

Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: _____ C. _____

Date: February 28, 2007

Topic: Resolution Releasing Richmond City Public Schools from the Division-Level Review Process

Presenter: Kathleen M. Smith, Director, Office of School Improvement
Dr. Deborah Jewell-Sherman, Division Superintendent, Richmond City Public Schools
Dr. Yvonne Brandon, Associate Superintendent for Instruction and Accountability,
Richmond City Public Schools

Telephone Number: (804) 225-2865

E-Mail Address: Kathleen.Smith@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

Board review required by

State or federal law or regulation

Board of Education regulation

Other: Memorandum of Understanding

Action requested at this meeting Action requested at future meeting: _____ (date)

Previous Review/Action:

No previous board review/action

Previous review/action

date _____

action _____

Background Information:

On April 4, 2005, the Board of Education and the Richmond City School Board entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to voluntarily participate in a division-level review conducted by the Department of Education. The Board of Education accepted the findings of *Charting a New Course for Richmond Public Schools*, a report by the Council of Great Cities Schools, December 2003, in lieu of the on-site Report of Findings (ROF) for a division-level review as authorized by 8 VAC 20-700-50, which stated at the time of the MOU: "The Board may accept a school division-level review conducted by an organization or agency upon the request of a local school board if the review meets or exceeds the requirements for reviews conducted by the Department as prescribed in 8 VAC 20-700-40."

On June 27, 2005, the Richmond City School Board adopted a corrective action plan that addressed the essential actions indicated in findings of the division-level review. Attachment A is a copy of the essential actions and compliance indicators identified in the MOU. Attachment B is an updated copy of the Richmond City Public Schools Balanced Scorecard (corrective action plan) indicating their progress

in meeting the essential actions and compliance indicators identified in the MOU.

In September 2005 the Richmond City School Board came before the Board of Education’s Committee on Lowest Performing Schools and summarized the progress made in meeting the compliance indicators for the essential actions as indicated in the division’s corrective action plan. At that time, the corrective action plan addressed the essential actions indicated in the MOU.

Summary of Major Elements

The division continues to monitor, modify, and implement the corrective action plan and has implemented essential actions that have promoted improved student achievement throughout the division.

In 2006-2007, 42 out of 49 or 86 per cent of the Richmond City Public Schools are rated as fully accredited. Of the seven schools not fully accredited, five schools are rated as accredited with warning and two are rated as conditionally accredited. The Department of Education continues to monitor and provide technical assistance to these schools through the academic review process, turnaround specialist program and the Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools (PASS) initiative.

| NAME OF SCHOOL | PROGRAM OR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY VDOE | ACCREDITATION STATUS |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Richmond Alternative School | Continued assistance in writing and implementing an alternative accreditation plan. | Conditionally Accredited |
| George W. Carver Elementary | Turnaround Specialist is employed. | Conditionally Accredited |
| Martin Luther King, Jr. Middle School | Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools (PASS). Coach is working in the school at least 16 hours per month. | Accredited with Warning |
| Boushall Middle School | Turnaround Specialist is employed. Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools (PASS). Coach is working in the school at least 16 hours per month. | Accredited with Warning |
| Elkhardt Middle School | Turnaround Specialist is employed. Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools (PASS). Coach is working in the school at least 16 hours per month. | Accredited with Warning |
| Chandler Middle School | Turnaround Specialist is employed. Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools (PASS). Coach is working in the school at least 16 hours per month. | Accredited with Warning |
| Reid Elementary School | Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools (PASS). Coach is working in the school at least 16 hours per month. | Accredited with Warning |

The summary of key responsibilities indicated in the MOU for the Board of Education and the Richmond

City School Board are as follows:

3. SUMMARY OF KEY RESPONSIBILITIES

- 3.1 **The School Board** and the Board of Education agree to the roles and responsibilities as described in Attachment II, which is specifically incorporated by reference in this MOU as if fully set forth herein..
- 3.2 **The School Board** agrees to develop, submit and implement a *division-level improvement plan* based on the essential actions and compliance indicators noted in Attachment I within 60 days of signing the MOU by the authorized representatives of the Board of Education and the School Board.

