



SFUSD SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Office of the Superintendent
555 Franklin Street, 3rd Floor | San Francisco, CA 94102
PH: (415) 241-6121

September 8, 2011

Hon. Katherine Feinstein, Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco
Department 206
400 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102-4514

Dear Judge Feinstein:

On behalf of the Board of Education and the San Francisco Unified School District, I enclose the San Francisco Unified School District's response to the 2010-2011 Civil Grand Jury Report entitled "*Log Cabin Ranch Moving Towards Positive Horizons*" which was released on July 5, 2011. The attached document responds to the findings and recommendations in the civil grand jury report as required by California Penal Code Sections 933 and 933.05.

Sincerely,

Carlos A. Garcia
Superintendent of Schools

Cc: San Francisco Board of Education
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
County of San Francisco Office of the Grand Jury

Encl.

**SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT RESPONSE TO 2010-
2011 CIVIL GRAND JURY REPORT
(LOG CABIN RANCH: MOVING TOWARDS POSITIVE HORIZONS)**

For each Finding of the Civil Grand Jury, the response must either: (1) agree with the finding, or (2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why. For each Recommendation made by the Civil Grand Jury, the responding party must provide one of the four responses:

Response One: the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary explanation of how it was implemented;

Response Two: the recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for the implementation;

Response Three: the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation of the scope of that analysis and a time frame for the officer or agency head to be prepared to discuss it (less than six months from the release of the report); or

Response Four: the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation of why that is.

FINDINGS

Finding #7: Current vocational programs offered at the Ranch set up the residents for disappointment because permanent jobs are not available in those areas of training. Additionally, training is not adequate for entry level positions.

Response: The District disagrees that jobs are not available in the areas of training provided at Log Cabin Ranch. The Conservation Corps provides carpentry, construction, and landscape training to all students and forklift training for students who are 18 and over, and there are jobs available in these areas of training. However, the District agrees that the training provided at Log Cabin Ranch is not adequate for entry level positions in the construction industry. There are transition opportunities for students after they leave Log Cabin through the Conservation Corps to attend job readiness programs at GoodWill Industries and Asian Neighborhood Design.

Last year, there were 12 pupils enrolled at Log Cabin Ranch. Currently, there are 24 students enrolled. Due to the limited enrollment at the site, as well as limited resources overall, Log Cabin Ranch does not possess a vocational program that provides entry-level training. However, the District does provide transition support, through a dedicated employee along with weekly case meetings with Juvenile Probation and SFUSD staff, to students who are leaving Log Cabin to assist them to either return to SFUSD schools, or to participate in other educational or vocational training programs if they graduate from Log Cabin.

Notably, SFUSD comprehensive schools do not currently have any vocational programs that provide training adequate for entry level employment positions. However, this year the District began development of a Career Technical Education (CTE) pathway with the

Public Utilities Commission (PUC), to establish a vocational training program that is intended to provide a pipeline to employment at the PUC. SFUSD students, including those who matriculate from Log Cabin Ranch, will be eligible to participate in this pathway. This is a planning year with the goal being program implementation for the school year 2012-13.

Finding #9: The basic high school program in its current form offers a limited education curriculum.

Response: The District disagrees to the extent that this statement suggests that students do not have access to the full range of classes necessary to obtain a high school diploma or GED. The teachers assigned to Log Cabin Ranch provide instruction in the humanities, math, science, and world languages, and are also credentialed to provide special education services. Students also have access to a wide range of University of California A-G approved online courses, including the opportunity to take SF City College courses to earn concurrent high school and college credits. However, the District agrees to the extent that the statement suggests that the education program could be more engaging and could better utilize the unique resources that are available at the Log Cabin site. The addition of a new instructor with a strong project based background is leading to more integration of Community Day projects with the core curriculum as well as utilizing the natural resources at the Ranch.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation # 7: Vocational and apprenticeship programs should be developed in fields such as auto mechanics, metal working and welding, pipe fitting, solar panel installation or other union-affiliated positions.

Response: Response Four: The District cannot reasonably develop the listed vocational and apprenticeship programs at Log Cabin Ranch due to the limited enrollment numbers at the site, as well as limited resources overall.

