SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD OF EDUCATION

Agenda Item#___8.1_____

Meeting Date: December 16, 2010

Subject: Superintendent's Priority Schools Report

☒   Information Item Only
☐   Approval on Consent Agenda
☐   Conference (for discussion only)
☐   Conference/First Reading
☐   Conference/Action
☐   Action
☐   Public Hearing

Division: Office of Accountability

Recommendation: None

Background/Rationale:

The Superintendent's six Priority Schools were designated in spring, 2010. The focus of this initiative is to "turnaround" SCUSD's lowest performing schools and to incubate the instructional initiatives outlined in the strategic plan in order to provide models of successful strategies that may then be taken to scale with other low-performing schools.

Financial Considerations:

ARRA Title I funds $5,112,364 and Deferred Maintenance funds $1,531,277

Documents Attached:

Priority Schools Plan

Estimated Time of Presentation: 20 minutes
Submitted by: Mary C .Shelton, Chief Accountability Officer
Approved by: Jonathan P. Raymond, Superintendent

SUPERINTENDENT'S PRIORITY SCHOOLS PLAN

Sacramento
City Unified
School District

December 16, 2010

Board of Education Executive Summary
Accountability Office
December 16, 2010

Sacramento
City Unified
School District

I. Introduction

The third pillar of Sacramento City Unified School District's *Strategic Plan 2010-2014: Putting Children First*, is Organizational Transformation, a commitment to our community that our district is dedicated to improving teaching and learning as a means of better preparing our graduates for college and 21 century careers and providing equity and access to all students. One of the strategies to meet this goal is that we will "use Superintendent's Priority Schools as places of innovation to attack persistent under-performance and the achievement gap." The Priority Schools are meant to be learning laboratories, incubators of innovation that serve as early implementers of district initiatives. The Priority Schools are "turnaround" schools in the sense that the actions we have taken are meant to put the schools on a trajectory for high performance.

Priority Schools are designed around a simple philosophy: one size does not fit all. Realizing this, each school has been redesigned around a set of principles that both provide guidance as to what is important and allow for the individual needs of each school. These design principles are:

- Set the conditions for success through strategic staffing and facility improvements
- Focus on rigorous student work
- Focus on professional learning and collaboration
- Focus on family and community engagement
- Focus on organizational transformation

How the schools were selected

In February, 2010, SCUSD was informed by the California Department of Education that one of our elementary schools, Oak Ridge Elementary, was one of the 5% lowest performing schools in California. The Superintendent directed his Academic Team, consisting of the Chief Academic Officer and the Associate Superintendents, as well as the Director of Assessment, Research and Evaluation, to examine data related to the performance of SCUSD's lowest-performing schools, including Oak Ridge.

The team examined data including California Standards Tests, achievement trends over the last five years, length of tenure of principals, years of teaching experience of staff, Academic Performance Index, Adequate Yearly Progress and Program Improvement status as well as graduation rate and dropout rates. Consideration was given to the capacity of the District and resources available to devote to the school turnaround process. Finally, we examined what

Board of Education Executive Summary
Accountability Office
December 16, 2010

Sacramento
City Unified
School District

interventions for struggling students were already in place. We were looking for evidence of promise – schools with the potential to turnaround but haven't been changing fast enough.

The Team reached a decision to designate six schools, three elementary, two middle schools and one high school as Priority Schools for 2010-11. All of the schools were in the lowest 20 percent in the state in terms of achievement.

<u>Why this initiative is critical to district improvement</u>

SCUSD currently has 44 schools in Program Improvement Status (PI), which is 59% of its total schools. Thirteen of these are in Year 5 or greater of PI status. The District itself is in Year 3 Program Improvement. Most importantly, only 51% of our students are proficient in English Language Arts and 56% are proficient in mathematics. Sixty-eight percent of our students live in poverty. To reach our goal of ensuring that <u>all</u> of our students are college and career ready at graduation, we must systemically improve the way our students learn and our teachers teach. The organization must transform to become an efficient, effective model with a laser-like focus on student learning and instruction. The Priority Schools are meant to be incubators of innovation and first in line for resources and support, so that these schools may serve as models for proven strategies that may then be used across all schools in the District.

