construction teaches that a state must “exhaust race-neutral measures that the state is authorized to enact, and that have a reasonable possibility of being effective.” Id. California certainly has the authority to authorize the establishment of new laboratory schools, and appellees have failed to carry their burden of showing that such an alternative would not “have a reasonable possibility of being effective.”

Another reasonable race-neutral option would be for UES to conduct its research on “the ethnically diverse student population now present in the urban school community.” Hunter, 971 F.Supp. at 1328. The district court held that appellees had demonstrated that “the race and ethnicity-oriented research conducted at UES could not otherwise be performed in the actual urban elementary schools” in California.12 Id. at 1332. The district court erred in discounting “the efficacy of [this] alternative,” Paradise, 480 U.S. at 171, 107 S.Ct. 1053 (plurality opinion). This race-neutral alternative clearly has a “reasonable possibility of being effective.” Coral Constr., 941 F.2d at 923.

The district court found that existing public elementary schools would not allow teachers and researchers to control such things as class size, age groupings or student-teacher ratios. See Hunter, 971 F.Supp. at 1332. This is hardly an insuperable barrier. Any public school policies or procedures that present a potential impediment to conducting research in the public schools could be modified or eliminated, as appropriate, by the Board of Education and/or the California legislature.13

The district court also found that ensuring necessary levels of parental involvement in, and cooperation with, research carried out in public schools would be difficult. See id. The district court cited Professor Harry Handler’s testimony that “depending on voluntary participation by parents produces additional bias in the study being undertaken through the self-selection involved in volunteering. At UES, in contrast, parents agree to participate in all of the types of activities.” 14 Appellees produce no evidence, however, that the putative “bias” caused by self-selection in a public school context could not be substantially or totally eliminated by simply offering suitable incentives (e.g., tax credits or cash payments) to ensure that parents participate in any research as required.

The district court, referring to Professor Ronald Gallimore’s testimony, found that “attrition of teachers and school support” 15 presented a significant obstacle to educational research in public schools. Hunter, 971 F.Supp. at 1332. At trial, Professor Stipek expressed a similar view, stating that “[a] laboratory school . needs teachers who are experienced working with researchers and who understand and accept that their job responsibilities require them to collaborate with researchers, to try, experimentally, innovative practices, and to evaluate those new methods and practices.” These practical concerns are not, however, insurmountable.
Appellees fail to demonstrate why public school teachers could not be provided with any requisite training and then induced, or even required through contract, to collaborate with UES researchers. Even if public school teachers could not be utilized, appellees offered no evidence showing that UES teachers and research teams, given appropriate support and authorization from the California legislature and/or the Board of Education, could not simply be placed at certain public schools as their research requires. Furthermore, the lack of public school “support” for educational research could easily be addressed through appropriate state legislation and/or changes in public school policy and operating procedure.

Finally, even if appellees’ theory of racial reductionism were valid, there is no reason for UES not to eschew the use of race in its admissions procedure and instead to choose students based on their particular “learning style.” A properly constructed test, or series of tests, could allow UES to identify children who display whatever “learning style” it wished to study “without resorting to stigmatizing and fractionalizing racial classifications.” Coral Constr., 941 F.2d at 923. Given this possibility of an individualized admissions method, the only plausible explanation for appellees’ use of a race-based system “would seem to be simple administrative convenience,” Croson, 488 U.S. at 508, 109 S.Ct. 706. That defense is unacceptable. Appellees’ interest in avoiding the bureaucratic effort necessary to tailor UES’s admissions procedure to race-neutral factors “cannot justify a rigid line drawn on the basis of a suspect classification.” Id.

C

Appellees’ offer essentially six rationales to justify their reliance on race in the UES admissions process, namely: to ensure funding; to study the race-specific “learning styles” of children; to publish the results of research; to disseminate the results of research; to train future researchers and teachers; and to meet the requirements of specific studies. These rationales cannot justify the racial quotas that UES employed.22

The “funding” rationale is legally untenable, as “a State may not protect the public fisc by drawing an invidious distinction between classes of its citizens.” Memorial Hospital v. Maricopa County, 415 U.S. 250, 263, 94 S.Ct. 1076, 39 L.Ed.2d 306 (1974). Further, as best one can discern, the rationales based on the race-based “learning styles” of children, the desire to publish and disseminate research results, and the need to train future researchers and teachers, all appear to require only some general level of racial/ethnic diversity. Appellees’ expert witnesses testified, for example, that: UES requires “a diversity comparable in rough terms to urban schools” (Professor Saxe) (emphasis supplied); “it is imperative that UES have a student population that is perceived and accepted as being representative of the population in the public schools” (Professor Handler) (emphasis supplied); UES needs “the kind of diverse populations that challenge . schools all over the state” (Professor Gallimore) (emphasis supplied). Professor Stipek, director of UES, testified that the required “diversity” at UES would need to include some unspecified “critical mass” of each significant ethnic group represented in the urban school population, but conceded that she could not “give specific percentages.” Plainly, this need for some undefined level of racial/ethnic diversity at UES bears scant relation, let alone the constitutionally required “exact connection,” Adarand, 515 U.S. at 229, 115 S.Ct. 2097 (internal quotation marks omitted), to the use of a racial/ethnic quota system.

The rationale premised on the need for racial/ethnic diversity in specific studies conducted at UES also lacks any kind of connection to the racial/ethnic quotas used. The only studies mentioned by appellees’ expert witnesses were a bilingual research project involving native Spanish and English speaking students, and an instructional program being developed on the Harlem Renaissance. The bilingual study only requires the selection of children based on their native language, and is therefore irrelevant to any purported need for racial/ethnic diversity or racial quotas. The Harlem Renaissance project is geared solely toward African-American students and it does not, even by its own terms, require any specific number of those students. Thus, it, too, lacks any connection to UES’s asserted need for a set number of students from different racial/ethnic groups.
Finally, UES’s utilization of a mixed-race category is a “red flag [ ]” signaling that its admissions procedure “is not, as the Equal Protection Clause requires, narrowly tailored.” Monterey Mech., 125 F.3d at 714. Indeed, UES’s racially classified admissions system is overinclusive. The theory underlying UES’s research mission is, in important part, that a child’s race/ethnicity is specifically tied to a distinct “learning style.” But if this is true, the targeted selection of mixed-race children is incomprehensible-how could such a theory possibly require the selection of mixed-race students? Use of this puzzling category is compelling evidence that UES’s admissions method is not narrowly tailored. Cf. Croson, 488 U.S. at 506, 109 S.Ct. 706 (“random inclusion of racial groups that . may never have suffered from discrimination . strongly impugns the city’s claim of remedial motivation”); Wygant, 476 U.S. at 284 n. 13, 106 S.Ct. 1842 (plurality opinion) (“The Board’s definition of minority to include blacks, Orientals, American Indians, and persons of Spanish descent further illustrates the undifferentiated nature of the plan.”) (citation omitted).

Appellees only attempted justification for the anomalous presence of a mixed-race category in UES’s admission procedures came from Professor Stipek. She claimed that “many children identified in California statistics in a single ethnic category are in fact of mixed ethnicities,” and noted that “researchers . as well as government organizations . are working on alternative strategies to collect ethnicity data that do not force individuals into single categories.” Accordingly, Professor Stipek explained that it was “inappropriate” to require multi-ethnic applicants to choose just one racial/ethnic category. This explanation manifestly fails to explain how the theory of race-specific “learning styles” justifies the selection of mixed-race students. The use of a mixed-race category in UES’s admissions procedure is simply irreconcilable with the “onerous ‘narrowly tailored' requirement,” Wygant, 476 U.S. at 294, 106 S.Ct. 1842 (O’Connor, J., concurring).

V

I would reverse the judgment of the district court. UES’s racially classified admissions procedure does not comport with the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. In my judgment, Hunter is “entitled to reapply under an admissions system that invokes none of the[ ] serious constitutional infirmities,” Hopwood, 78 F.3d at 962, discussed in this opinion.

I respectfully dissent.

FOOTNOTES

1. There is no suggestion that any different admission procedures were employed in the process resulting in Keeley’s rejection than in Cia’s earlier acceptance.

2. Keeley was four years old when the suit was initiated. Gina Brandt brought the suit as Keeley’s “mother and next friend,” and Keeley is represented by her father, Richard Hunter, attorney at law.

3. The parties agree that UES’s admission’s process is not part of a remedial program.

4. The district court accepted each of the defendants’ witnesses as an expert in their field. Dr. Mitchell received a Ph.D. from Stanford University in 1983. He served as chair to Dartmouth’s Department of Education, and Deputy to the President of Stanford University before becoming Dean of UCLA’s Graduate School of Education in 1992. He has published numerous scholarly articles on education and school reform.

5. Dr. Stipek also testified as an expert witness. She received a Ph.D. in developmental psychology from Yale University. She has published numerous articles on early childhood and elementary education. She has been with the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies since 1977.
6. The appellant argues that only an interest inremedying past discrimination can justify UES use of race/ethnicity as one of a number of factors in its admissions process. We disagree. The Supreme Court has never held that only a state's interest in remedial action can meet strict scrutiny. In fact, in Miller v. Johnson, 515 U.S. 900, 115 S.Ct. 2475, 132 L.Ed.2d 762 (1995), the Court expressly left open the question whether "compliance with the [Voting Rights] Act, standing alone, can provide a compelling interest independent of any interest in remedying past discrimination." Id. at 921, 115 S.Ct. 2475 (emphasis added). The Court in Shaw v. Hunt followed Miller and left this question open: "In Miller, we expressly left open the question whether under the proper circumstances compliance with the Voting Rights Act, on its own, could be a compelling interest. Here once again we do not reach that question." Shaw v. Hunt, 517 U.S. 899, 911, 116 S.Ct. 1894, 135 L.Ed.2d 207 (1996) (internal citation and parenthetical omitted). In addition, contrary to the dissent's assertion, this court has not "held that '[r]ace based classifications must be reserved strictly for remedial settings." Infra at 1071 (quoting Coral Construction v. King County, 941 F.2d 910, 920 (91)). Rather, this court held that where the asserted state interest is remedying past discrimination, this remedial interest must be supported by concrete evidence of discrimination. See id; see also Monterey Mechanical v. Wilson, 125 F.3d 702, 714 (9th Cir.1997) (same). In Coral and Monterey, this court simply followed the Supreme Court's decision in City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co., 488 U.S. 469, 109 S.Ct. 706, 102 L.Ed.2d 854 (1989), which required a "strong basis in evidence" for race-based remedial action. These holdings have no bearing on the question whether a non-remedial interest, such as the operation of a research-oriented elementary school dedicated to improving the quality of education in urban public schools, can serve as a compelling interest sufficient to survive strict scrutiny.

7. Dr. Harry Handler has a Ph.D. in Educational Psychology from the University of Southern California, and, at the time of his testimony, was Adjunct Professor and Special Assistant to the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies. Dr. Handler was Superintendent of the Los Angeles Unified School District for seven years.

8. Dr. Howes has a master's degree in child study from Tufts University, a Ph.D. in developmental psychology from Boston University, and post-doctoral training in social psychiatry at Harvard University. Dr. Howes has published books, treatises and studies in her field including a series on child care policy studies.

9. In 1995, there were 46 students admitted to the Early Childhood Program. Consequently, each child made up 2.2% of the class.

10. "We cannot have a subject sample that does not have meaningful distribution of ethnicity and still meets the scientific standards that we are held to. Otherwise, you can't do research there." Dr. Stipek's Trial Testimony for April 9, 1997.

11. No one would challenge a decision of UCLA medical school to explicitly consider ethnicity in selecting study participants for research on Gaucher's disease or Tay-Sachs-diseases that occur predominantly in the Jewish population. Nor would anyone have a problem with a study on the effects of nutrition in the prevention of sickle-cell anemia that limited study participants to Black children. Nor would anyone object to a similar study of pernicious anemia that limited participants to older persons of Northern European descent. The National Institute for Health is currently calling for grant applications for research investigating why prostate cancer occurs with greater frequency in white and black men than in Hispanic and Asian men.

1. Appellees characterize UES as "a controlled laboratory for educational researchers, akin to the laboratories used by physical scientists."

2. An information brochure prepared by UES states: "As a school that is seeking and disseminating ways to improve the children's learning and social development, Seeds UES must have a population of children that is relevant to the student population in California. To achieve this, [GSE & IS] sets gender, ethnicity and family income population goals for
A representative cross-sample is necessary, according to appellees, because “findings cannot be generalized beyond the population on which the research was conducted.”

Hunter is one-quarter Japanese and three-quarters Caucasian.

The demographic racial breakdown, as self-reported, of the 215 children who applied for admission to UES’s EC-I program was as follows: 110 Caucasians (51.2%); 49 mixed-race (22.8%); 23 African-Americans (10.7%); 19 Asians (8.8%); and 14 Latinos (6.5%). The demographic racial breakdown, as self-reported, of the 46 admitted applicants was as follows: 18 Caucasians (39.1%); 8 mixed race (17.4%); 6 African-Americans (13%); 4 Asians (8.7%); and 10 Latinos (21.7%).

Although appellants bring suit under Title VI, a racial classification is permissible under Title VI only where it satisfies the strict scrutiny standard applied under the Equal Protection Clause. See Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265, 287, 98 S.Ct. 2733, 57 L.Ed.2d 750 (1978) (Powell, J.); id. at 328, 98 S.Ct. 2733 (Brennan, White, Marshall, and Blackmun, JJ.).

Throughout this opinion, I will refer to this asserted interest with the shorthand “educational research.”

First seen in Wygant v. Jackson Bd. of Ed., 476 U.S. 267, 274, 106 S.Ct. 1842, 90 L.Ed.2d 260 (1986), this theory holds that minority students are in need of “role models” to alleviate the effects of prior societal discrimination.

As Judge Wiener, concurring in Hopwood v. State of Texas, 78 F.3d 932 (5th Cir.1996), observed, “the Supreme Court [has] declined to define compelling interest or to tell us how to apply that term.” Id. at 965 n. 19 (Wiener, J., concurring); see also Susan M. Maxwell, Note, Racial Classifications Under Strict Scrutiny: Policy Considerations and the Remedial-Plus Approach, 77 Tex. L.Rev. 259, 296 (1999) (“the Court’s view on the constitutionality of nonremedial racial classifications remains ambiguous”).

Justice Scalia has, however, offered one: “a social emergency rising to the level of imminent danger to life and limb—for example, a prison race riot, requiring temporary segregation of inmates.” Croson, 488 U.S. at 521, 109 S.Ct. 706 (Scalia, J., concurring).

It bears noting that Justice Powell’s oft-cited opinion in Bakke, which approved the consideration of race as “one element in a range of factors a university may properly consider” in achieving diversity among its student body, Bakke, 438 U.S. at 314, 98 S.Ct. 2733, “garnered only his own vote and has never represented the view of a majority of the Court,” Hopwood, 78 F.3d at 944.


Justice Thomas intolerance for racial classifications would presumably only yield in a situation where such classifications are unavoidably “necessary to eliminate [a State’s] own maintenance of a system of unlawful racial classification,” Croson, 488 U.S. at 526, 109 S.Ct. 706 (Scalia, J., concurring).

As noted above, seven circuit courts of appeal (including this circuit) have agreed that only the remediation of identified past discrimination can justify government-sponsored racial classifications.
I deliberately omit the word “urban” from the articulation of UES’s interest, as nothing in today’s holding would prevent research into effective strategies for the education of any particular racial mix of children found in any particular geographical setting.

The Court in Croson expressed an unwillingness to accept a justification that lacked a specific link to identified discrimination because that “would be to open the door to competing claims for ‘remedial relief’ for every disadvantaged group. Courts would be asked to evaluate the extent of the prejudice and consequent harm suffered by various minority groups. Those whose societal injury is thought to exceed some arbitrary level of tolerability then would be entitled to preferential classifications. We think such a result would be contrary to both the letter and spirit of a constitutional provision whose central command is equality.” Croson, 488 U.S. at 505-06, 109 S.Ct. 706 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Likewise under the holding in the opinion filed today. Courts will now be thrust into the unseemly position of having to determine which “research” projects are sufficiently genuine and worthy to justify the use of racial classifications. A look back at our history belies this court’s apparent faith in the judiciary’s capacity to “distinguish good from harmful governmental uses of racial criteria.” Metro. 497 U.S. at 609, 110 S.Ct. 2997 (O’Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and Scalia and Kennedy, J.J., dissenting); see also Wittmer, 87 F.3d at 919 (“common sense undergirded the pernicious discrimination against blacks now universally regretted”); cf. Korematsu v. United States, 323 U.S. 214, 65 S.Ct. 193, 89 L.Ed. 194 (1944); Plessy, 163 U.S. 537, 16 S.Ct. 1138, 41 L.Ed. 256.

Another important consideration of narrow tailoring, noted in Adarand in the context of a challenge to a remedial race-conscious program, is “whether the program [is] appropriately limited” in scope and duration “such that it will not last longer than the discriminatory effects it is designed to eliminate.” Adarand, 515 U.S. at 238, 115 S.Ct. 2097 (internal quotation marks omitted). In this case, because appellees asserted interest in educational research is vague and amorphous, UES’s admissions procedure, a fortiori, cannot be “appropriately limited” in scope and duration. Cf. Croson, 488 U.S. at 507, 109 S.Ct. 706 (“it is almost impossible to assess whether the Richmond Plan is narrowly tailored to remedy prior discrimination since it is not linked to identified discrimination in any way”).

According to Professor Stipek, one of appellees’ expert witnesses at trial, “[e]thnicity is an important variable in research related to education because there is evidence that children with different ethnic backgrounds often have different learning styles, respond differently to the same instructional approaches and have different styles of interaction with the teacher.”

The district court did not make a specific finding on this discrete question. The closest it came was to make the undifferentiated statement that an ethnically diverse student population presents “issues and challenges [that] include[ ] limited language proficiency, different learning styles, involvement of parents from diverse cultures with different expectations and values and racial and ethnic conflict among families and children.” Hunter, 971 F.Supp. at 1328-29. To the extent that this statement could be construed as containing a finding of fact that any particular race/ethnicity is inextricably linked to any particular “learning style,” such a finding is, on this record, clearly erroneous. More broadly, the “premise that differences in race . reflect real differences . is utterly irrational and repugnant to the principles of a free and democratic society.” Metro. 497 U.S. at 618, 110 S.Ct. 2997 (O’Connor, J., joined by Rehnquist, C.J., and Scalia and Kennedy, J.J., dissenting) (internal quotation marks omitted).

It bears emphasis that, although the majority opinion in Metro accepted the approximate fit of means (the FCC’s race-based preferential licensing policy) to ends (diversity of broadcast viewpoints), it did so only through the use of intermediate scrutiny. Strict scrutiny may well have led to a different majority opinion.
21. According to Mitchell, three other University of California campuses (i.e., San Diego, Santa Cruz and Irvine) are presently discussing plans to build their own research-oriented laboratory schools. He testified, however, that he "ha[d] no idea" whether the naturally occurring diversity around those campuses would produce a sufficiently diverse applicant pool to obviate the need for racial quotas. Mitchell also testified that he "ha[d] not undertaken to ask the question [whether] any of the other nine campuses of the University of California" outside of UCLA are sufficiently diverse to eliminate the need for racial quotas.

22. The district court's conclusion that this race-neutral alternative was unavailable presents a mixed question of law and fact that we review de novo. See National Ass'n of Radiation Survivors v. Derwinski, 994 F.2d 583, 587 (9th Cir.1993).

23. The California legislature has shown itself willing to support the establishment of nontraditional schools. For example, as appellant notes, the California legislature enacted the Charter Schools Act of 1992, Cal. Ed.Code §§ 47600, et seq., which authorized the creation of up to 100 charter schools to, inter alia, "[e]ncourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods," Cal. Ed.Code § 47601(c).

24. I note in passing that neither Professor Handler, nor any other of appellees' witnesses, explained how the "bias" resulting from the "self-selection" of public school parents differs from the bias resulting from the "self-selection" of UES parents who, as a condition of their childrens' enrollment, agree to participate in research projects as needed.

25. Professor Gallimore described this lack of "school support" as follows: "researchers can be asked to leave with no notice by a principal or superintendent even after years of investment and effort."

26. Professor Stipek testified, for example, that racial/ethnic diversity is necessary to secure funding from the National Institutes of Health, a "primary outside funding source for childhood education research."

27. UES admitted exactly 18 Caucasian (39.1%), 10 Latino (21.7%), 8 mixed-race (17.4%), 6 African-American (13%), and 4 Asian (8.7%) students. Although appellees' witnesses preferred to characterize these numbers as "general targets" or "general goals," rather than outright quotas, UES "appeared to be especially adept at meeting its yearly 'goals.'" Hopwood, 78 F.3d at 948 n. 36. UES did so, as Professor Stipek explained, by translating any "goal" into a "specific number" in the course of making admissions decisions.

28. The publication and dissemination rationales are based on the need to maintain credibility among the academic and teaching communities. According to Professor Stipek, members of these communities would "question the relevance" of UES's research unless it had "a population of children and families that reflects the diversity of California's urban public schools."

Opinion by Judge PREGERSON; Dissent by Judge BEEZER.
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Preface

Explain the school self-study process used to accomplish the outcomes of the self-study, i.e., any modifications from the model self-study process. By addressing these outcomes of the self-study, the school will have accomplished:

1. The involvement and collaboration of all staff and other stakeholders to support student achievement
2. The clarification and measurement of what all students should know, understand, and be able to do through school-wide learner outcomes and academic standards
3. The analysis of data about students and student achievement
4. The assessment of the entire school program and its impact on student learning in relation to the school-wide learner outcomes, academic standards, and ACS WASC criteria
5. The alignment of a long-range action plan to the school’s areas of need; the capacity to implement and monitor the accomplishment of the plan.

Welcome, WASC Visiting Committee!

We are pleased to welcome you back to Geffen Academy at UCLA. Geffen Academy is an independent, university-affiliated secondary school, serving students of UCLA families and well beyond, as represented by the fact that our students come from nearly 90 different zip codes across the region. The school opened in the fall of 2017 and is now completing its fifth year of operation in 2021-2022. The school’s founding values are embedded in our core documents, which are restated below.

**Mission Statement:** Geffen Academy at UCLA values academic depth and inspiration within a humane educational environment. Our community is guided by principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion. Geffen Academy students are encouraged to be questioners, analysts, and presenters, who are creative, collaborative, and active young adults. Our students practice their skills, competencies, and relationships with deliberation. Geffen Academy graduates believe that knowledge is beautiful, transformative, and relevant to one’s life and civic responsibility in a global community.

**Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI):** At Geffen Academy, the principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) are integral to the school’s overall mission, vision, and practice. We strive to be a transformative school that upholds a more just world and challenges systems of oppression that undermine humanity and our ecosystem. As Educators, students, and families, we believe that a transformative educational
experience acknowledges and develops the diversity of identities and experiences that individuals and communities bring to institutions; we understand that individuals and communities are the agents of change in our institution.

