

# Virginia Board of Education Agenda Item



**Agenda Item:** F

**Date:** January 28, 2016

<b>Title</b>	First Review of Requests for Continued Rating of <i>Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School</i> from Seven School Divisions		
<b>Presenter</b>	Beverly Rabil, Director, Office of School Improvement, Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement		
<b>E-mail</b>	Beverly.Rabil@doe.virginia.gov	<b>Phone</b>	(804) 225-2865

**Purpose of Presentation:**

Action required by Board of Education regulation.

**Previous Review or Action:**

Previous review and action. Specify date and action taken below:

Date: October 23, 2014: Final Review of Requests for Conditional Accreditation from Nine School Divisions

**Action Requested:**

Action will be requested at a future meeting. Specify anticipated date below:

February 25, 2016

**Alignment with Board of Education Goals: Please indicate (X) all that apply:**

X	Goal 1: Accountability for Student Learning
	Goal 2: Rigorous Standards to Promote College and Career Readiness
	Goal 3: Expanded Opportunities to Learn
	Goal 4: Nurturing Young Learners
	Goal 5: Highly Qualified and Effective Educators
	Goal 6: Sound Policies for Student Success
	Goal 7: Safe and Secure Schools
	Other Priority or Initiative. Specify:

**Background Information and Statutory Authority:**

Goal 1: Considering the request for *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from Seven School Divisions for nine schools will support accountability for student learning.

8 VAC 20-131-300.C states that a school shall be rated *Accreditation Denied* based on its academic performance and its failure to achieve the minimum threshold for the graduation and completion index required to be rated *Fully Accredited* or *Provisionally Accredited-Graduation Rate*, for the preceding three consecutive years or for three consecutive years anytime thereafter.

As outlined in 8 VAC 20-131-315, as an alternative to the Memorandum of Understanding required for schools rated *Accreditation Denied*, a local school board may choose to reconstitute the school and apply to the Board of Education for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School*. The

application shall include specific responses that address all areas of deficiency that resulted in the *Accreditation Denied* status.

If a local school board chooses to reconstitute a school, it may annually apply for an accreditation rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* as provided for in 8 VAC 20-131-300.C.5. The *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* rating may be granted for a period not to exceed three years if the school is making progress toward a rating of *Fully Accredited* in accordance with the terms of the Board of Education’s approval of the reconstitution application. The school will revert to a status of *Accreditation Denied* if it fails to meet the requirements to be rated *Fully Accredited* by the end of the three-year term or if it fails to have its annual application for such rating renewed.

**Summary of Important Issues:**

The following nine schools were granted a rating of *Conditionally Accredited* for the 2014-2015 school year and are seeking continuation of this status by requesting a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School*.

Name of Division	Name of School Requesting Rating of <i>Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School</i>
Dinwiddie County Public Schools	Dinwiddie Middle School
Hampton City Public Schools	Jane H. Bryan Elementary School
Lynchburg City Public Schools	Sandusky Middle School
Norfolk City Public Schools	P. B. Young, Sr. Elementary School (PK-2)
Norfolk City Public Schools	Tidewater Park Elementary School
Petersburg City Public Schools	Vernon Johns Junior High School
Richmond City Public Schools	Thomas C. Boushall Middle School
Richmond City Public Schools	Armstrong High School
Virginia Beach City Public Schools	Bayside Middle School

Achievement data for each school division and each school’s application for Conditional Accreditation are included in Attachments A1-A7.

Technical Assistance

All schools granted continued ratings of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will participate in the Aligning Academic Review and Performance Evaluation (AARPE) technical assistance from the VDOE. Technical assistance will focus on developing sample evidence for the sample performance indicators in Teacher Performance Standard 4: Assessment of and for Learning. The sample evidence for each performance indicator will become a tool that can enhance the division’s observation tools. Principals/division staff will use their own work as a starting point and will bring “real work” artifacts to each session throughout the year.

In addition to the Technical Assistance described in the Board materials, school divisions with schools that are approved for a continued rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will be required to enter into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the Essential Actions that must occur in 2015-2016. School divisions that are denied their requests for a continued rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Board of Education.

**Impact on Fiscal and Human Resources:**

The Office of School Improvement will use the academic review budget to fund contractors for the Aligning Academic Review and Performance Evaluation (AARPE) technical assistance sessions and any additional technical assistance.

**Timetable for Further Review/Action:**

Final review is expected at the February 25, 2016, Board meeting.

**Superintendent's Recommendation:**

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Virginia Board of Education receive for first review the requests from seven divisions for continued ratings of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for nine schools.

**State Accountability - Accreditation Designation**

Accreditation is based on assessments taken in the previous year.

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Accreditation Rating	Area(s) of Warning
2010-2011	2009-2010	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	N/A
2011-2012	2010-2011	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	Mathematics, History
2012-2013	2011-2012	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	Mathematics
2013-2014	2012-2013	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	English, Science
2014-2015	2013-2014	<i>Conditionally Accredited</i>	English
2015-2016	2014-2015	<i>TBD</i>	English, Science

**State Accreditation Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
English	89%	82%	85%	60%	64%	67%
Mathematics	72%	66%	62%	71%	72%	70%
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	64%	72%	62%
History	74%	69%	77%	70%	70%	81%
Graduation Completion Index	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Federal Accountability Status (Applicable to Title I schools only.)**

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Federal Rating	Federal Status
2010-2011	2009-2010	Not Title I	Did Not Make AYP
2011-2012	2010-2011	Not Title I	Did Not Make AYP
2012-2013	2011-2012	Not Title I	Improvement Plan Required
2013-2014	2012-2013	Not Title I	Improvement Plan Required
2014-2015	2013-2014	Not Title I	Improvement Plan Required
2015-2016	2014-2015	Not Title I	Improvement Plan Required

**Federal Accountability Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
Reading	87%	81%	84%	62%	62%	66%
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	54%	58%	59%
Mathematics	70%	64%	60%	69%	70%	65%
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	64%	73%	62%
History	75%	71%	77%	65%	70%	80%

MR. WILLIAM DAVID CLARK  
Superintendent

BONNIE L. GHOLSON  
Clerk of the Board

Kelley B. Frakes  
12945 Hatcher Drive  
Church Road, Virginia 23833  
William R. Haney  
3615 Shoreview Drive  
Sutherland, Virginia 23885  
Gregory K. McCammon  
12500 Courthouse Road  
Dinwiddie, Virginia 23841



Sherilyn H. Merritt  
25136 Floyd Avenue  
Petersburg, Virginia 23803  
Barbara T. Pittman  
14408 Monks Neck Road  
Petersburg, Virginia 23805

## Dinwiddie County Public Schools

Office of the Superintendent  
P.O. Box 7 / 14016 Boydton Plank Road ♦ Dinwiddie, Virginia 23841-0007  
(804) 469-4190 / Fax (804) 469-4197  
[www.dinwiddie.k12.va.us](http://www.dinwiddie.k12.va.us)

July 24, 2014

Mr. Christian N. Braunlich  
President  
Commonwealth of Virginia Board of Education  
P.O. Box 2120  
Richmond, VA 23218

Dear Mr. Braunlich and Board Members:

In accordance with Standard 8 VAC.20-131-315 of the Virginia Standards of Accreditation, a school division may seek “Conditional Accreditation” by application from the Virginia State Board of Education. This letter serves as an official application from the Dinwiddie County School Board and Superintendent for Conditional Accreditation status for Dinwiddie Middle School based on changes in student population/demographics, changes in school consolidation/SOL data, changes in staff population, and shared governance under the school reconstitution model.

Dinwiddie Middle School is the only middle school in Dinwiddie County, a rural area adjacent to the City of Petersburg to the north and Nottoway County to the south. During the 2013-14 school year, Dinwiddie Middle School served 1,033 students in grades 6 through 8. The breakdown of our student population was Caucasian – 52%, African-American - 37%, Two or more races – 5%, Hispanic – 5%, and American Indian or Asian – 1%. Fifty percent of the student population qualifies for participation in the free/reduced lunch program, and four out of the five feeder elementary schools are Title I schools.

For the 2014-15 school year 72 teachers and other staff will provide services to our middle school students. Of the 72, 64 of those are classroom teachers; 48 are fully licensed in their respective content areas, with 9 being provisionally licensed and 7 positions are currently undetermined as we continue to seek qualified applicants. Based on the 2013-14 teacher evaluation data, 90.1% of teachers and staff members were rated as either proficient or exemplary, while 9.9% were rated either developing/needs improvement or unsatisfactory. Please refer to Attachment A – Teacher Performance and Licensure Data, for additional information.

Prior to 2008-09 Dinwiddie Middle School served grades 6-8. Beginning with the 2008-09 school year the grade configuration changed and the middle school served grades 6 and 7, Dinwiddie Junior High served grades 8 and 9, and Dinwiddie High School served grades 10-12. This was necessitated due to increased enrollment at the secondary level as well as completion of a new, larger high school building. Beginning with the 2012-13 school year, due to an unexpected decline in student population as well as a reduction in state revenues it was necessary to re-configure for a second time our secondary schools back to a traditional scenario with Dinwiddie Middle School housing grades 6-8 and Dinwiddie High School housing grades 9-12.

From 2008-12, grades six and seven struggled with SOL results especially in the area of mathematics at Dinwiddie Middle School. At the same time, Dinwiddie Junior High School had very good scores and was fully accredited. When the consolidation back into the more traditional secondary configuration occurred during the 2012-13 school year, none of the SOL scores from the Junior High was allowed to be used toward accreditation at either the middle school or the high school. This put the newly consolidated middle school in the "Accredited with Warning" category in the area of math. Using a three year average in conjunction with grade eight SOL scores would have allowed the middle school to reach full accreditation. However, when mathematics scores improved in 2012-13, English scores decreased during the implementation of new tests and a change in the pass rate from 70% to 75%. For further clarification and comparison please refer to Attachment B.

Dinwiddie Middle School, having previously been identified as hard to staff, continues to have a very inexperienced teaching staff. During the 2013-14 school year, 69% of the English teachers had 5 years or less experience, with 39% having less than 3 years experience. 50% of the entire faculty had 5 years or less teaching experience. For the 2014-15 school year, 77% of the English teachers will have 5 years or less of teaching experience and 58% of the entire faculty will have 5 years or less teaching experience. Dinwiddie Middle School will have 15 new teachers this school year due retirements, non-renewals and resignations. In addition to staff changes, the master schedule has been adjusted to provide daily instruction in the areas of English and mathematics. History, science, physical education and electives will be taught in a semester block of 78 minutes per period. A forty minute remediation, enrichment and/or extension time has been included in the daily schedule. Please see Attachment C for a comprehensive list of strategies and initiatives implemented in 2013-14 as well as new programs proposed for 2014-15.

The "Conditionally Accredited" status is being requested under the reconstitution model of shared governance. A Shared Governance Committee will be established with its primary role to oversee and monitor improvement of the overall English program. The committee will be comprised of teachers, administrators, central office staff, a parent, and a VDOE consultant/coach. This committee will make data driven decisions to improve instruction in all areas with specific emphasis on reading and writing with the final goal of having Dinwiddie Middle School "Fully Accredited". The committee will be required to report regularly to the school superintendent as well as the Dinwiddie School Board as shown in Attachment D.

In closing, it is our hope that based on the rationale outlined above and the creation of a governance committee to oversee and monitor the English instruction, you will grant Dinwiddie Middle School its request for "Conditional Accreditation" status.

Sincerely,



Barbara Pittman  
Chairman  
Dinwiddie County School Board

Attachment A  
Dinwiddie Middle School  
Current Grade Span: 6<sup>th</sup> thru 8<sup>th</sup>  
Dinwiddie County Public Schools

**Teacher Performance and Licensure Data**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Number of Teachers</b>	<b>Percent of All Teachers</b>	<b>Area of Teaching</b>
<b>Number and percent of teachers scoring above proficient in 2013-2014</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7%</b>	
<b>Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015</b>	<b>5</b>		
<b>Number and percent of teachers scoring proficient in 2013-2014</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>83.1%</b>	
<b>Number of the proficient teachers returning in 2014-2015</b>	<b>49</b>		
<b>Number and percent of teachers scoring below proficient in 2013-2014</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9.9%</b>	
<b>Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015</b>	<b>5</b>		
<b>Number and percent of teachers fully licensed in 2014-2015</b>	<b>56*</b>	<b>78%*</b>	
<b>Number and percent of new teachers to the school in 2014-2015</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20%</b>	
<b>Number and percent of provisional teachers in 2014-2015</b>	<b>9*</b>	<b>12%*</b>	
<b>Number and percent of teachers not teaching in their endorsed area in 2014-2015 (name each area in which teachers are not endorsed)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	
<b>Number and percent of long-term substitutes-that may be employed possibly more than 45 days (licensed or not licensed) in 2014-2015 (name each area in which there is a long-term substitute that may be employed more than 45 days)</b>	<b>1#</b>	<b>1%#</b>	<b>Spanish (possibly)</b>

Note: Seven positions have not been filled at the time of this submission, so they are not included in the number/percentages for fully or provisionally licensed teachers. This can be updated once all staff is hired.

\*-These numbers and corresponding percentages will change once the 7 open positions are filled.

#-There is a possibility that a long-term sub may need to be used if a qualified Spanish teacher cannot be hired.

**Principal Tenure at this School and description of track record of success in working in a low-performing school: Explain in a paragraph**

**Al Cappellanti is a veteran administrator who has completed eight years as principal in Dinwiddie County Public Schools. He was appointed principal of Dinwiddie Middle (6-8) in May of 2006 with the school being “Accredited with Warning”. With secondary school reorganization in 2008 he left the Middle School to become principal of Dinwiddie Junior High. At this time the Dinwiddie Middle School was at “Fully Accredited” status and would remain so until 2011. While at the junior high, his school achieved full accreditation until reorganization in 2012 when Dinwiddie County returned to a more conventional secondary model of high school (9-12) and middle school (6-8). During his return to the middle school he has helped provide guidance that has seen improvement in SOL results in mathematics and science. The school has identified reading and writing as an area that improvement must occur to move to full accreditation. Mr. Cappellanti understands the importance of improving achievement to meet the goals for the school and the division. His success previously at Dinwiddie Middle School and at the Dinwiddie Junior High shows that he has the ability to work with students and staff that are in a school not performing at acceptable levels.**

**Area(s) of Reconstitution:**

**Governance**

**Change in Staff**

**Change in Instructional Program**

Attachment B

Reading SOL scores – 2011-12/2012-13/2013-14 comparisons

	2011-12 <u>pass rate</u> <b>Old test</b>	2012-13 <u>pass rate</u> <b>New test</b>	2013-14 <u>pass rate</u> <b>New test</b>	<u>Difference</u>
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade	88%	62%	64%*	+ 2%
7 <sup>th</sup> Grade	80%	66%	64%*	- 2%
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade	<b>84%</b>	58%	64%*	+ 6%
<b>Bold – 8<sup>th</sup> grade scores could not be used in 3 year average</b>				
* - with recovery included				

Writing SOL scores – 2011-12/2012-13/2013-14 comparisons

	2011-12 <u>pass rate</u> <b>Old test</b>	2012-13 <u>pass rate</u> <b>New test</b>	2013-14 <u>pass rate</u> <b>New test</b>	<u>Difference</u>
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade	<b>82%</b>	55%	57%	+ 2%
<b>Bold – 8<sup>th</sup> grade scores could not be used in 3 year average</b>				

**Strategies/initiatives implemented/begun during the 2013-14 school year**

- New lesson plan template was implemented mid-year (based on VDOE post-review report)
- Curriculum was reviewed and adjusted mid-year (based on VDOE post-review report)
- Staff development on unpacking of Standards of Learning and determining cognitive levels utilizing Bloom's Taxonomy
- New PLC (Professional Learning Community) meeting template was implemented mid-year (based on VDOE post-review report)
- New walk-through template was created for English, History, and Science. Separate Math walk-through form was created
- Math Coach hired to oversee the delivery of support and resources to middle and high school math teachers
- Master Schedule was adjusted to make-up lost time due to snow days – additional core time added – April/May
- SOL Math and Reading tutors/classes worked with at-risk students – pull-out elective classes and in-class tutoring
- Selected to participate in VTSS (Virginia Tiered Support System) program (VDOE initiative)
- Staff Development targeted English and topics related to Special Education/Inclusion (VTSS)
- Lesson Plans and quarterly assessments developed collaboratively
- Assessment data reviewed and strategies developed to address needs
- After-school SOL Booster camps sessions
- Algebra Readiness Initiative (ARDT)
- MAP was purchased and given in Spring as a diagnostic tool for Reading

**Strategies/initiatives implemented/continued for 2014-15 school year**

- New lesson plan template implemented - continued
- Curriculum reviewed and adjusted – summer 2014
- New PLC (Professional Learning Community) meeting template implemented - continued

**Attachment C  
(continued)**

- Pre/post and benchmarks assessments developed collaboratively – August 2014
- Lesson Plans developed collaboratively during weekly content meetings - ongoing
- VTSS (Virginia Tiered Support System) initiative continued with greater implementation of resources, strategies, and initiatives
- MAP Reading and Math diagnostic assessments given as pre, mid-year, and post assessments – used to identify students needing remediation, enrichment, extension, along with Tiered II & III intervention strategies
- Weekly English Instructional meetings are planned with the administration during planning time (develop lessons plans, discuss assessment data, and plan for remediation)
- One monthly faculty meeting designated as VTSS Professional Development time – Schedule attached as Attachment D
- Assistant principal in charge of English will be freed up of other responsibilities to do more walkabouts, observations, and monitoring of overall English programs/initiatives
- Hire a Middle School Reading Specialist and Reading teacher to work with teachers and students; developing overall school reading program, working with students in small groups, monitor pacing, instructional delivery, review assessment data, conduct staff development, and serve on the Oversight Committee (Reading Specialist)
- Positive Behavior Support System (with VTSS assistance) implemented
- Master Schedule adjusted to build in dedicated 40 minute remediation/enrichment/extension time
- Provide mentors and extra support to staff – 8 out of the 13 English teachers have 5 years or less experience; over 50% of the faculty has 5 years or less teaching experience
- Create an English Oversight Committee (Shared Governance)
- An additional outside person (VDOE Coach) will serve as a school support person on the Oversight Committee
- Writing across the curriculum, Reading in the content area/classrooms, SIM (Strategic Instruction Model) for special education teachers and co-teaching workshops are some of the professional development activities planned as part of our participation in the VTSS (Virginia Tiered Support System) initiative.

**Shared Governance Oversight Committee Members – not limited to names below**

Alfred Cappellanti – Principal  
Teresa Stump – Assistant Principal  
Edward Banks – Assistant Principal  
Sharon Yates – Director of Secondary Education & CTE  
Director of Assessment & Student Services – TBD  
Royal Gurley – Director of Special Education  
Christie Clarke – Director of Staff Development & Instructional Technology K-12  
Pam Aerni – K-12 Math Coach  
Amber Davis – 8<sup>th</sup> grade English representative/English Department chair/VTSS team member  
Caitlin Hughes -7<sup>th</sup> grade English representative – new hire  
Brandi Atkins – 6<sup>th</sup> grade English representative  
Reading Specialist – TBD  
Stacy Lewis – Guidance Counselor/VTSS team member  
Aleemah Spence – VTSS team member  
VTSS team member – TBD  
VTSS team member – TBD  
VDOE Coach – TBD  
Parent – TBD

**Shared Governance Oversight Committee Meeting dates**

Time: 4:00 pm to 5:00 pm – 1 hour duration

September 29  
October 27  
November 24  
December 15  
January 26  
February 23  
March 23  
April 27  
May 26  
June – TBD

**Shared Governance Oversight Committee/School Board reporting dates**

August 12, 2014  
October 14, 2014  
December 16, 2014  
February 17, 2015  
April 21, 2015  
June 9, 2015

**Attachment D  
(continued)**

**VTSS Professional/Staff Development Dates:**

Time: 3:00 pm to 4:00 pm – 1 hour duration

September 22

October 20

November 17

December 15

January 20

February 16

March 16

April 20

May 18

Requesting a Conditional: Yes

Conditional or Denied in Past Accreditation Cycles:

Conditional 2007

Reconstitution Type(s) for Conditional: Governance

Link to the corrective action plan:

**Achievement Data**

**State Accountability - Accreditation Designation**

Year	Accreditation Rating	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Area(s) of Warning
2002-2003	<i>Provisionally Accredited/Meets State Standards</i>	2001-2002	N/A
2003-2004	<i>Provisionally Accredited/Needs Improvement</i>	2002-2003	N/A
2004-2005	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2003-2004	English
2005-2006	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2004-2005	English
2006-2007	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2005-2006	Mathematics
2007-2008	<i>Conditionally Accredited</i>	2006-2007	Mathematics
2008-2009	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2007-2008	N/A
2009-2010	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2008-2009	N/A
2010-2011	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2009-2010	N/A
2011-2012	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2010-2011	Mathematics, History
2012-2013	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2011-2012	Mathematics
2013-2014	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2012-2013	English, Science
2014-2015	<i>TBD</i>	2013-2014	English

**Federal Accountability Sanction**

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Federal Status (SIG- PRIOR TO WAIVER PROIRTY/FOCUS OR NOT TITLE I)
2010-2011	2009-2010	Not SIG
2011-2012	2010-2011	Not SIG
2012-2013	2011-2012	Not Title I
2013-2014	2012-2013	Not Title I
2014-2015	2013-2014	Not Title I

**Federal Accountability Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates								State Pass Rates	
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2012-2013	2013-2014
Reading	79%	83%	82%	87%	81%	84%	62%	62%	75%	74%
Writing	78%	81%	N/A				54%	58%	76%	75%
Mathematics	64%	72%	68%	70%	64%	60%	69%	70%	71%	74%
Science	86%	88%	N/A				64%	73%	81%	80%
History	73%	73%	65%	75%	71%	77%	65%	70%	85%	84%

**Graduation and Completion Index, if applicable**

Year	Index
2011	n/a
2012	
2013	
2014	

**State Accountability - Accreditation Designation**

Accreditation is based on assessments taken in the previous year.

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Accreditation Rating	Area(s) of Warning
2010-2011	2009-2010	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	N/A
2011-2012	2010-2011	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	English, Science
2012-2013	2011-2012	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	English, Mathematics
2013-2014	2012-2013	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	English, Mathematics, Science
2014-2015	2013-2014	<i>Conditionally Accredited</i>	English
2015-2016	2014-2015	<i>TBD</i>	English

**State Accreditation Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
English	75%	68%	65%	44%	59%	63%
Mathematics	87%	77%	29%	67%	72%	71%
Science	Gr 3: 72% Gr 4-5: 89%	Gr 3: 58% Gr 4-5: 56%	Gr 3: 61% Gr 4-5: 83%	58%	89%	70%
History	Gr 3: 84% Gr 4-5: 94%	Gr 3: 53% Gr 4-5: 80%	Gr 3: 71% Gr 4-5: 74%	75%	81%	94%
Graduation Completion Index	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Federal Accountability Status (Applicable to Title I schools only.)**

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Federal Rating	Federal Status
2010-2011	2009-2010	Not Title I	Did Not Make AYP
2011-2012	2010-2011	Not Title I	Did Not Make AYP
2012-2013	2011-2012	Not Title I	Priority School
2013-2014	2012-2013	Not Title I	Priority School
2014-2015	2013-2014	Not Title I	Priority School
2015-2016	2014-2015	Not Title I	Higher Expectations Met

**Federal Accountability Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
Reading	70%	64%	61%	48%	54%	65%
Writing	94%	76%	80%	43%	72%	N/A
Mathematics	87%	69%	30%	62%	70%	74%
Science	82%	59%	72%	61%	90%	74%
History	89%	71%	73%	77%	82%	94%



AMERICA'S FIRST  
IN FREE EDUCATION

## School Board of the City of Hampton

July 30, 2014

Mr. Christian N. Braunlich, President  
Commonwealth of Virginia Board of Education  
413 Stuart Circle  
Suite 130  
Richmond, VA 23220

Dear Mr. Braunlich:

Preliminary Standards of Learning pass rates for Jane H. Bryan Elementary School indicate that Bryan Elementary will not be accredited for the 2014-2015 school year. In accordance with Standard of Accreditation 8 VAC 20-131-300.C., we are requesting conditional accreditation based on restructuring school governance.


The school has worked closely with division staff and Cambridge Education (Lead Turnaround Partner) over the last two school years to improve its performance to the point accreditation benchmarks will be met in three of the four core subjects, with the exception of English. Because of the school and division level actions that contributed to strong gains in student performance over the past two years, there is a strong likelihood that Bryan Elementary will meet or exceed all state accreditation benchmarks at the end of the 2014-2015 school year.

Bryan Elementary currently serves 387 students in grades K-5. The demographic make-up of the student population is as follows:

- 71% African-American
- 19% Caucasian
- 6% Hispanic
- 4% Other Ethnic Groups
- 88% Free or Reduced Lunch
- 22% Students with Disabilities

In the two years since Bryan Elementary was identified as a Priority school, scores have improved to the point that the school now meets the accreditation benchmarks in all core subject areas except English. Figure 1 shows the improvement in SOL scores over the past three years. As depicted in the chart, in the areas where the school was warned (English and Math), overall pass rates in mathematics have steadily improved (29% pass rate to 72% pass rate) and now exceed the state benchmark. English pass rates improved by 15 percentage points during the 2013-2014 school year. Improvements in both warned areas reflect the school's intense efforts to adjust teaching strategies and practices to address the rigor of the SOLs in these subjects.

**Figure 1. Bryan SOL Pass Rates (2011-12 through 2013-14)**



At the end of the 2011-2012 school year, the school was reconstituted and replaced 51% of the teaching staff and the school's administrative team. The grade-by-grade changes in staff that occurred are depicted in Table 1.

**Table 1. Bryan Elementary staff changes at the end of the 2011-2012 School Year**

Grades	Changes
K	2 of 3
1	3 of 3
2	1 of 3
3	2 of 3
4	3 of 3
5	2 of 3

In addition to the changes in classroom staffing, the school gained the following personnel:

- One reading specialist
- Two interventionists (one reading, one math)
- One data coach
- One behavior management coach

Of the newly hired teachers, two were first-year teachers. The remaining new hires were comprised of experienced teachers with track records of student success. All new faculty were fully certified and received teaching assignments within their areas of endorsement.

During the 2013-2014 school year, Bryan Elementary employed 24 classroom teachers, four resource teachers (art, music, physical education, library), three instructional support personnel (reading specialist, reading interventionist, math interventionist), a data coach, a behavior management coach, and a guidance counselor. In addition, the school received support from instructional coaches in the areas of reading and math.

Table 2 depicts the anticipated changes in staffing for the 2014-2015 school year. The new staff members are a combination of new and experienced teachers, and all of these individuals will be new to Bryan Elementary. All new hires will once again be fully certified in their teaching assignments. It is also important to note that the school's principal for the previous two school years has resigned and that the assistant principal was appointed interim principal effective July 1, 2014.

