



Oakland Unified School District

Charter School Renewal Site Visit Report

Dolores Huerta Learning Academy

**1936 Courtland Avenue
Oakland, California 94601**

Principal: Francisco Gutierrez

Dates of review: November 12-13, 2008

**Lead Reviewer: Ting L. Sun
Team Reviewer: Renee Middleton**

Cambridge Education (LLC)

Content of the report

Part 1: The School Context

Information about the school

Part 2: Overview

School strengths
School challenges

Part 3: Main findings

Overall evaluation
How well the school meets the renewal site visit criteria

Part 4: School Quality Criteria Summary

Part 1: The School Context

Information about the school

Dolores Huerta Learning Academy (DHLA) is a small charter school that serves 208 students in grades kindergarten through 8 (K-8). The school is in its tenth year of operations, and this is its second renewal.

DHLA's current enrollment consists of 92% Hispanic, 7% African American, and 1% Asian students. Nine percent (90%) of the students are known to be eligible for the free and reduced lunch program. Four students at the school have been identified with special needs and 155 students have been identified as English Learners (EL). The student attendance rate DHLA averages at 96%.

The school's student performance on state assessments has been marked with drastic ups and downs. For example, while DHLA well-exceeded its Academic Performance Index (API) growth target in 2008 with a 24-point gain, the school's previous year 2007 growth API had dropped 81 points. DHLA's 2007 API base score of 594, ranks the school at 1 statewide and 1 among similar schools.

Part 2: Overview

School Strengths:

- The small school size contributes to an environment where adults and children all know each other.
- The school has hired a coach to work with teachers.
- The board is committed to the concept of a quality community-based school in the neighborhood.
- The students and parents like the K-8 grade structure because students can stay in the same site from elementary through middle school.
- The school has a large cash reserve balance that can be readily made available for school priorities, such as larger facilities and/or instructional resources.

School Challenges:

- Student achievement over the lifecycle of its charter term has been erratic and is overall low in comparison to other district and charter schools.
- The school has struggled to make its dual immersion program effective.
- There is little curricular cohesion in the school and instruction is weak overall.
- School policies and procedures have not been cohesive nor consistently implemented.
- The school has consistently had a high rate of teacher turnover, for example, 7 of 12 teachers are new this year.
- The school has not utilized its cash reserves effectively to improve the overall consistency and quality of the school's educational program.
- The principal is new to the school this year and has yet to establish himself with the school community and to impact school improvement.
- The school community is not in agreement on the future direction of the school.

Part 3: Main Findings

Overall Evaluation:

This is an inadequate school overall.

Is the School An Academic Success?

Dolores Huerta Learning Academy (DHLA) is a school that has not been able to implement an effective, cohesive educational program. The school is in its tenth year of operations and on its second charter renewal, but in that time, the dual-language immersion program outlined in its charter has not been implemented with any consistency nor cohesion. Not only has the school been unable to attain the 50/50 Spanish-speaking, non Spanish-speaking students required of the model, a purposeful and focused instructional program necessary for promoting literate and bi-literate students has not been supported for success.

As a result, the school's performance is inadequate. Student achievement on state assessments has been marked with drastic ups and downs during the term of its current charter. DHLA began its current charter term in Program Improvement (PI) under the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, but was able to pull-out of PI in 2005. However, the following year, the school showed an 81-point drop on its 2007 growth API. But then last year, DHLA exceeded its Academic Performance Index (API) growth target in 2008 with a 24-point gain. Despite a couple years of positive jumps in student achievement, the school's current overall performance is still low, placing the school well-below state and district medians. DHLA's 2007 API base score of 594, ranks the school at 1 statewide and 1 among similar schools. The school is now back in Program Improvement (PI) Year 1 under NCLB.

Though the teachers and staff care about the students, expectations for student achievement are not high. There is no cohesive curriculum from grade-level to grade-level. Though there is an expectation that teachers teach to state standards, there is little evidence of how comprehensively aligned the curriculum is to all core content standards. Instruction in classrooms range from underdeveloped to unsatisfactory, either because teachers are new to the profession or because teachers lack depth of certain content areas and or do not adequately engage students. Overall the curriculum lacks rigor.

Students interviewed report that they like their school because it is small and encompasses elementary and middle school grade levels, but could not articulate what was unique or special about the school or about its educational program. Parents interviewed like that the school is a K-8 structure, but generally are unhappy about the lack of communication from the school around changes to the core educational premise from Spanish dual immersion to an English only program.