Geffen Academy’s students experience learning in an environment where Educators are committed to ongoing research, growth, and discovery in their disciplines and in their teaching; where they see their students as sources of knowledge and approach the classroom as a space where they learn from and with students; and where they adapt content knowledge to connect to students’ motivation, abilities, needs, backgrounds, and experiences. Indeed, Geffen Academy believes the teaching profession is complex and honorable and deserves respect and recognition. We strive to create a community of Educators that represent excellent teaching, deep understanding of content, and offers an example of what Educators need to be effective, that offers a positive work environment, and that honors the well-being of Educators.

Geffen Academy’s founding School-Wide Learning Goals (SWLGs) have remained constant since the school’s inception. They are:

- Persistent Inquirers
- Thinkers & Creators
- Powerful Communicators
- Compassionate Partners
- Adaptable Learners

**Self-Study Process in 2021-2022**

Since our initial WASC visit in 2019, we have been preparing ourselves for this self-study. Over the past few years, our team has worked to address the areas we indicated in our 2019 Action Plan and Major School Needs, along with other challenges that have come up along the way. The update and progress report on these items can be found in Chapter I.

Our 2021-2022 self-study process was a full team effort. Through the self-study process, we sought to understand, clarify, and measure our school program with input from all stakeholders of Geffen Academy at UCLA. Our work on this report began in earnest during the Summer of 2021 during our Leadership Retreat, which included all of our Department Chairs as well as our Academic Leadership team. We introduced the ACS-WASC FOL 2019 handbook, laid out the plan and timeline, and worked together to brainstorm ideas to answer the questions in Chapter III. From that point forward, we introduced the work and document to the wider Educator body.

In September, we created nearly 15 working groups to help discuss, compile, and analyze the findings. Additionally, we held numerous Educator Focus groups,
Department Chair Focus groups, and Departmental Focus groups to help us understand more about what is happening in our school community. Using the information, evidence, and findings provided by the working groups we constructed a narrative response within the report’s template. Our Leadership Team reviewed the self-study report Chapters I-III and together compiled and authored Chapters IV-V. Lastly, we are making the final report available to the entire Educator body in advance of the Visiting Committee’s time on our campus.

In addition to the stakeholder input and leadership reflection, this report shares an analysis of 4 years of survey data from students, families, and Educators, completed in partnership with UCLA’s Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST). The work with CRESST is well reflected in Chapter II of this report. The report contained within is an accurate representation of Geffen Academy at UCLA. This self-study process has helped the school develop a strong sense of strengths and challenges and has enabled the school to create a long-range action plan that will lead Geffen Academy yet closer to our goal of being a secondary school for UCLA and beyond that encourages academic challenge with a humane approach to adolescent well-being.
Chapter I: Progress Report

- Describe any significant developments that have had a major impact on the school and/or specific curricular programs since the last full visit.
- Comment on the process for implementing and monitoring the school-wide action plan.
- Summarize progress on each section of the current school-wide action plan that incorporated all school-wide critical areas from the last full self-study and all intervening visits.
- Comment on the original critical areas for follow-up not in the current plan.

Since the last WASC visit in 2019, Geffen Academy at UCLA has grown considerably in terms of population, personnel, academic coursework, and physical footprint. For example:

- Enrollment rose from 367 students in 2018-2019 to 590 students in 2021-2022; there is now a full 6th through 12th grade program (Tables 1c and 1d).
- The team of Educators grew by nearly 50 percent; academic, non-academic, limited, and UCLA student personnel increased from 99 people to 140 people in 2021-2022 (Tables 1e and 1f).
- The addition of 11th and 12th grade classes required an increase in University of California (UC) and National Collegiate Athletic Association approved coursework (Table 1i).
- A successful College Guidance program was established, with 100% of the graduating Class of 2021 matriculating to a college or university.
- Geffen Academy’s Mission Statement was expanded to explicitly include a commitment to DEI. The school also created a DEI Council and DEI Mission Statement in Summer 2019 (Preface and Table 1j).
- The Student Life program expanded opportunities for student leadership and culture-building.
- The academic program for 12th graders expanded to include a culminating senior student project, A³: Academics, Arts, Alliance.
- The school celebrated the first graduating Class of 2021 and will graduate its second class of seniors in June 2022;
- Pandemic planning enabled the transition to a successful remote school program from March 2020 through March 2021 as well as a return to hybrid and in-person school with robust COVID-19 mitigation measures.
- The school transitioned from a trimester system to a semester system in 2021-2022.
The school made adjustments to the class schedule rotation to meet student academic, community, and cultural needs.

The school’s athletic program expanded such that more than 70% of students compete across 15 sports, with 40-plus teams that have already tallied 13 team championships, 20-plus individual champions, 15-plus CIF playoff berths, and a CIF Southern Section team title.

The school’s West Campus, consisting of four bungalow classrooms and tented blacktop space, was added for expanded outdoor dining and multipurpose space.

Soliciting Feedback: Geffen Academy has utilized multiple methods to draw feedback from the members of the school community. These have included:

- Annual school-wide surveys of students, families, and Educators;
- Formal and informal focus groups with parents/guardians, students, and Educators;
- Parent/guardian informational events with Q&A or FAQ components;
- Back-to-School Nights;
- Parent/Guardian-Educator Conferences;
- Meetings with the Family Engagement Co-operative (“Co-op”);
- Email correspondence, conversations, and observations, which have provided qualitative feedback; and
- Regular Academic Leadership meetings to set and determine action steps based on student, family, and Educator feedback.

Personnel Growth: As Geffen Academy’s student population has grown, so have the school’s personnel needs. Some of the notable new administrative and support positions added since 2018-2019 include:

- Upper School Associate Dean of Students
- Middle School Assistant Dean of Students
- Assistant Athletic Director
- Faculty Services Coordinator
- Associate Directors of Academic Advising & College Guidance (2)
- Academic Advising & College Guidance Specialist/Test Coordinator
- Student Counselors (2)
- Communications Manager
- Events & Alumni Manager
- Human Resources Generalist
- Business Operations Specialist
Curricular and Operational Changes: To support the expanded enrollment and grade levels, the school has increased curricular offerings, including adding opportunities for students to take advanced courses in every discipline. The result is a fully articulated scope and sequence for each department in every grade level.

Further, Geffen Academy has amended the daily rotation to accommodate additional class meetings as well as a remote and/or hybrid setting. For the foreseeable future, the school will continue its current rotation consisting of seven class meetings over ten days, each meeting for 55 minutes. Co-curricular activities and school culture-building opportunities are built into the schedule. This has taken form in the “H period” block that alternately holds space for grade-level Community Time, affinity groups, clubs, office hours, music lab, and study hall.

The leadership team has worked intensely since the 2019 ACS WASC Initial Visit to implement the school-wide action plan. The team has gathered feedback from the community, assessed curricular programs, worked with Educators on skills and programs, and reviewed data to understand progress or gaps in progress. Please see Table 1a for the specific steps taken as well as a report on progress.

With specific regard to items indicated as “Major School Needs” focused on student achievement from the 2019 ACS WASC Initial Visit, Geffen Academy has made excellent progress in a number of areas. In areas that are not completed, the school will add them as areas of focus for the future. Please see Table 1b for the specific steps taken as well as a report on progress.
## Table 1a: Geffen Academy at UCLA-WASC Action Plan 2019 Updated 2021-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Improvement</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Specific Steps</th>
<th>Assessing progress of steps</th>
<th>2022 UPDATED PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Construct a 6-12 curriculum that is published and includes a coherent scope and sequence of content, skills, while also building towards SWLG** | So that we are better able to assess ourselves and student learning. | ● Creation of courses for 6-12 (2016-2018)  
● Departmental articulations of 6-10 course connections to SWLG (Summer 2018)  
● Development of and articulation for standard format and elements of scope and sequence (2018-2019)  
● Building out scope and sequence (Summer and Fall 2019)  
● Feedback and assessment (Summer and Fall 2019)  
● Revisions (2019-2020 and ongoing) | Creation of an articulated, scoped and sequenced curriculum that is published to our community | Working in conjunction with Department Chairs, Educators, and the academic team, Geffen Academy at UCLA has achieved this area from our 2019 action plan.  
This is evidenced by our published and articulated graduation requirements, UC approved coursework, published course catalog, and departmental scope and sequence document.  
Please see the Course Catalog 2021-2022, the UC “a-g” course list, and Table 1i. |
| **Academic Coursework: Math** | We have a wide variety of learners and need to create curriculum and classroom environments where all learners can be successful. | ● MS, US, Dean of Faculty, and HOS with Learning Specialist and Student Support Services to meet with students and families to hear their concerns.  
● Partner with Learning Specialist and Student Support Services to Math Department Chair to discuss student anxiety and workload.  
● Middle School Director and Math Department work together to make specific changes to class process and culture.  
● Opening new sections of 7th and 10th grade math.  
● Re-configuration of Math curriculum as we shore up fundamental math knowledge. | Student, Educator, Family feedback | The Math department at Geffen Academy launched with a department chair who had a vision for a new and different approach to teaching math. The department chair left Geffen Academy suddenly in August of 2018. A new department chair moved the work forward but with a more traditional approach, prioritizing Algebraic fluency and computational efficiency. For some families and students, the experience has been excellent. For others, it has been a struggle.  
Geffen Academy continues to reevaluate the Math program to ensure it provides a rigorous and compassionate experience that is aligned with the School’s mission to offer a challenging program based on the science of adolescence.  
To support our students and Educators, the Leadership Team, including the Learning Specialist, has:  
● Worked with current Math Educators to create classrooms that mitigate student anxiety and workload.  
● Created the internal schema of a “Homework Pie,” which establishes guidelines for the upward expectations of time a discipline can occupy for homework outside of class. There has been progress, and the Math Department is less often charged with using more than its “slice of the pie.” However, the Math Department’s homework practices still require change.  
● Added additional courses, including a path for students who need additional support to complete the graduation requirements for math. Additionally, we will allow students who exhaust our curriculum to take coursework in Mathematics through UCLA.  
Please see Tables 1m and 1n.  
There is more work to be done with regards to alignment of the Math department with the overall School mission. |
| **Academic Coursework: Science** | We are examining the curriculum, scope and | ● Build consensus among the Science Department about the most effective development of the curriculum.  
● Hire new Department Chair | Clear direction of scope and sequence | Since 2019, we have hired a new Department Chair and added a physics teacher as planned. We plan to hire another physics teacher for 2022-2023. **Upper School** |
sequence, and the level of integration of Biology, Chemistry, and Physics across our Science program.

- Hold Department meetings and appoint curriculum leads in the MS and US.
- Partner with UCLA medical school/Life Sciences professors for ideas on best practices.
- Hire a Physics instructor to complete the science department.
- Science Department members meet with the Middle School Director regularly.

Synchronicity within the department

When the school opened in 2017-2018, and for the first year only, Geffen Academy offered a spiraling Upper School science curriculum, where students rotated topics each trimester. In 2018-2019, the School reimagined the approach and established the more traditional yearlong course sequence.

Since then, the Science department has not strayed from the “democratic” position that we do not offer advanced courses in the core grade level curriculum. Therefore, all of our students take the same science curriculum in the Upper School: Chemistry in 9th grade, Biology in 10th grade, Physics or Environmental Science in 11th grade, and a fourth year of science recommended in 12th (with completion of Physics required for graduation). The Science Department now offers four advanced (weighted) concentration courses in Chemistry, Biology, Physics, and Environmental Science.

Middle School
To better prepare and challenge our Middle School students, we have changed the sequence of courses in grades 6-8. Students now take Life Science in 6th grade, Environmental Science in 7th grade, and Conceptual Chemistry and Physics in 8th grade. This shift in the MS curriculum introduces students to a variety of science skills and topics and prepares students for success in the core US curriculum.

See Table 1o.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation and Evaluation Protocol</th>
<th>To provide feedback and growth to all Educators.</th>
<th>Review of existing practices of observation and evaluation, for example, UCLA Lab School, Danielson Method</th>
<th>Creation of observation and evaluation protocol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• MS Director, Leadership Team and Department Chairs determine best fit for school culture and purposes.</td>
<td>• Begin informal observations in 2nd Trimester 2019-2020</td>
<td>As employees of UCLA, Geffen Academy Educators are members of the UC-AFT bargaining unit. We are in the process of completing a “Sideletter” that determines a number of professional responsibilities for our classroom Educators. Our Observation and Evaluation protocols have been under development and negotiation within the bargaining process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify positions needed to address significant caseload in the Student Support Service</td>
<td>• Once approved, create job descriptions, for example, Assistant Learning Specialist, Student Services Coordinator, Athletic Department admin support</td>
<td>As currently developed, the evaluation includes two essential parts: classroom observation and an overall evaluation rubric. The observation protocol is connected to teacher growth and reflection, and the evaluation process focuses on overall job performance in defined domains of responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Successful recruitment and hiring</td>
<td>• More efficient workflow and caseload management in Student Support Services suite</td>
<td>We expect to begin full implementation of our evaluation process in 2022-23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing for Additional Support</td>
<td>To provide more support in the Student Support Services suite and Athletics Department.</td>
<td>More efficient workflow and</td>
<td>As the school has grown, so too have our staffing needs. Since 2019, Geffen Academy has increased our capacity to serve students and their families. Since 2019, we have hired:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Two additional Associate Directors of Academic Advising &amp; College Guidance (AACG) and one AACG Specialist/Test Coordinator;</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Two additional Associate Directors of Academic Advising &amp; College Guidance (AACG) and one AACG Specialist/Test Coordinator;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A Principal Learning Specialist, with an additional Assistant Learning Specialist to be hired in 2021-2022;</td>
<td></td>
<td>• A Principal Learning Specialist, with an additional Assistant Learning Specialist to be hired in 2021-2022;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An Associate Dean of Students, an Assistant Dean of Students, and one Student Services Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>• An Associate Dean of Students, an Assistant Dean of Students, and one Student Services Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A full-time School Counselor and a part-time School Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td>• A full-time School Counselor and a part-time School Counselor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Admissions | Our gift agreement allows us to grow to 50% enrollment of UCLA-affiliated families. | ● Outreach to UCLA Departments and Schools  
● Communication strategy with Communication Manager | Via applicant data collection and distribution to the team for review. | Through admissions to Geffen Academy, we continue to aid in the recruitment and retention of UCLA faculty and staff. Our overall percentage of UCLA families has remained stable at 32-33%, even as our student body has grown by 134 students from 2019-2020 to 2021-2022. Enrollment was impacted by the pandemic, and we did see a dip in UCLA-family enrollment in this period. It is also important to note that we have had some turnover and growth in the Admissions Department. We believe that the Admissions Department has now stabilized; in 2021, we hired a new Director of Admissions, recruited an Associate Director, and hired a full-time Admissions Specialist. This new team is making excellent progress to increase UCLA family enrollment at the same time as we attract outstanding students from across Los Angeles. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ● An Assistant Athletic Director and UCLA student worker(s) for additional support  
● 89% of academic Educators hold advanced degrees. Please see Tables 1e and 1f for more comparative information on our Educator growth. | | | Tuition Assistance (TA) Provided:  
● 2019-2020: $2,877,400  
● 2020-2021: $3,548,800  
● 2021-2022: $3,566,000  
Students Receiving TA Each Year:  
● 2019-2020: 150 students (73 MS, 77 US)  
● 2020-2021: 195 students (81 MS, 114 US)  
● 2021-2022: 204 students (84 MS, 120 US)  
Average TA Award Per Student:  
● 2019-2020: $19,055  
● 2020-2021: $18,198  
● 2021-2022: $17,370  
Please also see Tables 1k and 1l.
### Table 1b: Geffen Academy at UCLA-WASC Major School Needs 2019 Updated 2021-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018-19 Major School Needs Focus on Student Achievement</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>2022 UPDATED PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grow our standardized testing protocols to assure we capture relevant student achievement data</td>
<td>Completed → Continuing Progress</td>
<td>The Varsity Blues scandal and the COVID-19 environment have made standardized testing an even more challenging subject. During the recruitment season of 2020-21, we moved away from requiring the SSAT or ISEE placement testing for admissions; such tests are now optional. We do still offer Geffen Academy placement tests for Math and World Languages for incoming students and for students who wish to move into advanced-level coursework. Our Educators who teach the same sections within the same departments collaborate and offer consistent assessment opportunities. These are reviewed in department meetings and discussed against department norms and expectations. We have administered the PSAT when possible and have provided that data in the report. Please see Tables 1g and 1h. Many of our students take the SAT and ACT, though not all, since we have entered a true test-optional post-secondary environment. As an institution, Geffen Academy has had conversations with UCLA’s Center on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST), about potential assessment options, including Think Ready (College Readiness Performance Assessment System) and CWRA (College and Work Readiness Assessment) as possible options that would fit well with the school’s values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize the Educator’s Academic Handbook and the Employee Handbook</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Since the last visit, Geffen Academy has updated drafts to all documentation: Course Catalog, Family Handbook, Employee Handbook, Safety Guidelines, and Suicide Prevention Protocols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine student supervision protocols throughout the building</td>
<td>Completed → Continuing Progress</td>
<td>Our needs for supervision and protocols related to before school, during lunch, work periods, and after school continue to evolve and shift as the school grows. Prior to the COVID-19 shutdown in March 2020, we had grades 6-11 on campus. When we returned to a hybrid model in Spring 2021, the school had grades 6-12 but had only one division on campus at a time. Now, in 2021-2022, we have a campus serving seven grades. As such, the school has developed a supervision schedule that meets most of our needs, but not all. The main issue is personpower, relative to our Unit 18 agreements around a ‘duty free’ lunch period, and the reliability of our UCLA student workers’ schedules. We have increased our security staff: two full-time UCPD Security Officers, a mixture of part-time and hourly Security Guards, and UCLA Parking and Transit support for morning and afternoon carpool. We will continue to refine our protocols and recruit help. We have defined spaces and expectations for supervision. In 2021-2022, the expansion into West Campus has created even more need for supervision. Since 2019, we have added to our camera array inside and outside of our buildings. Additionally, we have added to the team a Facilities and Operations Coordinator, who helps coordinate the front lobby and interface between all facets of the campus community. We plan to continue adding support in this area in 2022-2023.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to grow the team in strategic ways, including:</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Since 2019, we have increased Student Life Suite staffing by adding an Associate Dean and an Assistant Dean, as well as a more defined Student Services Coordinator role. We plan to add grade(s) level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Add team members to support student life and student services;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:** The above information is a snapshot from the Geffen Academy at UCLA: ACS WASC Self-Study Report. The report details various aspects of the school's operations, including educational needs, testing protocols, and team growth strategies. The updates reflect the school's progress from 2019 to 2021-2022, highlighting changes in student life services, supervision protocols, and academic assessment options.
- Add team members to support Educators’ and students’ IT/EdTech needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWLGs</th>
<th>Continuing Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine</td>
<td>deans in 2022-2023, where an Educator is the primary point person for students for a grade level. We have also added one full-time School Counselor and a part-time School Counselor. We continue to employ a Principal Learning Specialist and added a Learning Skills Specialist to that team. In 2021-2022, we updated and reposted this position as an Assistant Learning Specialist and hope to hire this school year. In 2021-2022, we will add a full-time Licensed Vocational Nurse and a part-time Registered Nurse. We have also added a full-time Athletic Trainer and Strength and Conditioning Coach. The school currently has two IT Desktop Support staff members on campus. They work with our students and Educators, as well as interface with the main campus. We have posted and will hire in 2021-2022 a new IT Operations Manager. Additionally, we have added to the team a Facilities and Operations Coordinator position, who helps coordinate the front lobby and interface between all facets of the campus community. We plan to continue adding support in this area in 2022-2023. Please see the “Staffing for Additional Support” section of Table 1a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improve consistency of the narrative feedback with regards to SWLGs</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Broadly speaking, the Leadership Team has created templates and shared expectations with Educators for a variety of feedback in the form of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Continuing Progress</td>
<td>- Email response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Official Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Progress Report Narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Parent/Guardian-Educator Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use of grading rubrics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determine when/if assessment strategies should align with the SWLGs</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Since 2019, and ongoing, departments have:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Continuing Progress</td>
<td>- Mapped out their scope and sequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Indicated where they make specific connections to SWLGs, Wellness, and DEI in their coursework and pedagogical approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Hold ongoing discussions regarding department homework load, late penalties, and overall philosophy around grading practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We are developing our observation and evaluation system during the 2018-2019 school year for full implementation in the 2019-2020 school year</strong></td>
<td>Completed → Continuing Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continue to the community’s understanding of the rationale behind the math program and continue to adjust elements of the grading practices in the Math Department</strong>;</td>
<td>→In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Further strengthen the curriculum and sequence of our Science Department</strong></td>
<td>Completed → Continuing Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A need to strengthen interdisciplinary work</strong>;</td>
<td>→In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A need to take the SWLGs (aspirational end goals) and make them more actionable for students and connection to their future selves</strong>;</td>
<td>→In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A need to help our students improve computer literacy throughout the curriculum—remote teaching guidelines</strong></td>
<td>→In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Make the “Architecture of Educating” more visible in teacher practices</strong>;</td>
<td>→In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Supporting Evidence presented in the tables below demonstrate the extent of the growth at Geffen Academy since the last WASC visit in 2019.

Table 1c: 2019-2022 Student Population Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Students Per Year</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>21-22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Grade</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Grade</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1d: 2019-2022 Student Population Ethnicity Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese/Chinese-American</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese/Japanese-American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean/Korean-American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina American/Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican/Mexican-American/Chicano</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial/Multiethnic</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Asianerican</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani/East Indian</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese/Vietnamese American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1e: 2019-2022 Educator Personnel Growth

**2019-2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Code Description</th>
<th>Count of Job Code Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic - Classroom</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic - Nondiscipline</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2020-2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Code Description</th>
<th>Count of Job Code Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic - Classroom</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic - Nondiscipline</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2021-2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Code Description</th>
<th>Count of Job Code Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic - Classroom</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic - Nondiscipline</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1f: 2018-19 v 2021-22 Educator Personnel Growth Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title Code</th>
<th>2018-2019</th>
<th>2021-2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic - Classroom</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic - Non classroom</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classroom Educators (FTE and PTE)
Non-Classroom Educators (FTE and PTE)
Limited Employees (coaches)
Student Workers
Table 1g: Percentage of 11th Grade Students Meeting PSAT Benchmarks in ERW*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020**</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geffen Students-ERW</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants-ERW</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* English, Reading, Writing

** No data available in 2020 due to testing restrictions during COVID-19.

Table 1h: Percentage of 11th Grade Students Meeting PSAT Benchmarks in Math

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020*</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geffen Students in-Math</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Participants-Math</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No data available in 2020 due to testing restrictions during COVID-19.

PSAT 11th Grade

Available for this report are the PSAT results for 11th grade students. In testing years 2019-2021, Geffen Academy students met the PSAT benchmark at a rate above that of the total number of the 11th grade testing population in the nation in both English, Reading, and Writing and Math. This data could not be analyzed by identity markers such as gender and race/ethnicity because those fields were not included in the reports available for this analysis.