**Table 2. Bryan Elementary staff changes for the 2014-15 School Year**

<b>Grades</b>	<b>Change</b>
K	2 of 4
1	1 of 4
2	1 of 3
3	2 of 3
4	2 of 3
5	1 of 3

Hampton City Schools (HCS) contracted with Cambridge Education to serve as the Lead Turnaround Partner (LTP) for Bryan Elementary. In accordance with guidelines established by the VDOE, the LTP will continue to provide support to school leadership in seven areas:

- Strengthening school leadership
- Ensuring effective teaching and learning
- Redesigning the master schedule
- Strengthening the instructional program
- Using data to improvement instruction

**Maintaining a safe school environment**

**Improving parent and community involvement**

Cambridge Education LTP services began with a Collaborative School Quality Review (CSQR) in which selected teachers and administrators from Bryan Elementary and designated HCS central office administrators, along with two Cambridge Education reviewers conducted a two-day school assessment examining six areas of school performance and producing a report that identified the factors in each of the six areas that supported quality teaching and learning, and the factors that prevent teaching and learning from being the best. For example, one finding from the CSQR that supported quality teaching and learning was that the school's leadership team was doing an effective job of developing a clear strategic direction through setting improvement goals to guide its work. In this same finding the review team indicated that expectations have been established and communicated for academic and behavioral norms to students, teachers, and parents. An example of a finding that prevented teaching and learning from being the best was found when the team analyzed lesson plans and conducted classroom observations. For this finding, the review team indicated that planned work is often insufficiently well matched to students' prior attainment or future learning needs and that lesson objectives lack clearly identified outcomes, which limit their value as students are unclear as to what they need to do to succeed. Findings from this CSQR were incorporated into action steps in the school's Indistar plan, and the LTP worked closely with school administrators and teachers throughout the school year to achieve the improvement goals outlined in the plan. The CSQR is an annual process that will be repeated each year of the three-year partnership with Cambridge Education.

In addition to the school improvement support provided by the LTP, HCS has established a support structure in the form of the District Level Support Team (DLST). This committee consists of key curriculum administrators in the division, and the executive directors of school leadership. The DLST convenes four times per year at the end of each grading period to review the following school progress indicators:

- Performance on quarterly benchmarks by gap group
- Student tier movement based on quarterly benchmarks
- Student attendance data
- Indistar plan updates

In these quarterly presentations, teachers and administrators share the data requested, along with detailed descriptions and explanations of both student progress, and areas where improvement is stagnant. In addition, the team engages in a dialogue regarding the support the DLST is providing to the school. For example, this school year Bryan faculty participated in several ongoing professional learning activities related to best practices in reading instruction as a result of ongoing collaboration between the DLST and the


reading instruction as a result of ongoing collaboration between the DLST and the school's leadership team.

Bryan Elementary has made great strides over the past two years and is on the brink of reaching full accreditation. A copy of the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter data presentation made to the DLST in June 2014 shows the progress and achievements of the school and has been enclosed in this letter. The progress shown in the presentation represents the efforts of all school stakeholders in improving the quality of teaching and learning and raising the number of students who are performing at or above expected levels for their grade. The school, with support from the LTP and HCS, has identified the specific strategies that drove the gains in achievement. A plan with specific strategies for addressing areas for improvement has been created and continues to be revised. All parties are committed to doing whatever it takes to move the school to full accreditation, and we are utilizing all available fiscal, human, and community resources to reach this goal.

We look forward to meeting with the Board to make this formal request for conditional accreditation for Jane H. Bryan Elementary School.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Martha M. Mugler". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Martha Mugler  
Chair  
Hampton City School Board

Enclosure

# **Jane H. Bryan Elementary School**




## **DLST Meeting Fourth Quarter Data Presentation**

**2013-14**




# Three-year Trend Data: Core Subjects






# Three-year Trend Data: Reading by Student Sub-Groups



SWD – Students with Disabilities




# Three-year Trend Data: Math by Student Sub-Groups



SWD – Students with Disabilities




# 2014 Gap Group 1: Reading and Math Trend Data



**Gap Group 1 - Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, Economically Disadvantaged Students (unduplicated)**




# 2014 Gap Group 2: Reading and Math Trend Data



Gap Group 2 - Black Students



# 2014 Tier 2 and 3 (Gr. 3-5) Reading Data




Tier 2 N=56  
Tier 3 N=44

Advanced Ontrack Almost Ontrack Off Track




# 2014 Tier 2 and 3 (Gr. 3-5) Math Data



Tier 2 N=66  
Tier 3 N=28



# 2014 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Teachers SOL Pass Rates by Content Area




Teacher 3 – Inclusion

Teacher 4 – Self-Contained



# 2014 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Teachers SOL Pass Rates by Content Area




Teacher 1 – Inclusion

Teacher 4 – Self-Contained



# 2014 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Teachers SOL Pass Rates by Content Area




Teacher 1 – Inclusion  
Teacher 3 – Self-Contained



# Year-to-Year Change/Growth in Math Gr. 3 to Gr. 4 Cohort

## 2014 Grade 4 Math SOL Y2Y Change




- 44 of 49 students showed growth (90%)
- The 17 orange bars are recovery students
- Recovery students comprise 9 of the top 10 students with the highest year-to-year growth



# Year-to-Year Change/Growth in Math Gr. 4 to Gr. 5 Cohort

## 2014 Grade 5 Math SOL Y2Y Change




- 33 of 40 students showed growth (83%)
- The 7 orange bars are recovery students, who are 4 of the top 12 students with the year-to-year highest growth



# Year-to-Year Change/Growth in Reading Gr. 3 to Gr. 4 Cohort

## 2014 Grade 4 Reading SOL Y2Y Change




- **20 of 50 students showed growth (40%)**  
The 4 orange bars are recovery students, and are 3 of the top 12 students with the year-to-year highest growth



# Year-to-Year Change/Growth in Reading Gr. 4 to Gr. 5 Cohort

## 2014 Grade 5 Reading SOL Y2Y Change



- 31 of 41 students showed growth (76%)
- The 10 orange bars are recovery students
- 7 of the top 13 students are recovery students with the year-to-year highest growth



# Number of Identified Students

Grade Level	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Y2Y Change*
Kindergarten	5	10	9	5	-5
First	11	25	11	15	-10
Second	20	22	16	15	-7
Third	26	18	23	14	-4


\*Spring 2013 to Spring 2014





# 1<sup>st</sup> Grade Spelling/Phonics Spring 2014

● Fall 2013 ● Spring 2014






# 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade Spelling/Phonics

● Fall 2013 ● Spring 2014

## Spring 2014




The desirable result is for the green bars to be higher than the blue



# 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Spelling/Phonics

Fall 2013 Spring 2014


## Spring 2014



The desirable result is for the green bars to be higher than the blue




# Kindergarten Oral Language





# First Grade Oral Language





# Tier 2 & Tier 3 Reading

## Areas of Concern

- Lack of foundational vocabulary
- SWD achievement gap

## Areas of Success

- Science waiver
- Reading support (tutoring during and after school; ERIAs, specialist, and interventionist)



# HCS Support for Reading

## Continuing Support

- Replacement of reading coach (i.e., contingency plan)
- Continue to attend and support data disaggregation meetings
- Provisional waivers
- Flexibility to use other research-based strategies and practices to best meet the needs of our students (UVA framework)



# Tier 2 & Tier 3 Math

## Areas of Concern

- Lack of basic math facts
- Multi-step word problems
- Need for common academic language and approach

## Areas of Success

- Math support (coach and interventionist)
- Teaching specific TEI test-taking strategies
- Fact fluency in K and 1st



# HCS Support for Math

## Continuing Support

- Continuation of math coach
- Additional interventionist services
- Attend and support data disaggregation meetings




## Five Most Successful School-Level Tasks

- G-2: Principal Communication of Change/Sense of Urgency
- G-3: Data Disaggregation Meetings
- K-5: Frequent Progress Monitoring of Students
- K-8: Preparing Standards-Aligned Lesson Plans
- K-9: Teaching to a Variety of Learning Styles



# HERE! Initiative Results

## 2-Year Change in Unexcused Absences (2012 – 2014)



	2012 Cumulative	2013 Cumulative	2014 YTD All	2 Year Change
<b>Bryan Elementary School</b>	121	105	39	-82

- Bryan had the third highest reduction in the number of unexcused absences over a two year period, and the first highest among elementary schools!



# 2013-14 Bryan Highlights

**71 students passed all of their SOLs  
(52 last year)**

**87 SOL scores were "Pass Advanced"  
(47 last year)**

**There were 15 perfect (600) scores  
(2 last year)**

**We have five (5) students with all Pass Advanced  
SOL scores**

**17 Recovery students passed 4<sup>th</sup> grade Math SOL**

**7 Recovery students passed 5<sup>th</sup> grade Math SOL**



# Academic Review Update: Lesson Plans

- **Home page of the Google docs site for Bryan lesson plans specifies:**
  - When lesson plans are due
  - Who will be checking the plans
  - The forms of feedback that will be provided
- **Home page also specifies the required components of the lesson plan:**
  - SOL Skill Number
  - Level of Bloom's Taxonomy
  - Learning Intentions- I Can statements (with measurable objective)
  - Differentiation Strategies
  - Key Vocabulary Terms (Content, key, testing, literature)
  - Materials/visuals (Optional)
  - Hook, During, & Closure



# Bryan Google Docs Lesson Plans Home Page

## 2013-2014 Lesson Plans

 Search this site

- Home
- 1st Grade
  - Griffith
  - Hodges
  - King
  - London
- 2nd Grade
  - Birdsong
  - Reese
  - Wells
- 3rd Grade
  - Bryant
  - Flahive
  - Price
- 4th Grade
  - Jaywork LA
  - Lewis LA
  - Williams LA
- 5th Grade
  - Barkley LA
  - Thomason
- Kindergarten
  - Henry
  - Jung
  - Pinos
  - Sarver
- Resource
  - Basye
  - Pearson
  - Smith

### Home

- Links to each classroom and resource teacher lesson plan

Teachers,

One of the characteristics of an effective teacher is lesson planning. Lesson plans are a critical part of successful instruction, should be available at the time of instruction, and must be submitted in google docs by 7:30 a.m. Monday morning. Therefore, administrators will frequently select random lesson plans from Google docs and provide feedback. The feedback may be provided from various sources (i.e.- administration, coaches, grade level chairs, etc.) and in different forms (i.e.- individual notes, weekly staff newsletters, staff meetings, observations, etc.). The Bryan Leadership Team decided on the following lesson plan components:

#### Lesson Plan Non-negotiable

- SOL's-# only
- Level of Bloom's Taxonomy
- Learning Intentions- I Can statements (with measurable objective)
- Differentiation Strategies
- Key Vocabulary Terms (Content, key, testing, literature)
- Materials/visuals (Optional)
- Hook, During, & Closure
- Hook- how will you get students engaged/introduced

• During- how will you support the teaching of the learning intention (activities, strategies, skills)

- Required lesson plan components

- When lesson plans are due
- Who will be checking the plans
- The forms of feedback that will be provided



# Bryan Google Docs Lesson Plans Home Page

## Lesson Plan Resources

### TITLE

 60FormativeAssessment Techniques to Check for Understan...

 Bloom's Taxonomy Card LA K-2.docx

 Blooms Taxonomy Grades 3-5-1.docx

 Handout5-MarzanoHighYieldStrategies.pdf

 Lesson Plan Evaluation

 Quick-Check-for-Understanding-Strategies.docx

 Reading and Math Blooms.pdf

 Revised Blooms Verbs Matrix

 Scan.jpeg

The home page also provides links to numerous resources to assist teachers in effective lesson planning.



7:20 - 7:45

Monday

# Bryan Google Docs Lesson Plan Sample

SOL #

Learning Intention/  
"I Can" Statement

**7:45 - 8:55**  
**Language Arts**  
**SOL #** 2.10c(I), 2.13d(E), 2.8h(R,S,T), 2.8a(D), 2.8e(K,L), 2.12a-d(E, F, G, H, I, J), 2.13d(E), 2.13c(C), 2.9e,f(L,Q,R)  
**Learning Intention:** all with 80% accuracy I can...  
**M:** ...create and find the answers to questions I create...use a glossary to find the meaning and location of words  
**T:** locate the main idea of a story  
**W:** ...analyze words to determine their part of speech  
**Th:** ...I can locate and correctly spell plural nouns. ...I can ask questions as I read to help be comprehend the story  
**F:** show what I know; write a personal narrative

## Cognitive Level (HIGHLIGHT Level)

Creating Evaluating Analyzing  
Applying Understanding Remembering

**Hook:** Ask students to create one question. Allow for discussion about what constitutes a question.

**During:** Watch the flocabulary 5 W song to introduce questioning. Students will assist teacher in creating anchor chart to deepen understanding of thick and thin questioning. Lead students through a discussion about how thin questions are easier than thick questions and that thick questions often require you to infer. TW read *Cherry and Olive* to practice questioning. Students will use sticky notes to ask questions before, during and after reading.

**Closure/Assessment:** Post it sticky note questions.

Bloom's Level

Hook

During

Closure

Resource 8:55 - 9:35

Resource Music 8:55 - 9:35

**9:35 - 11:15**  
**Language Arts Continued**  
**Writer's Workshop**

**Key Vocabulary:** guide word, questions, infer, singular, plural  
**Evidence of Differentiation:** Differentiated task sheets

**DOL**  
**Independent Center:** Guide word cut and sort to be graded  
**Respond to Reading -** comprehension guides reading response journal  
**Read to Self**  
**Writing:** SW complete graphic organizer while brainstorming ideas about why their best friend is their best friend.

Key Vocabulary

Differentiation Strategies

Lunch/Recess 11:15 - 12:15

Lunch/Recess 11:15 - 12:15

**12:20 - 12:55 - SS/Sci**  
**SOL #** SS 2.5a, b  
**Sci#** 2.2 a, b  
**Learning Intention:** all with 80% accuracy...I can...  
**M&W:** ...locate continents on a map  
**T, Th & F:** ...describe the changes in the lifecycles of frogs, deer and

## Cognitive Level (HIGHLIGHT Level)

Creating Evaluating Analyzing  
Applying Understanding Remembering

**Hook:** We are going to make a lap book. Do you know what that is?

**During:** SW will be instructed on how to create continent and oceans lapbook. Students will watch as teacher gives directions. Students will complete front



# Sample Lesson Plan Communication and Feedback

Teachers,

One of the characteristics of an effective teacher is lesson planning. Lesson plans are a critical part of successful instruction, should be available at the time of instruction, and must be submitted in Google docs by 7:30 a.m. Monday morning. Therefore, administrators will frequently select random lesson plans from Google docs and provide feedback. The feedback may be provided from various sources (i.e.- administration, coaches, grade level chairs, etc.) and in different forms (i.e.- individual notes, weekly staff newsletters, staff meetings, observations, etc.). The Bryan Leadership Team decided on the following lesson plan components:

**Lesson Plan Non-negotiable**

**SQL's-# only**

**Level of Bloom's Taxonomy**

**Learning Intentions- I Can statements (with measurable objective)**

**Differentiation Strategies**

**Key Vocabulary Terms (Content, key, testing, literature)**

**Materials/visuals (Optional)**

**Hook, During, & Closure**

**Hook-** how will you get students engaged/introduced \_\_\_\_\_

**: During-** how will you support the teaching of the learning intention (activities, strategies, skills)

**: Closure-** what will the students be able to demonstrate/mastery (assessment should match the learning intention) This area should include specific questions that match the level of Bloom's taxonomy

- These components were selected for the purpose of ensuring alignment, rigor, and focus of plans. Lesson plans will be reviewed using the "School Lesson Plan Evaluation Tool" (see enclosed) and should, at a minimum, meet all of the criteria under the "Functional Implementation" column. In addition, teacher evaluations and observations will document consistency in the effective writing and implementation of lesson plans.

If you have any questions, please let me know!

Mike

Michael Stult

Principal

Bryan Elementary School

- School administrators provide feedback and updated communication on expectations for lesson plans



## Next Steps for Lesson Planning

- Review and revise lesson plan template based on analysis of feedback from this year's plans
- Provide training and follow-up practice and coaching of building success criteria into lesson plans
- Continue mining the resources at the SAC Vault, to help improve alignment between the taught and the tested curriculum
- Continue providing user-end feedback to the school division on SchoolNet,



# Questions?



**Thanks for everything, Mr. Stutt!!**

Attachment B  
 Jane H. Bryan Elementary School  
 Current Grade Span: K-5  
 Hampton City Public Schools

**Teacher Performance and Licensure Data**

Description	Number of Teachers	Percent of All Teachers	Area of Teaching
Number and percent of teachers scoring above proficient in 2013-2014	3	11%	
Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015	3		
Number and percent of teachers scoring proficient in 2013-2014	25	66%	
Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015	22		
Number and percent of teachers scoring below proficient in 2013-2014	0	0%	
Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015	NA		
Number and percent of teachers fully licensed in 2014-2015	25	86%	
Number and percent of new teachers to the school in 2014-2015	7	24%	
Number and percent of provisional teachers in 2014-2015	4	14%	
Number and percent of teachers not teaching in their endorsed area in 2014-2015 (name each area in which teachers are not endorsed)	0	0%	
Number and percent of long-term substitutes-that may be employed possibly more than 45 days (licensed or not licensed) in 2014-2015 (name each area in which there is a long-term substitute that may be employed more than 45 days)	0	0%	

Principal Tenure at this School and description of track record of success in working in a low-performing school: Explain in a paragraph

The school's principal resigned at the end of the 2013-2014 school year to take a position in another school division. The assistant principal was appointed as Interim Principal effective July 1, 2014. While a detailed search process was conducted in an attempt to secure a veteran principal with a track record of success in working in a low performing school, no candidate matching these criteria was selected.

**Area(s) of Reconstitution:**

**Governance**

**Change in Staff**

**Change in Instructional Program**

Requesting a Conditional: Yes

Conditional or Denied in Past Accreditation Cycles:

No

Reconstitution Type(s) for Conditional: Governance, LTP

Link to the corrective action plan:

**Achievement Data**

**State Accountability - Accreditation Designation**

Year	Accreditation Rating	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Area(s) of Warning
2002-2003	<i>Provisionally Accredited/Meets State Standards</i>	2001-2002	N/A
2003-2004	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2002-2003	N/A
2004-2005	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2003-2004	N/A
2005-2006	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2004-2005	N/A
2006-2007	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2005-2006	English
2007-2008	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2006-2007	English
2008-2009	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2007-2008	N/A
2009-2010	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2008-2009	English
2010-2011	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2009-2010	N/A
2011-2012	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2010-2011	English, Science
2012-2013	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2011-2012	English, Mathematics
2013-2014	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2012-2013	English, Mathematics, Science
2014-2015	<i>TBD</i>	2013-2014	English

**Federal Accountability Sanction**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Based on Statewide Assessments in</b>	<b>Federal Status (SIG- PRIOR TO WAIVER PROIRTY/FOCUS OR NOT TITLE I)</b>
<b>2010-2011</b>	2009-2010	Not SIG
<b>2011-2012</b>	2010-2011	Not SIG
<b>2012-2013</b>	2011-2012	Priority
<b>2013-2014</b>	2012-2013	Priority
<b>2014-2015</b>	2013-2014	Priority

**Federal Accountability Pass Rates by Assessment Year by Assessment Year**

<b>Assessment Type</b>	<b>School Pass Rates</b>								<b>State Pass Rates</b>	
	<b>2006-2007</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>2008-2009</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
<b>Reading</b>	65%	80%	83%	70%	64%	61%	48%	54%	75%	74%
<b>Writing</b>	79%	63%	67%	94%	76%	80%	43%	72%	76%	75%
<b>Mathematics</b>	70%	75%	81%	87%	69%	30%	62%	70%	71%	74%
<b>Science</b>	77%	78%	80%	82%	59%	72%	61%	90%	81%	80%
<b>History</b>	71%	90%	85%	89%	71%	73%	77%	82%	85%	84%

**Graduation and Completion Index, if applicable**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Index</b>
2011	n/a
2012	
2013	
2014	

**Sandusky Middle School**  
**Grades: 6-8**  
**Lynchburg City Public Schools**

**State Accountability - Accreditation Designation**

Accreditation is based on assessments taken in the previous year.

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Accreditation Rating	Area(s) of Warning
2010-2011	2009-2010	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	N/A
2011-2012	2010-2011	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	Mathematics
2012-2013	2011-2012	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	Mathematics
2013-2014	2012-2013	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	English, Mathematics
2014-2015	2013-2014	<i>Conditionally Accredited</i>	English, Mathematics
2015-2016	2014-2015	<i>TBD</i>	English

**State Accreditation Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
English	84%	81%	85%	55%	52%	67%
Mathematics	71%	59%	50%	53%	45%	74%
Science	88%	93%	95%	76%	78%	72%
History	74%	73%	74%	70%	70%	82%
Graduation Completion Index	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Federal Accountability Status (Applicable to Title I schools only.)**

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Federal Rating	Federal Status
2010-2011	2009-2010	Not Title I	Did not make AYP
2011-2012	2010-2011	Not Title I	Did not make AYP
2012-2013	2011-2012	Not Title I	Improvement Plan Required
2013-2014	2012-2013	Not Title I	Improvement Plan Required
2014-2015	2013-2014	Not Title I	Improvement Plan Required
2015-2016	2014-2015	Not Title I	Met AMOs

**Federal Accountability Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
Reading	81%	79%	84%	53%	48%	66%
Writing	86%	85%	87%	60%	55%	60%
Mathematics	66%	57%	48%	46%	40%	69%
Science	89%	93%	95%	76%	69%	70%
History	74%	73%	75%	70%	69%	80%

A TRADITION OF EXCELLENCE FOR ALL



LYNCHBURG CITY SCHOOLS

## SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

915 Court Street  
 Post Office Box 2497  
 Lynchburg, VA 24505-2497  
 www.lcsedu.net



July 29, 2014

The Honorable Christian N. Braunlich  
 President  
 Virginia State Board of Education  
 PO Box 2120  
 Richmond, Virginia 23218

Dear President Braunlich:

Based on a review of student performance in math on SOL assessments administered during spring 2014, Lynchburg City Schools (LCS) anticipates that Sandusky Middle School (SMS) will not be accredited in mathematics. As this will be the fourth consecutive year of not being fully accredited in mathematics, Code of Virginia 8 VAC 20-131-300.C. states that a school shall be rated Accreditation Denied. Code of Virginia 8 VAC 20-131-315 provides school divisions the opportunity to apply for conditional accreditation; therefore, in anticipation of SMS not meeting accreditation requirements for the fourth consecutive year, Lynchburg City School Board is requesting a rating of Conditional Accreditation for Sandusky Middle School for 2014-2015. This request is made based on aspects of reconstitution that include the following:

- Staff change highlighted by the appointment of a new principal with a proven track record of turning around a low performing school,
- Creating a governance board/district transformation team to include the school division's central office personnel, representative(s) from Lynchburg College, a coach appointed by the Virginia Department of Education, community representatives, parents, and students. The school and governance board will utilize the Indistar School Improvement planning process to create and implement a school improvement plan at the school level that would be supported by and aligned with a division plan
- Revising the instructional program to include:
  - Refining the use of double block classes for mathematics and English;
  - Revising the pacing guides for all mathematics courses in grades six, seven, and eight to include anchor lessons, aligned assessments, and digital resources;
  - Delivering the math curriculum through the use of Chromebooks;
  - Utilizing a universal assessment in mathematics approved by the Virginia Department of Education; and

- o Implementing a tiered intervention system to address specific needs of each student.

These reconstitution initiatives will assist SMS in positively impacting student achievement factors including student/teacher relationships; student behavior; student engagement and motivation; alignment of the written, taught, and assessed curriculum in content and cognitive level; teacher professional development; and teacher/leadership evaluation.

At the end of 2013-2014, SMS served a student population of 576 students in grades 6, 7, and 8. Of those students, 69 percent were identified as economically disadvantaged, 50 percent as African American, 32 percent as Caucasian, six percent as Hispanic, three percent as Asian, eight percent as two or more races, and 14 percent as students with disabilities. Of those students with disabilities, 34 percent are a part of a division program serving disabled students with high needs/functional skills.

The chart below represents accreditation values for SMS for the past 11 years. The loss of accreditation in math for 2005-2006 followed a change in the math test from which the school recovered in a two-year period. The school maintained full accreditation for the next three years in accordance with state accreditation guidelines and became accredited with warning in math for 2010-2011. This was followed by a further change in the math assessment in 2011-2012 followed by a slight improvement for 2012-2013.

<i>Year</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>Math</i>	<i>History</i>	<i>Science</i>	<i>Accreditation Rating</i>
2003-2004	70	77		89	Fully Accredited
2004-2005	70	77		87	Fully Accredited
2005-2006	81	61	74	87	Accredited With Warning
2006-2007	81	64	71	92	Accredited With Warning
2007-2008	85	73	78	97	Fully Accredited
2008-2009	84	71	72	86	Fully Accredited
2009-2010	84	69	74	88	Fully Accredited
2010-2011	81	59	73	93	Accredited With Warning
2011-2012	85	50	74	95	Accredited With Warning
2012-2013	55	53	70	76	Accredited With Warning
2013-2014	48	37	68	64	Accredited With Warning

The following chart indicates SMS SOL performance by test for the past three years comparing the performance of the school to that of the division and state.

Test Level	Subject Area	School Pass Rate 2011-12	Division Pass Rate 2011-12	State Pass Rate 2011-12	School Pass Rate 2012-13	Division Pass Rate 2012-13	State Pass Rate 2012-13	School Pass Rate 2013-14	Division Pass Rate 2013-14	State Pass Rate 2013-14
Grade 6	English	82	81	87	83	83	89	49	58	73
Grade 7	English	80	82	89	85	82	88	53	63	74
Grade 8	Reading	77	85	90	85	84	89	59	55	71
Grade 8	Writing	85	87	88	87	84	88	60	58	70
Grade 6	Math	48	52	73	43	57	74	31	43	77
Grade 7	Math	37	45	77	18	14	58	32	39	61
Grade 8	Math	59	69	82	53	50	60	55	60	61
Grade 8	Algebra I	100	85	94	94	59	75	89	55	76
Grade 8	Science	90	91	92	92	88	92	65	61	76
Grade 6	US History I	66	74	81	60	77	81	58	70	83
Grade 7	US History 2	75	80	85	82	77	84	73	78	82
Grade 8	Earth Science	100	84	89	100	84	90	96	73	83
Grade 8	Civics & Economics	75	81	84	82	80	84	77	76	85

It is noteworthy that the overall drop in performance at SMS on all SOL assessments is in concert with the drop in performance at the division and state levels.

Following accreditation with warning in math in 2011-2012, a new principal was hired for SMS who had a degree in math, had taught secondary math, and had four years of experience as an assistant principal in a high school. In addition, an experienced, fully endorsed sixth grade math teacher was hired to fill a vacancy. In 2012-2013, two new math teachers were hired. One was a new position filled by a teacher having a math specialist degree. The other was a grade 7 and 8 math teacher who has a Postgraduate Professional Certificate in Mathematics. In 2013-2014, three new teachers joined the math department, all endorsed and licensed to teach mathematics at the middle school level. In addition, the division added two math coaches to the SMS staff. One was a retired LCS teacher who had a proven success rate with the other being one of the SMS teachers who has a Collegiate Professional Certificate in Mathematics and a history of success with students. For 2014-2015, the division is adding two additional teaching positions to SMS. One position has been filled by a teacher with proven success at another school in LCS, and the other position is in the initial hiring process as this position recently became available as a result of action of the General Assembly in 2014. With these two additional teaching positions in mathematics, the division will have added three positions to the SMS math department since 2011-2012.