Is the School an Effective, Viable Organization?

Dolores Huerta Learning Academy is not an effective, viable organization. After ten years of operations, learning results are relatively poor compared with other similar schools. This is because there has been little to no curricular cohesion and no clear adherence to an instructional model, much less the one outlined in its charter. Though liked and supported by some stakeholder, the past principal was not effective in implementing a solid educational program. The board has hired a new principal this year; however, he has yet to establish himself with the school community and to impact school improvement. School policies and procedures have not been cohesive or consistently implemented over the past term of the charter. Teacher turnover has been consistently high.

The board of directors is committed to a concept of a small, community-based charter school in the neighborhood; nevertheless, there are strong indications that the relationship between the board of directors and the past principal had been strained and at times tense. Unfortunately, communication with the present principal is not strong as evidenced by contradictions between what board members say and what the current principal says is the direction of the school's change from dual immersion to an English only program.

The school has a large reserve (at approximately 24% of its entire budget) and has had clean audits from the last two years reviewed. There are no clear strategic plans, however, for the use of these large reserves given that DHLA clearly has large academic needs.

Has the School Remained Faithful to the Terms of Its Charter?

Dolores Huerta Learning Academy has not implemented the thematically-based, dual immersion language program outlined in its charter to positive effect over the 10 years of its charter lifecycle. While its small school size and K-8 structure contributes to an environment where adults and children all know each other well, this has not translated to greater student achievement overall. The school has not met the measurable pupil outcomes terms agreed with the Oakland Unified School District (OUSD), and evidence and interviews during this review do not support a program that is in alignment with school's charter in this current year and in previous years.

Criterion 1: Improving Student Achievement

A charter school promotes student learning through a clear vision and high expectations. It achieves clear, measurable program goals and student learning objectives, including meeting its stated performance standards, state and federal performance standards, and closing achievement gaps of students.

This area of the school's work is unsatisfactory.

Dolores Huerta Learning Academy (DHLA) has not effectively implemented the educational program outlined in its current charter. The focus of the charter is to comprehensively support English language acquisition primarily for its large number of English Learners (EL) through two comprehensive language and literacy support strategies: the use of research-based English Language Development (ELD) strategies in all classes and the implementation of a Spanish/English dual-language immersion program, in which 90% of the instructional time is taught in Spanish to student in grades K-1; 80% in grade 2, 70% in grade 3 and 60% in grade 4. The school program would theoretically reach 50% Spanish and 50% Spanish/English instruction at grade 5. However, neither ELD strategies nor the dual language immersion model has been implemented with any consistency or cohesion over the past five years of its current charter. As a result, students at DHLA as a whole are not demonstrating acceptable literacy in either English or Spanish.

Student achievement results in the areas of English language arts (ELA) schoolwide are at 19% proficient overall, with proficiency levels that change drastically from one year to another and from one class or teacher to another from year to year. Math results are at 35% proficient and above schoolwide. Neither of these schoolwide proficiency percentages meets the measurable student outcomes agreed upon with the Oakland Unified School District for charter renewal. Additionally, there is evidence that the school has not been re-classifying its EL students, which could have been another measure of its goal of English proficiency for Spanish-speaking students.

The results of Spanish literacy among DHLA's students is much less clear as the school has not developed any way to measure this aspect of its program goals. Though there was evidence of published student poetry in Spanish and in English from previous years, Spanish proficiency in the areas speaking, reading and writing varies greatly among the Hispanic student population at the school. There is no evidence that the school has identified where students are in their Spanish literacy so that it can best support the students in these areas.

The erratic pattern of the school's CST's is reflected in the school's Academic Performance Index (API) scores that have experienced both large growths in certain years, +59 from 2004 to 2005, +54 from 2005 to 2006, and +47 from 2007 to 2008 and as well as significant dips, -81 from 2006 to 2007. As a result, school's current overall performance is still low, placing the school well-below state and district medians. DHLA's 2007 API base score of 594, currently ranks the school at 1 statewide and 1 among similar schools. The school is now in Program Improvement (PI) Year 1 under NCLB having previously been out of PI for past two years.