Table 1i: University of California “a-g” Approved Courses Curriculum Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Number of UC Approved Courses</th>
<th>Number of UC Approved Advanced Courses</th>
<th>Grades Served at Geffen Academy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6, 7, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1j: Geffen Academy at UCLA (Updated) Mission Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Mission Statement</th>
<th>Updated Mission Statement (Fall 2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geffen Academy at UCLA is a university-affiliated school for students in grades 6-12 that provides academic depth, inspiration, and a humane experience, based on the science of adolescence. Geffen Academy exists to serve in the recruitment and retention of UCLA faculty and staff.</td>
<td>Geffen Academy at UCLA is a university-affiliated school for students in grades 6-12. We value academic depth and inspiration within a humane educational environment. Our community is guided by principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geffen Academy students are encouraged to be questioners, analysts, and presenters who are creative, collaborative, and active young adults. Our students practice their skills, competencies, and relationships with deliberation.</td>
<td>Geffen Academy students are encouraged to be questioners, analysts, and presenters, who are creative, collaborative, and active young adults. Our students practice their skills, competencies, and relationships with deliberation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geffen Academy graduates believe that knowledge is beautiful, transformative, and relevant to one’s life and civic responsibility in a global community.</td>
<td>Geffen Academy graduates believe that knowledge is beautiful, transformative, and relevant to one’s life and civic responsibility in a global community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1k: UCLA-Affiliated Students Per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>21-22</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>19-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole Class</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>% of Grade Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Grade</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Grade</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Grade</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1l: Non-UCLA-Affiliated Students Per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>21-22</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>19-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole Class</td>
<td>Non-UCLA</td>
<td>% of Grade Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Grade</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Grade</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Grade</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1m: Diagram of Math Courses, Grades 6-12

Intro to Middle School Math

Pre-Algebra

Adv. Pre-Algebra

Algebra 1 Fundamentals

Algebra 1A

Algebra 1

Adv. Algebra 1

Geometry Fundamentals

Geometry

Adv. Geometry

Algebra 2 Fundamentals

Algebra 1B

Algebra 2

Adv. Algebra 2

Precalculus Fundamentals

Precalculus

*Adv. Precalculus

*Adv. Differential and Integral Calculus

Discrete Math

Differential and Integral Calculus

*Adv. Multivariable Calculus

*Adv. Integral Calculus, Series, and Analytic Geometry

Math Elective

*Adv. Statistics
Table 1n: Homework Pie 2021-2022, Grades 6-12

These figures are for standard courses (MS) and “college-prep” level courses (US), not advanced courses. It’s fair to assume that students in advanced classes will need to spend additional time on homework—though this is not a green light to overload students with work. Educators are asked to post the approximate time it will take for students to complete their work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 6</th>
<th>Homework expectations per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Arts/Music</td>
<td>.5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>1.5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Track</td>
<td>.5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1hr. 15min - 2 hr 15min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>1hr 15min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6 - 7 hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Homework expectations per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Arts/Music/I-Track</td>
<td>.5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1hr 15min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1hr 15min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1.5 - 2.5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>1hr 15min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7 - 8 hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th>Homework expectations per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Arts/Music/I-Track</td>
<td>1 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1.5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1.5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2-3 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1.5 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>1hr 15min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 - 10 hr</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Grade 9</strong></th>
<th><strong>Homework expectations per week</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>140-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration/I-Track</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Grade 10</strong></th>
<th><strong>Homework expectations per week</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>140-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Concentration/I-Track</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Grade 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Homework expectations per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>140-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Concentration/I-Track</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (in HOURS)</strong></td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grade 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Homework expectations per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>140-200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language/ *Concentration/I-Track</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Concentration/I-Track</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Concentration/I-Track</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (in HOURS)</strong></td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**12th grade students will need time to complete college applications. College Guidance has 40 minutes per week with 12th graders and works with Educator curricular calendars, so that Educators know when the 12th grade college application process is heavy.**
Table 1o: Science Curriculum, Grades 6-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Requirement</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>11th</th>
<th>12th (4th year recommended)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Systems Science</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>*Advanced Topics in Chemistry</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>*Advanced Topics in Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>*Advanced Topics in Chemistry</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>*Advanced Topics in Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Chemistry and Physics</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>*Advanced Topics in Chemistry</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>*Advanced Topics in Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Advanced Topics in Chemistry</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>*Advanced Topics in Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Advanced Topics in Chemistry</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>*Advanced Topics in Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics or Environmental Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Advanced Molecular Biology</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>*Advanced Molecular Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Advanced Molecular Biology</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>*Advanced Molecular Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration(s) Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Advanced Environmental Science</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>*Advanced Environmental Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*=weighted GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Advanced Astrophyics</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>*Advanced Astrophyics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter II: Student/Community Profile and Supporting Data and Findings

Tell the story of your school through the use of data and information. This thorough examination of the school includes:

- The history and background of the school
- A description of the school programs
- Demographics and achievement data
- Examination of perceptual data, such as surveys
- Findings, noting trends, irregular patterns or anomalies for the data, including longitudinal and disaggregated data
- A brief summary that includes:
  - Implications of the data
  - Identification of 2-3 preliminary major student learner needs (at this stage of analysis)
  - Important questions to be discussed in the Focus Groups.
- Related profile materials in the appendices at the end of the report.

History

Geffen Academy is a university-affiliated school for students in grades 6-12. The University of California, Los Angeles identified a need and desire for expanding educational opportunities for students in secondary education that was evidence-based, innovative, and guided by principles of adolescent wellness. Further, the university understood that a UCLA-affiliated secondary school that admitted students of UCLA employees could help the university with faculty and staff recruitment and retention. With the generous gift from the David Geffen Foundation, granted in 2015, and Regental approval in 2016, the school admitted its pioneering classes in 2017.

From inception, Geffen Academy was driven by an evidence-based approach. Years before it opened its doors, the members of the UCLA Academy Initiative, as it was called then, used relevant research to guide early decision-making, and made ongoing evaluation a priority for the school. Some examples of the earliest work include:

- The development of a logic model, based on the W.K. Kellogg Foundation Logic Model Development Guide (2004), that outlined the school’s goals as well as the mid- and long-term impact the school aspired to have for its students, Educators, the university, and the broader LA community;
- The creation of a Faculty Working Group that hosted extensive focus groups across UCLA’s broad and diverse campus comprised of UCLA faculty and
relevant experts;  
- Extensive research on peer schools in the form of visits or review of secondary sources;  
- Implementation of curriculum planning informed by two major literature reviews on learning in the 21st century and science and the brain. Examples from these literature reviews included: *Brainstorm: The power and purpose of the teenage brain* (Seigel, 2014) and *A more beautiful question: The power of inquiry to spark breakthrough ideas* (Berger, 2014);  
- Use of research to make day-to-day decisions such as defining the essential qualities of excellent Educators and generating interview questions for hiring protocols.

Since the 2017-18 school year, Geffen Academy has partnered with the Center on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST). In each of the five academic years, the collaboration has centered around collecting data for immediate school improvement and a more long-term project of defining outcomes/benchmarks for school success.

**School Programs**

**Curriculum and Academic Programs**

The curriculum at Geffen Academy is tied closely to the school's mission and its SWLGs. The curriculum has been developed to offer students opportunities to explore subjects broadly, as well as dive deeply into subjects of particular interest.

**Middle School**

Middle School is a period of discovery. Its curriculum has been designed to give students ample opportunities to explore their strengths, to challenge themselves, and to investigate ideas that inspire them. One important focus of the Middle School’s curriculum is the development of core disciplinary skills, as well as substantive work on the school-wide learning goals, thus beginning to develop students who are: Persistent Inquirers; Thinkers and Creators; Powerful Communicators; Compassionate Partners; and Adaptable Learners.

**Table 2a: Curriculum Overview for Middle School, Grades 6-8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>Advisory 6</td>
<td>Advisory 7</td>
<td>Advisory 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Ancient Minds</td>
<td>Reading Modern Minds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>Probing the Historian’s Craft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>i, Human</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Track</td>
<td>I-Track Foundations I</td>
<td>I-Track Foundations II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Placement in math courses</td>
<td>Placement in math courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>based on previous preparation</td>
<td>based on previous preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music, Visual Arts</td>
<td>Discovery Arts Rotation 6</td>
<td>Discovery Arts Rotation 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discovery Arts Rotation 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>PE Rotation 6</td>
<td>PE Rotation 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Life Systems Science</td>
<td>Ecology, Evolution and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness</td>
<td>Wellness Skills 6</td>
<td>Wellness Skills 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wellness Skills 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Language</td>
<td>French, Latin, Spanish and</td>
<td>French, Latin, Spanish and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandarin courses available;</td>
<td>Mandarin courses available;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>placement based on previous</td>
<td>placement based on previous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preparation</td>
<td>preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Academic Standards**

Students in 6th and 7th grades receive “Credit” or “No Credit” markings, along with narrative comments. “No Credit” in these grades for any term means that a student is not performing at grade level. If a student receives a “No Credit,” then the student will need to complete make-up work that is decided on by the classroom educator and Department Chair or may need to complete and pass a summer school class that is approved by the department and school administration.

8th grade students receive letter grades along with their narrative comments. An “NY” grade in the first semester of a year-long course means “Not Yet” and indicates that serious interventions are necessary, as the student is in danger of failing the class should their next semester continue along the same lines. An “F” at the end of the year means that a student will need to complete make-up work that is decided on by the classroom educator and Department Chair or must complete and pass a summer school class that is approved by the department and school administration.

**Upper School**

Upper School is a time of deliberate practice, taking skills learned in Middle School and applying them ever more deeply, expansively, and thoroughly. Geffen Academy’s curriculum reflects this by providing courses that challenge, prepare, and inspire.

All Geffen Academy students take courses that are considered general education requirements: these are courses taken at Geffen Academy that are required courses for
graduation. These general education requirements are accompanied by courses which allow students to delve more deeply into a field or fields of their choosing through taking concentration courses and advanced courses within or across disciplines. Concentration courses are those students take because they are interested in the topic or discipline. Advanced courses allow students to move at an accelerated pace and often demand additional work from the students by examining the methodologies within the particular field or discipline of the course. Most advanced courses have prerequisites, which may include departmental approval.

Students who take courses designated as “advanced” in the course catalog will earn the “advanced” notation on their transcript. Advanced courses that are designated in the course catalog as 11th grade level and higher are given an extra point (weighted) when calculating a grade point average. Advanced, weighted courses are marked in the catalog by (*). Some students’ course of study may include taking a UCLA class during the summer between 11th and 12th grade, as agreed upon by the student, student’s advisor, parents, and Geffen Academy administration.

Table 2b: Curriculum Overview for Upper School, Grades 9-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9th Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities (English/History)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary Cities—takes the place of separate History and English class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement based on previous training, grades, assessments, and preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French, Latin, Spanish, or Mandarin courses available, placement based on: previous training, grades, assessments, and preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music, Visual Arts and Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required year-long course in Music, Visual Arts or Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Track or Concentration Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning 9th graders: year-long I-Track concentration course or concentration course from another discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New 9th graders: I-Track Foundations III or year-long equivalent, with permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required year-long PE course or participation in the Athlete Conditioning class and Geffen Academy team sport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 10th Grade                                    |
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### English
- Studies in Genre

### History
- U.S. History

### Mathematics
- Placement based on previous training, grades, assessments, and preparation

### Science
- Biology

### World Languages
- French, Latin, Spanish, or Mandarin courses available, placement based on previous training, grades, assessments, and preparation

### Concentration Course
- Returning 10th graders: choice of concentration class any discipline; recommended to take second year-long course in Music, Visual or Performing Arts to satisfy graduation requirement
- New 10th graders: I-Track Foundations III or equivalent, with permission

### Wellness
- Wellness 10

### PE
- 10th graders are strongly encouraged to take the additional 1 semester PE class plus the 1 semester Emergency Preparedness class

### 11th Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Aesthetic Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Modern Global History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Placement based on previous training, grades, assessments, and preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Physics or Science concentration course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Languages</td>
<td>French, Latin, Spanish, or Mandarin courses available, placement based on previous training, grades, assessments, and preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Track Capstone or Concentration Course</td>
<td>Choice of I-Track Capstone or equivalent, or concentration class from any discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness</td>
<td>Wellness 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>If still outstanding, 11th graders are strongly encouraged to take Emergency Preparedness and complete their PE/Athletics graduation requirement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12th Grade
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### Student Demographic Data

#### Table 2c: Number of Students Enrolled*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Students Per Year</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>21-22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Grade</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Grade</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These totals represent totals at the start of the academic year.

#### Table 2d: Gender Identity at Geffen Academy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>21-22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper School</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Geffen Academy's student population includes students who identify as non-binary. Accurate data
collection and software reporting on this metric are areas of growth for the school.

Table 2e: Racial and Ethnic Identity at Geffen Academy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethnicity Data 2019-20</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
<th>2021-22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race and ethnicity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial/Multiethnic</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race and ethnicity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial/Multiethnic</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race and ethnicity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African-American</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial/Multiethnic</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Race and ethnicity categories based on US Census categories and UC categories (See Appendix B for this chapter).

**Race and ethnicity data questions have changed over the years in the enrollment form. In 2021-22, “Other” was eliminated from the race/ethnicity question.

***Because this is an optional question, these data do not reflect total population.

Achievement Data

Geffen Academy has been exploring the question of what constitutes student success and what achievement benchmarks are appropriate in light of the school's mission. In February 2020, the Head of School, Division Directors, and Department Chairs met with UCLA's CRESST to discuss assessment generally and to discuss the best standardized testing option for the school. Through this work, it became clear that a standardized test to measure the success of Geffen Academy students should include critical thinking, problem-solving, and communication skills. In addition, it should allow for consideration of student creativity. Therefore, Geffen Academy and CRESST were weighing two options that met the criteria: Think Ready and College and Work Readiness Assessment (CWRA).

In the weeks that followed these meetings, the school was required to turn its attention
to restructuring education as a result of the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. For this reason, Geffen Academy is presenting student achievement data that is currently available and will continue to pursue additional achievement measures that align with the mission and SWLGs.

**PSAT 11th Grade**

Available for this report are the PSAT results for 11th grade students. In testing years 2019-2021, Geffen Academy students met the PSAT benchmark at a rate above that of the total number of the 11th grade testing population in the nation in English, Reading, and Writing and Math. These data could not be analyzed by identity markers such as gender and race/ethnicity because those fields were not included in the reports available for this analysis.

| Table 2f: Percentage of 11th Grade Students Meeting PSAT Benchmarks in ERW* |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Years                              | 2019 | 2020** | 2021 |
| Geffen Academy Students-ERW        | 95%  |       | 99%  |
| Total Participants-ERW             | 67%  |       | 66%  |

*English, Reading, Writing

**No data available in 2020 due to testing restrictions during COVID-19.

| Table 2g: Percentage of 11th Grade Students Meeting PSAT Benchmarks in Math |
|--------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|
| Years                               | 2019 | 2020* | 2021 |
| Geffen Academy Students in-Math     | 87%  |       | 82%  |
| Total Participants-Math             | 42%  |       | 40%  |

* No data available in 2020 due to testing restrictions during COVID-19.

**Geffen Academy’s Advanced Classes and Achievement**

In addition to national benchmarks, Geffen Academy has started the process of defining benchmarks of academic rigor and key academic indicators. These will include quantifiable items such as the number of advanced classes offered and students
excelling in these classes (B+ or better). Tables 2h and 2i illustrate these initial findings. Table 2h illustrates the initial percentage of students taking advanced classes per academic year. In addition, Table 2i illustrates the percentage of students taking advanced classes by gender identification. It is important to note, for the academic years 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20 there is insufficient data about race and ethnicity in the database. Because of insufficient data, there are no determinations that can be made about race and ethnicity and advanced course work from these data. The school continues working on analyzing the data for 2020-21 and 2021-22. More information about students’ race and ethnicity has been found in the current year. In all, the collecting and organizing of race and ethnicity data will be an area of improvement for data collection in the future. There will also be particular attention to identity markers such as race and ethnicity, gender, and other categories to help the school identify achievement gaps in the student population, with a focus on underrepresented groups. Moreover, Geffen Academy will be collecting qualitative data such as culminating senior project and senior exit surveys to obtain qualitative data on student achievement vis-a-vis the SWLGs. The qualitative data collection will be coordinated in collaboration with CRESST as part of setting and measuring the school's benchmarks in the 2022-23 academic year.

Table 2h: Percentage of Students Enrolled in at Least One Advanced Class*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Upper School</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>None Offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2i: Advanced Classes and Gender Identity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>21-22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper School</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Geffen Academy’s student population includes students who identify as non-binary. Accurate data
collection and software reporting on this metric are areas of growth for the school.

**Graduation Readiness**

Currently, Geffen Academy offers 161 classes (see List of Advanced Courses and Student Achievement, 2017-2022) that meet the A-G requirements and that have been approved by UC (Table 2j). Geffen Academy graduation requirements exceed current A-G requirements (Table 2k). Moreover, the school offers a total of 73 advanced classes (9 in middle school, 64 in upper school). For the 2020-21 academic year, 41 students at Geffen Academy took classes at UCLA for university credit. In all, students are equipped to pursue post-secondary education at a variety of institutions. The school plans to survey alumni for a more complete assessment in order to understand post-secondary achievement and, in addition, to inform our current program’s ability to prepare students for post-secondary experience.

**Table 2j: University of California A-G Approved Classes, 2017-22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Number of UC Approved Courses</th>
<th>Number of UC Approved Advanced Courses</th>
<th>Grades Served at Geffen Academy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6, 7, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2k: Geffen Academy Graduation Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplines</th>
<th>University of California “A-G” Subject Requirements</th>
<th>Geffen Academy Graduation Requirements</th>
<th>Geffen Academy Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History/Social Studies</td>
<td>“A” area: 2 years</td>
<td>2 years, 10th and 11th grade, including US History and Modern Global History</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Humanities</td>
<td>“B” area: 4 years</td>
<td>4 years, 9-12th grade</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>“C” area: 3 years, including topics in Algebra and two-</td>
<td>3 years, 9-11th grade</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and three-dimensional Geometry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Science</th>
<th>“D” area: 2 years of laboratory science in 2 of the 3 disciplines of Biology, Chemistry, Physics</th>
<th>3 years, including biology, chemistry and physics</th>
<th>4 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Languages</td>
<td>“E” area: 2 years or through the second level of high school instruction of the same Language Other Than English (LOTE)</td>
<td>3 consecutive years of LOTE</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts and Performing Arts</td>
<td>“F” area: 1 year of Dance, Music, Theater or the Visual Arts</td>
<td>2 years, 9th grade required</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Preparatory Electives/ Concentration Courses</td>
<td>“G” area: 1 year chosen from “a-f” beyond those used to satisfy the “a-f” or courses approved in the “g” area</td>
<td>1 year (I-Track will fulfill this requirement)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Track</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2 years, including I-Track Capstone, or equivalent</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3 terms plus 1 term of Emergency Preparedness</td>
<td>4 terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A³ Senior Project</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Successful participation, completion, and final presentation of project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post-Secondary Readiness**

Much in the way that Geffen Academy aims to reimagine secondary education to improve students’ experiences, the school also seeks to redefine the college admission experience for students. Through the Office of Academic Advising & College Guidance (AACG), Geffen Academy supports students as they contemplate their post-secondary journeys by centering students’ needs and well-being. AACG helps students and families understand students’ own identities, interests, and inspirations to ultimately help
them make informed choices about their futures.

AACG’s unique college admission process underscores the importance of the journey, encouraging students to think deeply about their passions and aspirations. AACG works to challenge students’ preconceived notions about various institutions of higher education, broadening their horizons and mentoring them to seek out destinations that will further advance their skills, senses of self, and directions. Throughout high school, AACG works on supporting Geffen Academy students and families so that they can navigate the process with good spirit and in a low-stress environment toward purposeful ends.

In 2021, Geffen Academy graduated its first class. The senior class consisted of 64 students. Seniors applied to 224 colleges and universities. In total, 64 seniors applied to college and 64 seniors were admitted and planned to attend a 4-year post-secondary school. Thus, 100% of students in the class of 2021 were admitted to and planned to attend college. The school is proud of the graduates for their accomplishments, but even more so for the journeys they took to achieve them.

In the feedback received from the first graduating class at the end of their senior year, students expressed that Geffen Academy had prepared them to debate differences, to question the status quo and “how to build something from scratch.” The challenge seniors expressed in their letters to the school were largely about keeping a pioneering spirit for generations to come and confronting the school climate of polarized attitudes toward difference and diversity. On the one hand, students expressed that more needed to be done to address issues of race while other students felt constrained in their worldviews, specifically around issues of race. In all, students expressed readiness for their post-secondary steps in initial interviews.

Examination of Survey Data

Since 2017, Geffen Academy has partnered with CRESST to distribute online surveys to students, faculty and staff, and parents/guardians at Geffen Academy. Since then, the school-wide surveys have included questions about academic programs, student programs, school climate, social-emotional indicators, and other indicators related to the school's benchmarks. In addition, the surveys have been a critical tool to gathering feedback from all constituents as the school grows and evolves.

The tables below summarize the total numbers of community members surveyed and the rate of response for school years since the launch of the campus.

Table 21: Total Number of Surveys*
### Yearly Participation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Educators***</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018–19</td>
<td>248**</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This number includes the total number of surveys received. CRESST survey totals include all surveys answered past the demographic data.

**Larger number of students took the survey, but only this number was included in the analysis due to missing data.

**This number includes classroom and non-classroom Educators.

### Table 2m: Community Rate of Response*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>Educators</th>
<th>Non-Classroom</th>
<th>Parents**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-19**</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rate calculations based on total number of surveys received divided by total number of people in each category.

**This calculation assumes that only one survey is submitted per student.

***This year student survey completion was affected by SurveyMonkey system errors.

### Key Finding #1: Continuity in What Families Value in Geffen Academy

Feedback from surveys have served to illuminate key areas of strength and important areas of growth. Families value three consistent qualities of Geffen Academy: teacher quality, a sense of community, and the school’s Wellness program. Throughout the years, parents were asked to identify one thing about Geffen Academy that they would not like to see changed in the following school year. In a strong sign of continuity, these top three characteristics listed by parents in the 2017-18 survey remain highly valued in the 2018-19 and 2019-20 parent survey.

### Table 2n: What Parents Would Not Like to See Changed
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Teacher Quality | 14% | 17% | 25% | 35%
Sense of Community | 13% | 15% | 12% | 17%
Wellness Program | 13% | 13% | 16% | 12%
Philosophy/Mission/Goal | 12% | 14% | 7% | 9%
Class Schedule & Late Start | 8% | 9% | 8% | 5%
Administration/Staff | 5% | 14% | 8% | 11%

Key Finding #2: Student Leadership Opportunities

One of the missions of Geffen Academy is to provide students the opportunity to be participatory leaders in school culture. Several survey items address this overarching goal.