II. Design Principles:

* Set the conditions for success through strategic staffing and improvements to the facility

The driving theme behind the Priority School plan is to create a team of successful leaders and teachers at each school and then give them the flexibility to do what needs to be done while holding them accountable for the results. During the spring of 2010, five new principals for the Priority Schools were selected from the ranks of successful principals in SCUSD based on criteria such as Academic Performance Index growth at their current sites, years of successful experience at narrowing the achievement gap, performance of their current school as compared to similar schools and a proven track record of leadership. One principal, who had been at Father Keith B. Kenny for only one year, remained at the site. The Superintendent met with each of the six principals who accepted the challenge and they committed to remaining at the Priority School site for at least three years. The principals then selected Assistant Principals and Learning Specialists who would become their Leadership Team at each of the schools. Principals and Assistant Principals received a 10% salary bonus and agreed to work year round. Teachers at each of the schools were offered the opportunity to transfer to another site. Transfer requests were: Oak Ridge: 6, Fr. K.B. Kenny: 1, Jed Smith: 6, Fern Bacon: 6, Will C. Wood: 1 and Hiram Johnson: 5. At some schools, teachers whom the principal felt would stand in the way of reform were administratively transferred to other sites.

Board of Education Executive Summary
Accountability Office
December 16, 2010

Sacramento
City Unified
School District

Deep-cleaning, painting (both interior and exterior), and landscaping crews were dispatched during the summer months of 2010 to give the six schools a fresh, clean appearance and to set a new tone for the learning environments at each school. Budget details for these tasks are included in the Short Term Indicators chart in the Appendix to this document.

- Focus on Rigorous Student Work

During the summer months, all of the Priority Schools formed data inquiry teams that were subsequently trained and coached in the Data Wise process, a cycle of inquiry developed at Harvard's Graduate School of Education in 2001. Data Wise is aimed at helping the schools use student data, including tests and writing samples, more effectively as keys to improving teaching and learning. The teams are using their Common Planning Time to dig into data with their peers as they learn strategies for examining student work, ways to identify what students are struggling with, examine teacher practices that may have led to the struggles and determine an action plan to address the student problems.

Instructional coaches and administrators at each site have been learning to assist and coach teachers through this process. The focus of the work is to train teachers, by examining student work products, to change their practice in order to increase rigor and assist students in employing, on an everyday basis, higher order thinking skills. Coaches from Transformation by Design will continue to visit the schools throughout the year to work with teachers, administrators and instructional coaches to perfect the process.

To enable students to have extended learning time and to be able to implement student supports, Jed Smith, Father Keith B. Kenny, Oak Ridge, Will C. Wood and Fern Bacon added a half hour to their instructional day. In addition, Jed Smith, Father Keith B. Kenny and Oak Ridge implemented an extended Kindergarten day.

- Focus on Professional Learning and Collaboration

At Jed Smith, Oak Ridge, Father Keith B. Kenny, Fern Bacon, and Will C. Wood, teams of teachers were also trained this summer in Write Tools strategies, an academic writing program aimed at assisting teachers to instruct students in how to write at a higher level of complexity.

Additionally, Oak Ridge, Jed Smith and Father Keith B. Kenny teachers participated in Culturally Responsive Teaching Strategies, a program designed to assist teachers in acquiring "a toolbox" of strategy skills that address the needs of diverse learners.

Jed Smith and Oak Ridge are also early implementer sites for inclusive practices, a program that aims to include special education students as much as possible in regular education classes by

Board of Education Executive Summary
Accountability Office
December 16, 2010

Sacramento
City Unified
School District

training all teachers to work collaboratively in using strategies that address a wide variety of learning styles and needs.

