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**Like ACLC on Facebook**

<https://www.facebook.com/AlamedaCommunityLearningCenter/>

**Mark you Calendars for 12th Grade Graduation and the 8th Grade Promotion**

* 1. ACLC High School Graduation - June 14 @ 2:00pm
  2. ACLC 8th Grade Promotion - June 15th @ 6:00pm

**A Letter Of Recognition From the Campaign for Business and Education Excellence to the ACLC Community**

The American education system has a secret. Despite a national focus on a failing education system, many of our schools are doing well and successfully preparing students for college and career. After an extensive analysis of student data for every public school in California, Alameda Community Learning Center was a clear leader in getting students to grade level and beyond.

On behalf of Educational Results Partnership (ERP) and the Campaign for Business and Education Excellence (CBEE), I am writing to congratulate you. Alameda Community Learning Center has been named an Honor Roll school for the 2015 California Honor Roll. Your school will receive recognition in the press as a leader in student achievement, will be provided with a free banner to display on campus, and will be featured on our website where educators and policy makers seek out high performing schools so that they can replicate success.

The 2015 Honor Roll recognizes public elementary, middle, and high schools that demonstrate consistently high levels of student academic achievement, improvement in achievement over time, and reduction in achievement gaps.  For high schools, Honor Roll recognition includes measures of college readiness in students. This year, the California Honor Roll recognized 1,714 higher performing, higher poverty schools that are distinguished for their academic achievement and closing achievement gaps.

Through national research, we have identified a common set of success factors in higher performing Honor Roll schools and districts. These include clear, specific learning objectives aligned to college and career readiness, along with evidence-based instructional practices; establishing system-wide mission of college and career readiness for all students; investing in human capital; maintaining data and assessment systems to monitor school and student performance; and deploying resources and guidance to support schools' efforts to prepare all students for college and career.

**College Acceptances for ACLC**

This has been an exciting year with acceptances from many different colleges. Join me in celebrating the hard work from our amazing learners!

Brown Univ., Syracuse Univ., Mills College, Willamette Univ., Wesleyan Univ., Western Washington Univ., Seattle Univ., Oregon State Univ., Business Richmond Univ. London, Sierra Nevada College, Emerson College, Univ. of Nevada Reno, American Univ., Notre Dame, Kingston Univ. London, Santa Clara University, King’s College London, Loyola Marymount, Johns Hopkins Univ., Univ. of Limerick, Ireland, Univ. of Nevada Las Vegas, Scripps College, Univ. of Michigan, Univ. of Oregon, Howard University, Boston Univ., Nevada State, La Sierra Univ., Univ. of Maryland Eastern Shore, Oxford Brookes Univ., Brigham Young University, St. Augustine’s Univ., Chapman Univ., George Washington Univ., Case Western Reserve Univ., Clark Atlanta University, Oberlin College, Univ. of Washington, UC Santa Cruz, UC Merced, UC Riverside, UC Berkeley, UC Santa Barbara, UC Irvine, UC Davis, UC San Diego, UCLA, San Francisco State Univ., Humboldt State Univ., San Jose State Univ., CSU East Bay, Cal Poly SLO, CSU Los Angeles, Sonoma State Univ., Cal Maritime, Chico State Univ., Fullerton State, Sacramento State

|  |
| --- |
| **Henry Zhu, has been selected as a winner of the National Merit CSC (Computer Sciences Corporation)Scholarship.**  About the 2016 National Merit Scholarship Competition:  From approximately 1.5 million students who entered the 2016 National Merit Scholarship Program, only about 16,000 were named Semifinalists.  They were designated on a state representational basis, in proportion to each state's percentage of the national total of graduating high school seniors.  In order to advance in the competition and be considered for a Merit Scholarship award, a Semifinalist had to become a Finalist by fulfilling several requirements that included submitting a detailed scholarship application and presenting a record of very high academic performance.  All winners of about 7,400 National Merit Scholarships are being chosen from the group of approximately 15,000 distinguished Finalists. |

**The Annual "Jim Richards" Boat Races**

The Annual "Jim Richards" Boat Races were held at the Emma Hood Swim Center on the Alameda High School Campus Wednesday the 18th of May.  There were approximately 17 cardboard entries from ACLC and five from Nea.  Designed, decorated, constructed, and piloted by eighth grades, the regatta was a resounding success. In addition to the participating learners, high           schoolers from ACLC, parents and facilitators were also in attendance.