The roles and responsibilities as described in Attachment II of the MOU are included as Attachment C. The term of the MOU expired on December 31, 2006, and is defined in the MOU as:

1.6 **Term.** The Term of this MOU shall be from the date of the signature of the MOU by all parties to the MOU through December 31, 2006. Expiration of the Term of this MOU shall not serve as evidence that the Board of Education has determined that the School Board has completed all requirements of the division-level improvement plan and corrected all identified areas of non-compliance. The Board of Education shall identify all incomplete requirements and remaining areas of non-compliance in writing 60 days prior to completion of the Term. In the event that the Board of Education determines that the School Board has not completed all requirements of the division-level improvement plan and corrected all identified areas of non-compliance, the Board of Education may seek to extend the Term of this MOU by a majority vote of its members. The School Board and the Board of Education may extend the term of this MOU only by written amendment to this MOU.

If at any time during the term of this MOU or upon its expiration, the Board of Education determines that the School Board has completed all requirements of the division-level improvement plan and corrected all identified areas of non-compliance, the Board of Education shall by resolution notify the School Board.

The Richmond City School Board has completed all requirements of the division-level improvement plan and corrected all identified areas of non-compliance through the implementation and continued monitoring of the division-level improvement plan and has met the key responsibilities of the MOU as indicated in Attachment B.

The Board of Education did not meet in December; therefore, the request for the Board to pass a resolution notifying the Richmond City School Board of the expiration of the MOU could not be made until January. At the request of the Richmond City School Board, this request was postponed until this meeting.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board, by resolution, notify the Richmond City School Board that with continued monitoring and reporting to the Board of Education, it is released from the Memorandum of Understanding for the division-level review.

Impact on Resources:

None

Timetable for Further Review/Action:

None

Attachment A

(Attachment I of the MOU) Part A: Richmond City Schools Division-Level Review - Compliance Indicators