In addition, Father Keith B. Kenny teachers are being trained this year on-site by High Quality First Instruction practitioners provided by the Sacramento County Office of Education.

All Priority principals were also offered the services of a personal leadership coach who was experienced in school turnaround initiatives.

- **Focus on Family and Community Engagement**
  Additional support services, such as parent advisors, counselors, nurses, and social workers were added at the schools based on their individual needs. The focus of Year One is to set the stage for improvement by creating a climate and culture of active engagement of students in their own learning and parents and families in their students' learning progress. All of the Priority Schools have Parent Resource Centers (Will C. Wood and Hiram Johnson have expanded existing facilities for parents) and all are conducting home visits with the Parent Teacher Home Visit Project. Due to a grant received by the District from Target, all six schools will be organizing Family Academies designed to address parent/family educational and interest needs during the Spring of 2011. Stand Up for Sacramento Schools, a non-profit organization, will assist with the Home-School Connection Program at each site to recruit and organize parents and volunteers.

  Will C. Wood, Hiram Johnson, and Father Keith B. Kenny are working with the Family and Community Engagement Office to become certified as Welcoming Schools. Other Priority Schools will begin the process during the spring of 2011.

- **Focus on Organizational Transformation**

We know that, on an operational level, the school district needs to break down barriers between the central office and school sites to create a more effective flow of services. A new Office of Accountability was created assist in creating a "no-excuses"culture that offers supports and holds schools and principals accountable for results. The six Priority Schools report directly to the Chief Accountability Officer, eliminating "reporting layers", and all departments have been instructed that the Priority Schools' needs come first. They go to the "head of the line" for services and supports.

We know that, in order for the Priority Schools to be successful, adults in the school must work in teams. All Priority School Principals and Assistant Principals began training in August on collaborative leadership, led by Mike Mattos, author of "The Collaborative Administrator". This training, which will continue throughout the year, focuses on how to build and sustain collaborative teams.

Board of Education Executive Summary
Accountability Office
December 16, 2010

Sacramento
City Unified
School District

III. Next Steps:

• Evaluation

To begin to evaluate the success of the Priority Schools Initiative, both short-term and long-term indicators were developed. Short-term indicators, monitored quarterly, include student discipline suspensions, attendance rates, student quarter grades and family and student perceptions. More long-term indicators include changes in the academic program (as determined by a School Quality Review), improvement in student work products, and progress in student achievement as determined by multiple measures, both qualitative and quantitative.

These indicators, both short and long-term, are detailed in this document's Appendix, and first quarter data for 2010-11 is included.

• Continued professional development

All of the Priority Schools will assist in designing summer institutes for 2011 that deepen the current work and assist with determined needs by site. The Data Wise inquiry process training will continue and work on the Common Core Standards will be imbedded in that training.

• New Priority Schools

Criteria will be examined and refined for use in selecting possible new Priority Schools for 2011-12 beginning in January 2011. These criteria will include API growth over time, Program Improvement Status, growth in % of students at Proficient and Advanced Levels in English Language Arts and Math, growth in % of English Language Learners and Socio-economically Disadvantaged students at Proficient and Advanced Levels, Teacher Capacity and Principal Capacity in seven areas designated by the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders. New Principals and Leadership Teams will be selected for each school. Design Teams consisting of teachers, staff, parents and students (at secondary) for each school will be convened to work with the new principal to create a vision and design for the new Priority Schools.