Because of its poor academic performance overall, the school is now, in its last year before renewal, moving to the implementation of an English-only program, abandoning the dual language immersion program for reasons that are not very clear nor well-substantiated. The current principal feels that the model is not feasible because the school has been unable to attain the 50/50 Spanish-speaking, non Spanish-speaking students required of the model and that student performance results speak to why the model is not working. However, there is little evidence that the school has done the appropriate outreach or recruitment necessary to make the model work. Board members interviewed, on the other hand, say that the school is only exploring options other than dual immersion, including that of English-only program, but that no decisions on the direction of the school has yet been made.

The principal, however, hired English only speaking teachers in the lower grade level this year primarily because he feels he has clear direction from the board to move the school to an English-only program.

This decision is a point of contention among a number of staff members and teachers, many of whom feel that the decision was made with little or no stakeholder input.

The principal lists in the school's self-evaluation report for this review that a number of support systems are now being put in place to help teachers in supporting students as it moves to an English-only program, including contracting with the Bay Area Coalition of Equitable Schools (BayCES) for instructional coaches and to provide teachers with additional training in ELD strategies. Thus far, one coach has been hired to support teachers for one day a week. However, this is not sufficient given the myriad of needs related to curriculum and instruction at the school.

This is unfortunate as classroom instruction at all grade-levels is in need of assistance. There is no cohesive curriculum from grade-level to grade-level and so teachers do not have a guide as to how to carefully scope and sequence their curriculum. Collaboration is informal and through self-initiated conversations among individual teachers, and there is little accountability or follow-up by the school administration as to how common planning time is being spent. Though there is an expectation that teachers teach to state standards, there is little evidence of how comprehensively aligned each teacher's classroom curriculum is to all core content standards. Instruction in classrooms are too teacher-centered and range from underdeveloped to unsatisfactory, either because teachers are new to the profession or because teachers lack depth knowledge in certain content areas and/or do not adequately engage students. For example in observations of one teacher, a science lesson consisted of reading out of the textbook for students, where a student's question about the age of rocks was cut off and in a math lesson, the same teacher made critical mistakes on math problems. Articulating clear objectives, tapping for prior knowledge, pacing, checking for understanding and building upon student questions were observed to be weak in all classrooms, as neither new nor experienced teachers have been provided sufficient guidance in effective instructional strategies.

Though the teachers and staff genuinely care about the students, expectations for student achievement are not high, and the overall curriculum lacks rigor. Learning activities predominantly consist of completing worksheets or looking up vocabulary, taking notes from the teacher or taking turns reading out loud in class. Though these do not engage their interests, most students cooperate well by doing the tasks set by the teacher. When students are given work that requires applications of skills, they are rarely shown exemplars of what proficient level of mastery looks like or given detailed feedback on their work. As a result, they do not have a clear idea of the standards expected. There was little to no evidence of the use of ELD strategies to support students in their understanding of expectations other than teachers occasionally rephrasing instructions in Spanish.

The one positive aspect of the school identified by all stakeholders is its small size and the K-8 grade structure which allows students to remain at one school site for both their elementary and middle school experience. Student and their parents feel that this makes the school safer and contributes to everyone knowing each other. While this is true, the school has not leveraged this positive aspect to its best advantage by building a strong, cohesive culture focused on student achievement and accountability for student learning.

Criterion 2: Strong Leadership

The leaders of a charter school are stewards of the charter's mission and vision and carry out their duties in a professional, responsible and ethical manner. Charter school leaders use their influence and authority for the primary purpose of achieving student success.

This area of the school's work is unsatisfactory.

The current DHLA principal took over the position just this past July. He comes to the school with years of previous experience at other schools, including another charter school in Oakland. Unfortunately, he has yet to establish himself with the school community and to impact school improvement.

Based on stakeholder testimony and the ineffective implementation of the school dual Spanish immersion program, the previous school principal was not an effective instructional leader. Although

instructional leads, advisors and coaches had been hired in the past, none seemed to have “worked out” because of disagreements or role and responsibility confusion between academic leads and the previous principal. Further, it seems many school policies and procedures have not been cohesive or consistently implemented over the past term of the charter, including the school’s discipline policies. Because staff turnover has been high, there seems to be little “institutional memory” of what has and has not been done, with the exception of the office manager who has been with the school since its inception ten years ago.

