

Office of the Independent Monitor

Modified Consent Decree
333 So. Beaudry Avenue, 18th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
Tel: (213) 241-1797
Fax: (213) 241-7551

FREDERICK J. WEINTRAUB
Independent Monitor

JAY R. ALLEMAN
Chief Analyst

JAIME E. HERNANDEZ
Research Director

March 22, 2011

Sharyn Howell
Executive Director
Division of Special Education
333 S. Beaudry Avenue, 17th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017

Robert M. Myers
Attorney
Newman, Aaronson, Vanaman
14001 Ventura Blvd.
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423-3558

Catherine Blakemore
Attorney
Protection & Advocacy, Inc.
100 Howe Avenue, #185-N
Sacramento, CA 95825

Re: Integrated Student Information System Determination

Dear Ms. Howell, Mr. Myers and Ms. Blakemore:

On December 22, 2010 Plaintiffs' Counsel submitted written notice to the District of their intent to file a complaint with the Independent Monitor (IM) concerning the development and implementation of the Integrated Student Information System (ISIS) required by Section 11 of the Modified Consent Decree (MCD). The complaint asserted that the District had failed to complete ISIS within agreed upon timelines, and had engaged in personnel and contractual practices without the approval of the Plaintiffs' Counsel or the IM. In addition the notice sought six remedies.

Consistent with the requirements of the MCD the Parties met and conferred on January 5, 2011. At that meeting they were not able to reach an agreement. On February 1, 2011, the Plaintiffs' Counsel filed a complaint with the IM similar to the previous notice provided to the District.

The District responded to the complaint on February 16, 2011. The District's response did not challenge the accuracy of the Plaintiffs' Counsel's complaint, but did offer alternatives to the remedies sought. On February 28, 2011 the District submitted to the IM an addendum to the February 16th letter.


The District and Plaintiffs' Counsel met with the IM and the staff and ISIS consultant of the Office of the Independent Monitor (OIM) to discuss the current status of ISIS and the complaint. While the conversation was constructive no resolution was reached. It is therefore the responsibility of the IM to resolve the matter.

The IM makes the following determinations:

1. The assertions by Plaintiffs' Counsel that the District has failed to meet its obligations pertaining to ISIS are correct. The IM's rationale for reaching this conclusion is set forth in detail in the IM's *Report on the Progress and Effectiveness of the Los Angeles Unified School District's Implementation of the Modified Consent Decree 2009-2010 Part II* (March 2, 2011).
2. The remedies proposed by the District provide are generally appropriate but insufficient to guide the successful implementation of the ISIS requirements.
3. The District shall review the ISIS Checklist to determine if there are requirements that the District believes are no longer appropriate or cannot be implemented. The District shall provide its recommendations for change, with supporting rationale, to the IM and Plaintiffs' Counsel no later than May 1, 2011. After consulting with the Parties, the IM will make a determination. Once the checklist is finalized all of its requirements must be included in ISIS.
4. The District is currently in the process of testing the Phase 2 software. A summary of the Wave 1 gap analysis was provided to the IM and the Plaintiffs' Counsel. The District has indicated that the gap analyses of the SchoolMAX software and the Atlas system will be completed by the end of April. No later than June 1, 2011, the District shall provide the findings of the testing and its recommendations pertaining to the completion of the SchoolMAX software or the adoption of Atlas to the IM and Plaintiffs' Counsel. The Parties will meet to discuss the recommendations and jointly reach a decision. If no agreement is reached the IM will make a determination. Until a decision is made by the Parties or the IM the District is to take no actions that would preclude or impair the ability to make appropriate decisions.
5. Once a decision is made on how to proceed, the District has 60 days to provide the IM with an action plan for the completion of ISIS. The action plan shall include, but not limited to the following:
 - A. Defined Approach to ISIS Completion - This should provide clear vision about how the District expects to complete ISIS, and what the integration to any or all other District systems would look like. This must also present what effort and approach will be necessary to support legacy systems until the ISIS rollout is completed.
 - B. Assessment of effort (Harris, LAUSD, or other vendor) – This section needs to convey that the District has done an evaluation of all remaining technical effort, and to whom the effort will be assigned.
 - C. Milestone Chart - Expected to depict a high-level timeline for ISIS that can be supported by other deliverables to be completed in this action plan.
 - i. LAUSD Staffing and Other Resources Plan - a detailed resource plan that will depict everything that is needed to complete ISIS. This will include hardware, software, ISIS technical work, ISIS integration testing, pre-implementation documentation, user training, ISIS system configuration, ISIS rollout, and post-implementation support. If vendor resources are to be included, this plan must reflect the timing of acquiring those resources.
 - ii. Development of a Comprehensive ISIS Strategic Plan – Including the content previously documented (i.e., Current State Analysis, Roadmap, Short-term Improvement Plan, Evaluation of Alternatives, Restatement of the ISIS Charter, Change Management and Governance Plan, Resource Plan, Financial Management Plan, Risk Management Plan, Communications Plan, etc.)
 - iii. Preparation of a Detailed, Integrated ISIS Work Plan – reflecting the detailed tasks, dependencies, effort and responsibility for all remaining items needed in order to complete ISIS.
 - iv. Completion of Remaining Technical Development Work – e.g. interfaces, reports, and any other transaction processing (screen) development.
 - v. Completion of System Testing

- a) Completion of Acceptance Testing – for the software to be employed (SchoolMAX, Atlas, or something else)
 - b) Completion of Integration Testing – including all modules, interfaces and integration to other systems.
 - c) Completion of Performance Testing – to prove that ISIS can absorb the demands that will be placed upon it when rolled out to all District schools.
- vi. Preparation for Organizational Change Management
- a) Updates to District Policies and Procedures coordinated and completed
 - b) Training materials completed
 - c) Business process changes reviewed – approved by owners of the business processes.
- vii. Rollout Plan Delivered
- viii. User Training
- ix. Rollout Milestones
- x. Post-implementation Evaluation of ISIS

Sincerely,



Frederick J. Weintraub

c: Ramon Cortines, John Deasy, Judy Elliott, David Holmquist, Diane Pappas, Deneen Cox, Brigitte Ammons, Veronica Smith, Ron Chandler, Rolf Bishop, Thomas Hehir