Board of Education Executive Summary
Accountability Office
December 16, 210

Sacramento
City Unified
School District

IV. Appendix:

Priority Schools profiles:

Father Keith B. Kenny

ENROLLMENT

Ethnicity/Race	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Hispanic or Latino of Any Race	100	95	111	92
American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic	5	4	2	1
Asian, Not Hispanic	32	24	18	24
Pacific Islander, Not Hispanic			1	4
Filipino, Not Hispanic	2	5	1	
African American, Not Hispanic	208	205	150	126
White, not Hispanic	15	7	12	6
Two or More Races, Not Hispanic			17	21
Multiple or No Response	3	3		
Total	365	343	312	274

Free and Reduced Price Meals Eligibility	Percent of Students Eligible 2010-11	100%

Academic Performance Index (API)	2008 API Growth	2009 API Growth	2010 API Growth
AYP Target	620	650	680
School wide	686	631	714

	ELA - Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)						Mathematics - Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)					
	2008		2009		2010		2008		2009		2010	
	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria
AYP Target	35.2		46.0		56.8		37.0		47.5		58.0	
Schoolwide	27.6	No	26.3	No	31.9	Yes	41.1	Yes	34.5	No	39.6	Yes
African American or Black	27.2	Yes	23.6	No	26.7	Yes	38.4	Yes	31.1	No	33.3	Yes
Asian	41.2	--	45.5	--	--	--	52.9	--	54.5	--	--	--
Hispanic or Latino	27.9	Yes	27.1	--	37.9	Yes	47.5	Yes	37.5	--	43.9	Yes
White	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Two or More Races					36.4	--					36.4	--
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	27.6	No	23.4	No	33.1	Yes	41.1	Yes	32.3	No	39.9	Yes
English Learners	20.9	--	34.4	--	31.0	--	44.2	--	37.5	--	55.2	--
Students with Disabilities	11.8	--	16.7	--	30.8	--	11.8	--	11.1	--	30.8	--

Board of Education Executive Summary
Accountability Office
December 16, 210

Sacramento
City Unified
School District

Jedediah Smith

ENROLLMENT

Ethnicity/Race	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Hispanic or Latino of Any Race	42	38	51	58
American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic	7	3	2	3
Asian, Not Hispanic	31	32	33	24
Pacific Islander, Not Hispanic	12	10	19	21
Filipino, Not Hispanic				
African American, Not Hispanic	159	182	143	152
White, not Hispanic	15	19	15	7
Two or More Races, Not Hispanic			7	13
Multiple or No Response	2	2		
Total	268	286	270	278

Free and Reduced Price Meals Eligibility	Percent of Students Eligible 2010-11	100%

Academic Performance Index (API)	2008	2009	2010
	API Growth	API Growth	API Growth
AYP Target	620	650	680
Schoolwide	680	661	665

	ELA - Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)						Mathematics - Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)					
	2008		2009		2010		2008		2009		2010	
	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria
AYP Target	35.2		46.0		56.8		37.0		47.5		58.0	
Schoolwide	26.0	Yes	26.5	No	25.9	No	40.4	Yes	40.8	No	43.8	Yes
African American or Black	18.6	No	21.1	No	21.2	No	31.4	Yes	32.2	No	40.0	Yes
Asian	52.6	--	41.7	--	40.9	--	94.7	--	70.8	--	63.6	--
Hispanic or Latino	27.3	--	29.4	--	30.0	--	31.8	--	41.2	--	46.7	--
White	--	--	--	--	38.5	--	--	--	--	--	61.5	--
Two or More Races					--	--					--	--
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	25.4	Yes	26.5	No	24.2	No	39.4	Yes	40.8	No	43.0	No
English Learners	45.2	--	31.4	--	34.9	--	67.7	--	54.3	--	55.8	--
Students with Disabilities	38.5	--	37.9	--	25.0	--	34.6	--	41.4	--	44.4	--

Board of Education Executive Summary
Accountability Office
December 16, 210

Sacramento
City Unified
School District

Oak Ridge

ENROLLMENT

Ethnicity/Race	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Hispanic or Latino of Any Race	196	210	211	205
American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic	11	8	7	9
Asian, Not Hispanic	128	118	116	88
Pacific Islander, Not Hispanic	2	4	2	9
Filipino, Not Hispanic	2	2	2	
African American, Not Hispanic	75	96	100	98
White, not Hispanic	23	20	16	12
Two or More Races, Not Hispanic			5	6
Multiple or No Response	5	1		
Total	442	459	459	427