The raw material (cardboard) for the boats came predominantly from six relatively local sources:  Pagano's Hardware, Petco, O'Reilly's, Workwear and Beyond, International Paper, and Sears.

The tying Bronze Place finishers were Super Sayin Gods from Nea and Spitfire from ACLC with times of 17 seconds.  The Silver Place team was United States Sinker from ACLC (team members William Norboe, Susanna Tsay, and  Garrison Bleecker    ) who had a time of 16 seconds.  And in first place, taking Gold with a blazlingly fast time of 14 seconds, were Nicolette Herrerra-Ross, Sara Zhu, and Harrison Coorey and their boat, The Adriana Lombarge.

The times for some boats, like The Steam Punk Willie (1:58) were not for reaching the finishing line, but called on time without completion after running afoul of the lane lines.  Others like the RMS Titanic, Seas the Day, or Coelsige sank during the course of the race.

This year, in addition to the challenge of building a boat out of cardboard, there were other requirements.  Each team needed to develop a poem about their boat.  They also had to connect their boat to some historical period (in reality or literature) and include appropriate, decorative, elements that demonstrated this connection.  Learners needed to apply themselves in the areas of history and language arts in addition to math and science, while only the latter elements mattered for racing purposes.

**CCEF Annual Meeting Elections ~ New CCEF Board President Elected**

Every May the CCEF Board gathers to elect the Board of Directors for the next fiscal year.  This year, ACLC parent Juliette Bleecker joined the CCEF Board as president.  Juliette has extensive experience in fundraising, as well leading and working with non-profit boards.  Please join the CCEF Board in welcoming Juliette to the great team of parent, learner and staff volunteers on the CCEF Board.

*2016 / 2017 Directors*

Juliette Bleecker, President

Kris Thornton, Treasurer

Christine Kovach, Secretary

Daniel Bradac

Isabelle Burgess-Corkins

Avalon Cassard

Christin Cooper

David Hoopes

Martin Kharrazi

Katherine Kovach

Michelle Owens

Rudi Skowronski

Cassandra Waller-Mims

Lisa Yap

**Shifting from Lunch-master to AUSD**

Many families aren't aware of the many compliance issues every food services program is expected to follow.  There are expectations around handling food, what can be served, what needs to be monitored (like temperature), where the food can come from, handling money, overseeing Free & Reduced Lunch programs, and the list goes on.  Many charter schools work with a service that oversees the lunch process and assures the food vendor and the school is in compliance with all state and federal guidelines.  CLCS and the Nea and ACLC Administration got a crash course in compliance when it was discovered that our company, PUC, would not longer be able to provide the oversight we had  come to expect.

 PUC, our provider for student food service, notified us that they will no longer be offering meal program compliance services due to the enormous task of preparing for the audit and after careful consideration of their organization's risk and liability.

We have ventured out to 3rd party contractors to help with being within compliance. So far our efforts to work around this issue have left us in a bind with our current lunch vendor, whom is still not in compliance. We have also contacted other lunch vendors and have found that all are out of compliance or cannot handle the work without other contractors involved.

The state requires Independent School Food Services to manage their own food services by complying with the following:

 FRL and compliance:

* Receiving lunch applications and processing them through the state.
* Complying with federal/state regulations on how food is served, accounting practices with monies, how FRL reimbursement is being spent.
* Auditing daily lunch counts and accounting.

We found one organization that would do all that we needed in order to be in compliance, and that organization is the Alameda Unified School District.

The Alameda Unified School District has special catering services that could be the answer to our current food services problems. Here are some of the highlights:

* AUSD serves Breakfast, late breakfast (snack time) and hot lunch.
* They provide fresh homecook-style food from trays during lunch.
* They will provide a daily Salad Bar, and anyone can pay upfront with cash or through their prepaid account. (Breakfast, late Breakfast and Lunch)
* AUSD will have an On­Site team that handles everything from serving, accounting and clean up.