In one example, students were asked if they were involved in leadership groups or activities and if not, would they like to be? In Year 1, 44% of Geffen Academy students reported involvement in leadership groups, but this percentage declined over the next three years. As the involvement in leadership groups declined, the percentage of students not involved yet expressing the desire to be involved increased. The percentage rose from 20% in Year 1, or 43% in Year 3, and then dipped down to 30% in Year 4. The decrease in the percentage of students involved in leadership groups or activities could be a result of the increasing size of the student body from year to year. Without specific knowledge of the number and nature of such opportunities, it is difficult to interpret this pattern. Even if, however, the number of opportunities is not increasing at the same pace as student enrollment, the percentage of students interested in these groups and activities presents an opportunity to create more options.

Table 2o: Leadership Involvement at Geffen Academy
A similar pattern was observed in how students felt about making an impact at Geffen Academy (see Table 2o). The percentage of students indicating they believed they have an impact on decision making decreased from 42% in Year 1 to 26% in Year 4. The percentage of students who expressed a desire to have an impact, however, did not show the same pattern seen in Table 2f. Instead, student indication of a desire to feel they had an impact also decreased.

Table 2p: Student Perceptions of Their Influence on Decision-Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Would like to be (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, students were asked about their ability to influence school culture. In Year 1, 63% of students felt they had this ability, while in Year 4, the figure decreased to 43%. The percentage of students indicating they would like to feel they could influence school culture remained relatively constant across the four years.

Table 2q: Student Perceptions about Their Ability to Influence School Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Would like to be (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The leadership team has been working on strengthening leadership opportunities and a sense of belonging for students of all backgrounds. Some examples of this work include
the further development of Student Council, student-led clubs and affinity groups, presentations by the senior Class of 2022 to the school’s leadership team, and weekly announcements led by and delivered by students. Moreover, the school will be staffing for grade-level deans in the coming years to support the work of student life. In addition, this area of growth continues to be explored. Some recommendations for future action include:

- Creating more opportunities to be part of and/or lead cultural moments (e.g. Geffen Academy at UCLA Day, cultural celebrations, student-led Community Time)
- Making more use of the Upper and Middle School divisions for peer mentorship
- Examining the current club model with a focus on opportunity for leadership
- Adding leadership training opportunities for club and affinity group leaders
- Developing Educators in the area of student leadership

**Key Finding #3: Addressing the Achievement Gap**

As stated in the mission, Geffen Academy is committed to principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion. This includes equal learning opportunities and outcomes for students of different backgrounds. At the moment, the school does not have a reporting system that facilitates clear identification of an achievement gap. However, initial measures (see Table 2i) indicate that an achievement gap exists. The school has identified areas of growth in data collection and reporting systems.

In preparation for this report, the school found that capturing data specific to race and ethnicity has been a challenge due to Learning Management System (LMS) constraints. Currently, the school is working on working around the LMS constraints to arrive at a question and data set consistent with UC reporting. The school is also trying to understand how to minimize missing data. As a response to missing data, the team will be sending the race and ethnicity question to current families and Educators in an effort to collect more data. The information gap in terms of students racial and ethnic identification makes it difficult to generate reports on achievement and this identity marker.

In addition, there is not yet an automated reporting system for achievement measures such as grades, national standardized exams, or sample student work. The school's work with CRESST continues to focus on identifying benchmarks and achievement measures that are aligned with the mission. The second phase of this work has also started; it includes creating systems to collect data and automate reporting in order to be able to adjust and make improvements. The school aims at developing a data dashboard with these measures and reports for ease of application by
staff/administration and Educators. As a school founded on the premise of innovation, research-informed learning, and a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion, Geffen Academy understands the importance of collecting and having data available for decision-making at all levels of education. The school has made progress in this area by teaming up with CRESST, surveying the community, and making progress on a research agenda. In future years, the school has a clear understanding that improvements are needed in data collection and reporting systems.

**Findings**

With the help of this self-study, the school identified the areas of student needs as areas that underpin students’ sense of belonging. In order to provide equal learning opportunities and outcomes for students of different backgrounds, the school will need to strengthen its data collection and reporting system. As a second area of improvement, the school will focus on a students’ perception of belonging and leadership. The action items proposed for these areas are:

- Strengthen school-wide systems of data collection and reporting
- Identify and address achievement gaps
- Explore this perception of belonging and leadership through focus groups
- Explore current club model and the leadership opportunities afforded
- Create more opportunities for students to lead in activities and cultural moments
- Find moments for powerful integration and community building between the middles school and upper school students (e.g. peer-to-peer mentoring)
- Increase staffing in the student life team (e.g. grade-level deans)
- Professional development (PD) for Educators around scaffolding leadership practices and building student leadership capacities
Chapter III: Self-Study Findings

For each category of criteria include:
1. A summary of the degree to which these criteria are being met, including comments about the degree to which these criteria impact the school's ability to address one or more of the major student learner needs
2. A list of strengths
3. A list of prioritized growth areas.

Note: The four criteria categories are:
A. Organization for Student Learning
B. Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment
C. Support for Student Personal and Academic Growth
D. Resource Management and Development

Have available pertinent evidence for review by the visiting committee. This includes samples of representative student work that have been analyzed.

Category A. Organization for Student Learning

Review all the findings and supporting evidence and summarize the degree to which the criteria in Category A are being met. Include comments about the degree to which these criteria impact the school’s ability to address one or more of the identified major student learner needs (Chapter III).

A1. School Purpose Criterion

Beliefs and Philosophy

A1.1. Prompt: Evaluate the written purpose in relationship to the beliefs and philosophy of the school and its constituency served.

In review of the findings and evidence, Geffen Academy has determined that the school has established a clear vision and mission (purpose) that reflects the beliefs and philosophy of the institution. The purpose is defined further by the school’s developed and articulated SWLGs, which form the basis of the educational program for every student. Geffen Academy at UCLA was created with the dual purpose of serving UCLA’s goal of recruitment and retention of faculty and staff, and serving the Los Angeles community in all of its diversity.

Geffen Academy is authorized to enroll up to 50% of students from UCLA-affiliated families, allowing the school to act in service to the university in their recruitment and retention of employees. Currently, 32-33% of Geffen Academy students are from
UCLA-affiliated families. The competitive admissions process involves an application process and optional interview. Approximately 32% of families receive tuition assistance.

Purpose, Schoolwide Learner Outcomes, and Profile Data

A1.2. Prompt: Evaluate the degree to which the development of the school’s vision, mission, and schoolwide learner outcomes have been impacted by pertinent student/community profile data and identified future global competencies, and current educational research.

Geffen Academy at UCLA’s mission, SWLGs, and overall program are all developed to serve the student population and reflect the surrounding community. Geffen Academy has a clearly articulated “school purpose.” The findings and evidence reveal the constituencies related to Geffen Academy demonstrate an understanding and belief in the values set forth in the mission, SWLGs, and community-wide principles for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI). Further, the school's vision, mission, and SWLGs fully reflect current educational research and future global competencies. The fact that the school is newly-created, and created within the context of a world-class research university, has allowed it to quickly become an example of a modern and research-based program that is appropriate to the needs of 21st century students and Educators. In addition, the school has repeatedly shown an ability to adapt its program to the needs and challenges of the day, including an effective transition to a remote program as a result of the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Supporting Evidence

Table 3a: Geffen Academy at UCLA Mission Statement

Geffen Academy at UCLA is a university-affiliated school for students in grades 6-12. We value academic depth and inspiration within a humane educational environment. Our community is guided by principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Geffen Academy students are encouraged to be questioners, analysts, and presenters, who are creative, collaborative, and active young adults. Our students practice their skills, competencies, and relationships with deliberation. Geffen Academy graduates believe that knowledge is beautiful, transformative, and relevant to one’s life and civic responsibility in a global community.
Involvement of All

A1.3. Prompt: *Evaluate the processes 1) to ensure the involvement of representatives from the entire school community in the development/refinement of the vision, mission, and schoolwide learner outcomes and 2) to determine their effectiveness.*

Early in Geffen Academy’s history, leaders involved the entire UCLA community in setting the goals for the creation of a UCLA-affiliated secondary school. Ever since, Geffen Academy has continued to involve representatives of the entire school community in the evolution of the school’s mission, vision and goals.

The school communicates its values broadly and deeply with all community members. Further, the work of implementing the school’s mission is supported by imbuing the SWLGs and the principles of DEI throughout the curriculum and in co-curricular activities. This work is wide-ranging and occurs in the following subsections of the community with the common goal of keeping the mission, SWLGs, and program consistent and present.

### Supporting Evidence

- Friday Newsletters and Educator Bulletins (Wednesday);
- Looking Ahead informational events;
- 11th Grade Coffees with College Guidance;
- Grade Level Academic Advising & College Guidance Events;
- Back to School Nights;
- Parent/Guardian-Teacher Conferences;
- New Family Welcome Events;
- Calendar/list of events that are family facing;
- Hiring Committees;
- Student Council and Policy Committee;
- Parent Grade Reps and Co-op;
- Student and Parent Affinity Groups;
- Athletics and Physical Education;
- Dining Services;
- Student Dress Code;
- Educator PD;
- End of year reflection in June;
Constituency of Purpose, Schoolwide Learner Outcomes, and Program

A1.4. Prompt: Provide a range of examples that the school vision, mission, schoolwide learner outcomes, and program are consistent.

Students take full advantage of the array of programs offered, as shown in Chapter II, excelling in the areas of their own interest in respect and demonstration of the SWLGs. The school supports students in and out of the classroom so they can achieve their academic and personal best. Geffen Academy students express themselves creatively and artistically on stage, through music and in the visual arts, and also compete in athletics and academic competitions such as robotics, debate, and Science Bowl. In addition, students develop a keen sense of self-awareness and coping skills through Wellness and Physical Education curricula.

To excel in the modern world, students need to develop and maintain creative and critical thinking skills that will serve them in their post secondary life. Geffen Academy Educators facilitate student inquiry and the ability to process, interpret and apply information, leading students through a variety of learning experiences of independent and collaborative work. By graduation, students can classify, measure, and predict outcomes based on experience and knowledge. Appreciation of diversity of thought is encouraged when faced with scenarios with multiple outcomes. Overall, students’ ability to analyze data and circumstances, draw conclusions, and problem-solve makes them fully equipped to understand and thrive in the world beyond Geffen Academy.

The college admission process underscores the importance of the journey, encouraging students to think deeply about their passions and aspirations. The school works to challenge students’ preconceived notions about various institutions of higher education,
broadening their horizons and mentoring them to seek out destinations that will further advance their skills, senses of self, and directions. Throughout high school, the Office of Academic Advising & College Guidance (AACG) works on supporting Geffen Academy students and families so that they can navigate the process with good spirit and in a low-stress environment toward purposeful ends.

As evidenced by the pioneering Class of 2021 — Geffen Academy’s inaugural graduating class — the school’s approach is successful in preparing students for making choices about their post-secondary lives. The seniors showcased their openness to an array of possibilities and paths, applying to a total of 224 colleges and universities in 40 states and internationally as well. Students were admitted to schools large and small, urban and suburban, private and public; they were admitted to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and to schools created to serve students of particular faiths and denominations. They applied to and were accepted by all of the University of California campuses. They are pursuing studies in everything from technology and humanities to the visual and performing arts. While it is still early in the process, there is every indication this trend will continue for the Class of 2022.

Even in an exceptional admission cycle in which the COVID-19 pandemic altered how students learned about, applied to, and assessed post-secondary institutions, the seniors demonstrated their growth as Compassionate Partners as they completed the process with dignity and kindness. Geffen Academy is proud of the pioneering graduates for their accomplishments, but even more so for the journeys they took to achieve them. The graduates are a testament to the school’s mission statement, which states that “knowledge is beautiful, transformative, and relevant to one’s life and civic responsibility in a global community.”

In five years of operation, including several years amid the COVID-19 pandemic, the school has actualized a program that aligns to the mission and SWLGs. However, Geffen Academy is not a finished product; as a young school, it remains in constant motion, reflection, and iteration—with clarity about its direction.

Communication about Vision, Mission, and Schoolwide Learner Outcomes

A1.5. Prompt: Examine the effectiveness of the means to publicize the purpose and the schoolwide learner outcomes to the students, parents, and other members of the school community.

Since 2019, and even amid the COVID-19 environment, the school has made a concerted effort to ensure involvement of representatives in the development and refinement of school programming. Constituencies with which the school engages include: families and students; Educators and coaches; UCLA faculty, staff, and
students; and the larger Westwood Village community. There is considerable overlap among these groups, as people identify with these constituencies in multiple and intersecting ways.

With ample practice during the quarantine and shutdown, the school gained tremendous Zoom know-how. Since the community is geographically diverse, with traffic and parking as added challenges, Geffen Academy continues to use Zoom meetings and programming to excellent effect, understanding that, in certain formats, meeting remotely aids in access and increases inclusivity and participation.

In addition, the school publishes two dense newsletters each week, one for Educators and one for families. It also utilizes social media to publicize co-curricular programs, including athletics events. The school partners closely with the Co-op, which offers a mechanism for distributing leadership, requesting help, and disseminating information throughout the school’s community of families. Geffen Academy coordinates with grade-level parent representatives (“grade reps”), who help to amplify messaging and disseminate information. Division Directors meet monthly with grade reps and communicate regularly throughout the school year. In 2021-2022, the school introduced Tuesday Bulletins, which are student-produced announcements and segments, lasting for 15 minutes over Zoom, to inform the student and Educator community about student events and opportunities. Weekly Educator meetings allow classroom Educators to share information, stay abreast of schoolwide events and information, and work together on curricular and programmatic needs.

**Regular Review/Revision**

**A1.6. Prompt:** Evaluate the effectiveness of the regular process for review/revision of the core beliefs, school vision, mission, and the schoolwide learner outcomes. Include the degree to which the review/revision process addresses current and future learner needs and other local/global trends/conditions.

Geffen Academy is effective in the review and revision of its program and does not shy away from difficult choices. At the core, the school has not changed, despite the growth and headwinds of the last three years. The school still operates from the basis of its core documents: developing persistence; finding and connecting to one’s purpose; “meals with our people”; getting enough sleep; a commitment to serve UCLA; and reliance on the science of adolescence. Again, the school has remained adaptable and nimble at the same time as it has a clear direction.

**Supporting Evidence**
• Revised curriculum, the schedule, points of contact with families and Educators, added advanced courses;
• Constructed modular classrooms on the “West Campus” to expand the ability to offer its full academic program;
• Created new job positions to serve students;
• Developed a culminating program for seniors (the month-long A³ Senior Project) that affords students an opportunity to dive deeper into an existing project or experience a new one in Academics, Arts or Alliance (community-based work), and students reflect on this work in light of their experience at Geffen Academy in the context of the SWLGs;
• Reviewed and updated the Mission Statement in Summer 2019 (see Table 1j);
• Formed a DEI Council and updated the school website to include the DEI Vision Statement and steps taken at the Individual, Community, and Institutional levels.
• Added more programming for affinity groups and cultural events;
• Expanded curricular and programmatic connections to UCLA (e.g. support of students in UCLA academic programs, Advanced Research mentorships); and
• Conduct annual review of admissions materials (including the application form).

As a result, there is a strong degree of consistency in school purpose and SWLGs. The school mission articulates the value of academic achievement within a humane educational setting in a community guided by the principles of DEI. This is achieved through a concerted effort to support students as they develop and practice skills. This practice is based on acquisition of knowledge, with appropriate questioning, creative analysis, and collaborative skills.
A2. Governance Criterion

Clear Policies and Procedures

A2.1. Prompt: Evaluate the clarity of the policies and procedures regarding the selection, composition and specific duties of the governing authority.

Geffen Academy was created by the UCLA Chancellor under delegated authority from the University of California Board of Regents. The UCLA Chancellor delegates authority to the Head of School for Geffen Academy policy making, financial direction, and strategic planning. The Geffen Academy Head of School jointly reports to the UCLA Vice Chancellor of Academic Personnel and the UCLA Superintendent of PreK-12 Operations.

As a university-affiliated independent school, Geffen Academy is a department of UCLA and operates differently than most schools. As such, the school requires considerable collaboration and coordination with UCLA. There are also specific areas controlled by UCLA, including:

- Master budget and fees/rates/tuition levels;
- Human Resources hiring practices and protocols;
- UCLA Facilities Management and Capital Program;
- UCLA Risk Management;
- UCLA and Geffen Academy branding;
- UCLA Parking and Transportation;
- UCLA Dining Services;
- UCLA IT services;
- UC Police Department (UCPD);
- Student health management;
- Pandemic management;
- Legal counsel; and
- Overall plant management.

There are also specific areas that Geffen Academy controls, including:

- Admissions requirements;
- Curriculum (created in conversation with UCLA experts, research involving the science of adolescence, and pegged to UC “a-g” requirements);
- Dress code;
- Hiring decisions;
- School programming;
- Communications management;
- Parent/guardian engagement; and
• Graduation requirements.

Pretraining of Potential Board Members

A2.2. Prompt: Evaluate the effectiveness of the training that is offered to prospective or new school board members.

Relationship of Policies

A2.3. Prompt: Evaluate the adequacy of the policies to support the school’s vision, mission, and schoolwide learner outcomes through its programs and operations.

Involvement of Governing Authority

A2.4. Prompt: Evaluate the processes for the involvement of the governing board in the regular review and refinement of the school’s vision, mission, and schoolwide learner outcomes.

Since inception, the school has a better understanding of its needs and acknowledges the importance of continued representation from UCLA faculty and staff, who are eminent scholars on education, student representation, policy, business, and health. Geffen Academy is intentional in its partnerships with stakeholders, enjoying deep and valued input from UCLA.

Geffen Academy works in collaboration with an Advisory Council. While the Advisory Council has no fiduciary responsibility for the school’s operations, it functions to provide guidance to the school and serves as a conduit for information among major stakeholders, including the school community, UCLA, Westwood, the Los Angeles community, and secondary education more broadly. The Council bylaws were approved by UCLA legal counsel prior to the implementation of the Advisory Council. There is clear understanding of boundaries between Advisory Council, UCLA, and Geffen Academy as far as curriculum and operation of the school are concerned.

The Advisory Council Chair is appointed by the UCLA Chancellor. Members of the Advisory Council are appointed by the Chair, in consultation with the Head of School. The Advisory Council includes UCLA leaders, community leaders, UCLA faculty, parents of students at the school, and other individuals with the potential to support the school’s growth and success.

The Advisory Council meets three times each school year for a total of 14 meetings as of this Spring 2022 WASC report. Each meeting has showcased a different element of student work or school culture and featured a discussion about an area of the school’s need.

Prior to joining the Advisory Council, potential members meet with the Chair and Head
of School in order to review the roles and responsibilities of all members.

School Community Understanding
A2.5. Prompt: To what degree does the school community understand the governing authority's role?

Given Geffen Academy’s relationship with UCLA, it is clear to the school community that UCLA is the governing authority.

Relationship to Professional Staff
A2.6. Prompt: Determine whether there is clear understanding about the relationship between the governing board and the responsibilities of the professional staff and how that understanding is developed and maintained.

Given the school’s relationship with UCLA, this question does not apply to Geffen Academy.

Board Evaluation/Monitoring Process
A2.7. Prompt: Determine the degree to which there is clarity of the evaluation and monitoring procedures carried out by the governing board, including review of student performance, overall school programs and operations, and fiscal health of the school.

Complaint and Conflict Resolution Procedures
A2.8. Prompt: Comment on the effectiveness of the established governing board/school’s complaint and conflict resolution procedures as they apply to the school’s stakeholders.

While it is not in the mission of the Advisory Council to review student performance, evaluate overall school programs and operations, or monitor fiscal health of the school, Geffen Academy has a multi-layered governing relationship with UCLA. Therefore, there still exists a clear review of the school’s operation and finances by UCLA’s Office of Administration. Additionally, the Head of School reports educational outcomes to the UCLA Chancellor, the EVCP, Superintendent, Advisory Council, and the school community.

Evaluation Procedures
A2.9. Prompt: Comment on the clarity of the evaluation procedures carried out by the governing authority.

Again, Geffen Academy operates quite differently than most independent schools. The Advisory Council does not evaluate the school. The school operates under the authority
of the UCLA Chancellor. There are many areas of operation in which the school is evaluated by the university. For example, the school’s HR practices are monitored and directed by UCLA Campus Human Resources and supported through campuswide HR procedures, employee practices are evaluated by UCLA Labor Relations, and the hiring and release process are governed by collective bargaining agreements negotiated between the university and UC-AFT. All of the school’s operations and protocols are included in the Educator and Family Handbooks which are available and binding for Educators and enrolled families.

Evaluation of the Governing Authority

**A2.10. Prompt:** Review and assess the process for evaluating the governing authority.

As a unit of UCLA, Geffen Academy does not evaluate the university, the Chancellor, or the UC Regents. However, as stated in Section A2.9 above, Geffen Academy has its own evaluative processes to support the school’s short- and long-term goals.
A3. School Leadership Criterion

Define Responsibilities and Practices

A3.1. Prompt: Evaluate these administrator and faculty written policies, charts, and handbooks. Determine the clarity and understanding of these by administration and faculty.

Geffen Academy’s written policies, protocols, and procedures are wide-ranging. Since 2019, in consultation with UCLA experts and legal counsel, the school developed and improved existing handbooks, adopted protocols and policies, created a COVID-19 task force, and held training sessions for students, Educators, and coaches. The Human Resources Department now consists of a full-time HR Manager and HR Generalist and part-time HR Coordinator, who are available to offer training, answer questions, and provide clarity. Even with its own HR team, the school’s overall policy guidance and oversight comes primarily from UCLA.

Existing Structures

A3.2. Prompt: How effective are the existing structures for internal communication, planning and resolving differences?

Geffen Academy Educators use a variety of tools to communicate and plan in collaboration with one another. These include regular all-Educator meetings, classroom Educator meetings, and department meetings to ensure consistency and efficient flow of communication. Supporting digital methods include a weekly Educator Bulletin, the Portal, a dynamic master calendar, shared folders on Box and Google Drive, and Slack. When there are conflicts, Department Chairs, the Dean of Faculty, Division Directors, HR, the Chief Administrative Officer, and the Head of School partner with involved parties to resolve conflict, guided by our norms of restorative practices.

Involvement of Staff

A3.3. Prompt: How effective are the processes and procedures for involving staff in shared responsibility, actions, and accountability to support student learning?

Geffen Academy seeks regular input from staff in order to support accountability for student learning. Through Friday morning meetings, regular 1:1 meetings, student support meetings, curricular scope and sequence meetings, and ongoing Academic Leadership meetings, the school reviews individual student situations and overall student body needs in order to assure that there is shared responsibility and action on behalf of student needs.

Evaluation of Existing Processes
A3.4. Prompt: To what extent does the school leadership regularly review the existing processes to determine the degree to which actions of the leadership and staff focus on successful student learning?

Each year, Geffen Academy reviews its handbooks for clarity and relevance, making necessary edits and additions. The process includes a close review by counsel. In addition, the school has the benefit of being under the review and guidance of UCLA, an institution with 100 years of history, possessing:

- A strong central human resources department;
- An academic personnel office;
- A Staff and Faculty Counseling Center;
- An Organizational Development department;
- A Labor Relations team; and
- An Employee Relations department that provides additional policy, procedures and general support in the administrative and personnel management fields.