Free and Reduced Price Meals Eligibility	Percent of Students Eligible 2010-11	100%

Academic Performance Index (API)			
	2008	**2009**	**2010**
	API Growth	**API Growth**	**API Growth**
AYP Target	620	650	680
School wide	674	649	658

	ELA - Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)						Mathematics - Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)					
	2008		2009		2010		2008		2009		2010	
	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria
AYP Target	35.2		46.0		56.8		37.0		47.5		58.0	
Schoolwide	24.1	No	28.0	No	25.0	No	36.9	No	36.8	No	36.3	No
African American or Black	15.0	--	23.6	Yes	28.6	Yes	22.5	--	20.4	No	27.3	Yes
Asian	31.9	Yes	33.8	Yes	29.6	No	45.1	Yes	52.7	Yes	52.1	No
Hispanic or Latino	22.1	Yes	25.2	No	23.0	No	38.1	Yes	35.2	No	34.4	No
White	30.8	--	35.7	--	--	--	27.3	--	21.4	--	--	--
Two or More Races					--	--					--	--
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	24.1	No	28.0	No	20.8	No	36.9	No	36.8	No	29.8	No
English Learners	25.9	Yes	26.7	No	23.0	No	39.4	Yes	43.8	Yes	42.8	No
Students with Disabilities	9.4	--	16.3	--	21.1	--	15.6	--	18.6	--	34.2	--

Board of Education Executive Summary
Accountability Office
December 16, 210

Sacramento
City Unified
School District

Fern Bacon Middle

ENROLLMENT

Ethnicity/Race	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Hispanic or Latino of Any Race	395	360	355	300
American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic	10	5	3	4
Asian, Not Hispanic	213	197	162	140
Pacific Islander, Not Hispanic	11	10	15	11
Filipino, Not Hispanic	4	9	6	
African American, Not Hispanic	149	140	104	121
White, not Hispanic	50	46	24	18
Two or More Races, Not Hispanic			42	18
Multiple or No Response	4	2		
Total	836	769	711	612

Free and Reduced Price Meals Eligibility	Percent of Students Eligible 2010-11	100%

Academic Performance Index (API)			
	2008	**2009**	**2010**
	API Growth	**API Growth**	**API Growth**
AYP Target	**620**	**650**	**680**
School wide	680	661	665

	ELA - Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)						Mathematics - Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)					
	2008		2009		2010		2008		2009		2010	
	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria
AYP Target	35.2		46.0		56.8		37.0		47.5		58.0	
Schoolwide	26.4	No	26.2	No	31.4	No	25.1	No	25.3	No	25.9	No
African American or Black	19.4	--	21.1	No	31.6	--	12.2	--	13.8	No	21.5	--
Asian	29.8	No	24.7	No	35.5	Yes	37.4	Yes	41.8	Yes	36.9	No
Hispanic or Latino	25.8	No	28.2	No	28.4	No	22.3	No	20.4	No	22.0	No
White	33.3	--	30.0	--	44.4	--	28.2	--	26.7	--	44.4	--
Two or More Races					34.2	--					21.1	--
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	25.6	No	25.8	No	31.5	Yes	25.4	No	25.3	No	26.2	No
English Learners	18.5	No	18.8	No	24.4	No	24.1	No	25.1	No	24.9	No
Students with Disabilities	8.6	--	21.9	--	10.8	--	5.8	--	9.6	--	6.2	--