In addition to the teaching staff, a new principal has been selected to lead the school reform efforts at SMS. This individual has been a LCS principal for over 20 years and has led a previously low performing, high poverty school to be a high achieving school that has maintained full accreditation throughout

the most recent SOL revisions and often has had some of the top scores in the district and region while also being the school with the highest poverty.

The school division has made personnel changes at the division level that will directly impact SMS. As of June 2, 2014, a new assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction was added who has experience as a former principal, a director of schools for Fairfax County Public Schools, and most recently, Vice President of Teaching and Learning with Teach for America. As of July 1, 2014, the division created a new position of supervisor for mathematics which has been filled with a highly qualified math specialist.

Currently, SMS has nine math teachers on staff, all fully licensed and endorsed to teach mathematics at the middle school level. Two staff members are currently on a plan of assistance based on performance during 2013-2014. The administration is confident that the teachers have the capacity to improve as curriculum alignment is addressed.

A shared governance board/district transformation team will be instituted for 2014-2015. This team will include the following personnel.

- Dr. Scott S. Brabrand – Superintendent: Dr. Brabrand is in his third year in Lynchburg City Schools, previously serving as an assistant superintendent in Fairfax County Public Schools. Since his appointment as superintendent in Lynchburg, he has totally revised the Lynchburg City Schools Comprehensive Plan and has instituted and formalized the school improvement process in all schools, which is driven by that Plan, and includes as required all components of ESEA Flexibility Waiver and Virginia Department of Education SOA requirements.
- Dr. John C. McClain - Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction: Dr. McClain joined Lynchburg City Schools on June 2, 2014. He has previous experience as a principal and central office director for Fairfax County Public Schools and most recently was Vice President of Teaching and Learning with Teach for America.
- Mr. Brian S. Wray - Director of PreK-12 Instruction: Mr. Wray is the previous principal of Paul Laurence Dunbar Middle School for Innovation and has prior experience in taking Dunbar from accredited with warning in math to fully accredited in math.
- Mr. Michael K. Rudder - Director of School Improvement: Mr. Rudder assumed his new role of Director of School Improvement in 2013-2014. He had previously been director of elementary education directing the implementation of ESEA Flexibility Waiver in three focus schools and four schools that did not meet benchmark expectations for one or more subgroups.

- Dr. April M. Bruce - Director of Testing, Guidance, and Gifted: In addition to her expertise in the area of state testing, Dr. Bruce has prior experience as supervisor of math science in LCS. She has skill and expertise in middle school math instruction.
- Mrs. Marianne Turner - Director of Student Services: Mrs. Turner is new to LCS for 2014-2015. She comes to the school division from Orange County, California, with extensive experience and background in reform initiatives relative to student behavior.
- Mr. Wyllys D. VanDerwerker - Director of Special Education: Mr. Vanderwerker most recently received the Harrie M. Selznick National Council of Administrators of Special Education Distinguished Service Award in recognition of career long leadership in the field of special education administration.
- Dr. Roger E. Jones - Professor at Lynchburg College: Dr. Jones is a highly respected educator and former Principal and Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction for LCS. The Office of School Improvement at the Virginia Department of Education contracted with him in previous years to engage schools across the Commonwealth in best practices related to school improvement and reform.
- Dr. Gregory A. Wheeler - VDOE/LCS Contractor: Dr. Wheeler served as the lead of the academic review team in 2013-2014. In anticipation of his continued assistance in that role, LCS is contracting with him to serve on this governance board and to train LCS Lead Academic Coaches in unpacking the standards, aligning instruction and assessments to the Curriculum Framework Essential Knowledge and Skills in both content and cognitive level.

The governance board and SMS School Improvement Team will develop, implement, and monitor a school improvement plan using the Indistar Planning Tool. The plan will consist of indicators and strategies that center on the division's Comprehensive Plan, focusing on Achievement, Behavior, and Culture and the essential actions identified during the academic review conducted in 2013-2014. The school plan will include state required indicators TA01, TA02, TA03 to address student achievement and an indicator(s) addressing student behavior and school culture. TA01 requires the school to identify tools and strategies to identify students in need of intervention. TA02 requires the school to place the identified students into research/evidence based interventions. TA03 requires the school to regularly monitor the progress of the students and the impact of the prescribed interventions. All indicators, including the three required, will include measurable goals with appropriate tasks to reach those goals. In support of this student achievement initiative, the school division has recently revised its assessment protocol to assist SMS in the effective implementation of the three achievement indicators.

Once the school plan is in place, the governance board or members of the board will:

1. Present the completed plan to the school board;
2. Create a division plan using Indistar that aligns with the SMS plan;
3. Meet monthly with school administration to monitor the division and school plans;
4. Meet quarterly with the SMS school improvement team to monitor progress of students based on the following data:
  - a. Student attendance,
  - b. Teacher attendance,
  - c. Formative assessment data,
  - d. English, mathematics, science, and history grades,
  - e. Student discipline reports,
  - f. i-Ready assessment data,
  - g. Benchmark assessment data,
  - h. World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) data,
  - i. Student transfer data, and
  - j. Student intervention participation by intervention type; and
5. Conduct weekly site visits to observe instruction and participate in professional learning community meetings.

In addition to the work of the governance board, the school division will support the school improvement efforts at SMS in the following ways:

1. Hire a math specialist using funds as appropriated for such purpose by the General Assembly during the 2014 session;
2. Provide professional development related to the work of professional learning communities, unpacking the standards, aligning the written, taught and assessed curriculum, and creating and analyzing common formative assessments that are aligned to the Curriculum Framework Essential Knowledge and Skills in content and cognitive level;
3. Reduce instructional class size in math classes by increasing the math staffing by one FTE;
4. Revise the math pacing guides for grades 6, 7, and 8 to include anchor lesson plans, aligned assessments, and instructional resources that utilize technology;
5. Provide classroom sets of Chromebooks in all math classes;
6. Provide staffing sufficient to provide double block math classes in all grades;

The Honorable Christian N. Braunlich  
July 29, 2014  
Page Seven

7. Create and administer electronic benchmark assessments that are aligned to the math SOL;
8. Provide i-Ready, a research-based, VDOE-approved adaptive, diagnostic assessment for math;
9. Provide online research-based interventions, ie., i-Ready, ST Math; and
10. Provide teachers with up-to-date student data through the implementation of a new student information system and data dashboard.

The mission of Lynchburg City Schools is, "Every Child by Name, and by Need to Graduation." Given the establishment of a shared governance board and support from the school division indicated above, LCS is confident that it has the capacity to support Sandusky Middle School in improving student achievement that will result in positive movement toward full accreditation in mathematics, but more importantly, to support every student at Sandusky Middle School in moving in a positive direction that will lead to graduation. The governance board is comprised of educators that bring the knowledge and expertise needed to assist the school administration and faculty in maximizing growth for the students at SMS. Coupled with the appointment of a new principal with a proven record of turning around a struggling school and changes to the instructional program, the new team can and will get this work done.

Sincerely,



Dr. Regina T. Dolan-Sewell, Chairman  
Lynchburg City School Board

RTDS/wls

enclosure

cc: Scott S. Brabrand, Superintendent

Sandusky Middle School  
Grades 6-8  
Lynchburg City Public Schools

Teacher Performance and Licensure Data

Description	Number of Teachers	Percent of All Teachers	Area of Teaching
Number and percent of teachers scoring above proficient in 2013-2014	4	7.84%	
Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015	4		
Number and percent of teachers scoring proficient in 2013-2014	45	88.24%	
Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015	40		
Number and percent of teachers scoring below proficient in 2013-2014	2	3.92%	
Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015	2		
Number and percent of teachers fully licensed in 2014-2015	53	100%	
Number and percent of new teachers to the school in 2014-2015	7	13.73%	
Number and percent of provisional teachers in 2014-2015	0	0%	
Number and percent of teachers not teaching in their endorsed area in 2014-2015 (name each area in which teachers are not endorsed)	0	0%	
Number and percent of long-term substitutes-that may be employed possibly more than 45 days (licensed or not licensed) in 2014-2015 (name each area in which there is a long-term substitute that may be employed more than 45 days)	0	0%	

**Principal Tenure at this School and description of track record of success in working in a low-performing school: Explain in a paragraph**

Sandusky Middle School has a new principal for 2014-2015. He has been a principal with Lynchburg City Schools for 21 years. During those years of service he led a high poverty, low-performing school to full accreditation while meeting all adequate yearly progress requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and all annual measurable objectives based on ESEA Flexibility for the past two years. In addition, his school was among the top performing schools within the district and the region.

**Area(s) of Reconstitution:**

- Governance
- Change in Staff
- Change in Instructional Program

Requesting a Conditional: Yes

Conditional or Denied in Past Accreditation Cycles:

No

Reconstitution Type(s) for Conditional: Governance

Link to the corrective action plan:

### Achievement Data

#### State Accountability - Accreditation Designation

Year	Accreditation Rating	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Area(s) of Warning
2002-2003	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2001-2002	N/A
2003-2004	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2002-2003	N/A
2004-2005	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2003-2004	N/A
2005-2006	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2004-2005	N/A
2006-2007	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2005-2006	Mathematics
2007-2008	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2006-2007	Mathematics
2008-2009	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2007-2008	N/A
2009-2010	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2008-2009	N/A
2010-2011	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2009-2010	N/A
2011-2012	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2010-2011	Mathematics
2012-2013	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2011-2012	Mathematics
2013-2014	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2012-2013	English, Mathematics
2014-2015	<i>TBD</i>	2013-2014	English, Mathematics

**Federal Accountability Sanction**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Based on Statewide Assessments in</b>	<b>Federal Status (SIG- PRIOR TO WAIVER PROIRTY/FOCUS OR NOT TITLE I)</b>
<b>2010-2011</b>	2009-2010	Not SIG
<b>2011-2012</b>	2010-2011	Not SIG
<b>2012-2013</b>	2011-2012	Not Title I
<b>2013-2014</b>	2012-2013	Not Title I
<b>2014-2015</b>	2013-2014	Not Title I

**Federal Accountability Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

<b>Assessment Type</b>	<b>School Pass Rates</b>								<b>State Pass Rates</b>	
	<b>2006-2007</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>2008-2009</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
<b>Reading</b>	81%	82%	83%	81%	79%	84%	53%	48%	75%	74%
<b>Writing</b>	86%	91%	88%	86%	85%	87%	60%	55%	76%	75%
<b>Mathematics</b>	65%	70%	68%	66%	57%	48%	46%	40%	71%	74%
<b>Science</b>	95%	97%	86%	89%	93%	95%	76%	69%	81%	80%
<b>History</b>	71%	79%	73%	74%	73%	75%	70%	69%	85%	84%

**Graduation and Completion Index, if applicable**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Index</b>
2011	n/a
2012	
2013	
2014	

**P. B. Young, Sr. Elementary: Grades K-2 paired with Tidewater Park Elementary School: Grades 3-5 (Beginning 2014-2015)**  
**\*Historical Data from Tidewater Park Elementary School**  
**Norfolk City Public Schools**

**State Accountability - Accreditation Designation**

Accreditation is based on assessments taken in the previous year.

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Accreditation Rating	Area(s) of Warning
2010-2011	2009-2010	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	N/A
2011-2012	2010-2011	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	English, Mathematics, History, Science
2012-2013	2011-2012	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	English, Mathematics, History
2013-2014	2012-2013	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	English, Mathematics, Science
2014-2015	2013-2014	<i>Conditionally Accredited</i>	English, Science
2015-2016	2014-2015	<i>TBD</i>	English, Science

**State Accreditation Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
English	81%	59%	60%	44%	55%	53%
Mathematics	73%	62%	26%	57%	73%	70%
Science	Gr. 3: 74% Gr. 4-5: 71%	Gr. 3: 70% Gr. 4-5: 50%	Gr. 3: 58% Gr. 4-5: 73%	45%	36%	40%
History	Gr. 3: 83% Gr. 4-5: 72%	Gr. 3: 66% Gr. 4-5: 55%	Gr. 3: 52% Gr. 4-5: 60%	70%	76%	70%
Graduation Completion Index	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Federal Accountability Status (Applicable to Title I schools only.)**

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Federal Rating	Federal Status
2010-2011	2009-2010	Title I	Did not make AYP
2011-2012	2010-2011	Title I	Did not make AYP
2012-2013	2011-2012	Title I	Priority School
2013-2014	2012-2013	Title I	Priority School
2014-2015	2013-2014	Title I	Met AMOs
2015-2016	2014-2015	Title I	Improvement Plan Required

**Federal Accountability Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
Reading	65%	61%	55%	47%	54%	56%
Writing	71%	67%	77%	36%	67%	N/A
Mathematics	72%	64%	27%	49%	70%	73%
Science	72%	55%	63%	45%	41%	41%
History	74%	46%	53%	71%	79%	72%



June 30, 2014

Mr. Christian N. Braunlich, President  
Virginia Board of Education  
James Monroe Building  
101 N. 14<sup>th</sup> Street  
Richmond, VA 23219

Dear Mr. Braunlich,

Norfolk Public Schools is seeking conditional accreditation for Tidewater Park Elementary School for the 2014-2015 school year. As outlined in 8 VAC 20-131-315, as an alternative to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) required of schools rated accreditation denied, we have decided to reconstitute the school under the conditions defined by the Board of Education and the Standards for Accreditation. We are seeking a conditional accreditation as we continue to systematically address the deficiencies that have caused the school to be rated accreditation denied.

In an effort to provide more focus and support to the school's administration, leadership team, and staff, we have restructured our governance structure and developed an Office of School Turnaround and Improvement. Also, the school has been included as a focal point in the NPS Transformation Initiative, which involves reconfiguring the school's grade configuration from PreK-5 to grades 3-5 by combining the school with a neighboring school and improving the quality of the instructional program through intense professional learning for all building level administrators, teachers, and staff.

These actions are being implemented to improve student achievement by transforming the school's climate and culture. In short, we aim to improve student achievement by focusing on instructional best practices and professional learning directly aligned to the Standards of Learning embedded with our own Cycle for Results. We are confident that our efforts will be successful as research supports the 3-5 elementary grade configuration due to:

- A targeted focus on curricula
- More input and teacher collaboration on each grade level
- Expanded opportunities to match students to teachers according to teaching and learning styles
- Specific alignment among support staff such as resource teachers, intervention specialist and media specialists

As a Transformation school, Tidewater Park will be required to have parent compacts, student compacts, teacher compacts, personalized learning plans, and an advisory council. When implemented with fidelity, we know that these efforts will contribute significantly to the school's capacity to achieve full accreditation.

For the past three years, Tidewater Park has been a priority school serving approximately 360 students in grades PreK-5. The majority of the students enrolled are African-American (97%), but there are a few other ethnicities present (2% Hispanic and 1% multi-racial). The free and reduced lunch rate is approximately 100%. Of the 36 staff members assigned to the school, more than half (58%) have their Master's degree or better. One hundred percent of the staff is fully licensed, endorsed, highly qualified, and certified in the positions that they serve. The composition of the staff is racially balanced – 53% black, 42% white, and 2% multi-racial.

Tidewater Park is in its 3<sup>rd</sup> year of warning in English, Mathematics, and Science. However, the school has seen an increase in academic achievement over the last two years. The following table shows the growth in the various content areas based upon preliminary SOL results.

**2014 Preliminary SOL Results**

<b>English</b>		
	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
Grade 3	49	51
Grade 4	54	44
Grade 5	38	56
Grade 5 Writing	35	62
Overall	44	53

<b>Math</b>		
	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
Grade 3	50	52
Grade 4	62	74
Grade 5	39	88
Overall	50	71

<b>Science</b>		
	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
Grade 3	57	64
Grade 4		
Grade 5	36	36
Overall	47	50

Given the documented challenges of a school based in hyper-poverty, Tidewater Park has had its share of circumstances and problems with staff and administrative turnover. Two years ago, the principal was replaced with a highly passionate, nurturing, and committed principal. Now in

her second year, the new administration has improved both the climate and culture of the school. Both teacher and student attendance is increasing and teacher retention rates are up. Additionally, student discipline is down due to a strong focus on improving the quality of instruction at the school.

While the transformation/reconfiguration initiative has created some anxiety as to teacher assignments, a significant number of teachers have sought to transfer into the school and teach under the leadership of the new principal. The average number of years of experience for staff in the reconfigured 3-5 grades is 11 with several teachers having 20+ years or more.

As we move forward, we aim to continue to implement the Virginia Model for School Improvement using a shared governance framework established for priority schools under the ESEA flexibility waiver. We have reorganized our School Leadership Development department to create our own Office of School Turnaround and Improvement. While the Office of School Turnaround and Improvement has been specifically designed to provide more focused support for all NPS schools in improvement, its primary focus will be to monitor and support priority, focus, conditionally accredited, and accreditation denied schools.

The Office of School Turnaround and Improvement consists of the following:

- Executive Director, School Improvement
- Senior Coordinator, School Improvement
- School Improvement Administrators/Field Specialists (2)
- Budget Technician
- Administrative Assistant

The Executive Director of School Improvement will be responsible for collaborating with the VDOE's Office of School Improvement, Lead Turnaround Partners, and other stakeholders on behalf of the school; while monitoring and supervising the entire department, to include the school's principal. The Senior Coordinator and School Improvement Administrators will report to the Executive Director of School Improvement. Their roles and responsibilities will vary and will be derived from the school's improvement plan and topics discussed during the shared governance team meetings aligned to the 7 U.S.E.D. Turnaround Principles. Primarily, they will guide and support the school, the principal, and the leadership team with:

- Indistar programming and the school improvement processes
- Academic advisement, development of tiered interventions, progress monitoring, and student achievement data analysis,
- Family, community relations, and engagement activities
- Instructional planning and delivery
- Professional development for leaders and teachers

Additional support for the school will be provided by various central administration departments and shared governance team members. Shared Governance Team members will consist of division level representation across departments to include, but are not limited to representation from:

- Curriculum and Instruction/Title designee (each warned area of content will have a designee on the team)
- Accountability, Research, and Assessment designee
- Student Support Services designee
- Financial/Grant Services designee
- Special Education designee
- Transportation designee
- Human Resources designee
- English Learners designee

The shared governance approach has been instituted to ensure central office support and expertise is shared with building level leadership as a partnership to improve student achievement. Therefore, Shared Governance Team members will meet monthly with the principal and the school's leadership team to discuss academic progress, trends from classroom observations, personnel concerns, professional learning, parental/community engagement activities, and school improvement planning/implementation. The agenda has been aligned to the U.S.E.D.'s 7 Turnaround Principles and various strands derived from Indistar's Transformation Toolkit. Additionally, the school improvement plan has been updated to include essential actions from the most recent academic review conducted in December 2013. The monthly SGT meetings will provide a formal opportunity for members to monitor, discuss, and make decisions relative to the school improvement plan. The monthly SGT meetings will last 2.5 hours. A draft of the agenda is attached (Attachment 1).

Issues, concerns, and successes presented during the SGT meetings will be shared and discussed with the Superintendent's Cabinet. The Executive Director of School Improvement will be responsible for regularly communicating with the Superintendent and the School Board about progress and/or modifications needed to implement the school improvement plan. As necessary and to ensure timely decisions are made, the Executive Director has been granted some authority to act on behalf of the Superintendent. The intent of this decision making structure is to facilitate changes within the district, while developing the leadership capacities of the principal to empower and allow more autonomy at the building level.

We believe that by establishing a shared governance structure and processes to support school improvement, we will continue to progress towards reaching the benchmarks for full accreditation. Our goal is to improve learning outcomes for our students by implementing a theory of action focused on improving the professional practices of the adults responsible for the educational program. When the professional practices of adults improve, student learning

outcomes will improve. Following this logic model, we will inspect what we expect by implementing a system of quality controls through focus walks, data discussions, and immediate decision making; while addressing deficits immediately to improve student achievement (Attachment 2).

We are prepared to provide a laser-like focus and additional support to Tidewater Park Elementary. We believe that through these efforts, the students at Tidewater Park Elementary will be able to demonstrate increased academic success.

We look forward to meeting the Board to make this formal request for conditional accreditation for Tidewater Park Elementary.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Sincerely,



Dr. Kirk Houston  
Chairman  
Norfolk School Board

Cc: Dr. Kathleen Smith

Tidewater Park Elementary School  
Current Grade Span: PreK-5  
Norfolk Public Schools Public Schools

**Teacher Performance and Licensure Data**

Description	Number of Teachers	Percent of All Teachers	Area of Teaching
Number and percent of teachers scoring above proficient in 2013-2014	0	0 %	
Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015	0		
Number and percent of teachers scoring proficient in 2013-2014	19	83 %	
Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015	8		
Number and percent of teachers scoring below proficient in 2013-2014	0	0 %	
Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015	0		
Number and percent of teachers fully licensed in 2014-2015	15 <i>*As of 7/31/14, all positions are not filled</i>	78%	
Number and percent of new teachers to the school in 2014-2015	11	48 %	
Number and percent of provisional teachers in 2014-2015	0 <i>As of 7/31/14</i>	0 %	
Number and percent of teachers not teaching in their endorsed area in 2014-2015 (name each area in which teachers are not endorsed)	0 <i>As of 7/31/14</i>	0 %	
Number and percent of long-term substitutes-that may be employed possibly more than 45 days (licensed or not licensed) in 2014-2015 (name each area in which there is a long-term substitute that may be employed more than 45 days)	0 <i>As of 7/31/14</i>	0 %	

**Principal Tenure at this School and description of track record of success in working in a low-performing school: Explain in a paragraph**

Dr. Sharon Philips is completing her second year at Tidewater Park Elementary School. Under her leadership, the climate has increased as evidenced by the retention of staff. Student achievement has increased and the school is on a trajectory towards becoming accredited. Dr. Phillips is an experienced principal and is building a track record for success in leading this turnaround effort.

**Area(s) of Reconstitution:**

**Governance**

**Change in Staff**

**Change in Instructional Program**

Requesting a Conditional: Yes

Conditional or Denied in Past Accreditation Cycles:

No

Reconstitution Type(s) for Conditional: Governance

Link to the corrective action plan:

### Achievement Data

#### State Accountability - Accreditation Designation

Year	Accreditation Rating	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Area(s) of Warning
2002-2003	<i>Provisionally Accredited/Meets State Standards</i>	2001-2002	N/A
2003-2004	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2002-2003	N/A
2004-2005	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2003-2004	N/A
2005-2006	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2004-2005	N/A
2006-2007	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2005-2006	N/A
2007-2008	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2006-2007	N/A
2008-2009	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2007-2008	N/A
2009-2010	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2008-2009	N/A
2010-2011	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2009-2010	N/A
2011-2012	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2010-2011	English, Mathematics, History, Science
2012-2013	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2011-2012	English, Mathematics, History
2013-2014	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2012-2013	English, Mathematics, Science
2014-2015	<i>TBD</i>	2013-2014	English, Science

**Federal Accountability Sanction**

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Federal Status (SIG- PRIOR TO WAIVER PROIRTY/FOCUS OR NOT TITLE I)
2010-2011	2009-2010	Not SIG
2011-2012	2010-2011	SIG
2012-2013	2011-2012	Priority
2013-2014	2012-2013	Priority
2014-2015	2013-2014	Exiting Priority

**Federal Accountability Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates								State Pass Rates	
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2012-2013	2013-2014
Reading	83%	88%	80%	65%	61%	55%	47%	54%	75%	74%
Writing	93%	100%	94%	71%	67%	77%	36%	67%	76%	75%
Mathematics	74%	82%	71%	72%	64%	27%	49%	70%	71%	74%
Science	71%	58%	81%	72%	55%	63%	45%	41%	81%	80%
History	76%	70%	90%	74%	46%	53%	71%	79%	85%	84%

**Graduation and Completion Index, if applicable**

Year	Index
2011	n/a
2012	
2013	
2014	

**Vernon Johns Junior High School**  
**Grades: 8-9**  
**Petersburg City Public Schools**

**State Accountability - Accreditation Designation**

Accreditation is based on assessments taken in the previous year.

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Accreditation Rating	Area(s) of Warning
2010-2011	2009-2010	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	N/A
2011-2012	2010-2011	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	English, History
2012-2013	2011-2012	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	History
2013-2014	2012-2013	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	English
2014-2015	2013-2014	<i>Conditionally Accredited</i>	English, Mathematics
2015-2016	2014-2015	<i>TBD</i>	English, Mathematics, Science

**State Accreditation Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
English	74%	69%	85%	45%	50%	42%
Mathematics	88%	85%	81%	75%	69%	53%
Science	78%	78%	86%	77%	70%	60%
History	75%	56%	64%	72%	70%	70%
Graduation Completion Index	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Federal Accountability Status (Applicable to Title I schools only.)**

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Federal Rating	Federal Status
2010-2011	2009-2010	Title I	Did not make AYP
2011-2012	2010-2011	Title I	Did not make AYP
2012-2013	2011-2012	Title I	Priority School
2013-2014	2012-2013	Title I	Met AMOs
2014-2015	2013-2014	Title I	Improvement Plan Required
2015-2016	2014-2015	Title I	Priority School

**Federal Accountability Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
Reading	73%	76%	87%	47%	49%	40%
Writing	74%	58%	83%	42%	48%	39%
Mathematics	86%	85%	66%	66%	65%	49%
Science	78%	79%	87%	67%	59%	61%
History	75%	56%	65%	73%	70%	68%



**PETERSBURG PUBLIC SCHOOLS  
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES**

255 SOUTH BOULEVARD EAST  
PETERSBURG, VIRGINIA 23805-2700  
(804) 732-0510  
FAX (804) 862-8334

Date June 21, 2014

Mr. Chris Braunlich  
PO Box 2120  
Richmond, VA 23218

Dear Chairman Braunlich,

Please consider the request for conditional accreditation from Petersburg City School Board for Vernon Johns Junior High School that will support accountability for student learning. The Petersburg City School Board is seeking a conditional accreditation rating based on reconstitution.

For your reference:

Schools that are rated Accredited with Warning for three consecutive years and may be assigned the rating of Accreditation Denied in the fourth year of warning will be eligible to apply for Conditional Accreditation from the Board of Education in lieu of a rating of Accreditation Denied.

- 8 VAC 20-131-300.C. states that a school shall be rated Accreditation Denied based on its academic performance and/or achievement of the minimum threshold for the graduation and completion index if it fails to meet the requirements to be rated Fully Accredited or Provisionally Accredited-Graduation Rate, for the preceding three consecutive years or for three consecutive years anytime thereafter.
- As outlined in 8 VAC 20-131-315, as an alternative to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) required of schools rated Accreditation Denied, a local school board may choose to reconstitute the school and apply to the Board of Education for a rating of Conditionally Accredited. The application shall outline specific responses that address all areas of deficiency that resulted in the Accreditation Denied status.

As defined by the Standards of Accreditation, "reconstitution" is a process that may be used to initiate a range of accountability actions to improve pupil performance, curriculum, and instruction to address deficiencies that caused a school to be rated Accreditation Denied. Actions may include, but not be limited to, restructuring a school's governance, instructional program, staff or student population.