Existing structures for internal communication have grown better, more voluminous, and more targeted since 2019. The school believes in sharing important information through a variety of channels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Educator Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Friday E-Newsletter (primarily for families)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tuesday Bulletin (primarily for students);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Official Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Parent/Guardian-Educator Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Friday All-Educator Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Department Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grade-level and division meetings; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Informal conversations and standing meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Numerous points of connection in informal ways: birthday celebrations, coffee carts, group lunches, and informal outings among the Educator body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The school’s planning structure has continued to function effectively as it grows into Year 5 and beyond. To prepare for the school year and to focus on student learning, Geffen Academy has Leadership Meetings during the summer. The purpose of this time is to set an annual agenda and determine areas of focus. In the summer of 2022, the Leadership Meetings will focus on setting plans for the action items set forth in this
Throughout the school year, the Head of School effectively oversees the institution and works with the Middle and Upper School Division Directors, Dean of Faculty, Chief Administrative Officer, Chief Advancement Officer, Director of Admissions, Director of Academic Advising & College Counseling, Athletic Director, and Dean of Students to strategically plan for the short, medium, and long term. The effectiveness of Geffen Academy’s planning is evident in the trajectory of the school over its first years.

Specifically, standing groups within and among departments meet regularly. Other configurations of Educators meet regularly to review events and the master calendar, to monitor the academic and social-emotional needs of the students, and to respond to needs of individual families and the Co-op. The school has created an organizational chart so that an Educator or family knows whom to contact to refer a student for assistance as needed.

Geffen Academy believes people operate with best intentions, and that “kind and direct” feedback should be the norm. The school’s approach to decision-making provides opportunity for input and feedback, which allows people to hash out differences before the product is finished. Guided by UCLA Campus Human Resources and their conflict resolution policies, the school aims to address misunderstandings and disagreements in a timely manner to help restore relationships. With students, the school practices this restorative philosophy through conversation and reflection, as explained in the Family Handbook, p. 47-63. This applies to Educators as well as students. The school engages in a restorative approach to conflicts, where people are able to address the harm they have caused and work to restore relationships with their peers/community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archive of Educator Bulletins 2018-2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Conflict Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA Campus Human Resources and their conflict resolution policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative Conversations-Geffen Academy Norms Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedules of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday Meeting Rotations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Leadership Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMK+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AACG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SLS
Friday Morning Meetings
Orientation
Department Meetings with tasks
Department Chair meetings
WASC working groups based on indicators that are classroom and assessment based
Academic Leadership Meetings
PD days focused on pedagogy/student learning/student articulation
Dos and Don’ts/remote teaching guidelines
Student Support Meetings
Academic Support Meetings
Official Notes
Academic Advising meetings 1-on-1 with students
Office Hours
Academic Labs
Student Support Plans
A4. Staff Criterion

Employment Policies/Prompts

A4.1. Prompt: Evaluate the clarity of the employment policies and practices related to qualification/statutory requirements of current and potential staff for all programs, including all types of online instruction and specialized programs such as college/career preparation.

Geffen Academy Educators are qualified for their assigned responsibilities, are committed to the School’s mission, and engage in ongoing professional development (PD) to promote student learning. These PD opportunities are both internal through Geffen Academy and/or UCLA, and external through outside organizations. Additional training occurs through UCLA’s Learning Management System (LMS), targeted PD, and school-wide Educator in-service learning.

There are clear employment policies, established by UCLA and in accordance with existing labor and employment laws, related to qualification requirements of staff. All of the school’s positions for employment have accompanying job descriptions, which are approved by UCLA; this includes both Unit 18 (bargaining unit through UC-AFT) and non-bargaining employees. Positions include full-time, part-time, and limited.

The school’s employment policies are weighty but necessary. Once a position is approved and posted with explanations of the role and qualifications, it must remain open for several weeks. The school interviews at least two candidates per position, with a hiring committee made up of 3-5 Educators, using scripted and consistent questions with each candidate. Once a finalist is determined, reference calls are made and an offer is extended. When an offer is accepted, the new hire is then required to go to the main UCLA campus for a background check through Livescan and a TB test. Once cleared, the individual is allowed to come to Geffen Academy to begin training/orientation.

The University of California is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. All qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, disability, age or protected veteran status.

Moreover, the academic hiring language states: “As a condition of employment, you will be required to comply with the University of California SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccination Program Policy. All Covered Individuals under the policy must provide proof of Full Vaccination or, if applicable, submit a request for Exception (based on Medical Exemption, Disability, and/or Religious Objection) or Deferral (based on pregnancy) no later than the applicable deadline. For new University of California employees, the
applicable deadline is eight weeks after their first date of employment.”

Qualifications of Staff

A4.2. Prompt: Evaluate the procedures to ensure all staff members in all programs, including online instruction, based on staff background, training, and preparation are qualified for their responsibilities within any type of instruction to ensure quality student learning.

Geffen Academy’s thorough procedures ensure that all staff members are prepared to perform the duties described in their job descriptions. Depending on job function, varying degrees of education and experience are required. In some cases, academic administrators are required to hold a Ph.D. unless a special exception has been approved. Classroom Educators are required to have a minimum of a bachelor’s degree; department chairs are required to have a master’s degree. Currently, nearly 90% of our classroom Educators hold advanced degrees in their subject matter. The Head of School is required to have a Ph.D. and the Chief Administrative Officer is required to have a master’s degree in a related field. Additional conditions of employment include a background check, a TB test, Federal Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) training, and training as mandated reporters under the Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act (CANRA).

Throughout the recruitment and hiring process, Geffen Academy reviews prospective Educators’ backgrounds to ensure all are trained and prepared for their job responsibilities. Geffen Academy uses robust and diverse hiring committees in all of its hiring practices; the Head of School reviews all hiring committees in advance to assure that there is diversity, breadth, and depth across hiring practices.

Academic Educators are required to submit documentation to build their official personnel file’s dossier. The dossier includes the Curriculum Vitae, degree confirmation, special documentation to note extraordinary accomplishments (publications, awards, etc.), and a History Card containing the steps held within the UCLA Academic Personnel Office, Interfolio. This is in addition to the observation and evaluation system that is completed but still under bargaining.

Maximum Use of Staff Expertise

A4.3. Prompt: Evaluate the process to assign staff members and provide an appropriate orientation process to ensure all staff are qualified and prepared for their responsibilities including any type of online instruction.
The school has an effective process to welcome and integrate new Educators to Geffen Academy and UCLA. New Educators receive a detailed welcome email from Human Resources with foundational documents assigned to read before arriving on campus for orientation. All employees, regardless of classification, participate in a Business Office-hosted New Hire Orientation on their first day of employment. The orientation covers organization structure, benefits, mission statement, risk management, Information Systems policy, procedures and systems/network overview, building tour, and general policies and procedures. The orientation includes a packet of documents for self-study. Each August, there is an orientation at which classroom Educators meet the Dean of Faculty and other members of the leadership team to begin building relationships and learning about workflow, philosophy, and culture at Geffen Academy. New Educators also meet their department chairs and colleagues. Additionally, the school hosts a multi-day orientation for all Educators a week later in August to further orient the team to the mission and priorities of the upcoming school year, as well as the Educator norms. In previous years, the school has paired new Educators with more experienced Educators to help serve as an additional resource. Throughout the year, new Educators are supported by their Department Chair, Dean of Faculty, colleagues, and others.

**Defining and Understanding Practices/Relationships**

**A4.4. Prompt:** Evaluate the administrator and faculty written policies, charts, pacing guides, and handbooks that define responsibilities, operational practices, decision-making processes, and relationships of leadership and staff. Determine the degree of clarity and understanding of these by administration and faculty.

Since 2019, Geffen Academy has further developed and defined responsibilities and operational practices and streamlined decision-making processes. This has netted an effective range of handbooks and resources that improve clarity and understanding among Educators. Amid major pivots related to COVID-19 and remote schooling, the school has aimed to be planful, communicative, and steady in response and direction.

**Staff Actions/Accountability to Support Learning**

**A4.5. Prompt:** How effective are the processes and procedures for involving staff in shared responsibility, actions, and accountability to support student learning throughout all programs? Provide representative examples and data regarding impact on student learning.

We have continually reevaluated the effectiveness of involving Educators in shared
responsibility, actions, and accountability to support student learning. This review of informal and formal feedback, survey data, and reflection on growth and students’ needs has positively impacted the school program. Since 2019, Geffen Academy has added to the team and strengthened the focus on work that supports Educators and students in teaching and learning. This includes close collaboration between the Dean of Faculty, “master” Educators, Division Director(s), Learning Specialist(s), Head of School, Student Academic Liaisons, Department Chairs, and School Counselors to implement strategies to support the overall program. Educators are supported through mentoring, coaching, observation, school in-service days, and targeted PD. Students are supported through numerous avenues, including Official Notes, Office Hours, Study Hall, Academic Labs, targeted support through referrals, and identification in Student Support or Academic Support meetings. The school leadership team consistently messages and engages department chairs in messaging to classroom Educators the importance of proactive communication and support; grades and progress should not be a surprise during feedback cycles.

As a result of the established resources, strategies, and interventions, student support has increased. Since Geffen Academy is a young school, it is difficult to determine the long-term impact of these supports on learning directly. Early indicators offer sources of optimism; for example, out of 2,229 Semester 1 Upper School letter grades given, only 12 were lower than C-, suggesting that students are engaging strongly with the curriculum and performing at a high level. In addition, limited PSAT data indicates that students are achieving well beyond the state and national benchmarks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Plan process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geffen Academy Student Services email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Team bi-weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Emotional Support Team bi-weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Hall referral/monitoring Official Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Lab referral process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAT Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Audit process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter II: Student/Community Profile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support of Professional Development

**A4.6. Prompt:** How effective is the support of professional development/learning with time, personnel, material, and fiscal resources to facilitate all students achieving the
academic standards and the schoolwide learner outcomes? Provide evidence and examples.

Geffen Academy effectively supports professional development (PD) in ways. The school provides funds each year for Educators to attend professional learning opportunities, such as conferences, webinars, workshops, symposiums, and research presentations of their own material. Students and Educators have attended conferences together, such as the NAIS People of Color Conference (PoCC) and the Student Diversity Leadership Conference (SDLC). The school helps to arrange coverage for an Educator who misses class to participate in PD. Geffen Academy also provides faculty in-service training that supports professional practice. In addition, UCLA manages a campus-wide LMS database with training modules for employees; campus-wide opportunities for development are offered regularly.

Supervision and Evaluation

A4.7. Prompt: How effective are the school’s supervision and evaluation procedures in order to promote professional growth of staff in all areas such as their technological training?

Geffen Academy has created an observation and evaluation procedure with the goal of improving teaching and learning. The process centers around a reflective practice that values preparation, communication, teaching, and school culture. School leadership performed formal and informal observations of classroom Educators in 2019-2020. In addition, the leadership team regularly meets with non-Unit 18 Department Chairs for feedback. (This group was formally evaluated in 2020-2021 for merit increases.) The observation is not an evaluation, instead serving as a data point and an opportunity for Educator reflection and growth.

Since 2018, there has been ongoing collective bargaining with UC-AFT that involves setting the terms and conditions of teachers’ workload and compensation. Part of the process involves coming to agreement about the cycle of evaluations. The school has created a process and is eager to move forward; once the negotiation process is finalized, an evaluation process will commence.

Measurable Effect of Professional Development

A4.8. Prompt: Comment on the effectiveness of the processes in determining the measurable effect of professional development, coaching, and mentoring on student performance. Provide evidence about whether the professional development/learning has had a positive impact on student learning.
Geffen Academy’s internal professional development efforts have resulted in a greater understanding among Educators regarding how to engage with all learners. Internal PD opportunities have centered on developing Educator awareness and fluency around interventions for students with academic needs. This awareness, and an established process for student support plans, has made a positive impact—not just for students with learning differences, but for all learners. In the future, the school will seek to implement an effective operating process to determine the measurable effect of PD, coaching, and mentoring on student performance. Initially, this will consist of gathering written reflections for analysis. Indirectly, the school can measure the effect of PD using data from the annual CRESST survey and the perceived high quality of instruction and high level of student achievement.
A5. School Environment Criterion

Caring, Concern, High Expectations

A5.1. Prompt: To what extent does the school demonstrate caring, concern, and high expectations for students in an environment that honors individual differences and is conducive to learning?

The school’s demonstration of caring, concern, and high expectations for students manifests in numerous ways. This is primarily evidenced through Educators’ positive relationship-building with students and a “one mind at a time” approach. As an institution, the school has embedded relationship-building in the Wellness curriculum. Moreover, classroom Educators are encouraged to emphasize classroom culture that is inclusive, welcoming, humane, and conducive to learning. Student and family affinity groups provide additional points of connection.

In compliance with health and safety protocols, Geffen Academy prioritized face-to-face interaction in 2020-2021 through social-emotional cohorts and a return to hybrid school in Spring 2021. In 2021-2022, nearly a full week was devoted to grade-level retreats and orientation as students returned full-time to in-person school. Since 2019, resources have been allocated for the hiring of School Counselor(s), School Nurse(s), Associate and Assistant Dean(s), Student Services Coordinator, Athletic Trainer, and Learning Specialist(s).

Student Self-Esteem

A5.2. Prompt: To what extent does the school foster student self-esteem through high expectations for each student and recognition of successes?

Geffen Academy at UCLA provides many avenues for students to experience positive self-esteem through a combination of high expectations and relentless support. The school views students as individuals, each possessing a unique spark, and endeavors to foster a positive self-image in students in multiple ways. Early on, the school decided not to rank or otherwise quantify students. The school does not give academic awards or honor a valedictorian. Instead, there are other outlets for students to see and feel recognition of their successes. Further, Geffen Academy believes that self-worth derives from accomplishment; hard work yields growth, and students are given multiple opportunities to experience the growth that results from hard work and appropriate levels of challenge. Further, Geffen Academy celebrates achievement of students through grades, performances, and appropriate recognition.
Supporting Evidence

- Official Note highlights, where Educators send positive reinforcement home;
- Positive and supportive relationships with Educators, as seen through CRESST survey results;
- Healthful dining options and “meals with our people”;
- Athletics events, recognition, and sports celebration evenings;
- Club, affinity group, and Student Council leadership;
- Classroom activities in courses like Wellness, English/Humanities, and Physical Education;
- An Academic Advising process that encourages students to take rigorous but appropriate course loads, including advanced courses;
- A curricular and pedagogical approach that prioritizes persistence and adaptability; and
- A rigorous curricular approach that goes deeply into skills development and content acquisition.

Mutual Respect and Communication

A5.3. Prompt: What evidence supports mutual respect and effective communication among and between staff, students, and parents?

Supporting Evidence

- Weekly Friday E-Newsletters;
- Family meetings with individuals or small groups of Educators;
- Parent/guardian Zoom meetings (i.e. Back-to-School Nights, Division Level, Grade Level, AACG, Parent/Guardian-Educator Conferences, Looking Ahead, Athletics, Student Life, Admissions);
- Recurring co-curricular events (e.g. Educators vs. Students Basketball Game)
- CRESST survey results;
- Family contract language that gives expectations to the type of collaborative and positive relationships the school strives to have with families.

Teacher Support and Encouragement

A5.4. Prompt: How effective is the level of support and encouragement for teachers to...
use innovative approaches to enhance student learning?

The school’s mission and proximity to UCLA clearly establish an environment that encourages innovation at all levels and in all academic programming. It is within a department’s purview to create an interesting and engaging curriculum for students. As content experts who excel at educating secondary students, Educators are given wide latitude to offer innovative lessons. Within this structure, there are expectations of consistency across sections of class taught by different Educators so that students are exposed to equivalent skills and content. Also, the physical campus requires us to be creative with learning spaces. For example, the school uses outdoor spaces for I-Track and Art learning as well as Wellness and PE. As with any innovative endeavor, continuous improvement and iteration is required, particularly in 2021-2022, which is effectively Geffen Academy’s first year on campus, full-time, as a secondary school for grades 6-12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Zoom sharing of best practices (e.g. modification of the use of bulletin boards in the LMS to facilitate student communication during the remote learning period have continued);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I-Track: Individual PD funded around individual curricular areas (e.g. game design, Snap-The-Gap, Today’s Future Sound (beat-making for children);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research: Access to seminars and lectures at UCLA (e.g. 50th Year of the Internet, WOW (Wonder of Women) seminar (Semel Institute);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Math: Novel shared materials that extend understanding beyond the textbook (e.g. worksheets of non-standard problems);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Humanities: Points/season-based grading system;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Advising &amp; College Guidance approach; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UCLA usage survey (sent to Educators in February).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Safe, Clean, and Orderly Environment

A5.5. Prompt: Comment on your analysis of the effectiveness of a) the existing policies and use of resources to ensure a safe, clean and orderly place that nurtures learning, and b) all aspects of the school with respect to safety regulations including effective operating procedures for internet safety.

As the school has grown since 2019, so too have its safety, security and facilities needs, both physical and online. Geffen Academy devotes considerable resources to its physical space to ensure a safe and clean learning environment. The school adheres to
UCLA safety regulations and is in compliance with all applicable policies and protocols for physical and online spaces.

Some issues have arisen with the unhoused population of Westwood as well as local skateboarders, who have damaged the exterior of the campus performing tricks. Notably, the campus was burglarized in Fall 2021; while the campus was empty, the suspect scaled a wall and climbed the building, entering on the second floor. Luckily, UCPD assisted and eventually apprehended the suspect. However, given the short fence line, the campus is relatively easy to scale. The school plans to add fence toppers to increase the height and to make scaling the fences far more difficult.

Meanwhile, LA Metro is expanding the Purple Line on Wilshire Boulevard near the southern edge of campus; ongoing construction is expected for the next several years. Currently, Geffen Academy is surveyed for noise and air pollution given the heavy machinery and boring that is taking place nearby. Once the project is completed, the expectation is that there will be tens of thousands of riders, further increasing the density around the campus. While this presents an excellent transportation solution for Geffen Academy (and, more broadly, for UCLA), it also presents additional challenges. It is likely that Geffen Academy will need to expand a secure perimeter near the Metro station and increase security around campus. Another related consideration is a modification of current Bruin ID card-reading capabilities so that the school can electronically and securely monitor the flow in and out of the building.

There have been very limited online safety issues. UCLA’s security protocols on Zoom have enabled Geffen Academy to respond swiftly to mitigate any online safety concerns. The school has experienced 2-3 “Zoom bombing” incidents and was quickly able to shut down the offending sources.

**Supporting Evidence**

- Full-time custodian during the day and a crew at night who clean and sanitize;
- Connection to UCLA in providing custodial staff (flexibility in hiring additional custodial staff when necessary);
- UCLA Facilities has requirements for the custodial team to complete on a nightly basis;
- Classrooms have sanitizers, Lysol, and cleaning equipment;
- Security: Full-time security personnel through UCPD
  - Added security personnel (zero in Year 1 to 3 in 2021-2022)
- Traffic guards for morning drop-off and afternoon pickup;
- Partnership with UCLA Parking and Transportation for safety planning;
- Emergency backpacks in every classroom;
- Safety Committee and safety protocols;
- Cameras around the school (inside and outside);
- Proximity to fire department station and UCPD;
- Monthly fire drills;
- Close working relationship with UCLA’s Environmental Health and Safety, which includes filing of *UCLA Exposure Control Plan*;
- Biannual required training on *Cyber Security*;
- Resources offered through UCLA’s Chief Information and Security Officer’s website;
- Adherence to UCLA’s Risk Management policies and procedures;
- Family Handbook;
- Geffen Academy at UCLA On-Site Reopening Plan;
A6. Reporting Student Progress Criterion

Reporting Student Progress

A6.1. Prompt: Evaluate the effectiveness of the processes that inform appropriate stakeholders (governing board members, teachers, students and parents) about student achievement of the academic standards and the schoolwide learner outcomes?

Since 2019, Geffen Academy has added and now employs a variety of methods to inform stakeholders about student achievement, student culture, expectations, and growth toward SWLGs. The school prioritizes proactive communication with families and students. Educators are encouraged to communicate home through Official Notes early in the school year to establish positive relationships with families and students. Throughout the school year, Educators are asked to communicate home when a student is trending toward a B-/C+ or lower grade or if there has been any noteworthy or concerning behavior. Many other points of connection support these formal communications.

Monitoring of Student Growth

A6.2. Prompt: Evaluate and comment on the system used to monitor the progress of all students toward meeting the academic standards and schoolwide learner outcomes.

In evaluating the supporting evidence from A6.1, it appears that students are well-supported in understanding and achieving Geffen Academy’s academic standards and SWLGs. Since 2019, the school has greatly improved its outreach and communication with families and students. These efforts and transparency in the program have helped redefine and set expectations for what families can expect from Geffen Academy at UCLA.

The school aims to bolster its ability to collect and analyze data for categories of students so it can understand better whether there is an achievement gap and what steps it can take to eliminate any achievement gaps.

Modifications Based on Assessment Results

A6.3. Prompt: Provide examples of how assessment results have caused changes in the school program, professional development activities, and/or resource allocations demonstrating a results-driven continuous process.

As a department of UCLA, Geffen Academy collects and uses data to make informed decisions. The school collects data through qualitative and quantitative feedback.

Supporting Evidence
A7. School Improvement Process Criterion

Broad-Based and Collaborative

A7.1. Prompt: Comment on the effectiveness of the school planning process to ensure that it is broad-based, collaborative and fosters the commitment of the stakeholders, including the staff, students, and parents.

School Plan Correlated to Student Learning

A7.2. Prompt: How does the school ensure that the analyses of student achievement of the critical learner needs, schoolwide learner outcomes, and academic standards are incorporated into the plan and impacts the development, implementation and monitoring of the plan?

Since 2019, Geffen Academy has developed a broad-based and collaborative approach to its planning process, which includes feedback and input from the school community. There is regular communication with the community and feedback given to school leadership, including the Head of School, Division Directors, Dean of Students, Dean of Faculty, Department Chairs, Admissions Team, AACG Team, and Athletic Directors. Geffen Academy’s team has been in constant communication regarding the needs identified during the 2019 WASC visit and has worked concertedly to accomplish the goals set forth in the action plan. Ahead of the self-study visit in 2022, the school has made tremendous progress toward completing and refining components of its plan.
Further, student learning is routinely assessed in student support plan meetings, so that individual student needs are addressed immediately and appropriately.