FRL and state compliance are also handled through their service.

**Program Evaluation Survey Results**

The survey results were compared to the past 2 years. Below are tabulated responses for each question over the past 3 years. The percentages are based on a relatively positive answer.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Copy of ACLC parent feedback Semester 1 2015/2016** | | |
| **1. What grade is your learner in?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Percent** | |
| 6 | 22.4% | |
| 7 | 15.5% | |
| 8 | 19.0% | |
| 9 | 13.8% | |
| 10 | 10.3% | |
| 11 | 12.1% | |
| 12 | 6.9% | |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **2. The first quarter progress report I received in the mail from ACLC about my learner was timely and helpful.** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Strongly agree | | 24.1% |
| Agree | | 60.3% |
| Disagree | | 6.9% |
| Strongly disagree | | 1.7% |
| I did not receive the report | | 6.9% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **3. Describe the amount of homework for your learner.** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Too much | | 5.2% |
| About the right amount | | 63.8% |
| Too little | | 29.3% |
| Not applicable | | 1.7% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **4. I know how to contact a facilitator by e-mail when needed.** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Agree | | 93.1% |
| Disagree | | 6.9% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **5. Do you use Jupiter to monitor your leaner's grades?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Always | | 63.8% |
| Sometimes | | 31.0% |
| Rarely | | 3.4% |
| Never | | 1.7% |
| I don't know about Jupiter | | 0.0% |
| I don't know how to use Jupiter | | 0.0% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **6. How effective are facilitators at using jupiter grades?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Very | | 39.7% |
| Moderately | | 50.0% |
| Slightly | | 6.9% |
| Not at All | | 0.0% |
| Not Applicable | | 3.4% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **7. I know how my learner can get extra help with academic challenges.** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Strongly Agree | | 19.0% |
| Agree | | 67.2% |
| Disagree | | 12.1% |
| Strongly Disagree | | 1.7% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **8. ACLC Staff respond to e-mails within two school days when contacted.** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Always | | 41.4% |
| Sometimes | | 48.3% |
| Rarely | | 6.9% |
| Never | | 3.4% |
| Other (please specify) | | |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **9. ACLC considers the individual needs of learners.** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Strongly Agree | | 24.1% |
| Agree | | 56.9% |
| Disagree | | 15.5% |
| Strongly Disagree | | 3.4% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **10. ACLC supports the social development of your learner.** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Strongly Agree | | 34.5% |
| Agree | | 53.4% |
| Disagree | | 12.1% |
| Strongly Disagree | | 0.0% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **11. The academic expectations for your learner at ACLC are** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| High | | 34.5% |
| Moderate | | 53.4% |
| Low | | 12.1% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **12. How Effectively does ACLC implement project based learning?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Very | | 32.8% |
| Moderately | | 55.2% |
| Slightly | | 10.3% |
| Not at all | | 1.7% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **13. How effective are the administrative disciplinary practices and procedures at ACLC?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Very | | 15.5% |
| Moderately | | 37.9% |
| Slightly | | 8.6% |
| Not at all | | 5.2% |
| Not Applicable | | 32.8% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **14. How effective is the Judicial Committee process for handling disciplinary matters at ACLC?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Very | | 36.2% |
| Moderately | | 22.4% |
| Slightly | | 10.3% |
| Not at all | | 5.2% |
| Not Applicable | | 25.9% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **15. My child has accessible and functional use of technology at ACLC in the classroom and in The Center.** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Strongly Agree | | 22.4% |
| Agree | | 67.2% |
| Disagree | | 8.6% |
| Strongly Disagree | | 1.7% |
| Other (please specify) | | |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **16. How effective are the drop off/pick up procedures at ACLC? (Check all that apply)** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Very | | 19.0% |
| Moderately | | 34.5% |
| Slightly | | 17.2% |
| Not at all | | 6.9% |