## School Demographics

The demographics for Vernon Johns Junior High School are as follows:

Total Enrollment		584
Gender	Male	289
	Female	293
Race/Ethnicity	Black	556
	White	<
	Hispanic	18
	Other	<
Disability Status		73
LEP		18
Economically Disadvantaged		409
Title I Status		Target Assistance
Grade Levels Served		Grades 8 and 9
Total Number of Teachers		50
Total Number of Admin.		3
Highly Qualified Teachers		98.08%
Number of sections taught by highly qualified teachers		102
Number of class sections taught by teachers not HQ		2
		*The teacher teaching outside of her endorsement area holds a collegiate professional license with an endorsement in <i>Mathematics-Algebra I; Middle Education 6-8; Mathematics</i> . She taught two sections of geometry.
Teacher Summative Evaluation Ratings	Exemplary	7
	Proficient	30
	Developing	10

	Unacceptable	2
Plans of Action		*Based on evaluation ratings, 15 teachers will be placed on Plans of Action. This was documented and discussed during their evaluation. In addition to the teachers identified as developing and unacceptable, the principal also placed three teachers on action plans based on deficiencies within specific standards.

### School Data

Student data outcomes for Vernon Johns are as follows:

#### State Accountability-Accreditation Designation

##### Accreditation Ratings for Vernon Johns Jr. High School

Year	Accreditation Rating	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Areas of warning
2011-2012	Accredited with Warning	2010-2011	English & History
2012-2013	Accredited with Warning	2011-2012	History
2013-2014	Accredited with Warning	2012-2013	English

#### Federal Accountability

##### Federal Accountability Sanctions for Vernon Johns Jr. High School

Year	Based on Assessments in	Federal Status
2011-2012	2010-2011	Did not make AYP-English and Mathematics
2012-2013	2011-2012	Met All Federal AMOs
2013-2014	2012-2013	Met All Federal AMOs

#### Federal Accountability Pass Rates

##### Vernon Johns Jr. High School Federal Accountability Pass Rates

Assessment Type	2011-2012 Based on 2010-2011 Assessments	2012-2013 Based on 2011-2012 Assessments	2013-2014 Based on 2012-2013 Assessments
Reading	76%	87%	47%
Writing	58%	83%	42%
Mathematics	85%	66%	66%
Science	79%	87%	67%
History	56%	65%	73%

### Vernon Johns Jr. High School Pass Rates by Test

Subject	School Pass Rate 2011-2012	Statewide Pass Rate 2011-2012	School Pass Rate 2012-2013	Statewide Pass Rate 2012-2013
Reading 8	87	89	47	71
Writing 8	83	88	42	70
Civics	72	84	62	85
World History I	60	84	85	84
Algebra I	70	75	74	76
Geometry	77	74	87	76
Math 8	52	60	47	61
Earth Science	84	90	72	83
Biology	95	92	87	83
Science 8	90	92	61	76

### SOL Accreditation Performance

School Year	English	Math	History	Science
2011-2012	69%	85%	56%	78%
2012-2013	85%	68% (81% 3yr)	65%	87%
2013-2014	45%	69% (75% 3yr)	72%	66% (77% 3yr)
2014-2015 (Preliminary)	51%	67%	79%	58%

An analysis of the 2014-2015 preliminary accreditation data shows an increase in the English SOL performance (six percentage points) and an increase in the History SOL performance (seven percentage points). A decrease is seen in the Mathematics SOL performance (three percentage points) and the Science SOL performance (ten percentage points).

### Changes

The 2014-2015 academic year will bring about a small turnover in teaching faculty. A total of 15 new teachers will join the faculty of Vernon Johns; seven due to resignations, two from retirement and two from non-renewal. Additionally, four positions will be filled due to transfer, promotion within the division and the unfortunate death of a teacher. The human resources department has worked diligently to hire fully licensed teachers with content knowledge, the ability to communicate, and the willingness to seek and participate in opportunities for professional growth. The human resources department along with the administration will continue to improve the retention of teachers and build a core of experienced staff for sustainability, stability and future growth of Vernon Johns and Petersburg City Public Schools.

## **Governance Based on the rating of conditional accreditation**

The governance for Vernon Johns Junior High School will change from a once a month review to a weekly review of data with the principal, a member of the leadership team, and the Superintendent or his designee. Data that will be discussed will include the following: academic data, including observations and walk-throughs; attendance and discipline data; and strategies for interventions for tiers one, two, and three students. The principal was recently replaced and several staff members changed. Because there is a new principal, there will be a collaborative planning process with the central office leadership team on curriculum, lesson planning, and major process changes. The governance team that will review data with the Superintendent or his designee will consist of the Chief Academic Officer and the Director of Federal Programs and School Improvement. There will be a team selected by the Principal and the Superintendent or his designee to operate at the school level to review all data: academic, attendance, and discipline. The committee will meet prior to the Superintendent's weekly meeting and will meet once a month with the central office team which includes the CAO and the Office of Federal Programs and School Improvement. Prior to this year, the principal met once a month with the central office team to discuss data and tasks indicated in Indistar. Indistar will be used again this year, but will be monitored weekly rather than monthly.

The shared governance committee will provide focus on the specific warned areas as identified under the Virginia Standards of Accreditation or the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001). In conclusion, the following items will be or have already been put in place:

- Principal was removed and a new instructional leader was hired.
- Technical assistance will be provided to VJHS based on the areas identified in the 2013-14 academic review and follow-up review. (i.e. Math and reading consultants are currently working with staff and will continue through the 2014-15 school year).
- Curriculum is being aligned in all core subjects
- Principal will be required to report weekly through June 30 to the Superintendent and/or his designee.

Thank you in advance for any time that will be given to this request.

Sincerely,



Kenneth L. Pritchett  
School Board Chairman  
Petersburg City Public Schools

Vernon Johns Jr. High School  
Current Grade Span: 8-9  
Petersburg City Public Schools

**Teacher Performance and Licensure Data**

Description	Number of Teachers	Percent of All Teachers	Area of Teaching
Number and percent of teachers scoring above proficient in 2013-2014	6	12%	
Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015	3		
Number and percent of teachers scoring proficient in 2013-2014	32	64%	
Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015	27		
Number and percent of teachers scoring below proficient in 2013-2014	12	24%	
Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015	7		
Number and percent of teachers fully licensed in 2014-2015	47	94%	
Number and percent of new teachers to the school in 2014-2015	5	10%	
Number and percent of provisional teachers in 2014-2015	3	6%	
Number and percent of teachers not teaching in their endorsed area in 2014-2015 (name each area in which teachers are not endorsed)	0	0%	0
Number and percent of long-term substitutes-that may be employed possibly more than 45 days (licensed or not licensed) in 2014-2015 (name each area in which there is a long-term substitute that may be employed more than 45 days)	1	2%	Librarian

**Principal Tenure at this School and description of track record of success in working in a low-performing school: Explain in a paragraph**

Currently, the principal, Shannon Washington is coming from Hampton City Schools and at her previous school her areas of focus were Math and English. She designed her School Learning Plan to drive the mission of the school. Her goal as Principal at Vernon Johns is to empower teachers to take positive educational risks that will result in student engagement and achievement. She plans to celebrate success, encourage one another, and motivate her students. She will implement more student led conferences where students will be able to discuss their progress based on data and share that information with parents and teachers. In addition, she plans to implement monthly

**professional development workshops where teachers can participate and gain additional support with areas where they would like to improve (i.e., lesson planning, student engagement, etc.). Vernon Johns will be a professional learning community where teachers are discussing data and innovative ways to reach the students. They will have weekly meetings where they will plan lessons and common assessments together. These are proven strategies that work in low performing schools.**

**Area(s) of Reconstitution:**

Governance

Change in Staff- Change in principal for the 2014-2015 school year

Change in Instructional Program

**Requesting a Conditional: Yes**

**Conditional or Denied in Past Accreditation Cycles:**

Denied in 2007, 2008, 2009

**Reconstitution Type(s) for Conditional:** Governance, CAO

**Link to the corrective action plan:**

**Achievement Data**

**State Accountability - Accreditation Designation**

Year	Accreditation Rating	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Area(s) of Warning
2002-2003	<i>Provisionally Accredited/Needs Improvement</i>	2001-2002	N/A
2003-2004	<i>Provisionally Accredited/Needs Improvement</i>	2002-2003	N/A
2004-2005	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2003-2004	English, Mathematics, Science
2005-2006	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2004-2005	English, Mathematics, Science
2006-2007	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2005-2006	English, Mathematics, History, Science
2007-2008	<i>Accreditation Denied</i>	2006-2007	English, Mathematics, History
2008-2009	<i>Accreditation Denied</i>	2007-2008	English, Mathematics, History
2009-2010	<i>Accreditation Denied</i>	2008-2009	English, Science
2010-2011	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2009-2010	N/A
2011-2012	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2010-2011	English, History
2012-2013	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2011-2012	History
2013-2014	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2012-2013	English
2014-2015	<i>TBD</i>	2013-2014	English, Mathematics

**Federal Accountability Sanction**

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Federal Status (SIG- PRIOR TO WAIVER PROIRTY/FOCUS OR NOT TITLE I)
2010-2011	2009-2010	SIG
2011-2012	2010-2011	SIG
2012-2013	2011-2012	Priority
2013-2014	2012-2013	No Longer Priority
2014-2015	2013-2014	n/a

**Federal Accountability Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates								State Pass Rates	
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2012-2013	2013-2014
Reading	56%	58%	62%	73%	76%	87%	47%	49%	75%	74%
Writing	61%	65%	60%	74%	58%	83%	42%	48%	76%	75%
Mathematics	39%	50%	89%	86%	85%	66%	66%	65%	71%	74%
Science	74%	71%	68%	78%	79%	87%	67%	59%	81%	80%
History	47%	58%	70%	75%	56%	65%	73%	70%	85%	84%

**Graduation and Completion Index, if applicable**

Year	Index
2011	n/a
2012	
2013	
2014	

**Thomas C. Boushall Middle School**  
**Grades: 6-8**  
**Richmond City Public Schools**

**State Accountability - Accreditation Designation**

Accreditation is based on assessments taken in the previous year.

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Accreditation Rating	Area(s) of Warning
2010-2011	2009-2010	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	N/A
2011-2012	2010-2011	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	History
2012-2013	2011-2012	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	Mathematics
2013-2014	2012-2013	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	English, Mathematics, Science
2014-2015	2013-2014	<i>Conditionally Accredited</i>	English, Mathematics, Science
2015-2016	2014-2015	<i>TBD</i>	English, Mathematics, Science

**State Accreditation Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
English	75%	80%	83%	40%	53%	54%
Mathematics	78%	77%	50%	39%	55%	67%
Science	86%	80%	73%	40%	61%	68%
History	71%	68%	78%	72%	79%	84%
Graduation Completion Index	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Federal Accountability Status (Applicable to Title I schools only.)**

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Federal Rating	Federal Status
2010-2011	2009-2010	Title I	Did not make AYP
2011-2012	2010-2011	Title I	Did not make AYP
2012-2013	2011-2012	Title I	Priority School
2013-2014	2012-2013	Title I	Priority School
2014-2015	2013-2014	Title I	Improvement Plan Required
2015-2016	2014-2015	Title I	Improvement Plan Required

**Federal Accountability Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
Reading	73%	74%	85%	41%	50%	54%
Writing	86%	85%	83%	37%	47%	45%
Mathematics	75%	73%	52%	35%	48%	63%
Science	89%	82%	78%	45%	65%	68%
History	70%	70%	81%	75%	79%	84%



**SCHOOL BOARD OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND**  
**SCHOOL BOARD ROOM - 17TH FLOOR, CITY HALL**  
**301 NORTH NINTH STREET RICHMOND, VA 23219-1927 (804) 780-7716**

August 20, 2014

**MEMBERS**

**THE HONORABLE:**

DONALD L. COLEMAN  
 DISTRICT 7  
 CHAIR

The Honorable Christian N. Braunlich  
 Virginia State Board of Education  
 Richmond, VA 23219

KRISTEN N. LARSON  
 DISTRICT 4  
 VICE CHAIR

GLEN H. STURTEVANT, JR.  
 DISTRICT 1

KIMBERLY B. GRAY  
 DISTRICT 2

JEFFREY M. BOURNE  
 DISTRICT 3

MAMIE L. TAYLOR  
 DISTRICT 5

SHONDA HARRIS-MUHAMMED  
 DISTRICT 6

DERIK E. JONES  
 DISTRICT 8

TICHI PINKNEY EPPES  
 DISTRICT 9

Dear Chairman Braunlich:

Based on preliminary SOL assessment results, Thomas C. Boushall Middle School will not meet the benchmarks for full accreditation in the areas of English, Mathematics, and Science, which will subsequently result in the school being rated as *Accreditation Denied*. Alternatively, the School Board of City of Richmond is requesting to enter into an agreement with the Board of Education to reconstitute the school, thereby applying for a *Conditional Accreditation* status for Thomas C. Boushall Middle School for the 2014-2015 school year. The request for reconstitution focuses on the restructuring areas of governance, staffing and instructional programs. Although Thomas C. Boushall Middle School was identified as a priority school in 2013-2014, the school operated without a Lead Turnaround Partner (LTP). In 2014-2015, shared governance will include the addition of a Lead Turnaround Partner (LTP) and a district oversight plan that supports identification of need, strategic deployment of district or LTP support, and monitoring of deliverables by all entities on student outcomes. In terms of staffing, the district seeks to eliminate the use of long term substitutes in the school and meet projected needs with licensed teachers. In addition, Richmond Public Schools will enter into a partnership with Teach for America in August 2014 to provide qualified corps members for hard-to-staff schools beginning in 2015-2016, with preference being given to priority schools in the district. Findings from the Virginia Department of Education's academic review revealed a misalignment in lesson planning and the *Standards of Learning* and *Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework's* essential knowledge and skills, as well as rigor. The district has implemented the use of a new lesson plan template that incorporates the state's recommended components as a non-negotiable. Professional development on unpacking the standards for lesson planning and instructional delivery began in the summer of 2014 and will be the primary areas of focus for weekly monitoring and continued development through May 2015. The district will provide support and monitoring for continued professional development relative to the written, taught, and assessed curriculum's alignment with Virginia's *Standards of Learning* and *Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework* through monthly oversight and alignment of support from district-level Instructional Specialists and LTP services.

**School Demographics**

During the 2013-2014 academic school year, Thomas C. Boushall Middle School served 528 students in grades 6-8. Of the 30 teachers that provided daily instruction, three (3) experienced teachers were new to the school, five (5) were new to teaching and four (4) served as long term substitutes.

Of the 528 students, 93% of these students received free or reduced lunch. Thomas C. Boushall Middle School was identified as a priority school in 2009 and began implementation of a three-year turnaround model in 2010-2011. The school did not meet exit criteria at the conclusion of the three-year implementation in 2012-2013 and continued to be identified as a priority school in 2013-2014 school year. The school did not operate with a Lead Turnaround Partner in 2013-2014. The principal worked collaboratively with the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) and VDOE contractors throughout the 2013-2014 school year during the academic review and technical assistance sessions.

**Preliminary SOL Performance**

6th Grade			
School Year	English: Reading	Mathematics	US History I
2011-2012	85%	62%	68%
2012-2013	40%	42%	73%
2013-2014	43%	57%	72%

7th Grade			
School Year	English: Reading	Mathematics	US History II
2011-2012	89%	43%	90%
2012-2013	49%	18%	75%
2013-2014	54%	37%	82%

8th Grade					
School Year	English: Reading	Writing	Math	Civics and Economics	Science
2011-2012	80%	83%	41%	78%	76%
2012-2013	35%	37%	19%	75%	36%
2013-2014	51%	47%	33%	78%	59%

School Year	Algebra I	Earth Science	Geometry
2011-2012	100%	100%	-
2012-2013	78%	92%	-
2013-2014	93%	92%	100%

Thomas C. Boushall Middle School demonstrated improved scores in 11 of 13 courses. The only course not making a gain was US History I, which saw a 1 percentile decline, and Earth Science remained level. Gains ranged from 3 to 28 percentile points. The increases in 7 courses were “double digit” gains.

English: Reading demonstrated gains at each grade level from 2012-2013 to 2013-2014 (Grade 6: 3 point gain, Grade 7: 5 point gain, Grade 8: 16 point gain). Performance in grade 6, 7 and 8 had previously declined approximately 40-45 percentile points from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013. This decline occurred during the period that the English: Reading and writing state standards adopted in 2010 were assessed for the first time. In 2013-2014, writing scores have mirrored the performance in English: Reading with a small gain of 10 percentile points after a decline of 46 percentile points from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013.

Based on 2011-2012 student performance in reading across grades (Grade 6: 85%, Grade 7: 89%, Grade 8: 80%), it is evident that the present curriculum has not been aligned with the current *Standards of Learning and Curriculum Framework*.

Mathematics pass rates range from 33% in 8<sup>th</sup> grade to 93% in Algebra I. Mathematics performance declined by 20-25 percentile points in each mathematics course from 2011-12 to 2012-2013. Gains were realized in all grade level mathematics courses in 2013-2014 (Grade 6: 15 percentile points; Grade 7: 19 percentile points; Grade 8: 14 percentile points. Algebra I performance increased by 15 percentile points in 2013-2014. New mathematics standards that were adopted in 2009 were assessed for the first time in 2011-2012. Student performance in the previous mathematics test administration (2010-2011) evidenced a closer alignment of mathematics courses with the *Standards of Learning and Curriculum Framework* (Grade 6: 62%, Grade 7: 67%, Grade 8: 82%). It is evident that the present curriculum is not aligned with the current *Standards of Learning and Curriculum Framework*.

New history standards were adopted in 2008 and assessed for the first time in 2010-2011. US History I scores increased by 5 percentile points in 2012-2013 and decreased by 1 percentile point in 2013-2014. US History II declined by 15 percentile points to a 75% pass rate in 2012-2013, but recovered 7 percentile points in 2013-2014. History scores at each grade level have remained close to, or above the accreditation benchmark of 70. Although the curriculum evidences some level of alignment with the current *Standards of Learning and Curriculum Framework*, there exists an opportunity for greater alignment.

Grade 8 Science performance evidences a 40 percentile decline from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013, then a 28 percentile gain in 2013-2014. Earth Science remained level at 92%. The state adopted new science standards in 2010 that were assessed for the first time in 2012-2013. Student performance in 2013-2014 provides evidence that the school's present Grade 8 Science curriculum is not aligned with the current *Standards of Learning and Curriculum Framework*.

### **Staffing**

Since 2011-2012, Thomas C. Boushall Middle School staff turnover has been approximately 50%. In the 2014-2015 school year the school will begin with 8 new staff: three (3) mathematics (grade 6, 8); two (2) science (grade 6, 8); history (grade 7), special education (grade 7) and family consumer science. In a review of licensure, 100% of teachers are licensed in the area of their assignment. Staff includes one (1) provisionally licensed teacher in special education. In addition, up to 8 additional staff will need to be hired or transferred to the school based on the August 12<sup>th</sup> enrollment report. The executive leadership team's priority for staffing the school is demonstrated by the August 12<sup>th</sup> meeting with Human Resources and the Principal to develop a plan for fully staffing for Thomas C. Boushall Middle School. As enrollment data is collected, options will include transfers from other schools, use of Teach for America corps members (2015-2016), and long-term substitutes screened through Human Resources and the Principal. RPS has partnered with Teach for America to be to eliminate the practice of filling hard-to-staff teaching positions with long-term substitutes. Teach for America recruits high achieving recent college graduates, or professionals, who possess content expertise and the desire to play a role in ensuring educational equity for all students. Each Teach for America corps member will have successfully completed all required Teach for America preparatory training. Training will take place for corps members in 2014-2015 for placement in 2015-2016.

## Shared Governance and Oversight

Based on research that demonstrates the importance of establishing a relationship with central office and schools in need of improvement, Richmond Public Schools has initiated a strategic plan at the district level that will ensure processes and procedures are aligned to support and monitor Thomas C. Boushall's turnaround efforts. The measurable outcomes of the strategic intervention plan are improved student achievement and staff performance. The formal mechanism for support from central office experts, in partnership with the LTP and building-level experts, is demonstrated in the implementation of the district's initiative through the following actions:

- Dr. Dana T. Bedden, newly-appointed Superintendent of Richmond City Schools
- Reorganization of Executive Leadership Team (see RPS Organizational Chart, Attachment A)
  - Reorganization and newly created positions support a framework of direct instructional support to schools and building-level administrators through strategic deployment of resources based on data-driven needs that include the following direct reports to the Superintendent:
    - Associate Superintendent of Academic Services (newly created position providing oversight to newly created positions of Executive Director of Exceptional Education and Student Services, and Director of Curriculum and Instruction, as well as Director of Professional Development, Manager of State and Local Grants, Director of Federal Programs, Manager of Testing Services, and Coordinator of Research and Evaluation)
    - Executive Director of School Improvement and Innovation (newly created position providing oversight to two School Improvement Managers)
    - Executive Director of Secondary Schools (newly created) and Executive Director of Elementary Schools (newly created)
    - Executive Director of Exceptional Education and Student Services (newly created)
    - Director of Curriculum and Instruction (newly created)
- Establishment of an Office of School Turnaround and Innovation
  - Newly created office provides administrative supervision of all school improvement, innovation and programs in collaboration with district administrators and staff to ensure effective delivery of support services for schools from the district and LTP with onsite monitoring with a focus on performance outcomes
- Enhanced Annual Leadership Institute (includes all district-level administrators and instructional staff)
  - 2014-2015 Focus: "Building a Better District" and "The 20 Non-Negotiable Characteristics of Higher Performing School Systems"
- Establishment of monthly Principals Leadership Day (full-day professional development on every 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday)
  - Timely communication of district policy and departmental updates, as well as continued support for implementation of tasks to address Essential Actions from the academic review and LTP needs assessment
  - Ensure continued focus on the district's priorities based on *ACT Core Practice Framework*:
    - Provide clear, prioritized learning objectives by grade and subject that all students are expected to master
    - Provide strong principals, a talented teacher pool, and layered professional development

- Provide evidence-and standards-based instructional tools that support academic rigor for all students
  - Develop and use student assessment and data management systems to monitor student learning
  - Respond to data through curricular/instructional adjustments or targeted interventions
- Establishment of monthly Assistant Principals Leadership Day (4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday - full-day professional development)
  - Develop a pipeline of potential leaders
- Implementation of a longitudinal data system
  - Provide student data for timely analysis of instructional impact on student achievement and for efficient assignment and monitoring of interventions
- Alignment of Human Resources structures and processes to ensure high quality staffing
  - Contract with Teach for America (fill hard-to-staff positions/priority schools will receive preference for assignments)
  - Newly created district-level staffing position for exceptional education
- Establishment of the Office for Family and Community Engagement (FACE)
  - Parental outreach/involvement, truancy and dropout prevention
- Contractual agreement with a Lead Turnaround Partner to provide services that address the outside vendor's needs assessment and the Essential Actions from VDOE's academic review findings
  - Collaborate with central office Executive Leadership Team and LTP to establish performance metrics on which to measure LTP's services in relation to student achievement for inclusion in contract, or memorandum of understanding, and identification of shared responsibilities for delivery and monitoring of services, to include:
    - Corrective action plan with next steps, person responsible, timeline, required resources, expected outcomes and plan for monitoring and evaluation of impact
    - Support of school leadership (principal, lead teachers and instructional specialists/coaches) in addressing alignment of curriculum to *Standards of Learning* and *Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework* in lesson plans and delivery of instruction
  - Oversight of the LTP efforts will be provided by the principal, VDOE Office of School Improvement contractor and Office of School Improvement and Innovation.
    - Office of School Improvement and Innovation will support monitoring during weekly visits and during School Improvement Team meetings
      - Written feedback on lesson plans and observations will be reviewed and written feedback provided to the principal
      - District OSII will ensure identified needs are met by alignment of resources from LTP and district as evidenced in School Improvement Team meeting minutes
      - District OSII will ensure tasks identified during each School Improvement Team meeting are documented in the School's Improvement Plan and other actions evidenced in the meeting minutes
    - OSI contractor will monitor LTP, as well as district support for school turnaround efforts through monthly visits and attendance at one monthly School Improvement Team meeting

- Written feedback will be shared with school, OSI contractor and LTP within five (5) days of each Quarterly District-level Data meeting (focus on next steps - the who, what, when, evidence of completion)
- Attendance at VDOE technical assistance sessions (6) on *Aligning the Academic Review with Performance Evaluation (AARPE)* to support principal's implementation of required follow-up work from each session and receive training on providing feedback to principals. VDOE's purpose for these technical assistance sessions is to:
  - Improve instruction and instructional leadership practices by strengthening the alignment between the Performance Standards for Teachers and Principals and the Lesson Planning, Lesson Observation, Professional Development, and Leadership Academic Review Tools.
  - Develop sample evidence for the sample performance indicators in Teacher Performance Standards for professional knowledge, instructional delivery (planning), assessment of and for learning, and learning environment. The sample evidence for each performance indicator will become a tool that can enhance Richmond's observation tools. (District and School Leadership)

In August 2014, the Office of School Improvement and Innovation tiered priority schools based on a metric that included number of years in priority status, number of years *Accredited with Warning*, number of areas of warning, preliminary pass rate and benchmark gap by content area, and gain/regression points based on preliminary 2013-2014 data, etc. Thomas C. Boushall Middle School has been tiered for a moderate level of support and will receive, at minimum, the following:

- Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) will be used to assess what level students are performing at, what students know and are ready to learn, and to measure student growth
- Longitudinal data system will provide access to time-relevant and comprehensive student data to improve instructional practice and increase student achievement by supporting data-driven planning for differentiation and intervention selection
- District oversight: assigned Office of School Improvement and Innovation staff member will:
  - Conduct bi-monthly onsite meetings with principal targeting instructional leadership, feedback on lesson plans and observations
  - Facilitate prioritization and delivery of instructional supports from the district (i.e., instructional specialists), ensuring that professional development is aligned with identified needs and anticipated outcomes relative to student achievement
  - Provide district-level representation for the monthly School Improvement Team meetings (assist in continued maintenance of instructional focus and actionable next steps) See Attachment B
  - Provide support for and ensure completion of Essential Actions from the VDOE academic review
  - Ensure implementation of follow through on directives from the OSI-assigned contractor
  - Support monitoring of Lead Turnaround Partner services in relation to contracted performance outcomes
  - Ensure school improvement team's timely updates to the School Improvement Plan, including incorporation of tasks aligned to the Essential Actions from the academic review by September 1, 2014, and fall 2014 needs assessment by November 15, 2014.
  - Support the effective use of VDOE resources

- Participation in the ongoing VDOE technical assistance, *Aligning Academic Review with Performance Evaluation (AARPE)* training which focuses on developing sample evidence for the sample performance indicators in Teacher Performance Standards for professional knowledge, instructional delivery, assessment of and for learning, and learning environment
- Presentation of a quarterly data-driven progress overview by the Principal to the Superintendent, Associate Superintendent, Executive Director of Secondary, Executive Director of School Improvement and Innovation and School Improvement Program Managers, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, LTP representative and OSI contractor (summary to be provided to School Board)
  - Presentation will include inferences made from quarterly data analysis, next steps, request for support/resources and measurable outcomes relative to student achievement
  - Written feedback will be provided by district team

### **Instructional Program**

Thomas C. Boushall Middle School will contract with an outside evaluator for a complete needs assessment to be conducted by October 30, 2014. The school's instructional day will be modified for 2014-2015 to support 70 minutes of core instruction on a daily basis in lieu of the previous year's alternating block schedule. This will add approximately 48 hours of instruction over the school year. District-level instructional specialists will provide feedback on lesson plans developed for the first two weeks of school. Department chairs will meet biweekly with members to facilitate alignment of written plans. In addition, the following non-negotiable routines have been established for classroom teachers:

- use of snapshots for review of content from previous day's formative assessment (i.e, exit tickets) or spiraling of the curriculum;
- development and use of student learning objectives;
- implementation of writing across the curriculum, and;
- implementation of a positive behavior plan

In 2013-2014 the school underwent a VDOE academic review in fall 2013, with a follow-up in spring 2014. This review focused on examining the alignment of the written, taught and assessed curriculum. The overall finding of the review was the misalignment in the written, taught and tested curriculum. Resulting Essential Actions from the academic review target improvement of Tier I instruction by addressing the following practices:

- Providing written guidance and specific feedback to teachers on development of lessons and delivery of a taught curriculum that is aligned with the *Standards of Learning* and *Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework* by:
  - Teachers developing aligned lesson plans to the *Standards of Learning* and *Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework* with attention to the content and cognitive level, including clear student behaviors with conditions and criteria necessary to evidence learning
  - Principals and administrative staff providing written observation feedback to teachers that is frequent and specific in regards to the alignment of lesson plans and lesson delivery
  - Ensuring that school schedules provide time for all teachers to plan in horizontal collaborative groups, inclusive of special education and as individuals

Essential Actions from the academic review and the present, or planned, implementation status are presented in the chart below.