### Supporting Evidence

| • Table 1a |
| • Table 1b |
| • Parent Co-op meetings |
| • Grade Rep meetings |
| • Parent/Guardian committees |
| • Parent/Guardian affinity groups |
| • Student Council Policy Committee |
| • Student affinity groups |
| • Partnership with UCLA (e.g. parking lot, modulars, athletics, transportation, risk management, IT support, security, facilities management, dining, custodial) |
| • Department Chair meetings |
| • Department meetings |
| • Academic Leadership |
| • Social Emotional Support Team meetings |
| • Academic Support Team meetings |
| • Division Director meetings |
| • Various 1:1 or small group meetings around areas of calendar, event planning, Business Office, Admissions Office, AACG Office |

### Systems Alignment

**A7.3. Prompt:** *What evidence supports the systems alignment in areas such as professional goals, teacher evaluation, and strategic planning for the purpose of ongoing school improvement?*

### Correlation between All Resources, Schoolwide Learner Outcomes, and Plan

**A7.4. Prompt:** *Examine and evaluate the degree to which the allocation of time/fiscal/personnel/material resources support the implementation, monitoring, and accomplishment of the schoolwide action plan.*

Geffen Academy has committed appropriate and robust resources to accomplishing the goals outlined in its action plan, demonstrating an ability to make adjustments as needed, particularly amid the transition to remote teaching and learning at the start of the pandemic. Even in the virtual setting, the school has worked diligently to deliver
enriching academic experiences in a humane environment; build and strengthen partnerships across UCLA; and enhance programming and initiatives around DEI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Category A. Organization for Student Learning: Summary, Strengths, and Growth Needs

- Review all the findings and supporting evidence and summarize the degree to which the criteria in Category A are being met.
- Include comments about the degree to which these criteria impact the school’s ability to address one or more of the identified major student learner needs (Chapter III).

Summary (including comments about the major student learner needs)

Geffen Academy at UCLA has a clear mission and vision, articulated in documents and the philosophy of the school. These values as well as the SWLGs are exhibited in the classroom, hallways, stages/fields of competition, and artistic endeavors. The school’s program has been impacted by the analysis of data accumulated by CRESST and by Geffen Academy. The leadership team meets in various iterations consistently to review and address the needs of the school. Moreover, the school has created opportunities for stakeholders to come together to help promote and aid in the development of the school. For a young school, there are strong degrees of consistency between the mission/vision and programs. As the school continues to grow, it aims to create more explicit opportunities for students to make connections to the SWLGs in the classroom as well as more leadership opportunities and ways to further promote a sense of belonging.

Given the nature of Geffen Academy and the overall arc of its development, the role and composition of the Advisory Council make sense. As the school moves out of a startup phase and into a phase of consolidation, the role of the Advisory Council will continue to evolve. More broadly, the school’s affiliation and partnership with UCLA are evident across all facets of operations.

With assistance from UCLA, Geffen Academy’s handbooks, written policies and protocols, leadership structures and decision-making processes define and describe the responsibilities, operational and educational practices, and relationships of leadership and staff. These items — vetted through the university, including by legal counsel — inform processes and procedures for involving and engaging stakeholders. There are different modes for internal communication, strategies for planning, and various structures for resolving differences, including the Dean of Faculty, Department Chairs, and the school’s internal Human Resources Department. In certain instances, UC-AFT union representatives may become involved and communicate through the Business Office and Human Resources.
An advantage of working with UCLA is improved clarity in job descriptions, qualifications, and the hiring process. Nearly 90% of classroom Educators hold an advanced degree, and they have the background, training, and disposition needed to be successful in the classroom. To help aid in preparation, the school creates and reviews clear documentation for policies and procedures related to responsibilities, operational practices, and expectations. To support its philosophy, Geffen Academy offers to Educators mentoring, coaching, observations and evaluations (once successfully bargained), and professional development (PD). The school also offers opportunities to attend off-campus PD workshops as well as internal opportunities to learn as a school community. The incorporation of Learning Specialist(s) and a multi-year focus on Student Support Plans have positively impacted student performance.

As a whole, the school demonstrates caring, concern, and high expectations for students within a tolerant, humane, and safe environment. Through Student Life events, World Languages and Cultures Department, and affinity groups, Geffen Academy embraces and celebrates individual and cultural differences. Moreover, the school fosters student self-esteem through the provision of appropriate levels of challenge and accomplishment, Wellness lessons, athletics, arts, and other co-curricular activities. The campus building is secure, clean, and well-maintained, and IT is secured through the main UCLA campus network and a dedicated IT team. Geffen Academy's Educator norms prioritize kind and direct communication to help foster mutual respect and effective communication among stakeholders. When a restorative conversation is needed, respectful communication is used to address the harm and heal the relationships. Educators are given latitude to create innovative approaches to content and pedagogy; consistency is achieved via department meetings, agreed-upon projects, and course expectations for sections taught by multiple Educators.

There are many ways in which the school communicates and informs stakeholders about student progress and showcases SWLGs. This is accomplished through coordinated communications, a professional website, student-led Tuesday Bulletin meetings, Advisory Council, Official Notes, Parent/Guardian Conferences, and CRESST survey data. Through these feedback loops, semester grade audit meetings, existing bi-weekly Academic and Social-Emotional team meetings, and other teams who meet to support students, Geffen Academy monitors the progress of all students as they fulfill graduation requirements while growing as individuals and citizens.

As a school that makes data-informed decisions, Geffen Academy has utilized CRESST survey data along with other qualitative and quantitative data/feedback to inform parts of its action plan and areas of improvement. This has allowed the school to iterate on its program over the years and allocate resources accordingly to continually improve the school and its programs in alignment with its mission.
### Category A: Organization for Student Learning: Areas of Strength

- A robust curricular program with clearly developed scopes and sequences informed by SWLGs, DEI, and Wellness principles; and an emphasis on life skills that foster students’ ability to set and achieve goals;
- Educators who share their lifelong love of learning and considerable skill sets to inspire students to appreciate and enjoy learning opportunities;
- A deeply caring, reflective, safe, and inclusive school community;
- The intentional hiring of a diverse teaching and administrative team such that students of all backgrounds see themselves represented in the school’s adult population and leadership team;
- An active DEI program that reflects the population of the school and the greater world beyond the building, celebrating traditions while nimbly responding to major news events;
- Collaboration with CRESST at UCLA to gather data on the school’s development and implement research based processes for continual educational reflection and improvement;
- The Advisory Council, the expertise its members share with Geffen Academy, and its willingness to discuss meaningful subjects, such as college readiness and student leadership;
- Effective planning structures and leadership meetings, including in the summer;
- The devotion of considerable resources to the physical space to ensure a safe and clean learning environment, in compliance with all UCLA policies;
- Improved cadence of calendar, transparency of communication, planful feedback cycle and academic advising process, Learning Specialist and Student Support Plans (SSPs) process;
- Effective structures for internal communication, planning, and resolving differences, with evaluation of CRESST data informing future analysis;
- An intentional budget allocation and established approval process for PD funds, which Educators can use to attend PD opportunities of interest;
- The allocation of resources to hire School Counselor(s), School Nurse(s), Associate and Assistant Dean(s), Student Services Coordinator, Athletic Trainer, and Learning Specialist(s);
- The early decision not to rank or otherwise quantify students, thereby keeping the focus on the joy of the learning process;
- High expectations for the type of collaborative and positive relationships we wish to have with families, with affinity groups offering additional points of
connection; and

- The school’s mission and its proximity to UCLA, which encourage innovation at all levels and in all academic programming.

### Category A: Organization for Student Learning: Areas of Growth

- Refine data collection methods, expand data collection categories to understand any achievement gap, and explore how to create a data dashboard for future analysis of CRESST findings and additional student data;
- Continue developing leadership opportunities for students to engage in the SWLGs and work of DEI;
- Continue strengthening student voice and feedback while being mindful of what is possible given financial, logistical, and organizational constraints;
- Renegotiate some areas of the student dress code and continue to reinforce the dress code’s alignment with the school’s mission and emphasis on equity;
- Develop additional consequences for students when restorative conversations are not effective in changing behavior, beyond warnings, conversations, and an eventual behavior plan;
- Continue to improve on the publication of the school’s mission, vision, and values through various outlets, including efficiency of messaging of grade-specific items via parent Grade Rep distribution;
- Add more touch points for families to meet Educators in person early in the school year to help establish relationships;
- Add in-person events, in compliance with health and safety guidelines, to support continued strong recruitment of prospective students and families;
- Increase leadership retreats to deepen alignment between mission and practice, center school philosophy, and pinpoint common emphases each year;
- Incorporate the Advisory Council into the fabric of the school community by:
  - Utilizing the strength of the Advisory Council for strategic outreach and promotion of school goals;
  - Adding Geffen Academy student representation and representatives from UCLA (Recreation, Athletics, and Parking/Transportation);
  - Working on succession planning for founding Advisory Council Chair;
  - Establishing an annual retreat for goal setting and team building; and
  - Engaging with CRESST to review and/or evaluate the Advisory Council;
- Continue to improve methods for how Educators are informed about medical, personal, behavioral, or disciplinary situations involving students while using a
“need to know” system to maintain some student privacy;

- Hire additional student support staff, including Grade Level Deans, Upper School Assistant Academic Dean, and Dean of Instruction to support Educators in universal design and curriculum accessibility;
- Clarify the types of accommodations that can be offered given the school’s resources and its blended independent/public existence, with attention to classroom Educators’ understanding of SSP implementation;
- Improve Official Notes through Educator coaching and monitor for consistency;
- Effectively integrate the school’s hard-to-quantify SWLGs into the curriculum in overt and explicit ways, such as through:
  - The creation of a SWLG portfolio;
  - Norming SWLG language across documents and programs; and
  - Articulated DEI and Wellness outcomes;
- Continue to coach Educators to help them adapt their pedagogy to provide accommodations and appropriate interventions, including for missing work and classroom management challenges;
- Develop structures to implement an effective operating process to determine measurable effects of PD, coaching, and mentoring on student learning by:
  - Adding the explicit connection of PD to evaluation and observation protocol (once it is successfully bargained);
  - Evaluating the impact of outside PD by requiring a short reflection after each attendance that would be analyzed and stored for future reference;
  - Adding more in-service opportunities for Educators, with consistent use of exit surveys that would be analyzed and stored for reference; and
  - Develop PD that blends self-selection and community participation.
- Continue to improve advance planning and cadence of established school traditions, taking advantage of repeatable year calendar so Educators and students know what to expect;
- Reorganize files so important documents are more easily accessible and grouped, and create an Academic Handbook that includes documentation provided to academic Educators;
- Prepare for potential campus adjustments due to LA Metro’s Purple Line expansion, including security, building perimeters, and Bruin ID card-reading capabilities.
Category B: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

B1. What Students Learn Criterion

Current Educational Research and Thinking

B1.1. Prompt: Comment on the effective use of current educational research related to the curricular areas in order to maintain a viable, meaningful instructional program for students. Examine the effectiveness of how the school staff stay current and relevant and revise the curriculum appropriately within the curricular review cycle.

Geffen Academy at UCLA was formed on the principle that it would be a research-based organization with an orientation toward what is called the science of adolescence. To this end, what is implemented in the classroom has a solid foundation of research. Department Chairs and the Educator body meet regularly to discuss curriculum and share experiences that benefit students by delivering a meaningful curriculum that incorporates pedagogy that is both historically accepted and emerging in secondary education, based on research findings.

Every department has a scope and sequence and every course has a curriculum map that reflects this work; all of these are updated as necessary. The school takes published education standards into consideration when developing curricula, but student experience is extended beyond minimum requirements as the extraordinary resources available to Educators are used in the classroom.

Examples include the following:

- History: The department utilizes the sequence that is informed by current historiographical research and debates on topics in United States and global history. Those are derived from the practices articulated by the American Historical Association and the Organization of American Historians. The department is also committed to the idea of history, asking questions regarding the historian’s craft across all required courses.

- English: Curricular areas have been identified, and courses developed, based on the California Common Core State Standards with additional guidance garnered from the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges (California State University) and Academic Literacy: A Statement of Competencies Expected of Students Entering California’s Public Colleges and Universities (University of California). Additional research-based publications that guide the English Department philosophy include: Carnegie Corporation’s “Reading Next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy; “Writing Next: Effective Strategies to Improve Writing of Adolescents in Middle and High Schools”; The National Council of Teachers of
English “Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing”; Gallagher and Kittle’s (2019) research on elective reading, interactive notebooks, and a multi-draft writing process (Humanities 6 and English 8 courses).

- Wellness: Wellness Educators use a public health approach to issues facing adolescents that includes defining a problem, identifying associated risk/protective factors, developing/testing prevention efforts, and applying effective injury prevention strategies.

- World Languages & Cultures: The department firmly grounds its curriculum on the principles of backwards planning (Mctighe and Wiggins, 1998) and by American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) proficiency guidelines. In an effort to measure benchmarks and student growth, students take the Assessment of Performance toward Proficiency in Languages (AAPPL) at the end of the foundational series.

- Visual & Performing Arts: In addition to regular research at the UCLA Arts Library to find supporting material for instructional content, educational research is important to increasing and refining the effectiveness of instructional programming. Recently, this has included investigation of Los Angeles contemporary artists, technical advances in different media, and differentiation strategies specific to arts instruction (e.g. differentiation by negotiation, outcome, and extension).

- Music: Both Educators are involved with the local, national, and international research community of music education. They both serve as state representatives of the California Music Educators Association (CMEA), publish research articles, and present at conferences. Current research has informed the department in the following ways: There are decades of research documenting how students with less traditional music backgrounds are marginalized from school programs. Some barriers to access include auditions, reliance on Western notation, and access to instruments. Using the findings, the department created curricula and music spaces that did not require these elements for student participation. Research in music education is studied regularly in order to access and adopt materials for classes to become more inclusive (e.g. differentiated assignment prompts, videos and articles that represent diverse populations).

**Academic Standards for Each Area**

**B1.2. Prompt:** Evaluate to what extent there are defined academic standards for each subject area, course, and/or program (e.g., online instruction) that meet state or national/international standards and, if applicable, expectations within courses that meet
the UC “a-g” requirements.

Geffen Academy’s curriculum offers rich learning opportunities that meet or exceed standards and are not tied to standardized testing, as there is an embrace of the opportunities afforded by our experienced faculty and the relationship with UCLA. The school uses the guidance of Universal and/or Understanding by Design (UbD)/Backward Design principles in disciplines in order to develop a cohesive and coherent curriculum grounded in theory and best practices.

The UbD philosophy is clearly articulated in the Curriculum Maps for every course that describes each discipline’s philosophical approach, overarching goals, and vision. These documents also take content standards (state, national and/or international) into account so that graduates are prepared for postsecondary education. In addition, all Upper School courses are developed with the expectation that they will meet the expectations for UC “a-g” requirements. (As of March 2022, there are 160 courses approved through this system.)

The Middle School curriculum prepares students for the rigor of Upper School classes, while maintaining a humane learning environment, and supports students to reach their academic potential. As part of this process, the school supports student well-being by assigning academic grades only beginning in 8th grade and by assigning homework deliberately. Finally, the curriculum is under constant review and revision to improve the student experience and ensure that courses stay on track with the expected goals.

Congruence

B1.3. Prompt: Evaluate if there is congruence between the actual concepts and skills taught, the academic standards, and the schoolwide learner outcomes.

Congruence is evident across academic content and skills taught in the classroom, prevailing academic standards, and the SWLGs. This occurs throughout the 6-12 curriculum and is the result of intentional planning.

- The Upper School curriculum is aligned with UC a-g standards.
- The school is not tied to published standards, but some academic departments are firmly aligned to state or national standards, whereas others use them as guidance (e.g. I-Track, where limited instructional standards exist given the entrepreneurial and exploratory nature of the discipline).
- Scope and sequence documents have been written for every course, and they are all aligned with the school’s SWLGs and DEI and Wellness goals.

Geffen Academy Educators embrace backward design as a key principle, ensuring that instruction is focused on student learning as a means of building skills and knowledge to
meet necessary learning goals. Thus, the curriculum is not just about engaging students in content; it also ensures that students have the resources necessary to understand and demonstrate deep knowledge of the course material.

**Student Work — Engagement in Learning**

**B1.4. Prompt**: Evaluate to what extent the examination of representative samples of student work and snapshots of student engagement in learning demonstrate the implementation of a standards-based curriculum and the addressing of the schoolwide learner outcomes.

As previously stated, the school is not limited to following a standards-based curriculum; all classroom Educators seek to extend beyond published guidelines, particularly as the school takes advantage of its unique relationship with UCLA. Classroom Educators continually monitor student work and progress in order to determine the extent to which the curriculum is being followed according to the goals and expectations laid out in curriculum maps. It is very important that every student has a learning experience in line with the school's mission, vision, and values.

Curriculum maps and the associated scope and sequence of a course are the foundational documents through which the school determines that students experience a standards-based curriculum that takes the SWLGs into account. These documents are developed by each academic department by teams of Educators who give and receive feedback on their work.

Learning targets for students are visible on the Blackbaud Learning Management System (hereafter referred to as “the Portal”) and, in some classes, also in Google Classroom (not all Educators use this platform). On a more granular level, learning objectives are shared with students unit by unit, weekly, or by lesson. Such visibility provides clarity of expectations and maximally supports students.

Curriculum planning is typically undertaken individually with significant collaboration in grade-level teams, as well as impromptu work with other Educators. Assessment planning ideally happens before the lesson planning process; the goal is to determine the desired achievement from students and plan backwards to support students’ achievement.

Students are actively encouraged to identify with the SWLGs during the education process. It is not unusual to hear the expressions, “You are being a real Compassionate Partner right now” or “I'm being an Adaptable Learner” in the classroom. Students are taught to embody the SWLGs throughout their learning.

Finally, there is time intentionally set aside for classroom Educators to meet regularly,
which facilitates discussion on curricular developments, assessment pedagogy, grade-level norms, and implementation of the SWLGs. These opportunities not only allow Educators to maintain the curriculum in line with expectations (thus avoiding curriculum “creep”), but it also enables discussion on student engagement and subsequent corrective action if necessary.

The school needs to focus on assessing work regarding the evaluation of scope and sequences and how they connect (or do not connect) to curriculum maps. There is a need for more collaboration time as well as a system for Educator accountability for the alignment of classes to the departmental scope and sequences.

Accessibility of All Students to Curriculum

B1.5. Prompt: What have you learned about the accessibility of a rigorous, relevant and coherent curriculum to all students through the various courses/programs offered, e.g., online instruction? What did you learn from examining the demographics and situation of students throughout the class offerings? Evaluate how the instructional practices and other activities facilitate access and success for special needs students.

Early on, Geffen Academy’s curriculum was developed intentionally to meet both the UC requirements and the needs of the community. Departments have developed their curricula through identifying their Educator and departmental strengths, as well as meeting student interests in the context of the SWLGs. The school uses the Portal transparently to support student learning; Educators are required to post a weekly overview on the course’s main page to show plans for each week, as well as a weekly breakdown of time projected to be spent on homework and in-class work. Parental access to the Portal allows them to see assignments that are expected to be turned in and the due date, as well as grades for individual assignments and assessments and overall progress of the student.

The Learning Specialist’s office provides support and documentation for student support plans, which are posted on the Educators’ view of the Portal. In addition, the Learning Specialist office, as well as the administrative team, work collaboratively to examine and assess Educator needs in order to ensure that a variety of instructional strategies and types of learning experiences provide opportunities for all students. More detailed information on this aspect of student learning can be found in section C.

B1.6. Prompt: What evidence demonstrates acceptable student achievement of the academic standards and the schoolwide learner outcomes through defined performance indicators?
Student achievement is measured through a variety of methods, including grade-point average, informal and formal assessments, class activities, and student communication about experiences and knowledge gained. Evaluations are made frequently across the curriculum and at all grades, in multiple ways (e.g. pre-assessments, informal/formal assessments, and summative/cumulative assessments). Accommodations may be made for students for whom alternative approaches in assessment are needed, and differentiated instruction is implemented across the curriculum. Discipline-specific examples include:

- **English**: Student achievement of academic standards and school-wide learner outcomes is demonstrated through a series of benchmark assessments that provide a record of performance from grades 6-12. Each benchmark consists of a completely in-class, low-stakes assessment that assesses a specific skill while connecting this skill to a broader SWLG. Students are offered multiple opportunities to demonstrate achievement in the task over the course of the year. Student achievement is centrally collected and archived to be able to assess progress across the curriculum from grades 6-12.

- **History**: Students pursue document analysis as well as how to develop and refine a research question; and how to locate sources for research. Students learn how to distinguish between research and opinion; how to write a research paper; and how to develop research questions. In high school, students practice comparative analysis, develop their essay-writing skills, and continue mastering critical written analysis.

- **PE**: Skills tests, fitness testing, and activity-specific benchmarks are used to assess knowledge of the critical elements of each learning target. Furthermore, the department’s scope and sequences are worded as “I can” statements for each grade level; reassessment opportunities are available for students. Students are also expected to demonstrate motor skills outside of gameplay before demonstrating application in assessed activities.

- **Student Research**: In the first part of the program (11th grade), students are introduced to peer-reviewed research resources that are used throughout the year to assess their comprehension and ability to abstract advanced material. Communication skills are assessed through formal writing (research papers) and oral presentations (elevator pitches, “TED Talks,” formal presentations, and posters). The content of the mentored part of this program (12th grade) is delivered exclusively via the research mentor. Assessment is an extension of the junior year experience, the difference being that the materials are not supplied by the Geffen Academy Educator. In this part of the curriculum, students are assessed in two discrete competencies: a final academic paper, and production
and presentation of a research poster at a year-end community-wide event.

- Science: Students learn to formulate meaningful experiments in order to test a workable hypothesis. They learn to gather and analyze data and to communicate their findings in compelling ways. Students obtain information through various avenues such as research, labs, and scientific texts. The students then communicate that information through written and oral reports. The purpose is to allow each student’s voice and ideas to be heard equally and encourage them to share their insights with their peers. Students communicate their ideas and thoughts through different modes, giving students the opportunity to show mastery of the content in a way that is comfortable and stress-reducing.

- Math: Topics are spiraled across tests and quizzes throughout the year, which culminate in a cumulative final exam. Goals for each student include: making sense of problems; constructing viable arguments; and reasoning abstractly and quantitatively.

- World Languages & Cultures: The department utilizes California World Language Standards (2009) and SWLGs to formulate learning goals for students. Performance indicators vary in modality (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) and are aligned to the ACTFL. They include formative, summative, and some diagnostic assessments. The learning goals are communicated to students as “I can” statements. The assessments have a range of formats including videos, presentations, performances, quizzes, exams, conversation prompts, writing prompts, and listening exercises. Cultural topics are woven into assessments.

Integration Among Disciplines

B1.7. Prompt: Evaluate to what extent is there integration among disciplines and, if applicable, integration of outsourced curriculum into the program for which curricular integrity, reliability and security is maintained.

The curriculum at Geffen Academy embraces the teaching of skills that connect different disciplines, making the curriculum truly cross-curricular. Reading and comprehension skills extend across all subjects and numerical literacy extends to many situations of applied mathematics. Overall, departments would like greater touchpoints with Educators in other departments, specifically through time set aside in division-level meetings and through the sharing of scope and sequence documents across departments. Specific examples of inter-connectivity between departments include:

- Humanities: A formalized integration of History and English exists in the Humanities curriculum developed for grades 6, 9 and 12.
  - 6th grade: Skills development introduces historical thinking and writing
that persist through 12th grade.