| <p style="text-align: center;">Essential Action</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Implementation Timeline Level 1: Within 30 days of the approval of the division improvement plan Level 2: Within 60 days Level 3: Within 90 days</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Compliance Indicators</p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>1. School Board Leadership and Professional Growth</p> | | <p>A. Defining the roles of the superintendent and school board: Using the attached draft of roles and responsibilities derived from the Code of Virginia and Virginia Board of Education regulations as a starting point, the Richmond City School Board and division superintendent will create and follow a similar outline of responsibilities, consistent with the requirements of the Code and state board regulations.</p> <p>B. Professional Development: Engage an organization that has experience in providing school board with professional development to assist the board in successfully achieving a delineation of the roles and responsibilities; political unity on establishing student achievement as a high priority; approving, and monitoring school and staff performance goals; and ensuring the successful implementation of the essential actions in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).</p> <p>C. Monitoring the MOU Essential Actions: Schedule progress reports, no less than once per quarter, on the implementation of the MOU essential actions. Schedule informative reports on instructional issues during each monthly meeting. As a means of reinforcing the importance of instructional issues, such reports should be early on the agenda to ensure interested staff and community members are present during the reports.</p> <p>D. Process Model for Establishing Goals: As an expected outcome of the professional training, the board will develop and follow a process model for reaching consensus on performance goals for student achievement for staff and schools, a process of accountability for the achievement of the goals and a process to evaluate the accomplishment of the goals.</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>2. Student Performance Goals for Each School</p> | | <p>A. School-level performance goals: School-level student performance targets, based on the SOL test results, in English and mathematics will be established by the superintendent. The goals reflect individual targets that contribute to the division’s goals. Progress in achieving the school-level targets form the basis for division-level audits (Charting the Course) and staff evaluation goals (page 12 - GCSR).</p> <p>B. School-level monitoring plan progress toward the goals: Each school will complete a School Improvement Plan (SIP) that has benchmark targets on quarterly assessments as well as appropriate actions and strategies that will lead to attainment of the school performance goals. The plan will include the responsibilities and accountability process to ensure that teachers complete their assigned actions. The execution of this plan will be monitored through the division audits (Charting the Course) (page 12 and 13 - GCSR).</p> |
| <p>3. Standardized Quality Programs - Division-wide</p> | | <p>A. A division review of all instructional programs and basal texts used in English and mathematics: The expected outcome of the review is to select a single reading program for each grade level that is research-based, has a high correlation to the SOL, essential skills, and has proven success. This does not preclude the use of appropriate materials to meet IEP requirements or other specified individual needs (GCSR – page 13). The review will include at least the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A written inventory of all instructional programs in each school will be developed in a matrix to allow comparisons across the division. 2. An analysis of a school’s performance using this program will be part of the matrix to determine the program’s effectiveness. Low-performing programs will be dropped. 3. If the instructional program has a research-based record of success outside the division, an analysis of the implementation steps will be conducted. Low-performing, but research-based programs that have been effectively implemented will be phased out. 4. The programs that survive the analysis in components 2 and 3 will be checked for correlation to the essential skills in the DOE curriculum framework. A written correlation matrix of essential skills and their location in the division-wide program as well as identified alternative materials-indexed to the essential skills will be the compliance indicator. Programs with less than 75% correlation will be dropped or modified to improve correlation if they are retained. |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|--|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | <p>5. Develop a schedule of professional development that ensures a high quality implementation of the existing or new reading and mathematics programs for new as well as returning teachers. Develop a schedule to update new staff as they are hired.</p> <p>B. Implementation of a cohesive K-12 language arts program: Develop a timeline for the implementation of a single cohesive K-12 reading and language arts program, that is research based, of proven success and high correlation to the English SOL essential skills, complete with action steps to ensure appropriate professional development and assigned responsibilities.</p> |
| <p>4. Accountability System</p> | | <p>A. Board Accountability: The school board identifies actions it will take to improve student performance and measures the progress on these goals.</p> <p>B. Staff Accountability: A major concern, as noted in several citations on page 28 of the GCSR, is that “staff lack any accountability for (student) performance.” The accountability system needs to be based upon achieving student performance targets if the division is to meet it goals. Compliance indicators include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A revision of the expectations in the administrative and teacher evaluation system to reflect expected progress in student achievement indicators such as the SOL tests, PASSMARK tests, PALS post-tests, division textbook reading and mathematics tests, etc. 2. Establishment of performance targets using other tests besides the SOL tests that measure student reading levels and math proficiency. Examples might include: division-wide reading diagnostic tests, textbook tests and validated program reading proficiency tests. 3. Quarterly reviews of student performance by school and classroom on the benchmark PASSMARK tests as a progress indicator toward performance targets. Evidence of these reviews will be documented actions taken to improve low performance in schools or classrooms. 4. Student achievement performance targets will be established for central office staff generated within their responsibility in a subject area or their contribution to school’s performance targets. 5. Develop a schedule of staff development for administrators to assist them in implementing the teacher evaluation system, documentation procedures, options for providing assistance to teachers and classroom observation techniques. 6. Develop a schedule of staff development for teachers to explain expectations and |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | the procedures of the performance evaluation system. |
| 5. Data and Assessment System | | <p>A. Division-wide, aligned benchmark system: To address the concerns of the GCSR on page 36, a <u>written review</u> will be completed by Richmond Public Schools (RPS) staff of the tools used (Flanagan, Edutest, textbook or program tests, etc.) to assess student progress to determine: a) alignment of the tests, b) the value and use of the data for weekly, textbook and quarterly tests compared to the lost instructional time, c) the benchmark system used in non PASS schools, and d) the degree to which timely reports from the various tests used are available to teachers and principals in time to make use of the data. The outcome of the review will result in RPS staff recommending to the board and superintendent to address the concerns listed in the GCSR.</p> <p>B. Organizational support for assessment: To ensure the concerns noted on page 36 of the GCSR and the timely availability of test reports and accurate scoring, specific RPS staff members will be assigned responsibility for the various components of the testing program (i.e. PASS, quarterly assessment in non-PASS schools, Edutest, weekly tests, textbook tests, etc.). The responsibilities will be <u>specified and coordinated</u> to ensure appropriate and accurate test distribution, scoring, use of results, alignment to the SOL essential skills, test administration schedules and solving test use problems.</p> |

Richmond Public Schools Balanced Scorecard – Strategic Objectives, Measures and Projects

Mission: [RPS will] Educate ALL students to become highly successful, contributing citizens in a global society. Revised 12/13/06

Vision: [RPS will become] A premier learning community that is the first choice for ALL in Richmond and recognized nationally for student excellence.

Goals:

1. Improve Student Achievement
2. Promote a Safe and Nurturing Environment
3. Provide Strong Leadership for Effective and Efficient Operations
4. Enhance Capacity Building through Professional Development
5. Strengthen Collaborations with Stakeholders

6. Increase Parent & Community Satisfaction

Balanced Scorecard Categories:
 Customer/Stakeholder
 Budget/Financial
 HR Learning and Growth
 Internal Business Process

Types of measures:

1. Outcome measures (also called results or end-of-process measures or lagging indicators) - example: EOC/EOG test results.
2. Process measures (also called in-process measures, performance drivers or leading indicators) - example: percentage of teachers using the state's curriculum.