The new principal is making efforts to bring some consistency in implementing school policies; but on the whole, this has been observed to be ineffective. At a staff meeting, he was observed facilitating a discussion on behavioral infractions that would be categorized as either “in-house” versus “out-of-school” suspensions by having staff vote “thumbs up” or “thumbs down.” Several questions inevitably came up from staff to try to discern the degree of the infraction before he/she could vote (i.e. the difference between “stealing” another student’s pencil versus stealing money from a teacher’s purse). This caused the staff meeting to not only run long, but detracted from a much more fundamental discussion the staff needed to have around consistency in addressing behavior infractions from classroom to classroom and support for classroom management for newer teachers. The principal failed to notice that the cause of the staff questions was because many were confused around what was acceptable and not acceptable behavior at a much more fundamental level (i.e. chewing gum, talking out of turn, play fighting with other students, which sometimes turned to real fights). The facilitation was not well managed, and many staff members concurred that this was on par with how their staff meetings this year were facilitated.

To add further confusion related to school policies, the school principal redesigned the Parent/Student Handbook this year with a different mission and vision statement than that of the charter. This would be understandable given his clear understanding that the program would be moving to an English-only program. However, the mission statement in the 2008-2009 handbook actually speaks more specifically to a language development program than the original charter mission statement, and the admissions policies included are directed specifically for a dual-immersion program. Additionally discipline policies and special education policies are not well-articulated and defined. When asked about the discrepancy, the principal was unclear as to when the handbook was developed; but other sources indicated that the new principal this year developed the handbook himself about one month ago and that this handbook has yet to be distributed to students and their families.

Even more disconcerting, however, are contradictions between what board members say and what the current principal says is the direction of the school’s change from dual immersion to an English only program. The principal is absolutely clear that the direction the board has given him is to change the school to an English only program. Board members interviewed, on the other hand, say that the school is only exploring options other than dual immersion, but that no decision on the direction of the school has yet been made. Board members feel that the school leader and the staff should develop that direction. Staff, on the other hand, feel they have been left out of the decision-making process, and parents have already received word of the changes in the program. Some are also concerned that their input was not sought before the decision was made. Engagement of parents overall have not been effective as the parent site council has not been established yet this year.

Board members interviewed stated that one of the reasons they selected the current principal is because they felt he would have a stronger instructional background than the previous principal. . The current principal, however, stated the reason he made it a point to bring in instructional coaches from outside is because curriculum and instruction is not one of his areas of strength. While the principal stated that he visits each teacher’s classroom at least once a week, even for a few minutes, this was not a view shared by teachers. They would like to see him more often in their classrooms and to receive more feedback and support. Interviews with stakeholder groups indicate the instructional coach is currently using most of his time facilitating school wide staff development days and working with school administration on an instructional approach, so he has had very little opportunity so far to work directly with the teachers themselves.

Leadership decisions are often made for reasons that are not very clear nor well-substantiated as evidenced in the sudden decision to make the school an English-only program. Lack of follow-through is a theme found in many conversations related to the new principal. Many ideas ranging from curriculum to discipline are “talked about” but never implemented. The principal put together an elaborate “leadership team” design, delegating curriculum design and teacher evaluations to teaching staff members. This is neither necessary nor feasible given the small staff of twelve teachers and that little time or compensation is given to these teaching staff for taking on these large responsibilities. More than this, the principal has yet to coalesce the staff around a single cohesive mission and vision for the school. In a full day designated as “Charter Renewal Work Day” in October, the vision and mission of the school was discussed and teachers were divided up into groups to write sections of the new charter. While this would be an opportune time to validate staff input and responses to a new charter, the principal has yet to give staff feedback on what they had written or to pull a draft of what the teachers had written together for further discussion and review.

Criterion 3: A Focus on Continuous Improvement

A charter school engages in a process of continuous self-improvement in order to increase the effectiveness of its educational program. The school regularly assesses and evaluates student learning based on stated goals.

This area of the school’s work is unsatisfactory.

There is little evidence that DHLA uses data well either at the classroom level to inform instruction or schoolwide to plan for the future. A few teachers have established their own assessments to gauge baseline skills and have used previous year CST results to establish reading groups; but the school as a whole does not use data in a consistent manner nor purposefully to improve instruction. There was little evidence of student work that had been reviewed or corrected by teachers other than on traditional tests, and little evidence of rubrics to clearly define expectations for excellent work.