Essential Action	Status
1. Provide professional development and technical assistance for teachers and administrators on the <i>Alignment with/of Standards, Big Ideas, and Objectives Component of the School Lesson Plan Evaluation Tool</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional development on unpacking standards for science and social studies 3/11/14</li> <li>• Professional development for all teachers (new teachers 8/28/2014 and other teachers by 8/29/2014)</li> <li>• Bi-monthly support provided by OSI/LTP/contractors/district through 5/2015</li> </ul>
2. Establish and implement a system for monitoring lesson plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training on district-provided template and presentation of system for monitoring of plans during teacher workdays by August 2014</li> </ul>
3. Create division lesson plan template	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed</li> </ul>
4. Ensure teachers use the RPS lesson plan template to focus on the <i>Alignment Component</i> with evidence of unpacked standards, big ideas/essential questions, and objectives that include behaviors, conditions and criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will begin September 2014</li> </ul>
5. Conduct peer review of lesson plans during departmental meetings/grade level meetings and work collaboratively to ensure lesson plans are aligned with <i>Standards of Learning and Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring/feedback from September 2014 through May 2015 (monthly oversight by Office of School Improvement and Innovation team, Curriculum and Instruction and Executive Director of Secondary Schools)</li> </ul>
6. Provide additional service to support peer review of lesson plans and successive steps from action plan, including feedback as lessons are implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Begins September 2014 (weekly oversight by Office of School Improvement and Innovation team)</li> </ul>
7. View OSI training modules/videos in order to support the lesson plan essentials (Office of School Turnaround Team)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Began August 18, 2014 (monitored and supported by Office of School Improvement and Innovation team)</li> </ul>
8. Participate in differentiated professional development on the design of lessons and review of lessons with content specialists.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training to begin August 26 and 27 Department chairs will support development through May 2015</li> </ul>
9. Participate with Cohort III schools in VDOE/OSI differentiated technical assistance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• July, August (complete)</li> <li>• September, October, November and January</li> </ul>

In order to provide the high quality professional development required to implement the strategic plan outlined in this letter and provide time for collaboration and planning, the Superintendent will also be requesting the Richmond City School Board to consider a change in the actual number of contract days, as well as daily hours worked. The present teacher contract includes 200 days, however, teachers only work 191 actual days. Virginia's State Code states the following:

**Virginia Code §22.1-302. Written contracts required; execution of contracts; qualifications of temporarily employed teachers; rules and requirements.**

The standard 10-month contract shall include 200 days, including (i) a minimum of 180 teaching days or 990 instructional hours and (ii) up to 20 days for activities such as teaching, participating in professional development, planning, evaluating, completing records and reports, participating on committees or in conferences, or such other activities as may be assigned or approved by the local school board.

The Superintendent will request that teachers work the additional 9 days for which they are contracted. In addition, the Superintendent will propose an extension to the school day hours worked to support opportunities for planning and collaboration.

In closing, Thomas C. Boushall Middle School has made progress in approximately 50% of the courses assessed in 2013-2014. Although history has seen declines in grades 6-8, preliminary data indicates the school will meet the accreditation benchmark in this content area. Math performance has demonstrated gains for each grade level. Mathematics assessment and Grade 8 Science made gains of 12 percentile points. Based on the findings of the VDOE academic review, the underlying cause has been determined to be the misalignment between the content area curriculum and the *Standards of Learning* and *Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework* in each content area. The Essential Actions from the 2013-2014 VDOE academic review have provided a series of actionable steps to be taken at the district- and school-level in 2014-2015. The district has a newly appointed superintendent who has established an organizational structure aligned to bring a laser-like focus to instruction and provide targeted support, resources and oversight to the school. Completion of the VDOE recommended essential actions communicated to the district in May 2014 promises to bring significant improvement to academic performance in all content areas. The addition of a LTP for 2014-2015 will support the needs of this priority school through a thorough needs assessment and aligned deliverables. As described in this letter, the newly created Office of School Improvement and Innovation has targeted Thomas C. Boushall for moderate support in 2014-2015 and outlined a plan for timely support, resource allocations, and monitoring. Data clearly demonstrates that Tier I instruction is a concern in all content areas. RPS requests an opportunity to address the VDOE essential actions, secure a LTP and implement the strategic plan outlined in this letter to support dramatic improvements in student achievement in 2014-2015 under a status of *Conditional Accreditation*.

Respectfully Submitted,



Donald Coleman  
School Board Chairman



**School Improvement Team Agenda (non-negotiable)**

**I. Meeting Date (location and time)**

**II. Team Members in Attendance/Guests in Attendance (includes a designated Wise Ways “shepherd”, timekeeper, note taker, district representative, LTP representative, Principal and members of the school’s leadership team)**

**III. School Improvement Plan Indicators to Assess (may only apply to 2-year old indicators requiring reassessment unless school is a recently identified priority school)**

- List of indicators, including the description, serving as the focus topic(s) for the meeting
  - Generated by principal in collaboration with LTP and district
  - Based on the school turnaround “work” being done (i.e., data from review of lesson plans and observations, status of implementation for desired professional development outcomes, targeted services from the LTP, district or VDOE and outcome)

**IV. School Improvement Plan Indicators for Review**

- List of indicators, including the description, serving as the focus topic(s) for the meeting
  - Generated by principal in collaboration with LTP and district
  - Based on the school turnaround “work” being done (i.e., data from review of lesson plans and observations, status of implementation for desired professional development outcomes, targeted services from the LTP, district or VDOE and outcome)
- List of indicators, including the description, targeted for updates during this meeting

**V. Other Business (to include items dealing with school improvement plan only, reserve grade-level or faculty meetings for business dealing with management topics, field trips, etc.)**

- May include upcoming required reports or review of reports prior to submission (i.e., Leading, Lagging and Intervention reports, Quarterly Data Analysis Reports)
- Summaries (feedback) from walkthroughs and/or observations or review of improvement plan, written feedback etc. conducted by district, OSI contact, LTP

**VI. Action Taken**

- Responsible person, target completion date, next steps, report out date (if ongoing)
  - Includes requests for support and resources being requested from, or delivered by, the district or LTP
  - Determination if the action resides in the minutes or will become part of the school’s improvement plan
  - Review alignment to district priorities

**VII. Next Meeting (Date, Time Location)**

- Expected “report-outs”

**Thomas C. Boushall Middle School  
Current Grade Span: 6-8  
Richmond City Public Schools**

**Teacher Performance and Licensure Data**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Number of Teachers</b>	<b>Percent of All Teachers</b>	<b>Area of Teaching</b>
<b>Number and percent of teachers scoring above proficient in 2013-2014</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	
<b>Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015</b>	<b>3</b>		
<b>Number and percent of teachers scoring proficient in 2013-2014</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>85%</b>	
<b>Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015</b>	<b>31</b>		
<b>Number and percent of teachers scoring below proficient in 2013-2014</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	
<b>Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015</b>	<b>1</b>		
<b>Number and percent of teachers fully licensed in 2014-2015</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>37%</b>	
<b>Number and percent of new teachers to the school in 2014-2015</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>48.57%</b>	
<b>Number and percent of provisional teachers in 2014-2015</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>25.71%</b>	
<b>Number and percent of teachers not teaching in their endorsed area in 2014-2015 (name each area in which teachers are not endorsed)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>%</b>	
<b>Number and percent of long-term substitutes-that may be employed possibly more than 45 days (licensed or not licensed) in 2014-2015 (name each area in which there is a long-term substitute that may be employed more than 45 days)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8.57%</b>	<b>(2) exceptional education; (1) Title I math</b>

**Principal Tenure at this School and description of track record of success in working in a low-performing school: Explain in a paragraph**

The principal at Boushall Middle School was hired on July 1, 2011. Boushall Middle School has been transformed in the last three years under the principal's instructional leadership. Her focus on recruiting and building a highly skilled cadre of teachers, creating a culture where the students are "respectful, responsible and ready learn" and where student achievement is everyone's responsibility have led to improved student achievement. Teachers were held to

higher standard of accountability, but supported in the process with a multitude of aligned professional development plans. This transformation has resulted in a school culture of excellence where there are clear behavioral and academic expectations for students and staff. In closing, Thomas C. Boushall Middle School has made progress in approximately 50% of the courses assessed in 2013-2014. Although history has seen declines in grades 6-8, preliminary data indicates the school will meet the accreditation benchmark in this content area. Math performance has demonstrated gains for each grade level. Mathematics assessment and Grade 8 Science made gains of 12 percentile points.

**Area(s) of Reconstitution:**

**Governance**

**Change in Staff**

**Change in Instructional Program**

**Requesting a Conditional: Yes**

**Conditional or Denied in Past Accreditation Cycles:**

Conditional 2007, 2008, 2009

**Reconstitution Type(s) for Conditional:** Governance

**Link to the corrective action plan:**

**Achievement Data**

**State Accountability - Accreditation Designation**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Accreditation Rating</b>	<b>Based on Statewide Assessments in</b>	<b>Area(s) of Warning</b>
2002-2003	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2001-2002	Mathematics, History
2003-2004	<i>Provisionally Accredited/Needs Improvement</i>	2002-2003	N/A
2004-2005	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2003-2004	English, Mathematics, History
2005-2006	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2004-2005	English
2006-2007	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2005-2006	English, Mathematics, History
2007-2008	<i>Conditionally Accredited</i>	2006-2007	English, Mathematics, History
2008-2009	<i>Conditionally Accredited</i>	2007-2008	English, Mathematics, History, Science
2009-2010	<i>Conditionally Accredited</i>	2008-2009	Mathematics, History
2010-2011	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2009-2010	N/A
2011-2012	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2010-2011	History
2012-2013	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2011-2012	Mathematics
2013-2014	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2012-2013	English, Mathematics, Science
2014-2015	<i>TBD</i>	2013-2014	English, Mathematics, Science

**Federal Accountability Sanction**

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Federal Status (SIG- PRIOR TO WAIVER PROIRTY/FOCUS OR NOT TITLE I)
2010-2011	2009-2010	SIG
2011-2012	2010-2011	SIG
2012-2013	2011-2012	Priority
2013-2014	2012-2013	Priority
2014-2015	2013-2014	Exiting Priority

**Federal Accountability Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates								State Pass Rates	
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2012-2013	2013-2014
Reading	61%	57%	76%	73%	74%	85%	41%	50%	75%	74%
Writing	62%	60%	88%	86%	85%	83%	37%	47%	76%	75%
Mathematics	47%	48%	54%	75%	73%	52%	35%	48%	71%	74%
Science	74%	65%	84%	89%	82%	78%	45%	65%	81%	80%
History	45%	58%	72%	70%	70%	81%	75%	79%	85%	84%

**Graduation and Completion Index, if applicable**

Year	Index
2011	n/a
2012	
2013	
2014	

**Armstrong High School**  
**Grades: 9-12**  
**Richmond City Public Schools**

**State Accountability - Accreditation Designation**

Accreditation is based on assessments taken in the previous year.

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Accreditation Rating	Area(s) of Warning
2010-2011	2009-2010	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	N/A
2011-2012	2010-2011	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	GCI
2012-2013	2011-2012	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	Mathematics, History, GCI
2013-2014	2012-2013	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	Mathematics, History, Science, GCI
2014-2015	2013-2014	<i>Conditionally Accredited</i>	Mathematics, History, Science, GCI
2015-2016	2014-2015	<i>TBD</i>	English, Mathematics, History, Science, GCI

**State Accreditation Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
English	76%	82%	81%	79%	75%	71%
Mathematics	81%	74%	41%	43%	59%	672%
Science	74%	70%	72%	56%	64%	51%
History	77%	71%	64%	60%	64%	61%
Graduation Completion Index	N/A	66	64	72	82	80

**Federal Accountability Status (Applicable to Title I schools only.)**

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Federal Rating	Federal Status
2010-2011	2009-2010	Title I	Did not make AYP
2011-2012	2010-2011	Title I	Did not make AYP
2012-2013	2011-2012	Title I	Priority School
2013-2014	2012-2013	Title I	Priority School
2014-2015	2013-2014	Title I	Improvement Plan Required
2015-2016	2014-2015	Title I	Focus School

**Federal Accountability Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
Reading	80%	81%	74%	68%	76%	65%
Writing	61%	57%	64%	37%	36%	31%
Mathematics	78%	73%	34%	35%	56%	64%
Science	76%	72%	72%	55%	64%	54%
History	78%	64%	65%	60%	65%	64%



**SCHOOL BOARD OF THE CITY OF RICHMOND**  
**SCHOOL BOARD ROOM - 17TH FLOOR, CITY HALL**  
**301 NORTH NINTH STREET RICHMOND, VA 23219-1927 (804) 780-7716**

August 20, 2014

**MEMBERS**

THE HONORABLE:

The Honorable Christian N. Braunlich  
 Virginia State Board of Education  
 Richmond, VA 23219

DONALD L. COLEMAN  
 DISTRICT 7  
 CHAIR

Dear Chairman Braunlich:

KRISTEN N. LARSON  
 DISTRICT 4  
 VICE CHAIR

Based on preliminary SOL assessment results, Armstrong High School will not meet the benchmarks for full accreditation in the areas of Mathematics, History, and Science, which will subsequently result in the school being rated as *Accreditation Denied*. Alternatively, the School Board of the City of Richmond is requesting to enter into an agreement with the Board of Education to reconstitute the school, thereby applying for a *Conditional Accreditation* status for Armstrong High School for the 2014-2015 school year. The request for reconstitution focuses on the restructuring areas of governance, staffing and instructional programs. Although Armstrong High School was identified as a priority school in 2013-2014, the school operated without a Lead Turnaround Partner (LTP). In 2014-2015, shared governance will include the addition of a Lead Turnaround Partner (LTP) and implementation of district oversight plan that supports identification of need and strategic deployment of district, or LTP, support and monitoring of deliverables by all entities on student outcomes. In terms of staffing, the district seeks to eliminate the use of long term substitutes in the school and meet projected needs with licensed teachers. To address staffing concerns the district seeks to eliminate the use of long term substitutes in the school and meet projected needs with licensed teachers. In addition, Richmond Public Schools will enter into a partnership with Teach for America in August 2014 to provide qualified corps members for hard-to-staff schools, with preference being given to priority schools and 3<sup>rd</sup> year warned schools in the district. Findings from the 2013-2014 Virginia Department of Education's academic review revealed a misalignment in lesson planning and the *Standards of Learning* and *Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework's* essential knowledge and skills, as well as rigor. The district has implemented use of a new lesson plan template that incorporates the state's recommended components as a non-negotiable. Professional development on unpacking the standards for lesson planning and instructional delivery began in the summer of 2014 and this will be the primary area of focus for weekly monitoring and continued development through May 2015. The district will provide support and monitoring for continued professional development relative to the written, taught and assessed curriculum's alignment with Virginia's *Standards of Learning* and *Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework* through monthly oversight and alignment of support from district-level Instructional Specialists and LTP services.

GLEN H. STURTEVANT, JR.  
 DISTRICT 1

KIMBERLY B. GRAY  
 DISTRICT 2

JEFFREY M. BOURNE  
 DISTRICT 3

MAMIE L. TAYLOR  
 DISTRICT 5

SHONDA HARRIS-MUHAMMED  
 DISTRICT 6

DERIK E. JONES  
 DISTRICT 8

TICHI PINKNEY EPPES  
 DISTRICT 9

**School Demographics**

During the 2013-2014 academic school year, Armstrong High School served 974 students in grades 9-12. Of the 67 teachers that provided daily instruction, four (4) were new to teaching and three (3) were long-term substitutes.

Of the 974 students, 82% of these students received free or reduced lunch. Armstrong High School was identified as a priority school in 2009 and began implementation of a three-year turnaround model in 2010-2011.

The school did not meet exit criteria at the conclusion of the three-year implementation in 2012-2013 and continued to be identified as a priority school in 2013-2014 school year. The school did not operate with a Lead Turnaround Partner in 2013-2014. The principal worked collaboratively with the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) and VDOE contractors throughout the 2013-2014 school year during the academic review and technical assistance sessions.

**Preliminary SOL Performance (adjusted)**

**Armstrong High School**

School Year	English: Reading	Writing	Algebra I	Geometry	Algebra II
2011-2012	81%	64%	23%	34%	75%
2012-2013	68%	37%	41%	17%	66%
2013-2014	76%	36%	49%	64%	67%

School Year	VA & US History	World History I	World History II	World Geography
2011-2012	60%	66%	68%	50%
2012-2013	56%	50%	74%	0
2013-2014	65%	65%	66%	40%

School Year	Earth Science	Biology	Chemistry	Graduation Completion Index
2011-2012	78%	66%	88%	64%
2012-2013	58%	46%	75%	72%
2013-2014	70%	57%	82%	82%

English: Reading demonstrated an increase of 8 percentile points and Writing scores declined by 1 percentile point from 2012-2013 to 2013-2014. Performance in English: Reading had previously declined 13 percentile points from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013. The greater decline occurred during the period that English: Reading and Writing state standards adopted in 2010 were assessed for the first time. Based on the 2013-2014 English: Reading pass rate of 76%, it is evident that the present curriculum has been aligned fairly well to meet the rigor of the new standards. There is an opportunity to tighten the alignment for improved performance. The writing component of the curriculum requires review to identify areas of misalignment with the current *Standards of Learning* and *Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework*.

Mathematics pass rates range from 49% in Algebra I to 67% in Algebra II. Geometry scores have 47 percentile points, and Algebra I has increased by 8 percentile points from 2012-2013 to 2013-2014. New mathematics standards that were adopted in 2009 were assessed for the first time in 2011-2012. Based on the present pass rates in mathematics, it is evident that the present curriculum is not aligned with the current *Standards of Learning* and *Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework*.

World History I declined by 16 percentile points from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013 and made a 15 percentile point gain in 2013-2014. VA and US History scores declined by 4 percentile points from 2011-2012, then evidenced a 9 percentile points gain in 2013-2014.

A long term substitute filled the VA and US History position for approximately four months. World History II scores increased by 6 percentile points from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013 and dropped by 8 percentile points in 2013-2014. Based on the current scores in World History I, World History II, and VA and US History of 65%, 66% and 65% ,respectively, the curriculum does not appear to evidence alignment with the current *Standards of Learning* and *Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework* in 2013-2014.

Earth Science performance evidences a 20 percentile decline from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013, and a 12 percentile gain in 2013-2014. Biology scores decreased by 20 percentile points from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013, and made a gain of 11 percentile points in 2013-2014. Chemistry evidences a continuous decline of 13 percentile points and 7 points respectively. The state adopted new science standards in 2010 that were assessed for the first time in 2012-2013. At that time the declines in Earth Science, Biology, and Chemistry were 20, 20, and 13 percentile points respectively. The advancement of the inclusion model impacted performance, specifically in Biology. Student performance in 2013-2014 provides evidence that the school's present curriculum is not fully aligned with the current *Standards of Learning* and *Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework*.

The Graduation Completion Index has increased by 18 points from a low of 64% in 2010-2011 to 82% in 2013-2014. This gain represents the laser-like focus of the school on monitoring and support for students to graduate. Armstrong High School's School Improvement Grant-funded graduation coach position has supported these gains in the Graduation Completion Index.

### **Staffing**

Since 2011-2012, Armstrong High School has seen a turnover of 23% of the staff. In the 2014-2015 school year the school will begin with nine (9) new staff (1 Math, 3 Special Education, 1 English, 2 History, 1 guidance and 1 Health/PE). In a review of licensure, 95% of teachers are licensed in the area of their assignment. Provisionally licensed teachers comprise 3% of the staff (CTE Teacher, Special Education). Armstrong has successfully filled positions held by 3 long-term substitutes in 2013-2014. RPS has partnered with Teach for America in order to eliminate the practice of filling hard-to-staff teaching positions with long-term substitutes. Teach for America recruits high achieving recent college graduates, or professionals, who possess content expertise and the desire to play a role in ensuring educational equity for all students. Each Teach for America corps member will have successfully completed all required Teach for America preparatory training. Training will take place for corps members in 2014-2015 for placement in school in 2015-2016.

### **Shared Governance and Oversight**

Based on research that demonstrates the importance of establishing a relationship with central office and schools in need of improvement, Richmond Public Schools has initiated a strategic plan at the district level that will ensure that processes and procedures are aligned to support and monitor Armstrong High School's turnaround efforts. The measurable outcomes of the strategic intervention plan are improved student achievement and staff performance. The formal mechanism for support from central office experts, in partnership with the LTP and building-level experts, is demonstrated in the implementation of the district's initiative through the following actions:

- Dr. Dana T. Bedden, newly-appointed Superintendent of Richmond City Schools
- Reorganization of Executive Leadership Team (see RPS Organizational Chart, Attachment A)

- Reorganization and newly created positions support a framework of direct instructional support to schools and building-level administrators through strategic deployment of resources based on data-driven needs that includes the following direct reports to the Superintendent:
  - Associate Superintendent of Academic Services (newly created position providing oversight to newly created positions of Executive Director of Exceptional Education and Student Services and Director of Curriculum and Instruction, as well as Director of Professional Development, Manager of State and Local Grants, Director of Federal Programs, Manager of Testing Services, Coordinator of Research and Evaluation)
  - Executive Director of School Improvement and Innovation (newly created position providing oversight to two School Improvement Managers)
  - Executive Director of Secondary Schools (newly created) and Executive Director of Elementary Schools (newly created)
  - Executive Director of Exceptional Education and Student Services (newly created)
  - Director of Curriculum and Instruction (newly created)
- Establishment of an Office of School Turnaround and Innovation
  - Newly created office provides administrative supervision of all school improvement, innovation and programs in collaboration with district administrators and staff to ensure effective delivery of support services for schools from the district and LTP and onsite monitoring with a focus on performance outcomes
- Assignment of an Instructional Assessment Specialist to schools to support data collection for analysis by the principal as well as content area teams
  - Newly created position to ensure data from the new tools (i.e., NWEA MAP assessments, longitudinal data system) is available in a timely manner and to support data-driven decision-making
- Enhanced Annual Leadership Institute (includes all district-level administrators and instructional staff)
  - 2014-2015 Focus: “Building a Better District “and “The 20 Non-Negotiable Characteristics of Higher Performing School Systems”
- Establishment of monthly Principals Leadership Day (full-day professional development on every 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday)
  - Timely communication of district policy and departmental updates, as well as continued support for implementation of tasks to address Essential Actions from the academic review and LTP needs assessment
  - Ensure continued focus on the district’s priorities based on *ACT Core Practice Framework*:
    - Provide clear, prioritized learning objectives by grade and subject that all students are expected to master
    - Provide strong principals, a talented teacher pool, and layered professional development
    - Provide evidence-and standards-based instructional tools that support academic rigor for all students
    - Develop and use student assessment and data management systems to monitor student learning
    - Respond to data through curricular/instructional adjustments or targeted interventions

- Ensure an aligned focus with the district's priorities at the school level:
  - Set expectations and goals for teaching and learning based on the district's written curriculum
  - Select and develop teachers to ensure high-quality instruction
  - Promote strategies and build structures and schedules to support academic rigor
  - Monitor teacher performance and student learning
  - Use targeted interventions to address learning needs of teachers and students
- Establishment of monthly Assistant Principals Leadership Day (4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday - full-day professional development)
  - Develop a pipeline of potential leaders
- Implementation of a longitudinal data system
  - Provide student data for timely analysis of instructional impact on student achievement and for efficient assignment and monitoring of interventions
- Alignment of Human Resources structures and processes to ensure high quality staffing
  - Contract with Teach for America (fill hard-to-staff positions and priority schools will receive preference for assignments)
  - Newly created district-level staffing position for exceptional education
- Establishment of the Office for Family and Community Engagement (FACE)
  - Parental outreach/involvement, truancy and dropout prevention
- Contractual agreement with a Lead Turnaround Partner to provide services that address the outside vendor's needs assessment and the Essential Actions from VDOE's academic review findings
  - Collaborate with central office Executive Leadership Team and LTP to establish performance metrics on which to measure LTP's services in relation to student achievement for inclusion in contract, or memorandum of understanding, and identification of shared responsibilities for delivery and monitoring of services, to include:
    - Corrective action plan with next steps, person responsible, timeline, required resources, expected outcomes, and plan for monitoring and evaluation of impact
    - Support of school leadership (principal, lead teachers and instructional specialists/coaches) in addressing alignment of curriculum to *Standards of Learning* and *Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework* in lesson plans and delivery of instruction
  - Oversight of the LTP efforts will be provided by the principal, VDOE Office of School Improvement contractor and Office of School Improvement and Innovation
    - Office of School Improvement and Innovation will support monitoring during weekly visits and during School Improvement Team meetings
      - Written feedback on lesson plans and observations will be reviewed and written feedback provided to the principal
      - District Office of School Improvement and Innovation will ensure that identified needs are met by alignment of resources from LTP and district as evidenced in School Improvement Team meeting minutes
      - District Office of School Improvement and Innovation will ensure tasks identified during each School Improvement Team meeting are documented in the School's Improvement Plan and other actions evidenced in the meeting minutes

- OSI contractor will monitor LTP, as well as district support for school turnaround efforts through monthly visits and attend monthly School Improvement Team meetings
  - Written feedback will be shared with school, OSI contractor and LTP within five (5) days of each Quarterly District-level Data meeting (focus on next steps - who, what, when, evidence of completion)
- Attendance at VDOE technical assistance sessions (6) on *Aligning the Academic Review with Performance Evaluation (AARPE)* to support principal's implementation of required follow-up work from each session and receive training on providing feedback to principals. VDOE's purpose for these technical assistance sessions is to:
  - Improve instruction and instructional leadership practices by strengthening the alignment between the Performance Standards for Teachers and Principals and the Lesson Planning, Lesson Observation, Professional Development, and Leadership Academic Review Tools.
  - Develop sample evidence for the sample performance indicators in Teacher Performance Standards for professional knowledge, instructional delivery (planning), assessment of and for learning, and learning environment. The sample evidence for each performance indicator will become a tool that can enhance Richmond's observation tools. (District and School Leadership)

In August 2014, the Office of School Improvement and Innovation tiered priority schools based on a metric that included number of years in priority status, number of years *Accredited with Warning*, number of areas of warning, preliminary pass rate, and benchmark gap by content area and gain/regression points based on preliminary 2013-2014 data, etc. Armstrong High School has been tiered for a moderate level of support and will receive, at minimum, the following:

- Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) will be used to assess what level students are performing at, what students know and are ready to learn, and to measure student growth
- Longitudinal data system will provide access to time-relevant and comprehensive student data to improve instructional practice and increase student achievement by supporting data-driven planning for differentiation and intervention selection
- District oversight: assigned Office of School Improvement and Innovation staff member will:
  - Conduct bi-monthly onsite meetings with principal, targeting instructional leadership, feedback on lesson plans and observations
  - Facilitate prioritization and delivery of instructional supports from the district (i.e., instructional specialists), ensuring professional development is aligned with identified needs and anticipated outcomes relative to student achievement are determined
  - Provide district-level representation for the monthly School Improvement Team meeting (assist in continued maintenance of instructional focus and actionable next steps) See Attachment B
  - Provide support for and ensure completion of Essential Actions from the VDOE academic review
  - Ensure implementation of follow through from directives of the OSI-assigned contractor
  - Support monitoring of Lead Turnaround Partner services in relation to contracted performance outcomes

- Ensure school improvement team's timely updates to the School Improvement Plan, including incorporation of tasks aligned to the Essential Actions from the academic review by September 1, 2014 and fall 2014 needs assessment by November 15, 2014.
- Support the effective use of VDOE resources
- Participation in the ongoing VDOE technical assistance, *Aligning Academic Review with Performance Evaluation (AARPE)* training which focuses on developing sample evidence for the sample performance indicators in Teacher Performance Standards for professional knowledge, instructional delivery, assessment of and for learning, and learning environment
- District assigned Instructional Assessment Specialist to support analysis of data by principal, teachers and department teams, including support with cohort graduation monitoring
- Presentation of a quarterly data-driven progress overview by the Principal to the Superintendent, Associate Superintendent, Executive Director of Secondary, Executive Director of School Improvement and Innovation and School Improvement Program Managers, Director of Instruction, LTP representative, and OSI contractor (summary to be provided to School Board)
  - Presentation will include inferences made from quarterly data analysis, next steps, request for support/resources and measurable outcomes relative to student achievement
  - Written feedback will be provided by district team

### **Instructional Program**

Armstrong High School will contract with an outside evaluator for a complete needs assessment to be conducted by October 30, 2014. Department chairs will meet biweekly with members to facilitate alignment of written plans. In addition, the following non-negotiable routines have been established for classroom teachers:

- Implementation of Armstrong Priorities Freshman Academy – program to provide extensive and appropriate instruction for a cohort of 60 ninth grade students who enter with performance significantly below grade level (supported by Bon Secours Richmond Health Systems community partnership)
- Implementation of collaborative professional learning community initiative with John Marshall High School to ensure curriculum alignment and enhanced instructional strategies
- Participation by mathematics teachers in the Southern Initiative Algebra Project training (5 days/summer 2014) – additional training and follow-up pending funding
- Use of daytime Bridge Academy – a credit recovery initiative for students who need additional academic and SOL support to meet on-time graduation requirements
- Ongoing professional development and coaching with collaborative teams (17 teams weekly)
- Implementation of Positive Behavior Interventions Support – professional development and development of intentional outcomes
- Continued support for Coaches in the Classroom grant – academic support for all athletes

In 2013-2014, the school underwent a VDOE academic review in fall 2013 with a follow-up in spring 2014. This review focused on examining the alignment of the written, taught and assessed curriculum. The overall finding of the review was the misalignment in the written, taught and tested curriculum. Resulting Essential Actions from the academic review target improvement of Tier I instruction by addressing the following practices:

- Providing written guidance and specific feedback to teachers on development of lessons and delivery of a taught curriculum that is aligned with the *Standards of Learning* and *Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework* by:

- Teachers developing aligned lesson plans to the *Standards of Learning* and *Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework* with attention to the content and cognitive level, including clear student behaviors with conditions and criteria necessary to evidence learning
- Principals and administrative staff providing written observation feedback to teachers that is frequent and specific in regards to the alignment of lesson plans and lesson delivery
- Ensuring school schedules provide time for all teachers to plan in horizontal collaborative groups, inclusive of special education and as individuals

Essential Actions from the academic review and the present, or planned, implementation status are presented in the chart below.

Essential Action	Status
1. Provide professional development and technical assistance for teachers and administrators on the <i>Alignment with/of Standards, Big Ideas, and Objectives Component of the School Lesson Plan Evaluation Tool</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Professional development for all teachers (new teachers 8/19/2014 and other teachers by 8/20/2014); returning teachers by August 29, 2014</li> </ul>
2. Establish and implement a system for monitoring lesson plans to ensure alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Complete by August 2014</li> </ul>
3. Create division lesson plan template	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Completed</li> </ul>
4. Ensure teachers use the RPS lesson plan template to focus on the <i>Alignment Component</i> with evidence of unpacked standards, big ideas/essential questions, and objectives that include behaviors, conditions and criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will begin September 2014 and continue through May 2015</li> </ul>
5. Conduct peer review of lesson plans during departmental meetings/grade level meetings and work collaboratively to ensure lesson plans are aligned with <i>Standards of Learning</i> and <i>Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Monitoring/feedback from September 2014 through May 2015 (monthly oversight by Office of School Improvement and Innovation team, Curriculum and Instruction and Executive Directors of Secondary Schools)</li> </ul>
6. Provide additional service to support peer review of lesson plans and successive steps from action plan, including feedback as lessons are implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Begins September 2014 (weekly oversight by Office of School Improvement and Innovation team)</li> </ul>
7. View OSI training modules/videos in order to support the lesson plan essentials (Office of School Turnaround Team)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Begins August 26 and 27, 2014 (monitored and supported by Office of School Improvement and Innovation team)</li> </ul>
8. Participate in training for staff on implementing GIZMO and 10 Marks math into development of lesson plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● March 2014 training for all math teachers with 10 MARKS representative; April 2014 training for all math and science teachers on GIZMOs</li> </ul>
9. Participate with Cohort III schools in VDOE/OSI differentiated technical assistance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● July, August (complete)</li> <li>● September, October, November and January</li> </ul>

In order to provide the high quality professional development required to implement the strategic plan outlined in this letter and provide time for collaboration and planning, the Superintendent will also be requesting the Richmond City School Board to consider a change in the actual number of contract days, as well as daily hours worked. The present teacher contract includes 200 days, however, teachers only work 191 actual days. Virginia's State Code states the following:


**Virginia Code §22.1-302. Written contracts required; execution of contracts; qualifications of temporarily employed teachers; rules and requirements.**

The standard 10-month contract shall include 200 days, including (i) a minimum of 180 teaching days or 990 instructional hours and (ii) up to 20 days for activities such as teaching, participating in professional development, planning, evaluating, completing records and reports, participating on committees or in conferences, or such other activities as may be assigned or approved by the local school board.

The Superintendent will request that teachers work the additional 9 days for which they are contracted. In addition, the Superintendent will propose an extension to the school day hours worked to support opportunities for planning and collaboration.


In closing, Armstrong High School has made significant progress in the Graduation Completer Index from 64% to 82%. The 2013-2014 scores evidence improvement in 9 of 11 courses, with gains from 1 percentile point to 47 percentile points. Based on the findings of the VDOE academic review, the underlying cause has been determined to be the misalignment between the content area curriculum and the *Standards of Learning* and *Standards of Learning Curriculum Framework* in each content area. The Essential Actions from the 2013-2014 VDOE academic review have provided a series of actionable steps to be taken at the district- and school-level in 2014-2015. In addition, the comprehensive needs assessment to be conducted in Fall 2014 will provide additional data for areas of focus. The district has a newly-appointed superintendent who has established an organizational structure aligned to bring a laser-like focus to instruction and provide targeted support, resources and oversight to the school. Completion of the VDOE recommended essential actions communicated to the district in May 2014 promises bring significant improvement to academic performance in all content areas. The addition of a LTP for 2014-2015 will support the needs of this priority school through a thorough needs and aligned deliverables. As described in this letter, the newly created Office of School Improvement and Innovation has targeted Armstrong High School for moderate support in 2014-2015 and outlined a plan for timely support, resource allocations and monitoring. Data clearly demonstrates that Tier I instruction is a concern in all content areas. RPS requests an opportunity to address the VDOE essential actions, secure a LTP, and implement the strategic plan outlined in this letter to support dramatic improvements in student achievement in 2014-2015 under a status of *Conditional Accreditation*.

Respectfully Submitted,



Donald Coleman  
School Board Chairman

# Richmond Public Schools



Leadership Team  
Revised 05/19/20

**School Improvement Team Agenda (non-negotiable)**

**I. Meeting Date (location and time)**

**II. Team Members in Attendance/Guests in Attendance (includes a designated Wise Ways “shepherd”, timekeeper, note taker, district representative, LTP representative, Principal and members of the school’s leadership team)**

**III. School Improvement Plan Indicators to Assess (may only apply to 2-year old indicators requiring reassessment unless school is a recently identified priority school)**

- List of indicators, including the description, serving as the focus topic(s) for the meeting
  - Generated by principal in collaboration with LTP and district
  - Based on the school turnaround “work” being done (i.e., data from review of lesson plans and observations, status of implementation for desired professional development outcomes, targeted services from the LTP, district or VDOE and outcome)

**IV. School Improvement Plan Indicators for Review**

- List of indicators, including the description, serving as the focus topic(s) for the meeting
  - Generated by principal in collaboration with LTP and district
  - Based on the school turnaround “work” being done (i.e., data from review of lesson plans and observations, status of implementation for desired professional development outcomes, targeted services from the LTP, district or VDOE and outcome)
- List of indicators, including the description, targeted for updates during this meeting

**V. Other Business (to include items dealing with school improvement plan only, reserve grade-level or faculty meetings for business dealing with management topics, field trips, etc.)**

- May include upcoming required reports or review of reports prior to submission (i.e., Leading, Lagging and Intervention reports, Quarterly Data Analysis Reports)
- Summaries (feedback) from walkthroughs and/or observations or review of improvement plan, written feedback etc. conducted by district, OSI contact, LTP

**VI. Action Taken**

- Responsible person, target completion date, next steps, report out date (if ongoing)
  - Includes requests for support and resources being requested from, or delivered by, the district or LTP
  - Determination if the action resides in the minutes or will become part of the school’s improvement plan
- Review progress on Leading Indicator Report benchmarks
- Review alignment to district priorities

**VII. Next Meeting (Date, Time Location)**

- Expected “report-outs”

Armstrong High School  
Current Grade Span: 9-12  
Richmond City Public Schools

**Teacher Performance and Licensure Data**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Number of Teachers</b>	<b>Percent of All Teachers</b>	<b>Area of Teaching</b>
<b>Number and percent of teachers scoring above proficient in 2013-2014</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.92%</b>	
<b>Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015</b>	<b>1</b>		
<b>Number and percent of teachers scoring proficient in 2013-2014</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>94.83%</b>	
<b>Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015</b>	<b>46</b>		
<b>Number and percent of teachers scoring below proficient in 2013-2014</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3.85%</b>	
<b>Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015</b>	<b>1</b>		
<b>Number and percent of teachers fully licensed in 2014-2015</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>65%</b>	
<b>Number and percent of new teachers to the school in 2014-2015</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14.58%</b>	
<b>Number and percent of provisional teachers in 2014-2015</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4.17%</b>	
<b>Number and percent of teachers not teaching in their endorsed area in 2014-2015 (name each area in which teachers are not endorsed)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>%</b>	
<b>Number and percent of long-term substitutes-that may be employed possibly more than 45 days (licensed or not licensed) in 2014-2015 (name each area in which there is a long-term substitute that may be employed more than 45 days)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6.25%</b>	<b>(1)</b> <b>Exceptional Education</b> <b>(1) English</b> <b>(1)</b> <b>Technical Education</b>

**Principal Tenure at this School and description of track record of success in working in a low-performing school: Explain in a paragraph**

The principal's instructional leadership and focus on high school students' success is reflected by the school's the 18 percentile point gain in graduation rate (64% to 82%). The principal's strategic staffing plan has led to greater student learning as evidenced by gains from 2013-2014

to 2014-2015 by in English (8 percentile points) Algebra I (8 percentile points), Geometry (47 percentile points), VA and US History (9 percentile points), World History (15 percentile points), Earth Science (12 percentile points, Biology (11 percentile points), Chemistry (7 percentile points). Principal initiatives have included: Senior Parent Teacher Conferences for at-risk graduates, partnerships with local universities for internships and dual enrollment opportunities, community partnerships and staff recognition. Timely communication and monitoring is demonstrated by principal's weekly updates, daily discipline logs, and monitored weekly departmental meetings.

**Area(s) of Reconstitution:**

**Governance**

**Change in Staff**

**Change in Instructional Program**

**Requesting a Conditional: Yes**

**Conditional or Denied in Past Accreditation Cycles:**

No

**Reconstitution Type(s) for Conditional:** Governance

**Link to the corrective action plan:**

**Achievement Data**

**State Accountability - Accreditation Designation**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Accreditation Rating</b>	<b>Based on Statewide Assessments in</b>	<b>Area(s) of Warning</b>
2002-2003	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2001-2002	Mathematics, History, Science
2003-2004	<i>Provisionally Accredited/Needs Improvement</i>	2002-2003	N/A
2004-2005	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2003-2004	History
2005-2006	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2004-2005	N/A
2006-2007	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2005-2006	N/A
2007-2008	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2006-2007	N/A
2008-2009	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2007-2008	N/A
2009-2010	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2008-2009	N/A
2010-2011	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2009-2010	N/A
2011-2012	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2010-2011	GCI
2012-2013	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2011-2012	Mathematics, History, GCI
2013-2014	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2012-2013	Mathematics, History, Science, GCI
2014-2015	<i>TBD</i>	2013-2014	Mathematics, History, Science, GCI

**Federal Accountability Sanction**

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Federal Status (SIG- PRIOR TO WAIVER PROIRTY/FOCUS OR NOT TITLE I)
2010-2011	2009-2010	SIG
2011-2012	2010-2011	SIG
2012-2013	2011-2012	Priority
2013-2014	2012-2013	Continued Priority
2014-2015	2013-2014	Exiting Priority

**Federal Accountability Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates								State Pass Rates	
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2012-2013	2013-2014
Reading	83%	82%	87%	80%	81%	74%	68%	76%	75%	74%
Writing	91%	71%	74%	61%	57%	64%	37%	36%	76%	75%
Mathematics	81%	69%	71%	78%	73%	34%	35%	56%	71%	74%
Science	79%	74%	73%	76%	72%	72%	55%	64%	81%	80%
History	75%	71%	74%	78%	64%	65%	60%	65%	85%	84%

**Graduation and Completion Index, if applicable**

Year	Index
2011	66
2012	64
2013	72
2014	82

**Bayside Middle School**  
**Grades: 7-8**  
**Virginia Beach City Public Schools**

**State Accountability - Accreditation Designation**

Accreditation is based on assessments taken in the previous year.

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Accreditation Rating	Area(s) of Warning
2010-2011	2009-2010	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	N/A
2011-2012	2010-2011	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	Mathematics
2012-2013	2011-2012	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	Mathematics
2013-2014	2012-2013	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	Mathematics
2014-2015	2013-2014	<i>Conditionally Accredited</i>	English, Mathematics, History
2015-2016	2014-2015	<i>TBD</i>	English

**State Accreditation Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
English	86%	85%	86%	77%	68%	65%
Mathematics	71%	60%	50%	53%	61%	80%
Science	93%	91%	93%	84%	76%	72%
History	79%	80%	76%	72%	66%	83%
Graduation Completion Index	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Federal Accountability Status (Applicable to Title I schools only.)**

Year	Based on Statewide Assessments in	Federal Rating	Federal Status
2010-2011	2009-2010	Title I	Did not make AYP
2011-2012	2010-2011	Title I	Did not make AYP
2012-2013	2011-2012	Title I	Improvement Plan Required
2013-2014	2012-2013	Title I	Improvement Plan Required
2014-2015	2013-2014	Title I	Met AMOs
2015-2016	2014-2015	Title I	Improvement Plan Required

**Federal Accountability Pass Rates by Assessment Year**

Assessment Type	School Pass Rates					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
Reading	80%	81%	74%	68%	76%	69%
Writing	61%	57%	64%	37%	36%	56%
Mathematics	78%	73%	34%	35%	56%	768%
Science	76%	72%	72%	55%	64%	72%
History	78%	64%	65%	60%	65%	83%



School Administration Building# 6, Municipal Center

2512 George Mason Dr.

P. O. Box 6038

Virginia Beach, VA 23456

(757) 263-1000

**MISSION STATEMENT**

The Virginia Beach City Public Schools, in partnership with the entire community, will empower every student to become a life-long learner who is a responsible, productive and engaged citizen within the global community.

**School Board of the City of Virginia Beach**

Daniel D. Edwards, Kempsville, Chair

William J. Brunke, IV, Princess Anne, Vice Chair

Beverly M. Anderson, At-Large

Emma L. "Em" Davis, Lynnhaven

Dorothy M. "Dottie" Holtz, At-Large

Joel A. McDonald, Rose Hall

Bobby Melatti, At-Large

Sam Reid, Beach

Elizabeth E. Taylor, At-Large

Leonard C. Tengco, Centerville

Carolyn D. Weems, Bayside

Aaron C. Spence, Ed.D., Superintendent

July 23, 2014

Mr. Christian N. Braunlich, President  
Virginia Board of Education  
PO Box 2120  
Richmond, VA 23218

Dear President Braunlich,

In accordance with the provision outlined in 8 VAC 20-131-300C of the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*, The School Board of the City of Virginia Beach is seeking a conditional accreditation rating for Bayside Middle School based on reconstitution. The definitions of reconstitution we are applying include: Governance, Instructional Program, Staff and Student Body.

This request is made based on three years of student achievement data that indicate the current structure of Bayside Middle School is not meeting the academic and developmental needs of its students. There is a need to provide a more focused approach to staffing, professional learning, building teacher-student relationships, and instructional programming that recognizes the unique needs of the community. While Bayside Middle School has been the recipient of many different programs and human resources over the past few years, the allocation of those resources has not been focused and intentional in their implementation due in part to the current school structure. Therefore, our goal is to create two schools, one 6<sup>th</sup> grade only campus and one combined 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade campus, with a smaller student to teacher ratio to enable a stronger focus on student learning and to promote the development of relationships with parents. The Bayside 6<sup>th</sup> Grade Campus will earn accreditation separate from the Bayside 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Campus based on each campus having separate state identification numbers. The remaining documentation will outline how we will ensure focus and intentionality.

**Governance Team**

According to research conducted by the Wallace Foundation (2011), the practices of principals are divided into three core responsibilities: setting direction, developing people and developing the organization. Equally, the Wallace Foundation (2011) notes that "district offices can be turned into a crucial ally of education reform. What is required is that offices adopt the role of service centers for better teaching and learning." This is parallel to the expectations of the Virginia Department of Education's Office of School Improvement's Differentiated Technical Assistance Team.

By creating and including a shared governance team, the principals of these schools will have greater access to central office staff, who will assist and support the three core responsibilities. Equally, resources (both human and physical) can be identified, supported and monitored more closely to ensure increased student achievement and professional learning for staff. Therefore, the shared governance team for both the Bayside 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> grade campuses will consist of the principal, the director for middle schools, executive director for secondary Teaching and Learning, chief academic officer, executive director for Differentiated Academic Programs, and the assistant superintendent for Planning, Innovation and Accountability.

### **Instructional Programming**

The School Board of the City of Virginia Beach is committed to providing focused instructional resources to both Bayside school campuses that will include a reduction in class-size in core content classes (22:1). Both campuses will be staffed with additional reading and math specialists who will provide both direct reading and math instruction to students and structured, regular and job-embedded professional learning opportunities to staff. Equally, the current schedule will be revised to ensure that math and reading instruction occur daily. Students will develop social and organizational skills, as well as be provided remediation and enrichment as appropriate. The increased time for instruction in math and language arts will require additional professional learning for math and English teachers. This will become a part of the school's professional learning plan to ensure the time in class is focused and aligned to the standards. The essential actions identified in the 2013-14 Academic Review will also be used to develop professional learning and strengthen instructional programming.

### **Student Body**

The School Board of the City of Virginia Beach is committed to maximizing resources to meet the needs of the students at Bayside 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> grade campuses. We have committed to relocating the rising sixth grade students to an alternate location, thus creating a Bayside 6<sup>th</sup> grade campus, thereby creating a Bayside 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade campus. Early this school year, the central office staff held an informational meeting for parents and the community at the Bayside 6<sup>th</sup> grade campus to share the reason for the change, the vision and next steps. This event was very well attended and parents were allowed to ask questions during the meeting, as well as by email. Although there will be no changes to the zoning or the make-up of the student body, housing students in two separate buildings and separating all grade levels will facilitate focusing on the educational and the social-emotional needs of every student and building stronger relationships with parents

### **Staff**

The School Board of the City of Virginia Beach recognizes the unique needs of the students and community of Bayside 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> grade campuses, thus determining the staffing needs of the building has been a high priority. Members of the governance team, including the building principals have worked to develop teams at both campuses who are strong in their delivery of content, but also flexible, fair and consistent in providing engaging learning environments. This process began with our former superintendent (who is currently the deputy superintendent) meeting with the staff of Bayside Middle School to inform them of the plans and offering the option of voluntary transfer. Staff members who chose to remain were asked to pledge to a set of "staff expectations" and a three-year commitment.

In addition to the reconstitution of staff, the School Board is committed to supporting the central office staff in developing an alternate professional learning plan for Bayside 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> grade campuses. All staff members will be required to participate in professional learning that is job-embedded and driven by the needs of all students at either campus. The professional learning topics will include, but are not limited to, brain-based research, teaching the

adolescent learner, meeting the needs of the under-resourced learner and community, establishing effective professional learning communities, and focusing learning on the alignment of the written, taught and tested curriculum.

The current principal of Bayside Middle School, Dr. Paula Johnson, will serve as the principal for the Bayside 7th and 8th Grade Campus. Dr. Johnson is a 25 year veteran of public education as well as the 2013 Virginia Association of Secondary School Principals Assistant Principal of the Year. Dr. Johnson had extensive teaching experience at the elementary, middle and high school levels prior to starting her administrative career in 2006. Mrs. Joy Byrd-Butler has been chosen as the principal for the Bayside 6th Grade Campus. Mrs. Byrd-Butler, is a 20 year veteran of public education. Her previous assignment was as principal at Green Run Elementary School.

The remaining administrative staff for both campuses will consist of assistant principals, deans of students and an administrative assistant at the 7<sup>th</sup>/8<sup>th</sup> grade campus.

### Current Demographics

The demographic data summarized below are based on data collected at the end of the 2013-2014 school year and obtained through the division’s web-based management system. At the end of the 2013-2014 school year, Bayside Middle School enrollment was 987 students: 333 in grade 6, 330 in grade 7, and 324 in grade 8. In grades 6 and 7, 48.4% were male and 51.6% were female. In grade 8, 59% of students were male and 41% were female. Most students were age appropriate- 12 years old at the end of the 2013-2014 school year in grade 6, 13 years old in grade 7, and 14 years old in grade 8.

The majority of students at Bayside Middle were reported as NOT Hispanic/Latino (about 91%). Data indicates that 60% of students were African American and 20% were Caucasian, while Asian students made up 3.6% of the student population. There were 22 students identified as Limited English Proficient: 11 in grade 6, 4 in grade 7, and 7 in grade 8. Bayside Middle School was servicing 84 gifted and talented students: 34 in grade 6, 19 in grade 7, and 31 in grade 8. A total of 131 students were identified and receiving special education services based on an Individualized Education Plan: 39 students in grade 6, 51 students in grade 7, and 41 students in grade 8. Bayside Middle School provided 729 of 987 students (73.8%) with either free or reduced lunch: 64.6% free and 9.2% reduced.

This table is a summary of the information listed in the above narrative.

Category	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Total Unique
Count of Students	333	330	324	<b>987</b>
Male	47.4%	49.4%	59.0%	<b>512</b>
Female	52.6%	50.6%	41.0%	<b>475</b>
Hispanic/Latino	11.1%	6.4%	8.3%	<b>85</b>
NOT Hispanic/Latino	88.9%	93.6%	91.7%	<b>902</b>
Caucasian	20.4%	15.8%	24.4%	<b>199</b>
African American	54.1%	65.8%	60.8%	<b>594</b>
Asian	4.2%	3.9%	2.8%	<b>36</b>
Limited English Proficient	3.3%	1.2%	2.2%	<b>22</b>
Gifted and Talented	10.2%	5.8%	9.6%	<b>84</b>
Individualized Education Plan	11.7%	15.5%	12.7%	<b>131</b>
Free Lunch	64.6%	69.7%	59.6%	<b>638</b>
Reduced Lunch	7.5%	8.8%	11.4%	<b>91</b>

The mobility, average class size, attendance, and staff characteristics summarized below are based on data from the *Virginia Beach City Public Schools Annual Middle School Report Card* issued for the 2013-2014 school year (Attachment A). The data were collected in fall 2013.

Student mobility at Bayside Middle School was reported to be 30%. The average class size was reported at approximately 22 students in English and approximately 26 students in mathematics, science, and social studies. The school's average daily attendance was reported to be 95%.

Bayside Middle School staff was reported as 62% Caucasian and 30.6% African-American. Most staff were female (69.4%) and the majority had graduate degrees (56.9%). It was reported that the average years of teaching experience was 12.7 years.

### **Test Scores and Background Information**

Bayside Middle School has been accredited with warning in mathematics for three consecutive years. Based on preliminary data, it is projected that Bayside Middle School will not meet accreditation benchmarks in the areas of mathematics, English, and history for the 2014-2015 school year based on 2013-2014 SOL test data. Before sharing 2014 results it is important to review results from 2012 and 2013 to gain insight into the growth that did occur in math and reading from 2013 to 2014. When looking at unadjusted preliminary SOL test data comparing spring 2012 to spring 2013, grade 6 mathematics scores increased from 38.2% to 53.4%, a 15.2% increase from the previous year. Grade 8 mathematics increased slightly (.31%). Grade 7 mathematics and Geometry scores decreased 2.7% and 3.1% respectively, while Algebra I scores decreased by 21.5% (78.3% to 56.8%). Grades 6, 7, and 8 reading test scores as well as grade 8 writing scores decreased from spring 2012 to spring 2013 ranging from 23.9% to 31.4%. Grades 6 and 7 history scores showed slight increases from spring 2012 to spring 2013, 2.1% and 3.7% respectively. Grade 8 history scores decreased 5.9% from 72.3% to 66.4%.

When looking at unadjusted preliminary SOL test data comparing spring 2013 to spring 2014, mathematics scores at all levels, with the exception of Geometry, showed an increase. Grade 7 mathematics scores increased from 21% to 52.5%, a 31.6% increase from last year. Algebra I scores showed a 22.2% increase from last year (56.8% to 79.0%). Grade 8 mathematics scores increased from 29.9% to 40.8%, a 10.9% increase from last year. Grade 6 mathematics SOL test scores increased less than 1% (.89%) from spring 2013 to spring 2014. Geometry scores decreased 8.7% from last year (81.8% to 73.1%). Grades 6, 7, and 8 reading test scores as well as grade 8 writing scores increased from last year ranging from 2.5% to 10.8%. Grade 8 reading scores showed the largest increase, 10.8% from spring 2013 (56.9% to 67.7%). Grades 6 and 7 history scores showed decreases from last year, 3.9% and 2.5% respectively. Grade 8 history scores increased from 66.4% to 68.6%, a 2.2% increase from last year.