Measures can include:

- quality measures (numbers of defects, mistakes, rework, complaints)
- timeliness measures (on-time delivery as defined by the customer)
- cycle time measures (response time, number of tasks completed on schedule)
- quantity measures (number of classes taught, number of requests handled per week, number of teachers certified)
- cost measures (cost per student, cost per teacher, cost per meal)
- customer satisfaction measures (percent favorable responses on surveys)

Status Indicators:

✓=Met target

◆=Improved over baseline, but did not meet target

\$=On hold due to budget issues

X=Did not meet target

DP=Data pending

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------------------|------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------|--------|
| Goal 1: Improve Student Achievement | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 Improve student achievement by centrally developing, fully implementing locally, and continuously evaluating a rigorous, cohesive curriculum and instructional model and programs, complete with scope, sequence, schedule, formative assessments and rapid response teams. | 1 | EA2 EA3 EA6 | 1 | YWB | Process Measures: 1.1.a Date of completion for the new and revised curriculum and instructional model for all core area subjects for all grade levels. | N/A | 8/15/05 reading and math | 9/1/05 & 8/30/06 | Update Yearly | ✓ |
| | | EA2 EA3 EA6 | 1 | YWB | 1.1.b Date of full implementation for the division's formative student assessment tool and process. | N/A | 9/05 tool selected 1/06 qtrly data to the desktop | 6/06 tool selected 10/06 projected data to the desktop | Review Yearly | ✓ |
| | | | 1 | YWB | 1.1.c % of all students in grades two through eighth who are making satisfactory progress toward mastery of curricula as indicated by district formative assessments at the 1 st , 2 nd and 3 rd quarters. | N/A | Set Baseline | Baseline: Q1 50% Q2 60% Q3 70% | 70% | ✓ |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|-------------------------------|----------|-----|------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|--------|
| | | | 1 | YWB | 1.1.d Date of completion for setting targets for division and school achievement | N/A | 9/05 target set for schools | 9/30/06 target set for schools | Update Yearly | ✓ |
| | | | 1 | YWB | Outcome Measures: 1.1.e % of eligible children enrolled in Pre-school education programs that meet or exceed standards as indicated by local assessments. | TBD in 2005/06 | Set Baseline | 70% (8 of 8 standards) | 70% | ✓ |
| | | | 1 | YWB | 1.1.f % of all third grade students that complete the year reading at or above grade level as indicated by district and state assessments. | 74% 2004-05 | 78% | 79% | 90% | ✓ |
| | | | 1 | YWB | 1.1.g % of schools that demonstrate mastery in all subject areas as demonstrated by achieving full state accreditation. | 39 schools 76% 2003-04 | 41 schools 80% | 44/51 schools 86% | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | 1 | YWB | 1.1.h % of schools that achieve AYP | 27 schools 52% | 30 schools (58%) | 40/51 schools (78%) | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | 1 | YWB | 1.1.i % of students in senior class who graduate. | 94% 2003-04 | 96% | 95% | 100% | ◆ |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|-------------------------------|----------|-----|------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | 1 | YWB | 1.1.j % of students who graduate in 4 years. | 50.26% 2004-05 | 70% | 55.5% 2005-06 data | 85% | DP Waiting for state report |
| | | | 2 | YWB | 1.1.k * % of students taking the SAT that score at or above 500 on the verbal and mathematics subtests. | Verbal = 20% Math= 15% | Verbal = 25% Math = 20% | Verbal= 36.5% Math= 34% | 50% | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | YWB | 1.1.m % of students and adults participating in Career and Technical Education programs who meet national, state and/or local standards. | N/A | Set Baseline | 5% (students & adults meet standards) 78% (teachers industry certified) | 65% | ✓ |
| | | | | | *SAT data do not distinguish among grade levels; some 09, 10, and 11 students take the SAT in addition to seniors. | | | | | |
| | | | 2 | YWB | 1.1.n % of adults who meet national, state and/or local standards, including but not limited to GED and board certification/licensure. | 54% 2004-05 32% 2003-04 | 40% | 61% | 75% | ✓ |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|-------------------------------|----------|-----|------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | | 1 | YWB | 1.1.o % of PASS schools that meet AYP | 50% | 75% | 13/17 76% | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | 1 | YWB | 1.1.p % of PASS schools that reach SOL accreditation. | 76% 13/17 | 85% | 76% 13/17 | 100% | *X See corrective action |
| | | | 2 | YWB | 1.1.q % of high school students enrolled in dual enrollment and AP courses. | 704/ 11% | 15% | 1113 18% | 25% | ✓ |