- 9th grade: The focus is on comparative analysis, using close writing skill development to teach students how to develop analytical writing skills. The World Languages & Cultures Department has also collaborated in the 9th Grade Cities course, allowing integration based on Educator and student interest among the various diverse city offerings. There is an introduction to arguments through a Summary Benchmark assignment.

- 12th grade Rhetoric continues the development of argumentative writing, with additional focus on visual, political, and mathematical rhetoric, and is taught by Educators from both departments.

- Wellness: Wellness lends itself to integration with other disciplines as demonstrated by many units taught throughout the school: World Languages & Cultures (7th grade Cajitas cultural and ethnic exploration project); PE (nutrition, physical wellness, and harm reduction); Science (utilization of medical research to understand health and well-being); History (grade-appropriate discussions on DEI and current events relating to one’s personal history and background); and English (focus on adolescent development milestones and identity markers through literature and personal narrative).

- World Languages & Cultures: Because this department creates its units around themes that are relevant to the students and the school’s mission, there are a multitude of integration points with other departments and with student life. These include: connections with the Wellness program, Music Department, and other departments in advanced and conversation classes; Latinx Heritage Month speakers for Community Time; school-wide cultural celebrations; local Latinx organizations and volunteering opportunities; and curricula from museums and LA institutions on cultural components.

- Research: It is rare that a researcher only uses one skill set in their research journey, especially in STEM areas. For example, medical data alone will not deter smokers; instead, programs to encourage lower use of tobacco products require psychology research on personal risk assessment and individual motivation. Students are well-prepared for their work on the UCLA campus, as they have already developed strong writing and communication skills, are numerically literate at a high level and have had the opportunity throughout their I-Track experience to develop advanced programming skills. While formal integration does not exist between Research and other departments, there are several examples where collaboration has occurred on a project-by-project basis, reflecting the diverse nature of the program.
Curricular Review, Revision, and Evaluation

B1.8. Prompt: Comment on the effectiveness of the school’s curriculum review, evaluation, and review processes for each program area and its impact on providing a challenging, coherent, and relevant curriculum for all students. Evaluate the effectiveness of the processes to assess curricular gaps and modify the curriculum to ensure that specific student needs are being met.

As detailed in section B1.4, Geffen Academy has developed an effective process for the review and evaluation of each program area in the curriculum, which has been developed and articulated during the five years of the school’s existence. Department Chairs and Educators review their curriculum every year to ensure it is up-to-date with school needs and UC standards. The administrative team reviews the curriculum and the course catalog each year with Department Chairs, according to staffing needs and departmental opportunities for the future. However, there is no intentional review of the curriculum as a whole or a review of how individual curriculum maps connect to the departmental scope and sequence.

Educator meetings, many of which are focused on curricular development, as well as departmental and divisional meetings, aim to review and assess the curriculum’s effectiveness. Grade-level meetings allow Educators time to collaborate and determine whether or not any gaps exist within a discipline from one year to the next.

The school also holds PD days at regular intervals throughout the year where new and existing teaching practices are discussed. This intentional practice ensures that the classroom environment is optimized for student learning and growth, and the curriculum remains relevant and coherent across disciplines and within and across grade levels.

Collaborative Work

B1.9. Prompt: Comment on the collaborative strategies used to examine curriculum design and student work and its effect on refining lessons, units, and/or courses.

One of the defining principles of the Geffen Academy experience is an intentional and continuous evaluation of the curriculum to ensure that it meets both academic standards and the SWLGs. Year-round work on the curriculum ensures that the school meets the needs of students at every stage in their journey.

Every June and August, after the school year is complete and before the next one begins, Educators and administrators examine and reflect upon their work from the past year or the year ahead. Collective work is done in departments and in divisions in order to prepare for the following year at the class level and grade, adjusting as necessary.
based on the prior year’s experience. Meetings also take place at the divisional level for the broader school purpose throughout the year.

Throughout the school year, Friday Educator meetings and PD days are used to evaluate Educator work and collaborative strategies, and to identify gaps and opportunities that will benefit students. In these meetings, Educators use lesson-tuning protocols and grade-norming exercises and develop scope and sequences in order to examine curriculum design and student work.

A recent PD day, which was designed to support the curriculum, was spent on discussing differentiation in the classroom and practical application training (February 2022). Educators gave or “attended” lessons in small groups followed by lesson study and lesson-tuning protocols. Thereafter, Educators learned how to implement Acrobat proDC, an accessibility plug-in that allows assistive technology such as screen readers to interact with Adobe Acrobat. This technology will be applied to all PDF documents starting in the next academic year (2022-23). Both initiatives enable Educators to refine their work to support all students to attain their academic best.

**Policies — Rigorous, Relevant, Coherent Curriculum**

**B1.10. Prompt:** Evaluate the effectiveness of the process through which key stakeholders assess the curriculum in relation to these school’s policies.

Geffen Academy has developed and continually reviews a robust process that includes the school’s key stakeholders. The Administration and classroom Educators together play key roles in assessing the curriculum. The school’s policies, SWLGs, and standards are effectively interconnected to assure a highly integrated and effective review process among student, Educator, and parent stakeholders.

The effectiveness of the review process is measured by informal, formal, and summative assessments. There are yearly reviews and questionnaires submitted by Educators, students, and parents. Further, the yearly UC course evaluation process allows for external assessment of new courses and their integration into the curriculum.

**Articulation and Follow-up Studies**

**B1.11. Prompt:** Share examples of articulation with feeder schools and local colleges and universities, including comments on the regularity of their occurrence. What has been revealed through the follow-up studies of graduates and others regarding the effectiveness of the curricular program?

The Geffen Academy journey is a rigorous academic and extracurricular experience that
develops students who are ready for post-secondary life in and out of the classroom.
The Admissions team has partnerships with more than 20 sending schools, such as the UCLA Lab School, Warner Avenue Elementary School, Seven Arrows, Sinai Akiba, Westwood Charter School, Westside Neighborhood School, St. James School, and St. Matthew’s School.

Collaboration with sending schools includes visits to Geffen Academy (allows schools to better get to know our institutional values, philosophy, and sense of community); visits to sending schools (enables Geffen Academy to better know the sending institutions); “Lunch and Learn” events and school presentations (opportunities for students from a particular school to learn more about Geffen Academy).

All Geffen Academy students graduate having received individual guidance on their post-secondary opportunities. With only one graduating class to date, Geffen Academy’s follow-up data on graduates and others regarding the effectiveness of the curricular program is not yet extensive. The Class of 2021 was Geffen Academy’s first graduating class; all matriculated into four-year universities. Class of 2022 students are currently in the college admissions process; they are exploring a range of post-secondary opportunities.

B2. How Students Learn Criterion
Research-based Knowledge

B2.1. Prompt: Provide a range of examples that demonstrate teachers are current in the instructional content taught and research-based instructional methodology.

Geffen Academy classroom Educators use a variety of approaches to remain current in research-based education, and they apply that information to their classroom practice in a manner related to the SWLGs and academic standards described in the individual curriculum maps. Examples below demonstrate how Educators remain current in their respective disciplines and research-based pedagogy for the benefit of students:

- **Math:** A majority of department members have a master’s degree or higher in the content they teach. Educators attend annual math conferences, listen to education-related podcasts, and read current research on math education and share the information with colleagues at department meetings. Department members regularly attend and interact with the California Math Conference and other online meetings.

- **Science:** PD experiences at science conventions bring in new ideas and approaches that are implemented in the classroom. Use of NGSS standards and a skill-based approach (phenomena- and inquiry-based) are seen across the
department.

- **Music:** Department members are active in state and national music education organizations and hold committee positions. In addition, they attend and present at local, state, national and international music education conferences, attending sessions on the latest research. Both Educators are published authors in their respective fields and apply current research in the classroom, adjusting curricula and pedagogy accordingly.

- **PE:** Members of the department attend courses regularly to keep their credentials active and to learn new instructional techniques. Examples include: Shape America Webinars; Connected PE Webinars; OPEN PE Webinars; National Strength and Conditioning Association; NATA webinars; CAHPERD; CSUF Clear Induction Program; American Red Cross Professional Instructors Updates; BSN Sports; and the Geffen Academy Wellness Institute.

- **Research:** Department director attends online and in-person meetings to foster content knowledge to complement active projects and to develop more general education leadership skills. Examples include the Qatar Institute Workshop in Tissue Engineering (online), UCLA Annual Stem Cell Symposium (online and in-person pre-COVID-19 pandemic) and Certificate in School Management and Leadership (CSML), a dual program from Harvard Business School and Harvard School of Education.

- **World Languages & Cultures:** A majority of the Educators in the department have a master’s degree or above. In addition, the department has a commitment to department-wide training in proficiency measures and staying current in fields of expertise. Educators have been trained in Oral Proficiency Interviews (OPI). In addition, most Educators attend one conference a year. Most recently, an Educator has published a chapter in a book titled *Multilingual La, La, Land*. Two other Educators have presented in 2020-21 and 2021-22 at the UCLA National Heritage Language Resource Center Conference and the California Language Teacher Association. Another Educator received the 2022 Jane Harriman Hall Professional Development Scholarship, a prestigious award in her field.

**Planning Processes**

**B2.2. Prompt:** *Comment on the planning processes, including the use of formative assessment results, to engage all students actively at a high level of learning consistent with the academic standards and schoolwide learner outcomes.*

Educators at Geffen Academy have developed a variety of processes to support the
engagement of students in order to help them achieve a high level of academic performance, consistent with our academic standards and SWLGs. As described in section B 1.2, since the school used the principles of backward design in curriculum planning, students are fully aware of expectations and goals for each subject. In addition, Educators use different kinds of formative assessment throughout their classes in order to check for understanding and to check for engagement. Continual review of the classroom experience at department and divisional levels focuses on maintaining the clarity of expectations for students; subsequently, there is a demonstrated high level of learning consistent with the SWLGs. Some examples of formative assessments that demonstrate active student engagements consistent with the SWLGs include:

- Art: Students reflect on their work and demonstrate a high level of involvement and interest in the process.
- English: Student work is assessed by “bucket grading” based on an accumulation of points throughout a grading period. Assignments are by choice as much as possible and students may opt into which/how many projects they wish to complete. Check-ins are also made frequently either verbally or through low-stakes free writes, in addition to benchmark assessments with associated rubrics.
- History: Daily discussion of readings is used to develop analytical skills, to check on understanding, and to assess student engagement. Many classes use rubrics to grade class preparation and participation.
- I-Track: Students have many options and can choose which projects they want to do through a bucket system. Educators check in with students individually on classwork with feedback.
- Research: A series of check-ins with students has been developed with input from senior researchers at UCLA in a manner that mirrors how they work with their students. The fluid and unpredictable nature of research means that the mode of assessment is progress-based, not dependent on a final product, and includes brief presentations, a journal club, and one-on-one meetings with the Director of Student Research.
- PE: Educators use classwork adjustments to meet student performance and use student feedback to determine assessment effectiveness.
- Wellness: Student feedback is used in a formative way to determine student progress. Educators take in student feedback through anonymous and notecard responses and use them to adjust lessons for the next class.
- World Languages & Cultures: Student self-evaluations are used to reflect on participation in class; Educators use a participation rubric to give students
feedback on their rate and quality of participation.

Professional Collaboration

B2.3. Prompt: Comment on the effectiveness of how administrators and teachers use various collaborative strategies to examine curricular design and student work to improve learning and teaching, including demonstrating critical thinking, problem solving, knowledge, and application. Include examples of the selection of the instructional approaches based on the learning purpose(s) desired.

The school’s SWLGs were developed prior to the school’s opening with the intent, among other criteria, that Geffen Academy students would develop critical thinking skills and be able to find effective solutions to problems while also gaining knowledge and habits that they could apply in the real world. The school also chose to use the guidance of backward design principles in order to focus the curricular maps with the goal of developing a cohesive and coherent curriculum using an instructional approach grounded in research and best practice.

The school’s Educators are committed to working in a collegial and collaborative manner, capitalizing on the considerable skill sets of the classroom Educators and also drawing on external expertise (e.g. UCLA and other external sources of educational research) when necessary. Time has been set aside during Educator and department meetings to work in partnership on curriculum-building and the examination of student work. This work has been successful in part because of the clear commitment to continually review classroom practice and modify where appropriate. However, Educators would like more time for and a more consistent approach to such work.

Recent examples of such work include:

- On a school-wide level, the events of Spring and Summer 2020 provided additional momentum to already robust DEI programming. Significant collaborative time during planned PD time that summer embraced DEI programming to respond to current events for the benefit of the student experience in the following year. One subgroup within the DEI Council is at work on refining a draft of a DEI/Curricular rubric that can be used for Educators to self-evaluate their courses.

- The Student Research Program is the epitome of application of knowledge to the real world. Since there are no published standards for the school to apply to this program, the SWLGs act as the guiding principles for assessment. Consequently, the classroom practice component of this course is constantly under review and subsequent modification as the research landscape changes. This was no more
evident than during the pandemic, when Geffen Academy and UCLA’s pivot to remote operations was completed successfully. In this case, the reassessment of curricular goals is a collaboration between Geffen Academy and UCLA.

- In the most recent PD day, Educators worked in small, multi-disciplinary groups using a lesson-tuning protocol to receive feedback on and better differentiate a lesson or project.

Professional Development

B2.4. Prompt: Comment on the effectiveness of how the school uses ongoing professional development to enhance the curriculum and improve learning and teaching.

For external professional development (PD), Geffen Academy has a budget that allows Educators to pursue areas of interest and/or specific expertise development. There is an application process asking the applicant about how the opportunity relates to their work or will enhance their work. The application must be signed by the Department Chair, Dean of Faculty, and relevant Division Director. Applications are then vetted by the Professional Development Committee, made up of the Dean of Faculty, the Upper School Division Director, the Middle School Division Director, and an Educator.

For the school’s internal PD, all new Educators attend a week of orientation training that focuses on the school’s mission, vision, values, and priorities for the year. This is followed by two weeks of all-Educator training that establishes norms for the upcoming school year at department, divisional, and school levels. Weekly Friday Educator meetings include PD work according to the school and Educators’ needs. In addition, full-day Educator in-service days take place three or four times each academic year. Lastly, a reflective and planning period takes place after the close of school in mid-June.

The Business Office also oversees mandatory training courses related to Human Resources and UCLA compliance (e.g. IT Security, FERPA, CANRA, anti-harassment) to ensure the school’s compliance with UCLA requirements.

Challenging and Varied Instructional Strategies

B2.5. Prompt: Provide a range of examples from examining students working and their work that give insight to the degree to which all students are actively engaged in learning to achieve the academic standards and the schoolwide learner outcomes. This includes students demonstrating critical thinking, problem solving, knowledge and
application and the development of a wide range of technological skills.

Students are encouraged in all classes to dive deeper into their work in ways that not only interest them, but also challenge them to succeed in critical thinking and problem solving while offering knowledge and exposure to a wide range of technological skills, all within the context of the SWLGs. In the classroom, strategic seating charts and classroom layouts are used to facilitate discussions and group work. Students work with different partners throughout the school year; group work is prioritized in many classes. Specific examples of student work that demonstrate deep engagement include:

- I-Track: The curriculum actively encourages students to demonstrate critical thinking and knowledge development as they seek answers to problems. From the Makerspace equipment to advanced coding practice, students are encouraged to apply existing or emerging technology in their learning process in a multitude of ways (e.g., robotics, 3D printing, music production, multimedia journaling, and use of creative suites for programming and VR).

- Wellness: Students have the opportunity to work on social justice topics that intersect with their identity markers by creating infographics that are shared with fellow students, allowing for critical reflection in a safe space. This program, Cajitas, was inspired by the Ethnic Studies and Religious Studies departments at USD, where doctoral students examined their ethnic and cultural backgrounds to better understand how they shape current iterations of their identity.

- Research: Students have the opportunity to work with academic researchers at UCLA and gain exposure to cutting-edge technology and information. Students have leeway to push as far as they want to extend themselves, frequently feeling surprised at the depth of knowledge they attain.

- World Languages & Cultures: Students are expected to speak in the target language throughout the class. Use of self-assessments and participation rubrics are used to gauge participation and to provide feedback to students. Project-based learning is used to target different areas of language learning: interpersonal communication, presentational communication, presentational writing, etc. Moreover, the department is committed to a deep study of culture and student identity. For example, the Autorretrato (Self-Portrait) project offers students a creative way to consider their own identities via introspective critical thinking and engagement with the Latin American tradition of self-portraiture.

- Visual and Performing Arts: The Theater curriculum engages students in acting, writing script adaptations, improvisation, viewing productions, and optional design assignments. Grading by accumulated points allows students to choose assignments that fit their interests, while class-wide critiques allow all students to
learn from the variety of interests in the classroom. The Ceramics curriculum focuses on learning the language of contemporary art, developing artistic thinking skills and technical skills, and developing visual literacy through the process of making and group critique.

Technological Integration

B2.6. Prompt: Comment on the integration of technology within the school so that all students develop a wide range of technological skills.

Geffen Academy uses the Portal for a variety of applications, such as: student and family records; grades; attendance; individual class pages; calendar functions (test/assessment calendar; athletics; school functions); student, Educator, and school schedules; and storage of school policy documents available to various audiences.

Geffen Academy Educators teach using technology in many classes. Each classroom is equipped with technology that supports teaching and learning via access to a fast, secure and reliable wireless network maintained by UCLA. Multimedia approaches (slide shows, videos, music, Kahoots, etc.) are used to present lessons and students who have a need may use computers to take notes. Material presented in the classroom can be archived on the Portal, Google Drive or in the UCLA Box system.

Some disciplines (e.g. Math, Visual Arts, I-Track) rely more heavily on technology than others. By the time students graduate, they have amassed a broad range of technological skills from developing and maintaining electronic documents up to and including advanced coding and robotics if they have interests in those areas.

Some examples of discipline-specific integration of technology include:

- **English:** The department integrates technological skills with everyday assignments as part of “just-in-time” instruction. Other specific examples include specific units in the Journalism course on desktop publishing that include introduction to, and advanced use of, Adobe InDesign and Photoshop. The department also uses various online tools such as Slideshow, ToyTube and NoodleBib to support the learning process.

- **History:** In addition to the use of projectors to facilitate multimedia presentations in the classroom, the department also utilizes interactive websites for timelines, interactive games, and iCivics interactive lessons. Documentaries and podcasts on historical events and contemporary issues are also used as learning tools.

- **Math:** Technology specific to math is used extensively by all Educators (e.g. Desmos, Dragonbox, and GeoGebra), as are free online sites for a range of demonstrations and activities. Another site, ixl.com/math, is used to address
individual student needs and improve understanding of new concepts. In addition, Educators occasionally flip their classes and assign pre-recorded lectures as well as other available recorded lectures on specific topics.

- **Music:** Students begin using Pro Tools (industry-standard digital audio workstation) in 9th grade to record group performances and compositions. By 10th grade, students are recording original albums in the studio and working as recording engineers for other student musicians’ projects. In 11th and 12th grades, students lead all recording sessions and also serve as mixing and mastering engineers. Using Pro Tools, students utilize a range of digital effect plug-ins to mix and master student songs. In the analog realm, students in music production classes learn to set up and operate a live sound system. All of the components are analog: power amps, mixer, EQ, compressor, and monitors/subwoofers. Students also learn to use analog technology in the studio: guitar pedals, rack-mount effects, and microphones.

- **Research:** Students undertaking research at UCLA or via remote instruction from UCLA or other universities frequently gain access to technology that they otherwise would not experience in the secondary setting. Examples include advanced laboratory equipment and data analysis tools and access to advanced coding and medical applications of technology, such as MRI scan analysis.

- **Science:** Educators use PASCO tools in lab work so students can collect and analyze data during experiments. In addition, Excel, Google sheets, R, and Desmos are used to graph and analyze data. Students learn how to use scientific instruments such as PCR machines, spectrometers, and centrifuges.

- **PE:** Google Classroom is used for students to submit assignments ranging from exit tickets to use of Fitness Game and creation of their own exercise videos where students demonstrate how to perform exercises (with accommodations if needed), including proper warm-up and cool-down techniques. Students also perform peer assessments in order to improve on exercise technique.

- **Wellness:** Technology is frequently used for student online research and instructional purposes, as previously described. There is also a significant focus on safe use of technology, from internet research to social media.

- **World Languages & Cultures:** Technology is a key component of teaching and learning throughout the department. Examples include use of online games and practice materials and use of online graphics software (Adobe Illustrator, Canva, etc.) for project based learning (all classes); use of videos editing software for projects on biographies (Spanish); application of an online website in Mandarin to practice typing characters (students read characters first and then type them out.
in a limited time); use of online research tools and databases of Spanish language (Advanced Spanish classes); and online book creator to create stories.

- Visual and Performing Arts: Some classes (e.g. Animation and Photography) utilize technology heavily. The 6th grade theater classes use a Google suite of applications for the Fables project, part of a grade-wide commitment to helping new students feel confident in their use of technology, including laptops.

- I-Track: Over their secondary school experience, Geffen Academy students take nearly 5 years worth of courses in the Middle and Upper School. The focus of the curriculum is to use computer programming, technology, fabrication, and design thinking as a framework for developing innovators, entrepreneurs, and leaders. In various classes, like I-Track Foundations I-III, Creative Computing, Fabrications, Robotics, Advanced Intro to Computer Science, and Advanced Topics in Computer Science, students solve real-world problems using a variety of physical/digital tools to employ the design thinking process. I-Track asks students to understand the problem from a user-centered perspective. In so doing, they explore solutions with rapid prototyping and iteratively refine solutions. As a result, students are:
  - Confident in their creative abilities to tackle challenging problems;
  - Brave and not afraid to fail, realizing that failure is a key component of innovation;
  - Empathetic and seek to understand the perspectives of people with different backgrounds and circumstances when solving problems;
  - Persistent in learning how to learn new skills; and
  - Motivated to make a difference in their communities.

Evidence of Results based upon Challenging Learning Experiences

**B2.7. Prompt:** Comment on the student work and how it demonstrates critical and creative thinking, problem solving, knowledge attainment, and application skills.

As noted previously, the school’s SWLGs were developed prior to the school’s opening with the intent that Geffen Academy students would develop critical thinking skills and be able to find effective solutions to problems while also gaining knowledge and habits that they can apply in the real world. Students are encouraged to think critically and creatively, problem-solve proactively, and apply learned skills as they acquire knowledge throughout the curriculum. Educators encourage independent and group work in a supportive and nurturing environment.

Some examples of such student work include:
• I-Track: The program is predicated on project-based learning with an emphasis on growth-mindset observation and feedback over high-stakes assessments. Students demonstrate conceptual fluency and mastery in multiple ways.

• Research: Student work demonstrates creative and critical thinking in written work and poster presentations. Research in and of itself is a problem-solving endeavor in which students apply and critique knowledge gained in the process.