This table is a summary of the information listed in the above narrative.

Test	Spring 2012 Percent	Spring 2013 Percent	Percentage Point Change from 2012 to 2013	Spring 2014 Percent	Percentage Point Change from 2013 to 2014
Grade 6 Mathematics	38.16	53.36	15.20	54.25	.89
Grade 7 Mathematics	23.65	20.97	-2.68	52.54	31.57
Grade 8 Mathematics	29.60	29.91	.31	40.83	10.92
Algebra I	78.30	56.77	-21.53	78.95	22.18
Geometry	84.91	81.82	-3.09	73.13	-8.69
Grade 6 Reading	79.65	52.79	-26.86	58.54	5.75
Grade 7 Reading	85.76	61.83	-23.93	64.29	2.46
Grade 8 Reading	83.45	56.91	-26.54	67.68	10.77
Grade 8 Writing	84.77	53.35	-31.42	59.38	6.03
Grade 6 US History I	65.06	67.13	2.07	63.19	-3.94
Grade 7 US History II	60.12	63.82	3.70	61.31	-2.51
Grade 8 Civics	72.30	66.35	-5.95	68.62	2.27

### Changes in Staff

Staffing a school is one of the most essential pieces to the school's success. Not only is there a need to have teachers who have strong content knowledge, but they also must have the ability to connect with their students and the community they serve. For those reasons a tremendous amount of effort has gone into reconstituting the staff, especially within the four core subject areas at Bayside Middle School. Not only has the staff been reconstituted, but there also has been an increase in staff allotment for the 6<sup>th</sup> grade campus and the 7/8<sup>th</sup> grade campus. During the 2013-14 school year there were 37 core 6<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup> grade teachers. Without any major changes in the student count, we have increased the number of core teachers to 50 for both schools, thus reducing the class sizes for all core content area classes to 22 students per class.

During the second semester of the 2013-14 school year, the decision was made to reconstitute the staff at Bayside Middle School for the 2014-15 school year. Teachers who were currently teaching at Bayside Middle School were given the opportunity to be placed elsewhere in the division or agree to a three year commitment to stay at Bayside Middle School while also agreeing to a list of expectations (Attachment B). With this request, 17 of the 37 (45.9%) core subject area teachers left their teaching positions at Bayside Middle School. As previously mentioned, the goal was to create two schools, one housing only the 6<sup>th</sup> grade students to focus on the transition to secondary education and the other to house the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students in separate areas on the original campus. While reviewing the changes in staffing, please note there are currently 2 vacancies, which will be filled in August.

During the 2013-14 school year, there were 15/37 or 40.5% of the core teachers on a probationary status (within their first three years of teaching). For the 2014-15 school year at Bayside Middle School (7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Campus), there

will be 32 core teachers with 15/30 (50%) of the teachers on probationary status including those with experience hired from outside of our division who will be on a one year probationary period per school board policy. In addition 9/30 (30%) teachers hold advanced degrees within the core areas and 28/30 (93.3%) staff currently hired are fully licensed. One 7<sup>th</sup> grade English teacher and one 8<sup>th</sup> grade science teacher have provisional licenses.

This table is a summary of the information listed in the above narrative.

	2013-14 Bayside MS Grades 6, 7, 8	2014-15 Bayside MS Grades 7 and 8	2014-15 Bayside MS Grade 6
<b>Core Team Teachers</b> Math, English, Sci, SS	37	32 (currently 2 vacancies)	18 (currently 1 vacancy)
<b>Probationary Status</b>	15/37 (40.5%)	15/30 (50%)	11/17 (64.7%)
<b>Advanced degrees</b>	15/37 (40.5)	9/30 (30%)	5/17 (29.4%)
<b>Fully licensed</b>	34/37 (91.8%)	28/30 (93.3%)	15/17 (88.2%)
<b>Provisional license</b>	3/37 (8.1%)	2/30 (6.6%)	2/17 (11.7%)

### School Governance

The shared governance team’s primary role is to provide timely service to the principal in the identified areas. This includes, but is not limited to, addressing staffing concerns, instructional needs, community needs and professional learning opportunities. Each member was chosen because of his/her prior experiences as building principals in addition to his/her current role that will facilitate the school improvement process.

This table below is a summary of the information listed in the above narrative.

	Direct Supervision of the Principals	Curriculum Support	Professional Learning Support	Data Support	Staffing Support
<b>Principals</b>		X	X		X
<b>Director of Middle School</b>	X				X
<b>Chief Academic Officer</b>		X	X		
<b>Executive Director of Secondary Instruction (Department of Teaching and Learning)</b>		X			X
<b>Executive Director of Differentiated Academic Programs and Professional Learning (Department of Teaching and Learning)</b>			X		X
<b>Assistant Superintendent, Planning, Innovation and Accountability</b>				X	

The governance team will serve both campuses and meet twice a month (Attachment C) at Bayside Middle School (7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Campus). The governance team will function as a professional learning community. As previously mentioned, the governance team will work collaboratively to establish priority areas to include increasing student achievement and building the knowledge and leadership capacity of the staff. These priority areas will derive from the essential actions of the last academic review, as well as from the five strategic objectives that are a part of Virginia

Beach City Public Schools' strategic plan, *Compass to 2015*. The essential actions, strategic objectives and identified data will drive the agenda of the meetings to ensure focus. The agenda for the governance team meetings will be generated by the Principal and the Director of Middle Schools (Attachment D). The agenda will be sent to the members of the governance team prior to the meeting, so that the appropriate human and/or material resources can be brought to and considered at the meeting. The committee will report to the division superintendent on a monthly basis (Attachment E). Additionally, reports will be made to the school board throughout the process.

**Instructional Resources-** The governance team will collaborate to identify human and material resources that are needed at both campuses, based on student needs. Once the resources have been identified, a critical path with staff assignments and timelines will be developed to ensure effective implementation.

**Instructional Programming-** The governance team will collaborate to identify the multiple data points that will be used to inform instruction. A timeline of implementation and monitoring will be developed by the team. Essential Actions from the 2013-14 State Academic Review will be used to enhance instructional practices and develop professional learning (Attachment F). The essential actions outlined for the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade campus include the following:

PD 05- Incorporate peer coaching, modeling and problem solving as systematic follow up to professional development

PD 09 – Provide professional development opportunities for newly implemented instructional interventions to include training, monitoring and follow up/collaboration.

PD 13 – Provide training for teachers on planning instruction to engage students with disabilities to a greater extent in active learning opportunities and to develop a plan for systematic monitoring of the implementation.

SP 04 – Develop a system for monitoring instruction that includes: documenting instructional practices used; collecting and reporting baseline data; providing feedback that is timely, specific and actionable and support to teachers

SC 11 – Promote positive relationships among all stakeholders to promote positive peer relationships, shared ownership, collaboration among staff, enhanced through student teacher relationships.

**Communication-** All communication to staff will come from the principal directly, not members of the governance team.

**School and/or classroom visits-** Classroom and/or school observations will be conducted by members of the governance team. Other observers may include the superintendent, chief of staff, deputy superintendent, senior leadership, division level leadership, curriculum coordinators and instructional specialist. The observations will be focused on data collected by the principal and have clear expectations and guidelines. Timely feedback will be given to the principal who may then share the feedback with the teacher.

## Closing

As previously mentioned, the School Board of the City of Virginia Beach is committed to the reconstitution of Bayside Middle School. The table below contains Spring 2014 Unadjusted Preliminary SOL Data. The three schools listed under Bayside 6 and Bayside 7, are the primary elementary schools that will feed into the Bayside 6<sup>th</sup> Grade Campus. Currently, Bayside 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Campus is warned in the area of math and we predict this will extend to both English and Social Studies for 2014-15.

Spring 2014 Unadjusted Preliminary Data	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	History
Bayside Gr 6	58.54		54.25		63.19
Bayside Gr 7	64.29		52.54		61.31
Williams Gr 5	64.74	48.69	64.58	43.68	68.75
Bayside Gr 5	79.41	51.35	66.18	68.18	82.09
Luxford Gr 5	69.33	55.26	72	53.33	66.22
Shelton Park Gr 5 (10 students)	90	70	80	100	100

While the accreditation of Bayside 6 will stand alone because it is a separate school, the central office staff has developed the improvement plan for both campuses to address student achievement and staff continuous learning. Over the past three years, Bayside Middle School has not met accreditation standards in mathematics. With Virginia Beach City Public Schools' current vision for the new schools, we are focused on a re-creation of teaching based on the needs of the student body these two schools serve. The school division is committed to creating an environment for teachers to build their self-efficacy, continuously learn and implement new strategies, to communicate and collaborate with their peers within the school and across the division to refine their skills. The development of the shared governance team demonstrates the commitment of the school division to guide and support school-level leadership. Recognizing the absolute importance of improving instruction in each of the core content areas, we also understand the importance of focusing on the whole child and creating an environment where students will want to come to school to learn and where parents will be comfortable being a part of the process.

Sincerely,



Daniel Edwards  
Chairman, School Board of the City of Virginia Beach

## Attachments (6)

cc: Aaron C. Spence, Ed.D., Superintendent  
Sheila S. Magula, Ed.D., Deputy Superintendent  
Kevin A. Hobbs, Chief of Staff  
Amy Cashwell, Ed.D., Chief Academic Officer for Teaching and Learning

VIRGINIA BEACH CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

**Annual Middle School Report Card**

ISSUED 2013-2014


Virginia Beach City Public Schools is pleased to provide you the sixteenth *Annual School Report Card*. The purpose of this report card is to communicate to various audiences regarding educational accountability and to demonstrate our commitment to 21st century student outcomes. This report card provides access to information pertaining to student and staff characteristics, school performance, and progress toward meeting state and federal accountability standards. In addition to traditional accountability measures, this report card also contains measures of student performance that are aligned to the 21st century student outcomes identified in our Strategic Plan *Compass to 2015* (<http://www.vbschools.com/compass/index.asp>).

The long-term strategic goal of *Compass to 2015* is to successfully prepare and graduate every student. The near-term goal is that by 2015, 95 percent or more of VBCPS students will graduate having mastered the skills that they need to succeed as 21st century learners, workers, and citizens.

The focus of the strategic plan is on teaching and assessing the skills our students need to thrive as 21st century learners, workers, and citizens. The outcomes for student success are that all VBCPS students will be:

- Academically proficient;
- Effective communicators and collaborators;
- Globally aware, independent, responsible learners and citizens; and
- Critical and creative thinkers, innovators and problem solvers.

The strategic objectives for reaching our student outcomes concentrate on providing our teachers and staff with the resources for engaging every student in rigorous and relevant instruction and creating opportunities for parents and community members to fulfill their essential roles as actively engaged partners in supporting student achievement and outcomes for student success.



## **BAYSIDE**

### **Middle (6-8)**

#### ***Home of the Raiders***

965 Newtown Road  
Virginia Beach, VA 23462  
757-648-4400 (phone)  
757-473-5185 (fax)  
bayms@vbschools.com  
<http://www.baysidems.vbschools.com>

## **2013-2014**

Ms. Paula X. Johnson, Principal  
Mr. John Chowns, Assistant Principal  
Ms. Tracey A. MacMillan, Assistant Principal  
Ms. Lauren Gay, Administrative Assistant

**State Accreditation Status:**  
Accredited with Warning

**Federal Accountability Status:**  
Did Not Meet All Annual Measurable Objectives

## READING YOUR SCHOOL REPORT CARD

This report card for your child's school includes information related to school, staff, and student characteristics in addition to student performance measures. Unless otherwise noted, the information provided is for the 2013-2014 school year. Other information about your child's school and all other schools in the division is available at [www.vbschools.com](http://www.vbschools.com). Additionally, the [Standards of Learning \(SOL\) performance data for this school](#) is provided by the state and can be found at the Virginia Department of Education website (<https://p1pe.doe.virginia.gov/reportcard>) and at <http://www.vbschools.com/sol/index.asp>.

### SCHOOL INFORMATION

#### Mobility

Student Mobility: 30%


#### Average Class Size

English	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies
22.1	26.1	26.6	26.4

#### Attendance 2012-2013

School Average Daily Attendance: 95.0%  
 Division (MS) Average Daily Attendance: 95.7%

#### Overall Quality of Education




The bar chart displays the percentage of each group agreeing that the school provides a high-quality education.

# Survey not administered in 2009-2010 or 2011-2012.

### STAFF CHARACTERISTICS

Administrative/Intern: 4      Instructional: 72  
 Classified: 41                  Other: 4

#### Fall 2013 Staff Characteristics



#### Additional Characteristics for Instructional Staff


	School	Division (MS)	State
Female	69.4%	76.4%	*
Male	30.6%	23.6%	*
Average years of teaching experience	12.7	14.7	*
Percentage with graduate degrees	56.9%	53.3%	*
Percentage new to the system	13.9%	6.0%	*
Percentage of core courses not taught by highly qualified teachers 2012-13	0	0^	1
Percentage of teachers with provisional credentials 2012-13	7	3^	5

\* Not Available      ^ Entire Division

### STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

School Membership: 993      Division Membership (MS): 16,006

#### Fall 2013 Student Characteristics



#### Additional Student Characteristics

	School	Division (MS)
Female	48.1%	48.9%
Male	51.9%	51.1%
Economically Disadvantaged	70.7%	37.1%
Gifted	7.4%	15.7%
Limited English Proficiency	1.9%	1.8%
Migrant	0.1%	<0.1%
Special Education	12.7%	11.0%

## STUDENT PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The EXPLORE assessment (<http://www.actstudent.org/explore/>) is a norm-referenced, curriculum-based test which is developed by ACT, Inc., the same company that created the ACT college entrance exam. The assessment is administered to all eighth-grade VBCPS students during the fall semester. The EXPLORE assessment focuses on four core subject areas including English, mathematics, reading, and science. Student performance in each subject area is scored from 1 to 25. The table below displays how this school performed in each subject area and how the school compares to all other middle schools across the division and the nation.

### 2013-2014 EXPLORE Performance


Subject Area	School	Division	Nation
English	12.5	14.8	14.7
Mathematics	14.3	16.0	15.5
Reading	13.6	15.6	14.6
Science	15.9	17.4	16.6

In addition to the subject area tests, EXPLORE collects information about student career interests as well as their future educational and career plans.


### 2013-2014 Future Plans

Future Educational and Career Plans Category	School	Division
Job Training in the Military Services	6.0%	5.7%
Apprentice/Job Training	2.0%	1.0%
Career/Technical School	7.3%	3.1%
2-Year/Junior College	5.0%	3.1%
4-Year College/University	29.2%	31.5%
Graduate or Professional Study	36.5%	36.6%
Undecided	7.3%	11.2%
Other Plans	6.0%	7.0%
No Response	0.7%	0.7%


### 2013-2014 Students' Career Interests




#### EXPLORE English




#### EXPLORE Mathematics



#### EXPLORE Reading



#### EXPLORE Science



## STUDENT PERFORMANCE INFORMATION





The Integrated Performance Task (IPT) is a performance-based test designed to measure critical thinking, problem solving, and written communication skills. The assessment is administered in the fall and spring of each school year to students in the seventh grade. The skills assessed by the IPT are among the outcomes for student success identified in the school division's strategic plan, *Compass to 2015*, as being essential for success as 21st century learners, workers, and citizens. Student performance on each section of the IPT is categorized using four levels: 4 (Advanced), 3 (Proficient), 2 (Emerging), and 1 (Novice). The percentages displayed below represent the percent of seventh-grade students at this school and across the division who scored at each performance level on the IPT during spring 2012-2013.

### PERCENT SCORING AT EMERGING LEVEL OR HIGHER

Group		School	Division
Critical Thinking 1	All Students	51.1%	70.8%
	African American	45.4%	55.6%
	American Indian	<	57.1%
	Asian	<	77.8%
	Caucasian	66.7%	78.1%
	Hispanic	44.8%	63.8%
	Native Hawaiian	<	68.0%
	Multiracial	50.0%	71.9%
Critical Thinking 2	All Students	42.9%	60.3%
	African American	36.1%	44.7%
	American Indian	<	81.0%
	Asian	<	68.7%
	Caucasian	52.8%	66.6%
	Hispanic	48.3%	54.7%
	Native Hawaiian	<	72.0%
	Multiracial	50.0%	64.3%
Problem Solving	All Students	83.9%	89.0%
	African American	81.4%	82.7%
	American Indian	<	85.7%
	Asian	<	90.8%
	Caucasian	87.5%	91.3%
	Hispanic	86.2%	87.8%
	Native Hawaiian	<	96.0%
	Multiracial	100.0%	92.4%
Written Communication	All Students	29.7%	53.4%
	African American	23.2%	34.5%
	American Indian	<	47.6%
	Asian	<	69.6%
	Caucasian	38.9%	60.9%
	Hispanic	34.5%	45.8%
	Native Hawaiian	<	56.0%
	Multiracial	60.0%	57.6%

< Data not reported for less than 10 students

### PERCENT SCORING AT EACH LEVEL



## STUDENT PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The [Scholastic Reading Inventory \(SRI\)](#) is a multiple-choice, computer adaptive reading assessment which is administered to middle school students in grades 6 through 8 at different times during the year. This assessment provides teachers and parents with information related to their student's reading comprehension and growth which can be used to track student progress. Using a student's [Lexile level](#), this assessment also allows teachers to tailor instruction and assign each student appropriate reading materials based on his/her ability. The numbers reported below represent the percent of students at this school and all other middle schools in the school division who were reading on grade level at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year in 2012-2013.


### READING ON GRADE LEVEL

Group		Beginning of Year		End of Year	
		School	Division	School	Division
Grade 6	All Students	53.9%	69.9%	62.9%	80.0%
	African American	50.2%	54.4%	59.6%	66.5%
	American Indian	<	85.7%	<	81.3%
	Asian	66.7%	75.1%	91.7%	85.2%
	Caucasian	61.2%	76.9%	67.7%	86.0%
	Hispanic	52.0%	65.4%	62.5%	75.9%
	Native Hawaiian	<	87.0%	<	91.7%
	Multiracial	55.2%	76.1%	60.0%	85.3%
Grade 7	All Students	62.5%	75.3%	75.9%	86.5%
	African American	53.7%	60.4%	68.0%	76.1%
	American Indian	<	78.9%	<	90.5%
	Asian	90.0%	84.4%	90.0%	89.1%
	Caucasian	76.3%	81.8%	90.0%	91.3%
	Hispanic	66.7%	70.3%	76.9%	81.2%
	Native Hawaiian	<	78.3%	<	81.8%
	Multiracial	<	78.8%	<	91.4%
Grade 8	All Students	61.5%	76.2%	77.2%	86.8%
	African American	58.7%	63.7%	73.1%	77.7%
	American Indian	<	62.5%	<	82.4%
	Asian	60.0%	80.9%	70.0%	87.4%
	Caucasian	74.6%	82.7%	88.7%	92.1%
	Hispanic	54.5%	70.3%	77.8%	80.4%
	Native Hawaiian	<	72.0%	<	85.7%
	Multiracial	62.5%	78.9%	91.7%	88.6%
All Grades	All Students	59.0%	73.8%	71.1%	84.3%
	African American	53.9%	59.4%	66.1%	73.1%
	American Indian	<	75.5%	<	85.2%
	Asian	71.9%	80.3%	84.4%	87.2%
	Caucasian	70.8%	80.5%	82.2%	89.7%
	Hispanic	58.4%	68.7%	72.1%	79.0%
	Native Hawaiian	<	78.9%	<	86.6%
	Multiracial	61.1%	77.9%	73.9%	88.2%


< Data not reported for less than 10 students

### Trends by Year End-of-Year SRI Performance


**Grade 6 Percent Reading on Grade Level**



**Grade 7 Percent Reading on Grade Level**



**Grade 8 Percent Reading on Grade Level**



**Mission**

*The Virginia Beach City Public Schools, in partnership with the entire community, will empower every student to become a life-long learner who is a responsible, productive and engaged citizen within the global community.*

Dr. Sheila S. Magula, Superintendent  
Virginia Beach City Public Schools  
2512 George Mason Drive, Virginia Beach, VA 23456-0038

**Notice of Non-Discrimination Policy**

Virginia Beach City Public Schools does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, disability, or age in its programs and activities and provide equal access to the Boy Scouts and other designated youth groups.

School Board policies and regulations (including but not limited to, Policies 2-33, 4-4, 4-43, 5-7, 5-33, 5-44, 6-7, 7-11, 7-48, 7-49 and Regulations 5-44.1, 7-11.1, 7-57.1) provide equal access to courses, programs, counseling services, physical education and athletic, vocational education, instructional materials, and extracurricular activities.

To seek resolution of grievances resulting from alleged discrimination or to report violations of these policies, please contact the Title IX

Coordinator/Director of Student Activities at (757) 263-2020, 1413 Laskin Road, Virginia Beach, Virginia 23451 (for student complaints) or the Section 540/ADA Coordinator/Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources at (757) 263-1133, 2512 George Mason Drive, Municipal Center, Building 6, Virginia Beach, Virginia 23456 (for employees or other citizens). Concerns about the application of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act should be addressed to the Section 504 Coordinator/Director of Guidance Services and Student Records at (757) 263-1980, 2512 George Mason Drive, Virginia Beach, Virginia 23456 or the Section 504 Coordinator at the student's school.

Alternative formats of this publication which may include taped, Braille, or large print materials are available upon request for individuals with disabilities. Call or write Mary Ann Morrill, Department of Planning, Innovation, and Accountability, Virginia Beach City Public Schools, 2512 George Mason Drive, P.O. Box 6038, Virginia Beach, Virginia 23456-0038, (757) 263-1199 (voice); (757) 263-1131 (fax); (757) 263-1240 (TDD) or email her at [maryann.morrill@vbschools.com](mailto:maryann.morrill@vbschools.com).

No part of this publication may be produced or shared in any form without giving specific credit to Virginia Beach City Public Schools.

Additional information about the data used in this report card can be found at [http://www.vbschools.com/school\\_data/report\\_cards/](http://www.vbschools.com/school_data/report_cards/)

**SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS**

Mr. Daniel D. "Dan" Edwards, Chairman  
(District 2 - Kempsville)

Mr. William J. "Bill" Brunke, IV, Vice Chairman  
(District 7 - Princess Anne)

Mrs. Beverly M. Anderson  
(At-Large)

Mrs. Emma L. "Em" Davis  
(District 5 - Lynnhaven)

Mrs. Dorothy M. Holtz  
(At-Large)

Mr. Joel A. McDonald  
(District 3 - Rose Hall)

Mr. Bobby Melatti  
(At-Large)

Mr. Sam Reid  
(District 6 - Beach)

Mrs. Elizabeth E. Taylor  
(At-Large)

Mr. Leonard C. Tengco  
(District 1 - Centerville)

Mrs. Carolyn D. Weems  
(District 4 - Bayside)

**STAFF EXPECTATIONS**

- Know and support the mission of the Bayside Middle School community. The mission is to provide equal opportunities to all students to reach their full potential, giving each student the knowledge and skills necessary to meet the challenges of the future.
- Know, understand, and implement Bayside Middle School’s Plan for Continuous Improvement (PCI) with fidelity.
- Maintain an attendance record that reflects a commitment to the students, mission and goals of Bayside Middle.
- Participate in required training and professional development and subsequently collaborate with colleagues to implement instructional practices from the learning experiences.
- Cultivate relationships with students and their parents, while being knowledgeable and understanding of the characteristics and needs of adolescents.
- Take an active role in all PTA, school and community projects, and other after-school activities, as needed and/or assigned by administration in an effort to build school/community relationships.
- Collect and analyze data from classroom, school and district sources to drive instructional practice and promote student learning and growth.
- Provide frequent, meaningful, descriptive feedback to students and parents.
- Use formative and summative data to develop daily learning plans, report on student progress and share/examine within collaborative planning sessions.
- Write, submit and be ready to reflect on learning plans that are aligned with VBCPS curriculum and are differentiated to meet the unique needs of students.
- Welcome visitors/guests from both the district and state levels into your classroom to observe your lesson delivery, review your learning plans and determine the level of student engagement.

I understand there is a minimum of a three-year commitment to Bayside Middle School, and I agree to the above expectations. (Signed forms must be returned to Dr. Paula Johnson.)

Printed Name \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



### Governance Team Meeting Schedule

All meetings will be held at the Bayside 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Campus  
Start time of 3pm

August 22

September 12

September 26

October 10

October 24

November 14

December 12

January 9

January 23

February 13

February 27

March 13

March 27

April 24

May 8

May 22

June 12

June 26



**Governance and Bayside Middle School Leadership Team Agenda**

- Data Review – Where are we?
- PCI and State Review Finding Updates – Where are we going?
- Support and Resources Needed – What do we need to get there?
- Evaluation – How will we know if we have gotten there?
- Next Moves





**Meetings to Update the Superintendent**

All updates will be agenda items on the weekly Senior Leadership Team meeting agendas

September 8

October 13

November 10

December 8

January 12

February 9

March 9

April 13

May 11

June 8

July 13

**State Academic Review**

**Attachment F**

**Part I. General Information**

**For each school not fully accredited, complete this form at the time of the review and submit to the OSI division contact.**

**Name of Division: Virginia Beach Public Schools**

**Name of School: Bayside Middle School – Year 3, Mathematics**

**Name of the Lead Contractor assigned to the Division: Courtney Graves with Rick Bowmaster**

**Email address of OSI contact to send this form after the first review and final follow-up in April:**

**Date of the Review: (November 21-January 17) January 6 and 7, 2014**

**Final Follow up – April 2, 2014**

**Name of Team Members (include OSI, contractors, school staff and division staff):**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
<b>Gloria Harris</b>	<b>Executive Director Department of Teaching and Learning, Elementary Education</b>
<b>James Pohl</b>	<b>Executive Director Department of Teaching and Learning, Secondary Education</b>
<b>Kathy Starr</b>	<b>Department of School Leadership Director of Elementary Schools</b>
<b>Kellie Cedo</b>	<b>Title I Coordinator</b>
<b>Lorena Kelly</b>	<b>Elementary Language Arts Coordinator</b>
<b>Sharon Shewbridge</b>	<b>Elementary Mathematics Coordinator</b>
<b>Krista Barton-Arnold</b>	<b>Department of School Leadership Director of Elementary Schools</b>
<b>Johanna Ortiz</b>	<b>Elementary Mathematics Instructional Specialist</b>
<b>Sheila Cooper</b>	<b>Title I Instructional Specialist</b>
<b>Teresa Davis</b>	<b>Elementary Science Coordinator</b>
<b>Dena McElligott</b>	<b>Middle School Mathematics Instructional Specialist</b>
<b>Manny Cenizal</b>	<b>High School Mathematics Coordinator</b>
<b>Tina Mazzacane</b>	<b>Secondary Mathematics Coordinator</b>
<b>James Smith</b>	<b>Department of School Leadership Director of Middle Schools</b>
<b>Veleka Gatling</b>	<b>Executive Director for Differentiated Academic Programs and Professional Learning</b>
<b>Courtney Graves</b>	<b>VDOE Contractor – Elementary Schools</b>
<b>Rick Bowmaster</b>	<b>VDOE Contractor – Secondary Schools</b>

**Part II. Findings and Problem Identification**

**Provide the team’s overall findings and problem identification.**

<p><b>Division</b></p>	<p>Two years ago the division experienced a drop in performance in mathematics, which we contributed to our curriculum being misaligned with the Standards of Learning. Last year we worked as a division to refine and realign our objectives to the SOLs. We certainly saw an improvement, but that trend needs to continue. While realigning the objectives was extremely important, we are now focusing on application and a deeper understanding of mathematical concepts. We continue to need improvement in the areas of computation and estimation, probability, stats, patterns, functions, Algebra, measurement and Geometry. The division has also provided Content-Focused Training for Mathematics Coaches. These coaches learned to coach math teachers by modeling questioning and instructional strategies, providing feedback to the teachers, as well as planning with them, and expanding their knowledge of mathematics.</p> <p>The Division Instructional Specialists recognize a need to refine the mathematics and language arts curriculum guides. Division leadership recognizes that the building level administrative teams need training on how to deliver descriptive feedback and how to focus their feedback on instruction</p> <p>Please see Division Report for Essential Actions based on these findings.</p>
<p><b>School</b></p>	<p>Based on a review of the artifacts, the team’s findings are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback was instructional in nature vs. procedural or managerial.</li> <li>• A review of the Plan for Continuous Improvement (PCI) reveals a need for a more comprehensive approach to the documentation of monitoring and the subsequent data collected from that monitoring.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Teacher</b></p>	<p>Based on a review of the artifacts, the team’s findings are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The written, taught and tested curriculum artifacts need to be brought to the Functional Implementation Level.</li> <li>- Activating prior knowledge and providing connections between learning experiences does not occur consistently.</li> <li>- There is some evidence of the use of data to drive instruction.</li> <li>- Unit assessments were all multiple choice.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Previous Academic Review Findings (if applicable)</b></p>	<p>Essential Actions from AR review are as follows:</p> <p>PD 05 – Incorporate peer coaching, modeling and problem solving as systematic follow up to professional development.</p> <p>For the 2013-2014 school year Bayside Middle School has made a concerted effort to incorporate peer coaching and modeling into our professional development program. Our monthly professional development workshops are provided for the entire faculty. Each workshop focuses on a relevant need of our building and the needs of our student population. An instructional strategy is embedded within the delivery of the information, a strategy that teachers can effectively use in their own classrooms. Each quarter there is an adjusted</p>

dismissal day that allows on-the clock time to conduct additional professional development sessions based on current needs. Additionally, core and elective teachers meet two times per week in a Professional Learning Community (PLC). An administrator or a building specialist attends each PLC. The PLC time is dedicated collaboration and communication among peers with a specific focus upon planning, disaggregating data and sharing successful instructional strategies. Lastly, through the Mentorship Program, new teachers are paired with veteran teachers which allows new teachers to do peer observations, be observed by the veteran teachers and to receive ongoing feedback regarding implementation of daily lessons, classroom management and utilization of time.