| | | | | | 1.1.r # of elementary schools that offer foreign language K-2. | 14 | 20 | 16 | 29 schools (100%) | \$ ◆ |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----|------|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| <p>*Corrective Action: School Improvement Areas for 2006-07</p> <p>Boushall: English, Math, History</p> <p>Chandler: English, Math, History</p> <p>Elkhardt: English, Math, History</p> <p>King: English, Math</p> | | | | | <p>Instructional Specialists have observed in all priority middle schools and have developed corrective action plans for each content area. Content area progress is monitored through bi-weekly and 9-week assessments. Staff development sessions have been planned, and are held after school and during planning times. Coaches and tutors have been assigned to teachers and students needing additional assistance.</p> | | | | | |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----|------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Goal 2: Promote a Safe and Nurturing Environment | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Implement a continuum of services to create safe, orderly and nurturing instructional environments to meet the diverse learning needs of all children. | | | 2 | FW | Process Measures: 2.1.a % of RPS school based staff trained in de-escalation process for student discipline and suspension. | 15% | 75% | 40% | 100% | ◆ |
| | | | 2 | FW | 2.1.b % of students requiring an alternative education setting who are accommodated within the RCPS. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | 1 | FW | Outcome Measures: 2.1.c % of RCPS schools that meet the federal and state standards for safe and nurturing schools. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | RC | 2.1.d % reduction in out of school suspensions. | 5,376 (2004-05) | 10% reduction | 5,892 9.59% increase | 40% reduction from 2004-05 | *X See corrective action |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----|------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------|
| <p>*Corrective Action: To decrease out of school suspensions for 2006-07, with a focus on the top 2 disciplinary infraction codes, defiance and disruptive demonstrations.</p> | | | | | <p>Strategies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training all staff in Fred Jones Model by Sept. 2007 • Implement Resolving Conflict Creatively Model in 7 elementary schools • Provide T/TAC Training for schools in partnership with VCU • Continuously track disciplinary referrals and intervene where appropriate • Roundtable discussion w/ schools, using past violation data to determine appropriate intervention • Implement a task force to recommend alternatives to out-of-school suspension • Determine and implement strategies for rewarding positive student behavior | | | | | |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----|------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------|
| 2.2 Ensure instructionally sound and safe facilities through a facility planning process that uses standards that support educational objectives. | 1 | | 2 | TS | Process Measures: 2.2.a % of the RCPS Facilities Master Plan phase I that is implemented. | N/A | Set Baseline | 15.8% (3/19 sites) | TBD | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | TS | 2.2.b % of CIP projects that are completed on schedule and within budget. | N/A | 75% | 11/14 79% (within budget) 11/14 79% (on schedule) | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | | TS | Outcome Measures: 2.2.c % of schools in compliance with federal and state standards including but not limited to ADA, technology, safety: | | | | | |
| | | | | | - technology | 65% | 75% | 89% | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | | | - ADA | 8% | 10% | 8% (5/61 sites) | TBD | ✗ |
| | | | | | - safety | 100% | 100% | 100% (safety staff at all sites are certified) | 100% | ✓ |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----|------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------|
| Goal 3: Provide Strong Leadership | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Implement an aligned system of management processes to include strategic planning, balanced scorecard, project management, school improvement planning, and department balanced scorecards. | 4 | | 2 | DJS | Process Measures: 3.1.a % of PMOC projects completed on time and on budget. | N/A | 70% | 61% 11 of 18 projects | 90% | \$ ◆ |
| | | | 2 | DJS | 3.1.b % of stakeholder groups receiving clear communications to convey the purpose and effect of the balanced scorecard. | N/A | 100% of administrators | 100% of administrators | 100% of employees | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | DJS | Outcome Measures: 3.1.c % of departments and schools with a balanced scorecard and individual accountability tied to the BSC. | N/A | 100% | 97% (61/63) total: 51/51 schools 10/12 depart- ments | 100% | ◆ |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------------------|------|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 3.2 Implement an evaluation system of individual accountability that is aligned with division, school and/or department goals and expected outcomes. | 3 | | 2 | HF | Outcome Measure: 3.2.a % of principals, non-instructional administrators and support staff who are rated as high-performing employees by their direct supervisors. (High performing means they use best practices to meet the needs of their internal and external constituents and they provide effective and efficient customer service.) | N/A | Establish Baseline | 40% 21 of 52 principals rated "EE" for service to com- munity | 75% improve- ment over 2006 baseline | ✓ |