The school provides Data Director as a resource for teachers to gain benchmark assessment results and to access student performance on other tests such as the CSTs. However, many teachers reported they had not been able to access Data Director in a long time because the school’s internet was not working. The office manager reported, however, that Data Director has been accessible and that the internet issue was fixed a while ago. Additionally, data could very well be accessed through her, but very few teachers have even asked for data on their students.

The school has undergone quite a few formal reviews in the past five years, conducted by a consultant on dual immersion programs, the California Charter Schools Association and most recently by the Charter School Development Center. Most had strong recommendations for improvement programmatically and operationally. However, there is little evidence that school has acted upon any of the recommendations, and the school has not used these reports to effectively build a strategic plan from improvement.

Parents have a general sense of how their children are doing through parent conferences and report cards, though they are not aware of specific benchmarks or what the standards might mean. This year, with the hiring of English-only speaking teachers at the primary grade levels, communication with parents have become more of a challenge. Students report that they liked it better when their parents could speak to the teachers, without them having to act as an intermediary to.

Criterion 4: Responsible Governance

A charter school board and administration establish and implement policies that are transparent and focused on student achievement. Charter school board members and administrators have a cogent understanding of and comply with the laws that govern charter schools.

This area of the school’s work is inadequate.

The Dolores Huerta Learning Academy Board of Directors is a seven-member board made up members who live and work in the community. A teacher and some parents sit on the board. The current members have varied experiences in business and education and with community organizations in Oakland.

Interviews with two board members showed a genuine care and commitment on the part of the board to having a community-based charter school in the neighborhood. They indicated a strong reliance on the school principal to implement a viable academic program and to run an effective school. Nevertheless, the current conditions at the school is evidence that the board has not been effective in working with either the past school leader or the current one, in establishing clear direction for the school and in creating a culture of accountability for achieving student learning results. While there is general sense that the school principal is responsible for implementing the school program, the roles and responsibilities between the school administrator and school board of directors are not clearly delineated, so it is unclear who has ultimate accountability for making the school successful.

The board has an adopted set of bylaws, but it is unclear how well the board has worked with past and current school administrators in establishing clear schoolwide policies and ensuing follow-through on those policies. Board minutes and agendas are in order. Board meeting agendas are posted on the school website, though this has not been updated since August, and board minutes are taken and available upon request. The parent school site council has not yet been established this year, and it is unclear how well communication occurs between this parent site council and the school board. It is not evident that the school has a clear policy in place for resolving concerns or disputes, as it is not included in the parent handbook or other documents submitted.

All required reports to the district have been submitted in accordance with timelines established.

Criterion 5: Fiscal Accountability

A charter school fulfils its fiduciary responsibility for public funds and maintains publicly accessible fiscal records. The school conducts an annual financial audit which is made public.

This area of the school's work is underdeveloped.

There is good evidence that the Dolores Huerta principal and board of directors work through a formal budget process that adheres to required timelines. The school contracts with EdTech, a private firm, for all "back office" services, including budget design and tracking, accounts payable, purchasing and payroll at a fee that is approximately 7% of its budget. EdTech has established set of fiscal policies for the school and keeps the school abreast of laws trends that pertain to charter schools.

Approximately 24% of the school's budget (\$460,000) is in cash reserves. Board members have indicated that the reserves are for the purchasing of future facilities, for which there is a clear need at the school. However, there are no formal plans or a timeline in place for the search and acquisition of new facilities.

Additionally, while the school has done well in keeping a large reserve, it has not utilized its cash reserves effectively to improve the overall consistency and quality of the school's educational program. For example, the school admits that it has not been able to recruit the 50/50 Spanish-speaking, non Spanish-speaking students required of a true dual language immersion program; however, there is no evidence that the school has spent its resources well to advertise and recruit the right mix of students for the program. Some stakeholders have indicated that one of the reasons for high teacher turnover at the school over the past four years is because of its low pay. Others alluded that communication between the board and the former principal was not effective. As a result, it is unclear whether it was the former principal or the board of directors who was unable to effectively use its funds on the types of educational resources needed to make the DHLA program educationally sound.