**PD 09 – Provide professional development opportunities for newly implemented instructional interventions to include training, monitoring and follow up/collaboration.**

In addition to the ongoing monthly professional development opportunities, Bayside Middle School has offered two comprehensive training sessions focusing upon i-Ready, which is the research-based instructional software that is currently being used. The first training session concentrated on how to best prepare for the diagnostic component and how to best utilize the adaptive lesson plans both in the classroom and in remediation activities. The second training session was more specific to utilizing the data reports and the classroom implications of that data. Another newly implemented instructional intervention is the Bayside Middle School Learning Plan. During the summer, the teachers worked collaboratively in order to produce this new learning plan and to determine what each phase of the plan should contain in order to have the greatest impact on student learning and achievement. We are continually keeping a pulse check on the professional development needs of the faculty and providing training and monitoring the utilization of newly implemented instructional strategies and interventions.

**PD 13 – Provide training for teachers on planning instruction to engage the special needs students more in active learning opportunities and develop a plan for systematic monitoring of the implementation.**

Core teachers at Bayside Middle School have been allocated collaborative planning days, which are used for instructional planning and for creating balanced assessments. Administrator and/or content specialist lead each collaborative planning day. Our mathematics collaborative planning days are coordinated and facilitated by the building’s math specialist as well as the school division’s mathematics coordinator in an effort to ensure that the instructional planning is engaging and relevant to our student population. The implementation of the instructional planning and delivery are monitored through formal observations and teachers are provided direct feedback. When necessary, the math specialist has modeled specific phases of the Bayside Middle Learning Plan.

**SP 04 – Develop a system for monitoring instruction that includes: documenting instructional practices used; collecting and reporting baseline data; providing feedback and support to teachers.**

Since the start of the 2013- 2014 school year, members of the administrative team, endorsed and experienced in each specific content area, supervise our core teachers. Each teacher is required to post learning plans, on a weekly basis, to the school’s Sharepoint site. The Sharepoint site is monitored by the administration. Also, PLC teams are required to upload PLC minutes to the site in order to document outcomes and needs. Requiring both learning plans and PLC minutes to be posted provides transparency for collaboration across the curriculum particularly for our elective teachers charged with a mathematics or English SMART instructional goal. We are continually monitoring baseline data as well as formative and summative assessment data. This data is collected through the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) database, the i-Ready (meets the VDOE-required instructional program proven by research to be effective in raising achievement in math) reporting database and the school student information system, Synergy. Core Teams/Teachers meet with their students to complete a Student-Grade Improvement Plan for each student showing a negative trend in the data and in classroom performance. Teachers are provided with ongoing, detailed feedback. The School Improvement Team, consisting of the administrators and the various specialists in the building, observe classrooms and remediation sessions regularly. Central office specialists conduct learning walks and provide feedback to the administration. Also, teacher leaders from the Center for Teacher Leadership (CTL) conduct formal observations and provide specific feedback and instructional strategies to the teachers observed.

**SC 11 – Promote positive relationships among all stakeholders to promote positive peer relationships, shared ownership, collaboration among staff, enhanced through student teacher relationships.**

The promotion of positive relationships among all stakeholders has been a specific focus of our ongoing professional development program. Beginning with the opening week of school, the constant theme has been on instructional delivery, student engagement and the learning environment through effective teaching that focuses on building relationships, using rigor and relevance. Our “Power of Positivity” workshop was conducted to ensure that our focus was clear. The staff, in order to get teacher feedback and buy in, has collaborated upon each new instructional intervention. They are given the opportunity to vote on various topics to confirm that their voice is heard. Teachers participate in various committees such as the Instructional Leadership Team, Principal’s Advisory Committee and School Planning Council, where they are given a platform to share professional ideas and concerns, to collaborate with peers and to further develop as essential leaders. Positive relationships have been built with the students and the community through various events such as the Open House/Welcome Back Cookout and the i-Ready incentive program. It is clear to faculty, students, and parents that we are making a concerted effort to provide a positive and productive school with a specific focus on building relationships through rigorous and relevant instruction.

**Part III. Tools and Documents for the Review**  
**What tools and documents were reviewed?**

Check	Name of Tool	Documents Reviewed
	Division: Leadership Basic Components Evaluation Tool	
	Division: Curriculum Guide Alignment and Basic Component Evaluation Tool	
	Division: Professional Development Basic Component Evaluation Tool	
	School: Leadership Basic Component Evaluation Tool	
	School: Lesson Plan Evaluation Tool	<b>31 Mathematics 6 Plans</b> <b>20 Mathematics 7 Plans</b> <b>27 Mathematics 8 Plans</b> <b>31 Pre-Algebra Plans</b> <b>25 Algebra I Plans</b>
	School: Lesson Observation Evaluation Tool	<b>14 Formal Observations</b> <b>13 Learning Walks</b> <b>13 Minis – Walk throughs</b>
	School: Assessment Alignment and Basic Components Evaluation Tool  Language arts vs math	<b>8 Mathematics 6</b> <b>14 Mathematics 7</b> <b>11 Mathematics 8</b> <b>19 Algebra I</b> <b>(all teacher-made)</b>
	School: Data Analysis Basic Components Evaluation Tool	
	School: Professional Development Basic Component Evaluation Tool	
	School: Master Schedule Evaluation Tool	

#### **Part IV. Essential Actions for the Division through April 2014**

**Essential actions may be changed after review by OSI. The final document will be sent to the division contact after final review by OSI.**

**See Division Level Report**

#### **Part V. Essential Actions for the School through April 2014**

**Essential actions may be changed after review by OSI. The final document will be sent to the division contact after final review by OSI.**

1. Essential Actions outlined below should be integrated into the school's Plan for Continuous Improvement (PCI) plan by April 1, 2014.
2. By April 1, 2014, the staff of Bayside Middle School will have participated in a Tiered Intervention Support workshop delivered by Rick Bowmaster. Implementation of this professional development learning should be monitored and evidence of that implementation (or planned implementation) should be provided to the review team for the follow up visit in April.

#### **Written Curriculum – Score=1**

3. Revise lesson plans to the level of functional implementation. Lesson plans should meet the following criteria:

- Align the Standards of Learning and Curriculum Framework Essential Knowledge and Skills in both content and cognitive level (evidence of standards unpacked).
- Link plans to the unit or curriculum big ideas (Essential Questions, Enduring Understandings, and Themes).
- Outline objectives (include the behaviors the students will exhibit to show learning and conditions under which the students will exhibit those behaviors).
- Outline the criteria used to determine whether the learners have met the objective. (Alignment with/of Standards, Big Ideas, and Objectives (Lesson Plans)).

2/24 - Notes from Progress Check: Have added essential understanding to lesson plans. Learning plans will be drafted during PLCs. Troy Walton, math specialist, participates in all PLCs. Mr. Walton is ensuring protocols for learning plans are being included. Monitoring is increasing. Mr. Walton is sending "This week in Math" to Mrs. Johnson. There is a new system and process in place for lesson planning. Revamped learning plans. Making them more detailed.

3.1 By April 1, 2014, teachers will have reviewed the mathematics curriculum guide in an effort to ensure that their learning plans include the above criteria. The administrative team will monitor the inclusion of these components in the learning plans. Evidence of this monitoring should be provided to the review team at the follow up visit in April.

2/24 – Notes from Progress Checks: Discussed what the documentation of this essential action will look like i.e meeting minutes, learning plans with review notes, etc.

#### **Taught Curriculum – Score=2**

4. Revise observation tool to the level of Functional Implementation. Observation tools should meet the following criteria:

- Facilitate learning experiences that align with the Standards of Learning and Curriculum Framework Essential Knowledge and Skills in both content and cognitive level.
- Communicate connections between the lesson and the unit or curriculum Big Ideas (Essential Questions, Enduring Understandings, Themes, etc.).
- Communicate objectives to students. Include the behaviors students will exhibit to show learning and the conditions under which the students will exhibit those behaviors).
- Communicate to students the criteria used to determine whether learners have met the objective.

2/24 – Notes from Progress Checks: Completed feedback training with other middle school leaders. Including more of the dialogue with teachers on the observation forms. Adding essential knowledge to learning plan will help with the observation piece.

4.1 By April 1, 2014, the administrative team will have developed a process to review alignment of the written, taught and tested curriculum during both formal and informal observations (including pre and post observations). The above criteria will be the focus of classroom observations. Evidence of this process will be made available to the review team for the follow up visit in April.

4.2 By April 1, 2014, the administrative team should consult the instructional specialist-created weekly pacing chart to determine SOL content that should be observed during observations. This information should be cited on the observation form with the goal of ensuring the alignment of the written and taught curriculum. Evidence of this monitoring should be made available to the review team for the follow up visit in April.

### **Tested Curriculum – Score=1**

5. Revise assessments to the level of Functional Implementation. Assessments should meet the following criteria:

- Align assessments with Standards of Learning and Curriculum Framework Essential Knowledge and Skills in both content and cognitive level.
- Align with objectives from individual lessons.
- Contain sufficient items to assess student mastery of state standards' Curriculum Framework Essential Knowledge and Skills and Big Ideas for the unit or lessons taught.

2/24 – Notes from Progress Check: Three professional development days were given to plan for units. Using city's pacing guides, we create tests firsts based on the objectives. Send to other city math specialists for feedback. Math student preview consists of practice questions based on the summative assessment. There are TEI items, multiple choice, etc. included on the assessments.

5.1 By April 1, 2014, the administrative team will ensure a balanced assessment approach relative to summative assessments. The team will review assessments for varied approaches and collect data on their findings. That data will be made available for the review team for the follow up in April.

5.2 By April 1, 2014, administrators will have developed a process whereby teacher-made assessments are reviewed and monitored for the criteria above, as well as the inclusion of the standard being measured, alignment to the taught curriculum and clear and concise directions.

**Part VI. Signature(s) after Initial Academic Review is completed and report is provided. Essential actions may be changed after review by OSI. The final document will be sent to the division contact after final review by OSI.**

---

**Contractor/Date**

---

**Division Lead/Date**

---

**Principal/Date**

**Part VII. Follow-up**

**Indicate the date and findings at all follow-up visits to the school or the division by any contractor assigned to the school. Submit this section after the final follow-up visit in April 2014. Notify the OSI if the school is not meeting the essential actions.**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Findings-Indicate what essential actions have been completed as a part of the school’s routine. Do not indicate “continuing to implement.” Be extremely specific about what the school has done or not done.</b>
	<p>1. Essential Actions outlined below should be integrated into the school’s Plan for Continuous Improvement (PCI) plan by April 1, 2014.</p> <p>Status of Implementation: Complete</p>
	<p>2. By April 1, 2014, the staff of Bayside Middle School will have participated in a Tiered Intervention Support workshop delivered by Rick Bowmaster. Implementation of this professional development learning should be monitored and evidence of that implementation (or planned implementation) should be provided to the review team for the follow up visit in April.</p> <p>Included in School Improvement Plan: Yes</p> <p>Status of Implementation: Faculty members were given an overview of the Virginia Tiered System of Support (VTSS) and began discussing how tiered instructional strategies can be implemented at Bayside Middle School. Dr. Rick Bowmaster of the Virginia Department of Education facilitated the training session. The desired outcome for this meeting is to bring awareness of VTSS to the instructional staff and for staff to begin thinking about the realities of the implementation of a tiered instructional support system in their classrooms and among their team of teachers and students. 2014-03-18 12:00:00-04:00 1 The session was recorded and any teacher who missed the meeting is to schedule a make-up time to watch the video recording.</p> <p>Documentation: Communication with Rick Bowmaster and description of the workshop on the School Improvement Plan</p>
	<p>3. Revise lesson plans to the level of functional implementation. Lesson plans should meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Align the Standards of Learning and Curriculum Framework Essential Knowledge and Skills in both content and cognitive level (evidence of standards unpacked).</li> <li>- Link plans to the unit or curriculum big ideas (Essential Questions, Enduring Understandings, and Themes).</li> <li>- Outline objectives (include the behaviors the students will exhibit to show learning and conditions under which the students will exhibit those behaviors).</li> <li>- Outline the criteria used to determine whether the learners have met the objective. (Alignment with/of Standards, Big Ideas, and Objectives (Lesson Plans)).</li> </ul> <p>2/24 - Notes from Progress Check: The team has added essential understandings to lesson plans. Learning plans will be drafted during PLCs. Troy Walton, math specialist, participates in all PLCs. Mr. Walton is ensuring protocols for learning plans are being included. Monitoring is</p>

	<p>increasing. Mr. Walton is sending ‘This week in Math’ to Mrs. Johnson. There is a new system and process in place for lesson planning. The administrative team is ensuring that lesson plans are more detailed.</p> <p>Included in School Improvement Plan: Yes</p> <p>Status of Implementation (4/2): Each grade level participated in one day of planning related to learning plans (March 11-13). The mathematics coach led this training. The template was revised and the missing components were added. Lessons are now divided into phases with detailed descriptions of instruction.</p> <p>Documentation: Lesson plans</p>
	<p>3.1 By April 1, 2014, teachers will have reviewed the mathematics curriculum guide in an effort to ensure that their learning plans include the above criteria. The administrative team will monitor the inclusion of these components in the learning plans. Evidence of this monitoring should be provided to the review team at the follow up visit in April.</p> <p>2/24 – Notes from Progress Checks: Discussed what the documentation of this essential action will look like i.e meeting minutes, learning plans with review notes, etc.</p> <p>Included in School Improvement Plan – Yes</p> <p>Status of Implementation (4/2): Monitoring is occurring through collaboration. See notes above.</p> <p>Documentation: Lesson plans</p>
	<p>4. Revise observation tool to the level of Functional Implementation. Observation tools should meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Facilitate learning experiences that align with the Standards of Learning and Curriculum Framework Essential Knowledge and Skills in both content and cognitive level.</li> <li>- Communicate connections between the lesson and the unit or curriculum Big Ideas (Essential Questions, Enduring Understandings, Themes, etc.).</li> <li>- Communicate objectives to students. Include the behaviors students will exhibit to show learning and the conditions under which the students will exhibit those behaviors).</li> <li>- Communicate to students the criteria used to determine whether learners have met the objective.</li> </ul> <p>2/24 – Notes from Progress Checks: Division level leaders completed feedback training with middle school leaders. School level leaders are now including more of the dialogue with teachers on the observation forms. Adding essential knowledge to learning plans will help with the observation piece.</p> <p>Included in the School Improvement Plan: Yes</p>

	<p>Status of Implementation (4/2): Feedback is richer and more substantial (one observation included comments related to the misalignment of a guided practice to the direct instruction) than previous submissions. Feedback is directly related to instructional pedagogy and the alignment of the written, taught and tested curriculum.</p> <p>Documentation: Observations with feedback</p>
	<p>4.1 By April 1, 2014, the administrative team will have developed a process to review alignment of the written, taught and tested curriculum during both formal and informal observations (including pre and post observations). The above criteria will be the focus of classroom observations. Evidence of this process will be made available to the review team for the follow up visit in April.</p> <p>Included in the School Improvement Plan: Yes</p> <p>Status of Implementation: See above</p> <p>Documentation: Observation tools (formal and informal)</p>
	<p>4.2 By April 1, 2014, the administrative team should consult the instructional specialist-created weekly pacing chart to determine SOL content that should be observed during observations. This information should be cited on the observation form with the goal of ensuring the alignment of the written and taught curriculum. Evidence of this monitoring should be made available to the review team for the follow up visit in April.</p> <p>Included in School Improvement Plan – Yes</p> <p>Status of Implementation – “This Week in Math” addresses the content that should be covered during the week. The addition of essential questions and enduring understandings to the learning plans has facilitated more instructional feedback.</p> <p>Documentation: “This Week in Math” was provided at 2/24 progress check.</p>
	<p>5. Revise assessments to the level of Functional Implementation. Assessments should meet the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Align assessments with Standards of Learning and Curriculum Framework Essential Knowledge and Skills in both content and cognitive level.</li> <li>- Align with objectives from individual lessons.</li> <li>- Contain sufficient items to assess student mastery of state standards’ Curriculum Framework Essential Knowledge and Skills and Big Ideas for the unit or lessons taught.</li> </ul> <p>2/24 – Notes from Progress Check: Three professional development days were given to plan for units. Using city’s pacing guides, the teams create tests first based on the objectives. Send to other city math specialists for feedback. Math student preview consists of practice questions based on the summative assessment. There are TEI items, multiple choice, etc. included on the assessments.</p>

	<p>Included in School Improvement Plan: Yes</p> <p>Status of Implementation (4/2): There is evidence of revised, balanced assessments.  Next Steps – deliberate attempt to address the cognitive levels at which standards are measured.</p>
	<p>5.1 By April 1, 2014, the administrative team will ensure a balanced assessment approach relative to summative assessments. The team will review assessments for varied approaches and collect data on their findings. That data will be made available for the review team for the follow up in April.</p> <p>Included in School Improvement Plan: Yes</p> <p>Status of Implementation: See above</p> <p>Documentation: Examples of assessments.</p>
	<p>5.2 By April 1, 2014, administrators will have developed a process whereby teacher-made assessments are reviewed and monitored for the criteria above, as well as the inclusion of the standard being measured, alignment to the taught curriculum and clear and concise directions.</p> <p>Included in School Improvement Plan: Yes</p> <p>Status of Implementation: The school level math specialist submits teacher made assessments to the division level math specialists for feedback and review. Planning days are used to unpack the standards and for backwards design.</p> <p>Documentation: Examples of assessments</p>

**Part VIII. Essential Actions for the Division from April 2014 through September 2014**  
Essential actions may be changed after review by OSI. The final document will be sent to the division contact after final review by OSI.

- See Division Level Report

**Part IX. Essential Actions for the School from April 2014 through September 2014**  
Essential actions may be changed after review by OSI. The final document will be sent to the division contact after final review by OSI.

- By September 2014, the teachers will have completed the Tiered Intervention Support with Rick Bowmaster and the administrative team will monitor for the implementation of those supports within the classroom.
- By September 2014, the administrative team will continue to monitor the development and growth of the revised lesson plan template.
- By September 2014, the administrative team will ensure that refinements and reinforcements (feedback on observations) be tied to professional learning.
- By September 2014, teachers should, when creating assessments, show a more deliberate attempt at choosing/writing assessment items at the cognitive level at which the standard will be measured on the SOL test.

**Bayside Middle School**  
**Current Grade Span: 7 - 8**  
**Virginia Beach City Public Schools**

**Teacher Performance and Licensure Data**

Description	Number of Teachers	Percent of All Teachers	Area of Teaching
Number and percent of teachers scoring above proficient in 2013-2014	0	0%	
Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015	N/A		
Number and percent of teachers scoring proficient in 2013-2014	10/12 Core 19/19 Non-Core	83.3% Core 100% Non-Core	
Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015	8/12 Core 16/19 Non-Core		
Number and percent of teachers scoring below proficient in 2013-2014	2/12 Core	16.7% Core	
Number of the above teachers returning in 2014-2015	0		
Number and percent of teachers fully licensed in 2014-2015 (as of 7/22/14, 2 core vacancies not included)	28/30 Core 31/35 Non-Core	93.3% Core 88.6% Non-Core	
Number and percent of new teachers to the school in 2014-2015 (Defined as new to the school regardless of years of experience)	15/30 Core 7/35 Non-Core	50% Core 20% Non-Core	
Number and percent of provisional teachers in 2014-2015	2/30 Core 4/35 Non-Core	6.7% Core 11.4% Non-Core	
Number and percent of teachers not teaching in their endorsed area in 2014-2015 (name each area in which teachers are not endorsed)	0	0%	
Number and percent of long-term substitutes-that may be employed possibly more than 45 days (licensed or not licensed) in 2014-2015 (name each area in which there is a long-term substitute that may be employed more than 45 days)	0	0%	

Principal Tenure at this School and description of track record of success in working in a low-

**performing school: Explain in a paragraph**

Dr. Paula Johnson was appointed as principal of Bayside Middle School effective July 2013, and she will continue to serve as the principal for Bayside Middle (7th and 8th Grade Campus). Dr. Johnson is a 25 year veteran of public education as well as the 2013 Virginia Association of Secondary School Principals Assistant Principal of the Year. Dr. Johnson had extensive teaching experience at the elementary, middle and high school levels prior to starting her administrative career in 2006.

Under Dr. Johnson’s leadership for the 2013-2014 SY, Bayside Middle School made improvements on nine of the twelve (75%) Standards of Learning test. When looking at unadjusted preliminary SOL test data comparing spring 2013 to spring 2014, mathematics scores at all levels, with the exception of Geometry, showed an increase. Grade 7 mathematics scores increased from 21% to 52.5%, a 31.6% increase from last year. Algebra I scores showed a 22.18% increase from last year (56.77% to 78.95%). Grade 8 mathematics scores increased from 29.91% to 40.83%, a 10.92% increase from last year. Grade 6 mathematics SOL test scores increased less than 1% (.89%) from spring 2013 to spring 2014. Grades 6, 7, and 8 reading test scores as well as grade 8 writing scores increased from last year ranging from 2.5% to 10.8%. Grade 8 history scores increased from 66.4% to 68.6%, a 2.2% increase from last year. Decreases occurred on three of the twelve (25%) Standards of Learning test. Grades 6 and 7 history scores showed decreases from last year, 3.94% and 2.51% respectively and Geometry scores decreased 8.69% from last year (81.82% to 73.13%).

This table is a summary of the information listed in the above narrative.

Test	Spring 2013 Percent	Spring 2014 Percent	Percentage Point Change from 2013 to 2014
Grade 6 Mathematics	53.36	54.25	.89
Grade 7 Mathematics	20.97	52.54	31.57
Grade 8 Mathematics	29.91	40.83	10.92
Algebra I	56.77	78.95	22.18
Geometry	81.82	73.13	-8.69
Grade 6 Reading	52.79	58.54	5.75
Grade 7 Reading	61.83	64.29	2.46
Grade 8 Reading	56.91	67.68	10.77
Grade 8 Writing	53.35	59.38	6.03
Grade 6 US History I	67.13	63.19	-3.94
Grade 7 US History II	63.82	61.31	-2.51
Grade 8 Civics	66.35	68.62	2.27

**Area(s) of Reconstitution:**

**Governance**

**Change in Staff**

**Change in Instructional Program**

**Requesting a Conditional: Yes**

**Conditional or Denied in Past Accreditation Cycles:**

No

**Reconstitution Type(s) for Conditional:** Grade Change, Instructional Program

**Link to the corrective action plan:**

**Achievement Data**

**State Accountability - Accreditation Designation**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Accreditation Rating</b>	<b>Based on Statewide Assessments in</b>	<b>Area(s) of Warning</b>
2002-2003	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2001-2002	N/A
2003-2004	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2002-2003	N/A
2004-2005	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2003-2004	N/A
2005-2006	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2004-2005	N/A
2006-2007	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2005-2006	N/A
2007-2008	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2006-2007	N/A
2008-2009	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2007-2008	N/A
2009-2010	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2008-2009	N/A
2010-2011	<i>Fully Accredited</i>	2009-2010	N/A
2011-2012	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2010-2011	Mathematics
2012-2013	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2011-2012	Mathematics
2013-2014	<i>Accredited with Warning</i>	2012-2013	Mathematics
2014-2015	<i>TBD</i>	2013-2014	English, Mathematics, History

**Federal Accountability Sanction**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Based on Statewide Assessments in</b>	<b>Federal Status (SIG- PRIOR TO WAIVER PROIRTY/FOCUS OR NOT TITLE I)</b>
<b>2010-2011</b>	2009-2010	Not SIG
<b>2011-2012</b>	2010-2011	Not SIG
<b>2012-2013</b>	2011-2012	Not Title I
<b>2013-2014</b>	2012-2013	Not Title I
<b>2014-2015</b>	2013-2014	Not Title I

**Federal Accountability Pass Rates**

<b>Assessment Type</b>	<b>School Pass Rates</b>								<b>State Pass Rates</b>	
	<b>2006-2007</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>2008-2009</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
<b>Reading</b>	83%	84%	88%	85%	85%	85%	60%	66%	75%	74%
<b>Writing</b>	93%	87%	89%	92%	86%	88%	55%	61%	76%	75%
<b>Mathematics</b>	68%	74%	70%	71%	58%	49%	50%	57%	71%	74%
<b>Science</b>	96%	95%	93%	93%	91%	92%	69%	68%	81%	80%
<b>History</b>	80%	82%	77%	80%	80%	69%	69%	68%	85%	84%

**Graduation and Completion Index, if applicable**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Index</b>
2011	n/a
2012	
2013	
2014	