| 3.3 Implement a performance accountability and review process to ensure that support activities are conducted in a timely, cost effective and high-quality manner. | 2,4 | EA4 EA5 EA6 | 2 | TS | Process Measures: 3.3.a Date when the division has established the process, organization and technology (data warehouse) for managing, organizing and evaluating data, including but not limited to assessment, federal and state compliance, financial and operational data. | N/A | 1/06 (phase I) | N/A | 1/08 | ⌘ |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|-------------------------------|----------|-----|------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| | | | 2 | TS | 3.3.b Date when data warehouse tools are used for analysis and treatment as an operational process. | N/A | 6/08 | N/A | 11/08 | \$ |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|-------------------------------|----------|-----|------|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------|---------|
| | | | 2 | TS | Outcome Measures: 3.3.c % difference between RCPS administrative costs and comparable districts as defined by Project SERVE and as compared to Norfolk. | 2004-2005: 2.60% (Administrative costs as % of total budget) Third lowest in administrative spending (compared with Project SERVE "comparable districts") In Norfolk, admin. costs are 54% higher than in Richmond. | Within 10% | TBD (awaiting 2006 data) | Within 5% | DP ◆ |
| | | | 2 | TS | 3.3.d Average percentage of favorable ratings on internal customer satisfaction surveys for departments listed below. | 2005-06 | Establish baseline | N/A (Actual is baseline) | 90% | |
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instruction & Accountability (C&I, EC, Guidance, SpEd, Research and Evaluation, Testing) | 85% | | | | ✓ |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|-------------------------------|----------|-----|------|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| | | | | | • Public Information Office | 86% | | | | ✓ |
| | | | | | • Professional Development and HRD | 89% | | | | ✓ |
| | | | | | • Pupil Personnel. | 85% | | | | ✓ |
| | | | | | • Technology | 71% | | | | ✓ |
| | | | | | • Finance and Internal Audit | 90% | | | | ✓ |
| | | | | | • Transportation | 74% | | | | ✓ |
| | | | | | • Plant Services and Property Management (Warehouse) | 84% | | | | ✓ |
| | | | | | • Purchasing (Textbooks) | 86% | | | | ✓ |
| | | | | | • Telecommunications | 87% | | | | ✓ |
| | | | | | • Budget/Planning | 92% | | | | ✓ |
| | | | | | • Risk | 91% | | | | ✓ |
| | | | | | • Food Services | 68% | | | | ✓ |
| | | | | | • Health Services | 88% | | | | ✓ |
| | | | | | • Grants | 85% | | | | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | TS | 3.3.e Percentage of performance targets (financial and workload) met for the departments listed above for service activities: | N/A | 80% | | 100% | ◆ |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------|------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction & Accountability (C&I/EC/Guidance, SpEd, Research and Evaluation, Testing) | TBD 2005-06 | Set Baseline | 81% | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Services (HR, PIO, Partnerships, Professional Development)) | TBD 2005-06 | Set Baseline | 92% | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finance & Operations (Budget/Planning, Finance, Grants, Technology, Plant Services, Property Management, Transportation, Purchasing, Risk, Nutrition, Telecommunications) | TBD 2005-06 | Set Baseline | 70% | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | TS | 3.3.f % of all grant funds, including but not limited to Title I funds, that are spent in direct support of division, school and/or department goals. | TBD in 2005-06 | 80% | 100% | 100% | ✓ |
| 3.4 Implement a program of HR/Teacher Recruitment, Retention and Placement to meet the goals of division and ensure that schools are equitably staffed. | 3 | EA 4 | 2 | HF | Process Measures: 3.4.a % of schools that are fully staffed with instructional personnel prior to the first student day of the school year. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | HF | Outcome Measures: 3.4.b % of schools staffed according to a gold standard (highly qualified) in each area below: | | | | | |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|-------------------------------|----------|-----|------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------|
| | | | | | - clear licensure (100% of teachers) | 50% | 60% | 93% | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | | | - advanced degrees (65%) | TBD in 2005-06 | Set Baseline | 4% (74% of schools have 30%-64% of classroom teachers with advanced degrees; 36% of all classroom teachers have advanced degrees) | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | | | - first year teachers average teacher experience (25% or less) | TBD 2005-06 | Set Baseline | 98% | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | | | - national board certification (15%) | TBD in 2005-06 | Set Baseline | 0% (26% of schools have at least 1 Nat. Bd. teacher) | 100% | ◆ |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------------|------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------|