School name: Dolores Huerta Learning Academy

School Quality Review	5	4	3	2	1
Overall evaluation score				X	

Criterion 1: Improving Student Achievement: A charter school promotes student learning through a clear vision and high expectations. It achieves clear, measurable program goals and student learning objectives, including meeting its stated performance standards, state and federal performance standards, and closing achievement gaps of students.		5	4	3	2	1
Criterion 1 overall score:						X
1.1	Achieves clear, measurable program goals and student learning objectives, including meeting its stated performance standards, and state and federal standards				X	
1.2	Achieves comparably improved student learning outcomes relative to students in traditional public schools that students would have otherwise attended					X
1.3	Demonstrates high expectations for student achievement					X
1.4	Provides a challenging and coherent curriculum for each individual student					X
1.5	Implements and directs learning experiences (consistent with the school's purpose and charter) that actively engage students				X	
1.6	Allocates appropriate resources in the way of instructional materials, staffing and facilities to promote high levels of student achievement					X
1.7	Promotes academic risk taking by supporting students in a safe, healthy and nurturing environment characterized by trust, caring and professionalism				X	
1.8	Productively engages parental and community involvement as a part of the school's student support system				X	
1.9	Shares its vision among the school community and demonstrates its mission in daily action and practice					X
1.10	Involves staff, students, parents and other stakeholders in its accountability for student learning and in the school's program evaluation process					X

Criterion 2: Strong Leadership: The leaders of a charter school are stewards of the charter's mission and vision and carry out their duties in a professional, responsible and ethical manner. Charter school leaders use their influence and authority for the primary purpose of achieving student success.		5	4	3	2	1
Criterion 2 overall score:						X
2.1	Effectively communicates and engages stakeholders in the vision mission of the school					X
2.2	Consistently puts into practice the educational program outlined in its charter.					X
2.3	Generates and sustains a school culture conducive to staff professional growth					X
2.4	Actively monitors and evaluates the success of the school's program					X
2.5	Provides regular, public reports on the school's progress towards achieving its goals to the school community and to the school's authorizer					X
2.6	Treats all individuals with fairness, dignity and respect				X	
2.7	Has a cogent understanding of the laws that govern charter schools and monitors the trends, issues and potential changes in the environment in which charter schools operate				X	
2.8	Makes management decisions and uses his/her influence and authority for the primary purpose of achieving student success				X	
2.9	Abstains from any decision involving a potential or actual conflict of interests			X		
2.10	Respects diversity and implements practices that are inclusive of all types of learners consistent with the school charter				X	
2.11	Engages community involvement in the school					X

Criterion 3: A Focus on Continuous Improvement: A charter school engages in a process of continuous self-improvement in order to increase the effectiveness of its educational program. The school regularly assesses and evaluates student learning based on stated goals.		5	4	3	2	1
Criterion 3 overall score:						X
3.1	Uses information sources, data collection and data analysis strategies for self-examination and improvement.					X
3.2	Establishes benchmarks and a variety of accountability tools for monitoring student progress and uses the results of these assessments to improve curriculum and instruction					X
3.3	Establishes both long and short term goals and plans for accomplishing the school's mission as stated in its charter.					X
3.4	Uses student assessment results to improve curriculum and instruction.				X	
3.5	Uses the results of evaluation and assessment as the basis for the allocation of resources for programmatic improvement.					X

Criterion 4: Responsible Governance: A charter school board and administration establish and implement policies that are transparent and focused on student achievement. Charter school board members and administrators have a cogent understanding of and comply with the laws that govern charter schools.		5	4	3	2	1
Criterion 4 overall score:					X	
4.1	Ensure that policies are implemented in a fair and consistent manner.				X	
4.2	Monitor the trends, issues and potential changes in the environment in which charter schools operate.			X		
4.3	Seek input from impacted stakeholders.				X	
4.4	Enact policies that respect diversity and implements practices that are inclusive of all types of learners consistent with the school charter.				X	
4.5	Actively engage the school's authorizer in monitoring the school's educational program and its fiscal status.			X		

Criterion 5: Fiscal Accountability: A charter school fulfils its fiduciary responsibility for public funds and maintains publicly accessible fiscal records. The school conducts an annual financial audit which is made public.		5	4	3	2	1
Criterion 5 overall score:				X		
5.1	Creates and monitors immediate and long-range financial plans to effectively implement the school's educational program and ensure financial stability.				X	
5.2	Conducts an annual financial audit which is made public.		X			
5.3	Establishes clear fiscal policies to ensure that public funds are used appropriately and wisely.			X		
5.4	Ensures financial resources are directly related to the school's purpose: student achievement of learning goals.			X		