• Science: Group work and discussion occur in all science classes. Students are asked to write down their notes as well as explain their thinking in their homework and assessments. Experimental work is designed so that students must devise methods based on what they know rather than use prescribed labs. Similarly, students discover content rather than just being told what to learn (e.g. derivation of the gas laws from first principles instead of learning given formulae).

• PE: The comment section of Google Classroom assignments is used to let students review their video performances (described in section B2.6) and critically engage with the body movements/components of fitness involved. Students also create SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-Bound) goals to showcase their understanding of the principles of periodization and fitness training and how to apply their knowledge to a followable, goals-based exercise program. Finally, students have opportunities to create their own games, where they apply various skills and increase the intensity of low-intensity activities of which they have prior knowledge.

• Visual and Performing Arts: The department has a commitment to project prompts that encourage students to tackle issues they find important in the course of making work that demonstrates skills. This means that both the creative process and class critiques function at multiple levels: the technique of the artist, the treatment of the subject, and the tone of the work.

• Wellness: The value of critical thinking, problem-solving and knowledge attainment and application skills are regularly discussed and applied in this curriculum at all grades, as students are encouraged to delve into topics as diverse as ethnicity and cultural identity, social justice, addiction, and how to navigate life as a young adult successfully (financial management, managing social media, etc). Students routinely critically reflect on published information and their own work, providing opportunities for peer connections and learning.

• World Languages & Cultures: Students are constant creators through language because of the department’s communicative approach. At the end of every unit, students are expected to produce a real-life artifact (e.g. blog, website, campaign, meme, tweet, debates, presentation) that highlights the application of
language forms and acquired vocabulary. As a result, students have continuous practice and are provided with the necessary scaffolds at the end of every unit to think critically and creatively and apply what they have learned to unit projects.

**Student Understanding of Learning Expectations**

**B2.8. Prompt:** Examine and evaluate the extent to which students know the standards/expected performance levels before beginning a new area of study; an example is the use of pacing guides for online instruction.

Classroom Educators use the curriculum maps and scope and sequence documents to ensure that performance levels are articulated clearly to students. The Portal’s “Bulletin Board” pages are used to communicate goals and expectations to students, often updated on a weekly or bi-weekly basis. Exceptions are made in subjects with long-term student experiences rather than unit-by-unit learning (e.g. Advanced Research 2, where the “unit” is a yearlong research project). In each class, rubrics for benchmark assessments and assignments clearly list expected student outcomes. Moreover, assignment directions show clear objectives/expectations or curriculum map language.

It would be helpful to have shared language across all departments for vertical alignment in regards to expectations and simplifying objective language for student documents. To achieve this, more time needs to be spent in grade-level meetings and on objectives set by the Department Chairs, along with greater accountability in maintaining student-accessible language.

**Student Perceptions**

**B2.9. Prompt:** Using interviews and dialogue with students, evaluate the extent to which students understand the expected level of performance based on the standards and the schoolwide learner outcomes. Evaluate the effectiveness of the student-teacher interaction based on student feedback.
Geffen Academy students are beginning to understand the expected level of performance as a result of a few factors. First, the school now has grade levels of students who previously took a given course and can pass on to rising students informal information about class expectations and experiences. Further, Geffen Academy has now graduated a class and has a second class that is receiving admissions to colleges and universities. Students and families now can develop an understanding of the level of rigor and curricular program that yields different post-secondary opportunities.

In addition, anecdotal evidence suggests that graduates have been able to navigate their early experiences in college. The school has a plan to garner more robust feedback from alumni moving forward; this includes the addition of an Events and Alumni Manager in February 2022.

**Student Needs**

**B2.10. Prompt:** *How do teachers address the variety of ways in which students learn and their individual needs through instructional approaches appropriate for the subject?*

Throughout the curriculum, most classroom Educators address differentiation to meet different student learning needs in many ways. This work embraces techniques supported by research learned either in-house or from external professional development resources. Approaches include:

- In-class collaborative small group work, whole-class format, and individual work.
- Combinations of low-stakes, timed, short-form and multi-draft, longer-form writing assignments with regular peer and 1:1 teacher feedback.
- Opportunities to revise graded work as an additional learning experience in many subjects (e.g. revision of papers and test corrections).
- A robust school-wide elective reading program that nurtures student curiosity, joy, and autonomy, while building reading endurance and expanding vocabulary.
- Use of a combination of tactile activities (journals, notebooks, posters, art projects, book annotations) and digital activities (Google Classroom, Google Forms, YouTube, word processing, Portal, Canva, Kahoot, etc.) to address different learning styles and interests.
- Frequent use of real-world applications to maximize student engagement.
- Regular office hours and appointment times for each Educator, which are published on the Portal so students and families know when Educators are available to meet with students individually.
- Academic Lab (Middle School and Upper School) for students to attend if they
need further support; new Upper School students and Upper School students who may need extra support are sought out by the Academic Liaison, who keeps tabs on their progress and offers workshops on executive functioning topics (e.g. time management, email etiquette).

- Frequent use of project-based learning, which incorporates different modes of communication (interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational).
- Choice of subjects for projects to foster intellectual engagement and facilitate different modalities of learning (e.g. 9th grade Humanities project, 11th grade Advanced English inquiry); this approach empowers students to explore their learning differences when compared with traditional AP courses.
- Students in Music courses at all levels learn to express themselves musically because “everyone is a composer.”

### Student Use of Resources

**B2.11. Prompt:** To what extent do students use resources for learning beyond the limits of the textbook such as effective use of technology, collaborative activities, and community resources?

The curriculum at Geffen Academy is not textbook-driven; the school provides numerous educational experiences, opportunities, resources, and invitations for learning “beyond the book.” Students take advantage of the aforementioned components during their learning experience in accordance with the SWLGs. All departments prepare lessons and activities with the intentional goal of engaging students in collaborative learning. Furthermore, Educators utilize community resources, especially those on the UCLA campus, for experiential learning in many areas. Some departmental examples include:

- **English:** The department partners with UCLA by bringing professors from the university’s English Department to work with students and conduct book discussions. All students receive digital Los Angeles Public Library access. Upper School students gain access to databases like JSTOR to assist with writing assignments. The 6th grade conducts a mock trial at UCLA’s School of Law using *Animal Farm*, which involves extensive work with and coaching from law professors and students.
- **History:** The department relies on primary sources to frame the curriculum. In both the Middle and Upper Schools, opportunities are created for students to partner with UCLA.
• I-Track: All students receive experiential instruction in design, documentation, presentation, fabrication, and digital and handmade techniques. The student learning process is guided by learning resources tailored to their projects needs, learning interests, and student-Educator identified areas for growth.

• Math: The curriculum is driven by department-created resources that train students to understand mathematics and its applications from first principles, rather than textbooks. Learning is enhanced via extracurricular activities such as Math Circle and custom-designed classes like Advanced Problem Solving.

• Music: UCLA student ensembles perform for students, Music History and Theory classes regularly visit the UCLA Music Library to locate scores for research, and special guests present to students, including UCLA professors; professors from other universities, a film composer, and a record label president.

• PE: The nature of exercise means that the PE program takes place both inside the school (in the gym) and externally as the need arises. UCLA facilities are used for swimming and other activities to support a broad range of activities. Local amenities (e.g. Westwood Recreation Center) have also been used.

• Research: There is no textbook for this program. Students are exposed to the vast array of research at UCLA through field trips and visiting speakers. In the second year, students work with a research mentor from UCLA or another research institution to experience real-life research. Students learn from accessing published research papers and primary sources online and from UCLA and other university-based libraries and collections (e.g. the Huntington Library and the Getty Museum).

• Science: All science courses use a wide variety of materials, labs, hands-on and experiential learning; none of the curriculum is based on textbook materials. Students also have the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and abilities in Science Bowl and local and/or state-level science fairs.

• Visual and Performing Arts: Prior to Covid-19, students had the opportunity to visit exhibitions, performances, museums, other field trips, plays, and artist talks; it is expected that these will return. The department collaborates with the Music department to document on-campus coffeehouse performances. Media Arts uses cinema and short films as references, and students also develop written research projects submitted as oral presentations and short documentaries as voiceovers. Most research is image-based and from sources beyond textbooks: internet, magazine articles, interviews, YouTube videos, etc. The department has hired two new Educators since the last self-study to teach digital art.
• World Languages & Cultures: To help students develop language proficiency and cultural knowledge and compassion, the department uses authentic materials (literature, short films, cinema, music, art, and music) as well as research and creative projects, educational technology, and instructor-created practice activities. The department also organizes cultural events in which the entire school can participate, including Dia de los Muertos, Rome’s birthday, Lunar New Year, and Mardi Gras.

• Wellness: To foster students’ social-emotional growth, the program is delivered to all grades with age-appropriate content derived from published resources.

Some school-wide examples of beyond-the-text learning include:

• Enrichment programs such as Science Bowl, Robotics and Math Circle have been developed in the spirit of the SWLGs, taking students’ learning beyond the reach of the formal academic program.

• Prior to the pandemic, students were exposed to community resources via field trips and speakers, which give the students hands-on experience beyond the classroom that enhances the learning process. This is expected to resume during the current academic year.

• All students, with parental approval, have access to the UCLA library system.

• The school hosts UCLA at Geffen Academy Day, an annual symposium featuring presentations by UCLA researchers, medical professionals, and staff members.

During the pandemic, in-person events, field trips, and other hands-on experiences were limited. However, Educators’ access to online resources and the evolution of online experiences during the pandemic led to utilization of a vast array of resources outside the school building. Examples include virtual tours of museums, TED Talks, and attendance at online conferences.

B3. How Assessment is Used Criterion

B3.1. Prompt: To what extent do teachers use appropriate assessment strategies to measure student progress toward acquiring a specific body of knowledge or skills? Evaluate the selection of and the use of proctors, the security systems for test documents, and the means to maintain the integrity of the assessments.

Geffen Academy Educators continually work on assessment strategies so that the techniques used to measure progress are both effective and humane. Most
departments do not rely heavily on summative assessments in the traditional sense of tests, since project-based learning is prioritized. In the event that formal testing occurs, the security and integrity of the assessment is the responsibility of the department. All documents are kept in a secure location on the Educator Google Drive platform and/or UCLA Box servers, neither of which are open to students.

Students take the PSAT on campus; standard procedures are in place to ensure the integrity of the testing process. The tests are administered and proctored by experienced Educators, and all documents are maintained in secure locations. Only students taking the PSAT are on campus on test days; all others have school-free days to ensure a quiet campus environment.

**Basis for Determination of Performance Levels**

**B3.2. Prompt:** *Evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the basis for which students’ grades, their growth, and performance levels are determined.*

Students in 6th and 7th grades receive “Credit” or “No Credit” markings, along with narrative comments. “No Credit” in these grades for any term means that a student is not performing at grade level. If a student receives a “No Credit,” then the student will need to complete make-up work that is decided on by the classroom Educator and Department Chair or may need to complete and pass a summer school class that is approved by the department and school administration.

8th grade students receive letter grades along with their narrative comments. An “NY” grade in the first semester of a year-long course means “Not Yet” and indicates that serious interventions are necessary, as the student is in danger of failing the class if their next semester continues along the same lines. An “F” at the end of the year means that a student will need to complete make-up work that is decided on by the classroom Educator and Department Chair or must complete and pass a summer school class that is approved by the department and school administration.

In the Upper School, Educators make every effort to help students succeed in their coursework; however, students must realize that they bear the primary responsibility for their own success. To graduate from Geffen Academy, all students are required to pass coursework with a “D-” or better. Because all University of California/California State University schools and many, but not all, private and state colleges and universities require that high school courses are completed with a “C-” or better for acceptance into their institutions, Geffen Academy recommends that, when a grade of “D+” or lower is earned, the relevant coursework is repeated. All Geffen Academy students are required to remediate a grade of “F,” as this is not a passing grade.
Demonstration of Student Achievement

**B3.3. Prompt:** Examine and evaluate how student work and other assessments demonstrate student achievement of the academic standards and the schoolwide learner outcomes.

Geffen Academy takes pride in evaluating student work to ensure that it reflects achievement and that it aligns with academic standards and school-wide learner outcomes. Because a diverse array of assessments is used across grade levels, Educators are able to thoroughly evaluate the extent to which students meet and exceed academic standards and outcomes. Progress is measured by examining such concrete assignments as collaborative projects and the student’s ability to verbally present their findings.

Geffen Academy students are familiar with the SWLGs so that Educators are able to craft lessons and assessments that attach meaning to those learning objectives and empower students to take ownership of their learning. In order to succeed in the 21st century, students must be proficient speakers, writers, and collaborators, as reflected in the SWLGs.

Since the school has a diverse student population, it is important to implement various assessment tools. For this reason, Educators use different means of assessments to engage a student’s strengths and address a student’s challenges. For example, students might verbally summarize a story, draw a picture of a historical event, compose a poem that identifies an author’s point of view, or present a slideshow on cultural identity. Cross-curricular opportunities exist to evaluate achievement while allowing students to deepen their understanding and to apply their knowledge in new and exciting ways. Finally, the Portal enables classroom Educators to share rubrics across subjects to facilitate access to equitable and consistent evaluations of student work and ensure that students are meeting both standards and objectives in the context of the SWLGs.

**Correlation**

**B3.4. Prompt:** Comment on the correlation of assessment of schoolwide learner outcomes, academic standards, course competencies, and instructional approaches used.

Throughout the academic program, SWLGs, academic standards, course competencies (applied skills/learning behavior), and instructional approaches are all integrated with each other. The correlation between planning documents is strong; changes in one lead
to changes in another. Every year, PD time is set aside to review how the student experience is embedded in the collective goals and objectives of instructional protocols to ensure that they support the learning process in the context of the SWLGs. The process of using scope and sequence documents to reflect departmental focuses and using curriculum guides as the standard course plan arose from the needs of a growing school and a number of planning meetings that happened before the opening of the school, and thus is uniquely suited to the overall approach to learning.

The review process is built into every department and course on an as-needed basis during the school year and always on a yearly basis over the summer. During these times, each department articulates unique goals and disciplinary competencies in a consistent framework in the context of the SWLGs.

**Modifications/Decisions based on Assessment Data**

**B3.5. Prompt:** Evaluate the effectiveness of how assessment data is collected, analyzed, and used to make changes and decisions about curriculum, instruction, professional development activities, and resource allocation.

Geffen Academy’s goal is to educate students to the very best of their potential. Assessment and evaluation are critical components considered when evaluating the interplay of curriculum and SWLGs so that appropriate decisions can be made regarding curricular modifications, pedagogy, training and resource allocation.

All assessments, including unit tests and quizzes, are analyzed by Educators and discussed within departments as needed to provide understanding of student progress in any given discipline. Consequently, classroom Educators can determine which students need additional support in a given area and provide resources where necessary. This may be achieved by test corrections, Office Hours attendance, or instructional modification as needed. In addition, an Assistant Middle School Academic Dean position was established during the 2021-2022 school year to assist classroom Educators in the process of supporting students in these and other situations. A similar position is planned for Upper School students.

As discussed in section B2.4, individual PD is available for classroom Educators to stay up-to-date on advances in their disciplines to enhance the learning process. Examples include technology training, subject-specific PDs and new and updated pedagogical methods. As the school implements an evaluation system and teacher learning plans and goals, it plans to be more proactive in regards to offering and using PD funds to achieve schoolwide goals.
The relationship with CRESST allows the school to gather and use qualitative and quantitative data as an assessment tool.

**Student Feedback**

**B3.6. Prompt:** To what extent is student feedback an important part of monitoring student progress over time based on the schoolwide learner outcomes and the curricular standards?

Feedback is valued at Geffen Academy throughout all grades, for every discipline and, importantly, to and from the student body. In relation to the curriculum, multiple facets of each student’s work are taken into account when considering student progress; Educators do not rely solely on end-of-unit or -semester assessments, instead taking a more holistic view of student work to acknowledge individuals’ strengths. Surveys, one-on-one meetings with Educators, and self-reflection of progress provide valuable opportunities for student participation in the learning process. These methods of feedback reinforce commitment to the SWLGs.

Classroom Educators strive to monitor student progress in a timely manner so that students always know where they stand in terms of expectations and meeting SWLGs. It is the school’s collective goal that no student, or their family, should be surprised if a student is not meeting course expectations. Feedback is a critical part of this process and is a two-way street; Educators give feedback to students, and student feedback is garnered regularly to determine individual and class progress.

There are three main kinds of feedback: peer-to-peer, student response, and Educator response, which require a variety of activities to track and monitor progress. Official Notes via the Portal inform the students, and everyone connected with them, so they can gauge their progress and demonstrate improvement. Additional ways for garnering feedback and assessing progress include one-on-one discussions, Office Hours, Academic Lab, student-led discussions, and written comments on assignments in class gradebooks on the Portal. Targeted questioning in class to guide students through the learning process is also helpful in determining whether learning goals are being met.

The school does not yet have a standardized method or comprehensive view of how and when to use student feedback either at the departmental or division level.

**Teacher Monitoring**

**B3.7. Prompt:** Evaluate the effectiveness of the teacher monitoring process over time and the use of student feedback as appropriate to determine whether academic
standards have been met.

As described in section B3.6, classroom Educators and student support team members use feedback extensively to guide students and to keep students, families, and Educators informed about student progress.

Some departments use published standards to monitor feedback and can determine the effectiveness of this approach against available literature. For example, Educators in the World Languages & Cultures Department use a detailed participation rubric that measures different aspects of student performance in the class. Students use “I can” statements based on ACTFL proficiency standards in order to reflect upon their ability to perform certain language tasks. These “I can” statements are introduced at the beginning of each unit and/or lesson and revisited periodically throughout the year.

Students willingly give feedback when asked and, in general, act positively to effect change in their work in and out of the classroom when necessary. Both feedback from student government representatives and data collected from the CRESST surveys have brought about positive changes to courses and curricula. Furthermore, the formative feedback cycles outlined in B2.2 also contribute to assessing whether students are moving towards the learning objectives and SWLGs.
Category B. Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment: Summary, Strengths, and Growth Needs

Review all the findings and supporting evidence and summarize the degree to which the criteria in Category B are being met. Include comments about the degree to which these criteria impact the school’s ability to address one or more of the identified major student learner needs (Chapter III).

Summary (including comments about the major student learner needs)

In the relatively short time that Geffen Academy has been in operation, the school has developed an academically robust program that challenges students to meet the SWLGs in a supportive, humane environment. The principles of DEI are embedded in every part of the curriculum. In addition, the Wellness program is given consideration in every course. The school seeks to develop an emphasis on sustainability in addition to principles of DEI and Wellness.

The academic curriculum is robust, meeting the UC a-g criteria for all Upper School courses and providing a Middle School program that prepares students for the rigor of the college preparatory upper school setting. The program has been designed to exceed rather than simply meet published standards for student learning, all within the context of the SWLGs. So far, there has only been one graduating class; the members of the Class of 2021 all progressed to four-year college programs in North America and around the globe. Students receive individualized attention from Educators through small classroom size, regular updates on progress, formal Office Hours, and comprehensive follow-up from the Academic Lab program and Student Support Services team members, as needed. Protocols are in place to provide feedback and necessary support in a timely way to students to ensure that they stay on track.
Prioritize the areas of strength and growth for Category B.

**Category B: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment: Areas of Strength**

1. The robust curriculum has been developed with recognition of state and nationally recognized standards, yet it delves deeper into academic areas to allow students an education that prepares them for post-secondary life in any area they choose. The special relationship with UCLA allows the school to maintain a wealth of curricular options that enable students to reach learning goals in a manner not typically available in the secondary school setting.

2. Educators are all highly experienced and driven in their fields and work consistently “beyond the textbook” for the benefit of the student experience.

3. The school provides time in the weekly schedule for Educators to collaborate and learn from each other in department, grade-level and school-wide discussion, thus ensuring that a challenging and meaningful curriculum is delivered in a humane manner to all students.

4. Instructional materials, pedagogy, and associated assessments are consistently reviewed and adjusted as needed. Attention is paid to research-based pedagogical advances, which are implemented as necessary.

5. Educators have access to varied options for PD, including opportunities at UCLA, which also serves as a rich source of instructional material.

**Category B: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment: Areas of Growth**

1. Allocate more Educator meeting time to discuss and assess the curriculum and to allow for more collaborative opportunities between departments.

2. Increase targeted applications for PD funding and solicit feedback on how the PD is being activated within the school.

3. Develop a role that would embrace the following areas:
   a. Continue to build on the academic vision of the school while maintaining a cohesive and all-encompassing curriculum;
   b. Oversee curriculum review cycles;
   c. Enhance academic collaboration with UCLA; and
   d. Manage the multiple connection points with UCLA for course schedules and resource approvals (e.g. computer software, access to libraries and
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other facilities).

e. Enable Geffen Academy to take advantage of its relationship with UCLA, which sets the school apart from others in the area.

4. Review the schedule to facilitate access to UCLA course offerings within the school year for juniors and seniors. This would open up opportunities beyond Summer School, and, importantly, create equity for students who are unable to take a course over the summer.

5. Create more opportunities for students to engage in service and experiential learning.

6. Make sustainability more visible on campus to mirror efforts taking place at UCLA.
Together In Education In Neighborhood Schools (TIE-INS)

TIE-INS is a collaboration between UCLA and LAUSD.

- Beethoven Street Elementary School
- Broadway Elementary School
- Brockton Avenue Elementary School
- Braddock Drive Elementary School
- Nora Sterry Elementary School
- Emerson Community Charter Middle School
- Mark Twain Middle School
- University High School Charter
- Venice High School

The Purpose

The collaboration enables children of UCLA employees who live outside the attendance area to go to nine public partnership schools.

In exchange, UCLA—with guidance from the schools’ leaders—provides assistance and enrichment in support of high achievement for all students in these schools.

Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Beethoven ES</th>
<th>Braddock ES</th>
<th>Broadway ES</th>
<th>Brockton ES</th>
<th>Nora Sterry ES</th>
<th>Mark Twain MS</th>
<th>Emerson MS</th>
<th>University HS</th>
<th>Venice HS</th>
<th>Total by Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>145*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>527*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A-Not in TIE INS during these years  * Missing data from schools/totals incomplete
UCLAinTIE-INS

Since the program’s inception in 2009, over 2,300 children of UCLA faculty and staff have benefited from participation in TIE-INS

Since 2017

50+

UCLA units and student groups engaged with our 9 TIE-INS schools

Enrichment programs include:

- computer science
- coding
- health & wellness
- mentorship
- tutoring
- visual & performing arts education
- SAT preparation
- UniCamp
- the UCLA Heat Lab

21,400

hours of BruinCorps tutoring in math and English Language Arts

Over

36,000

hours completed by UCLA students participating in service learning courses

Ongoing teacher and school administration professional development with the UCLA Writing Project, UCLA Math Project, School for Arts & Architecture and the Partner School Network for Algebra Improvement and more!

Beethoven Elementary – Braddock Drive Elementary - Broadway Elementary - Brockton Elementary

Nora Sterry Elementary - Emerson Community Charter Middle School

Mark Twain Middle School - University High School Charter – Venice High School

UCLA TIE-INS
https://tie-ins.gseis.ucla.edu