| | | | | | - teachers with over 5 years experience (75%) | TBD 2005-06 | Set Baseline | 26% | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | HF | 3.4.c Level of effectiveness of teachers as determined by increases in student achievement - % of teachers with an overall increase in students' SOL scores. | TBD from 2004-05 data | Set Baseline | TBD (pending implemen- tation of data ware- house) | 100% | \$ |
| Goal 4: Enhance Capacity Building through Professional Development | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 Implement a quality professional development program for all staff that is aligned with the division, school and/or department goals and expected outcomes. | 3 | EA4 EA6 | 2 | HF | Process Measures: 4.1.a % of instructional and support staff who complete professional development designed to deepen content knowledge or to improve the use of research based strategies and best practices to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards. | N/A | 100% | 100% | 100% | ✓ |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----|------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------|
| | | | 2 | HF | Outcome Measures: 4.1.b % of all licensed administrators who meet new state standards for endorsements and certification. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | 1 | HF | 4.1.c % of teachers in RCPS who are highly qualified in accordance with RPS policy, State and Federal guidelines. | 98.4% | 99% (exclude special ed for 2006) | 99.12% | 100% | ✓ |
| Goal 5: Strengthen Collaborations with Stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 Implement a comprehensive and aligned system of partnering and volunteering leading to more meaningful involvement in schools resulting in increased student achievement. | 1 | EA2 | 2 | HF | Outcome Measure: 5.1.a % increase in the number of business, government, civic, and community partnerships designed to impact specific district goals. | 300 in 2005-06 | 10% over baseline | 321 7% over baseline (1/2206 VA Mentoring Partnership survey) | 25% over baseline | ◆ |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----|------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|--------|
| 5.2 Collaborate with appropriate local entities to implement a plan to increase student attendance and access to health services and to reduce truancy and dropout rates. | 1 | EA2 | 2 | IJ | Outcome Measures: 5.2.a % of students dropping out. | 15% (03-04) 4.71% (04-05) | 10% | 2.5% | 2% | ✓ |
| | | | 1 | IJ | 5.2.b % of schools that meet the overall NCLB standard for attendance and for all NCLB subgroups: | | | | | ✓ |
| | | | | | NCLB overall | 54% 27/50 | 36% | 62% 31/50 | | ✓ |
| | | | | | all NCLB subgroups | 20% 10/50 | 36% | 28% 14/50 | | ◆ |
| | | | | | 5.2.c % of students/families that have access to health care services as reported by FAMIS. | TBD 2004-05 | Set Baseline | 86% | TBD | ✓ |
| | | | | | 5.2.d % of early childhood students that participate in health care screening. | 85% | 100% | 100% | 100% | ✓ |
| 5.3 Establish and implement protocol for internal and external communications throughout RPS. | 1 | | 2 | HF/FC | Process Measure: 5.3.a Date when protocol is available for use. | N/A | 01/06 | 12/06 (Target) | Update Yearly | ◆ |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----|------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------|
| 5.4 Implement a collaborative communications model to inform internal stakeholders about division goals, objectives and strategies in strategic plan and BSC. | 1 | | 2 | HF/FC | Outcome Measures 5.4.a % of administrative staff trained on BSC. | N/A | 100% | 100% | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | | HF/FC | 5.4.b % of teachers informed of BSC | N/A | 100% | 100% | 100% | ✓ |
| | | | | HF/FC | 5.4.c % of support staff informed of BSC | N/A | 100% | 100% | 100% | ✓ |
| Goal 6: Increase Parent & Community Satisfaction | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.1 Implement a comprehensive and aligned system of support for parents and guardians leading to more meaningful involvement in schools with a focus on increased student achievement, improved attendance, reduced disciplinary infractions, and fewer dropouts. | 1 | EA2 | 2 | HF/FC | Process Measures: 6.1.a % of parents who signed student/parent compact (Title I). | 21% | 40% | 21% | 90% | ◆ |
| | | | 2 | HF/FC | 6.1.b % of parents in all elementary and middle schools who attend 1 st quarter parent conference. | 33% | Set Baseline | 33% | 90% | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | HF/FC | 6.1.c Number of parent volunteers. | 1866 | Set Baseline | 1866 | 75% | ✓ |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|-------------------------------|----------|-----|------|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------------|----------------------|-------------|--------|
| | | | | HF/FC | 6.1.d % of schools who have active PTA/PTO units. | 65% | 75% | TBD | 100% | DP |
| | | | 2 | HF/FC | Outcome Measures: 6.1.e % of Richmond pre-kindergarten students who choose to attend RCPS elementary schools. | N/A | Set Baseline | 76% 1030/1354 | 85% | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | HF/FC | 6.1.f % of students enrolled in RCPS elementary schools who choose to attend RCPS middle schools. | N/A | Set Baseline | 87% 1517/1743 | 85% | ✓ |
| | | | 2 | HF/FC | 6.1.g % of students enrolled in RCPS middle schools who choose to attend RCPS high schools. | N/A | Set baseline | 86% 1562/ 1823 | 85% | ✓ |