As noted above, the enrollment at Log Cabin was 12 students last year and 24 students this year. Due to the low enrollment numbers, staff have worked one-on-one with students to help them transition back to SFUSD or to other vocational or educational programs when they leave Log Cabin. These low enrollment numbers would not support a full time vocational teacher at the site.

However, Log Cabin does provide vocational training through collaboration with other organizations, including the SF Conservation Corps and Urban Sprouts. The City of San Francisco pays Conservation Corps to provide students with carpentry and construction training. Through this collaboration, students have completed projects such as building benches, a woodshed, fences, planters for their garden, raised platforms for their movie theater, paved walkways as well as a BBQ and community area. The SF Conservation Corps training provides more hands-on construction than any other vocational construction program in SFUSD comprehensive schools. Through Urban Sprouts, the

students participate in urban gardening and some of the produce is sold at the farmers market in Laguna Honda and used in organic cooking at the site.

The District is working to integrate SFUSD academic instruction at Log Cabin with the hands-on activities initiated by these organizations. Additionally, the District has hired a dedicated teacher in the CTE office who is developing the first apprenticeship program in SFUSD in collaboration with the Public Utilities Commission, to establish a pipeline to employment at the PUC. SFUSD students, including those who matriculate from Log Cabin Ranch, will be eligible to participate in this pathway.

SFUSD is also in its first year of implementing a College Career Curriculum called Plan Ahead. The Plan Ahead curriculum exposes students to the graduation requirements, the entrance requirements for the University of California system, as well as activities where students research and plan the post secondary options for careers of interest. Teachers at Log Cabin are included in this training and curriculum.

Recommendation #9: SFUSD should explore additional educational options that would challenge all Log Cabin Residents. These options could include programs such as the "Big Picture" model currently used at San Francisco court-appointed schools or a charter school scenario.

Response: Response One: The District has implemented this recommendation by assigning a new teacher to Log Cabin Ranch who is fully trained in the Big Picture model. This teacher is charged with integrating relevant aspects of the Big Picture model into the curriculum at Log Cabin Ranch.

The former principal of the Principals Center Collaborative (PCC) was fully trained in the Big Picture model when it was adopted at that school site last year. The former principal transferred to Log Cabin Ranch as a lead teacher starting in August 2011, and will be working to bring some of the project-based elements of the Big Picture model into the existing Missouri model at Log Cabin. This integration includes the development of hands-on projects and curriculum that link academic instruction to the vocational learning that occurs through Urban Sprouts and the Conservation Corps.

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
GRAND JURY

Org: GAO Clerk
AA
e: COB, Leg Dep
Cpage

OFFICE
400 MCALLISTER ST., ROOM 008
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
TELEPHONE: (415) 551-3605

June 29, 2011

Supervisor David Chiu, President
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
#1 Dr. Carleton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2011 JUN 29 PM 12:37

Dear Supervisor Chiu:

The 2010-2011 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury will release its report to the public entitled "Log Cabin Ranch Moving Towards Positive Horizons" on Tuesday, July 5, 2011. Enclosed is an advance copy of this report. Please note that by order of the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, Hon. Katherine Feinstein, this report is to be kept confidential until the date of release.

California Penal Code section 933.05 requires the responding party or entity identified in the report to respond to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, within a specified number of days. You may find the specific day the response is due in the last paragraph of this letter.

For each Finding of the Civil Grand Jury, the response must either:

- (1) agree with the finding; or
- (2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why.

Further as to each recommendation made by the Civil Grand Jury, the responding party must report either:

- (1) that the recommendation has been implemented, with a summary explanation of how it was implemented;
- (2) the recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a time frame for the implementation;
- (3) the recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation of the scope of that analysis and a time frame for the officer or agency head to be prepared to discuss it (less than six months from the release of the report); or

(H) 110815
(R) 110816

- (4) that the recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an explanation of why that is. (California Penal Code sections 933, 933.05)

Please provide your responses to the Findings and Recommendations in this report to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court, Hon. Katherine Feinstein, not later than Tuesday, September 27, 2011, with an information copy sent to the Grand Jury Office at the above address.

Very truly yours,



Linda A. Clardy, Foreperson
2010-2011 San Francisco County Civil Grand Jury

cc: Members of the Board of Supervisors
Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board