| I walk/bike to school | | 22.4% |
| Other (please specify) | | |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **17. How satisfied are you with the cleanliness at ACLC?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Extremely | | 12.1% |
| Moderately | | 58.6% |
| Slightly | | 19.0% |
| Not at all | | 8.6% |
| Not applicable | | 1.7% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **18. I know how to participate in Parent Action Committee, CCEF (Creative Community Education Foundation), and other ACLC Governing Committees.** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Strongly Agree | | 39.7% |
| Agree | | 51.7% |
| Disagree | | 6.9% |
| Strongly Disagree | | 1.7% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **19. Which of these sources do you use to access information and updates about ACLC?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Email | | 100.0% |
| Newsletter | | 65.5% |
| ACLC Website | | 43.1% |
| Bulletin Boards | | 1.7% |
| Listserv | | 46.6% |
| Other (please specify) | | |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **20. My learner feels that he or she is an active member of the ACLC community.** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Always | | 44.8% |
| Sometimes | | 50.0% |
| Rarely | | 5.2% |
| Never | | 0.0% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **21. How safe does your child feel at ACLC?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Very | | 62.1% |
| Moderately | | 36.2% |
| Slightly | | 1.7% |
| Not at all | | 0.0% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **22. I know how to become an active participant in ACLC's democratic processes.** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Strongly agree | | 31.0% |
| Agree | | 48.3% |
| Disagree | | 17.2% |
| Strongly disagree | | 3.4% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **23. List 2 strengths of the ACLC program for your learner.** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| 1. | | 100.0% |
| 2. | | 91.4% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **24. List 2 things that could be improved at ACLC.** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| 1. | | 100.0% |
| 2. | | 93.1% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **25. What is your satisfaction with the overall quality of instruction at ACLC.** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Very satisfied | | 31.0% |
| Moderately satisfied | | 58.6% |
| Moderately dissatisfied | | 6.9% |
| Very dissatisfied | | 3.4% |
| Explain. | | |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **26.  I would recommend ACLC for other parents and learners.** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Strongly Agree | | 36.2% |
| Agree | | 51.7% |
| Disagree | | 8.6% |
| Strongly Disagree | | 3.4% |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **27.  My child enjoys going to ACLC.** | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** |
| Strongly Agree | | 39.7% |
| Agree | | 53.4% |
| Disagree | | 5.2% |
| Strongly Disagree | | 1.7% |
|  | | |
|  | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q1 | Q: Jupiter grades | Q facilitators jupiter grades | Q: progress report | Q amount of homework | Q: contact a facilitator by email | Q: extra help with challenges | Q: email within 2/days | Q: considers individual needs of learners | Q: ACLC supports social development |
| 2015/2016 | 94.75% | 83.28% | 72.22 | 63.27 | 95.68 | 91.36 | 91.05 | 80.86 | 72.53 |
| 2014/2015 | 79.4% (illuminate) | N/A | 69.96 | 65.67 | 92.70% | 90.56 | 90.13 | 84.55 | 84.12 |
| 2013/2014 | 93.82 | N/A | 70.1 | 61.34 | 90.21 | 92.26 | 91.23 | 87.63 | 85.57 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q: academic expectations at ACLC? | Q: administrative disciplinary practices and procedures | Q: JC process for handling discipline | Q: technology | Q: drop off | Q: CCEF | Q: cleanliness | Q: Access info. and update about ACLC | Q: Active memeber of ACLC | Q: Safety | Q: active participant in ACLC's democratic processes |
| 88.58 | 67.3 | 58.82 | 77.78 | 59.13 | 51.67 | 37.07 | email #1 answer | 79.98 | 87.35 | 76.06 |
| 93.56 | 76.83 | 71.26 | 78.54 | 47.64 | 52.79 |  | email #1 answer | 86.7 | 89.7 | 79.67 |
| 94.85 | 83.51 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 87.11 | 93.82 | 85.05 |

The free response questions were studied and common answers were identified.

Common suggestions for improvement included improving the JC and discipline procedures, improving administration and facilitators, increasing funding, improving the cleanliness (particularly bathrooms), improving the center (particularly the quiet area), and trying to restore some of the cultural aspects lost over the years.

Common areas of strength included facilitators, free periods and other freedoms granted, leadership, and projects.