| Strategic Objective (by Goal) | BSC Cat. | MOU | Tier | Sponsor | Measures | Baseline | 2006 Target | 2006 Actual | 2009 Target | Status |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|------------|------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6.2 Ensure needed resources are allocated for all students through an objective process using standards and allocation formulas. | 1 | EA7 EA8 | 1 | TS | Outcome Measure: 6.2.a % of schools at acceptable standard for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - media resources - media equipment - technology - textbooks - instructional supplies, materials and equipment - co-curricular programs - course offerings - CTE course offerings | TBD | Set standard in 2005-06 | 12/06 (Target pending approval of acceptable standard criteria) | 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% | DP  |

Acceptable Standard Setting for 6.2.a

Media Resources

Books (10 per child) copyright date no more than 15 years old

Videos

Online resources

Journals

1 set encyclopedias (less than 5 years old)

Magazines

Media Equipment

| | | |
|------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| _____ 1 | circulation desk | _____ Video Streaming |
| _____ 5 | student work stations | _____ Automated System |

Technology Equipment

| | |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| _____ Digital Camera/video camera | _____ Smart Board |
| _____ Overhead Projector | _____ Document Camera |
| _____ Disc Players | _____ CBL Equipment |
| _____ Video Teleconferencing Camera | _____ Probeware |
| _____ T.V. | _____ Color Copiers |
| _____ LCD Projector | _____ Poster Maker |
| _____ CD Players | _____ Laminator |
| _____ Cameras | _____ Timers |
| _____ VCR/DVD Players | _____ Scanners |
| _____ CD/DVD Writer | _____ Computers |
| _____ Tape Recorders | _____ Printers |
| _____ AverKey (connect TV to computer) | _____ Calculators |
| _____ Lab-on-a-Cart | _____ TI Navigators |

Textbooks (current within 6 years)

- 1 Copy for each child in core content areas
- 1 Class set for electives
- Every teacher has all resources with textbooks

Course Offerings

- Distance Learning
- Based on student request
- Dual enrollment
- Co-curriculum programs
- Zone school and other program offerings

(Attachment II of the MOU) Division-Level Academic Review: Summary of Key Responsibilities

| VISIT TYPE | Superintendent | Central Office Staff | Review Team |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Monitoring team Visits</p> | <p><u>Before:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure staff are prepared for visit • Ensure completion of any additional tasks assigned • Prepare documentation of plan development/implementation and essential action implementation according to timelines • Establish work space for team with computer/printer and internet access • Inform board of pending follow-up visit, and determine if any will attend exit meeting <p><u>During:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide reviewers with any additional/new information that may impact findings • Be available to reviewers on days of review to answer follow-up questions • Provide division-level information, as needed, to assist reviewers • Attend exit meeting (Cumulative Progress Report) with up to 2 board members, if any <p><u>After:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debrief with staff • Present findings at board meeting • Take additional action as necessary, based upon results of follow-up visit | <p><u>Before:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare documents and complete tasks, as assigned by review team, in preparation for follow-up visit. • Assist superintendent as requested <p><u>During:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be available to reviewers on days of review to answer follow-up questions • Provide division-level information, as needed, to assist reviewers • Attend exit meeting (presentation of Cumulative Progress Report), if requested by superintendent <p><u>After:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assist superintendent in developing and implementing corrective action plan and implementing essential actions, as requested | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare materials for follow-up visit • Confirm visit date with superintendent • Coordinate with all review team members <p><u>During:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze data • Review tasks to have been completed • Analyze corrective action plan development/implementation • Interview staff, superintendent • Prepare Cumulative Progress Report • Share results with superintendent and board member(s) <p><u>After:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare final Review of Findings and mail to superintendent and board chair • Present findings to Board of Education |

Throughout the Division-Level Academic Review process, the local school board should take those actions necessary that will enable the superintendent and central office staff to assist the board in meeting its responsibilities for increasing educational performance as described in the Standards of Quality.