Board of Education Executive Summary
Accountability Office
December 16, 210

Sacramento
City Unified
School District

Will C. Wood Middle

ENROLLMENT

Ethnicity/Race	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Hispanic or Latino of Any Race	277	272	309	315
American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic	12	9	8	10
Asian, Not Hispanic	312	296	276	234
Pacific Islander, Not Hispanic	6	8	6	16
Filipino, Not Hispanic	3	5	5	
African American, Not Hispanic	118	119	104	85
White, not Hispanic	75	60	39	34
Two or More Races, Not Hispanic			7	29
Multiple or No Response	4	2		
Total	807	771	754	723

Free and Reduced Price Meals Eligibility	Percent of Students Eligible 2010-11	100%

Academic Performance Index (API)			
	2008	**2009**	**2010**
	API Growth	**API Growth**	**API Growth**
AYP Target	620	650	680
School wide	710	709	705

	ELA - Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)						Mathematics - Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)					
	2008		2009		2010		2008		2009		2010	
	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria
AYP Target	35.2		46.0		56.8		37.0		47.5		58.0	
Schoolwide	35.5	Yes	36.8	No	39.8	No	47.8	Yes	43.3	No	41.8	No
African American or Black	28.0	--	29.2	--	27.5	--	22.6	--	19.1	--	20.0	--
Asian	44.9	Yes	44.7	No	49.2	Yes	65.3	Yes	58.5	Yes	59.3	Yes
Hispanic or Latino	26.0	No	28.6	No	36.2	Yes	40.8	Yes	36.1	No	33.9	No
White	36.5	--	39.6	--	35.5	--	36.5	--	35.4	--	32.3	--
Two or More Races					--	--					--	--
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	35.5	Yes	36.5	No	39.1	No	47.8	Yes	43.0	No	40.5	No
English Learners	29.0	No	27.7	No	33.7	Yes	49.7	Yes	40.6	No	41.6	No
Students with Disabilities	6.6	--	2.5	--	15.9	--	3.3	--	5.1	--	8.7	--

Board of Education Executive Summary
Accountability Office
December 16, 210

Sacramento
City Unified
School District

Hiram Johnson High School

ENROLLMENT

Ethnicity/Race	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Hispanic or Latino of Any Race	750	776	844	769
American Indian or Alaska Native, Not Hispanic	32	29	17	21
Asian, Not Hispanic	650	631	602	529
Pacific Islander, Not Hispanic	27	21	23	33
Filipino, Not Hispanic	12	11	15	
African American, Not Hispanic	395	347	331	247
White, not Hispanic	263	245	217	171
Two or More Races, Not Hispanic			103	138
Multiple or No Response	18	10		
			1	
Total	2147	2070	2153	1908

*The category "Two or More Races" and the addition of "Not Hispanic" to each race category began in 2009-10.

Free and Reduced Price Meals Eligibility	Percent of Students Eligible 2010-11	100%

Academic Performance Index (API)					Graduation Rate			
	2008	2009	2010		2008	2009	2010	
	API Growth	API Growth	API Growth	Met graduation	No	Yes	Pending	
AYP Target	620	650	680					
Schoolwide	611	617	611					

	ELA - Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)						Mathematics - Percent Proficient - Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)					
	2008		2009		2010		2008		2009		2010	
	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria	Percent	Met AYP Criteria
AYP Target	33.4		44.5		55.6		32.2		43.5		54.8	
Schoolwide	30.6	No	26.3	No	31.1	No	36.0	Yes	37.1	No	37.5	No
African American or Black	15.9	No	21.4	--	12.2	--	14.7	No	21.4	--	16.3	--
Asian	37.2	Yes	28.7	No	34.4	Pend	59.9	Yes	51.5	Yes	54.3	Pend
Hispanic or Latino	27.1	No	22.2	No	30.4	No	26.8	No	30.4	No	31.2	No
White	41.2	Yes	33.9	--	51.9	--	32.8	Yes	31.7	--	40.7	--
Two or More Races					41.2	--					38.2	--
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	30.4	Yes	26.4	No	30.6	No	37.1	Yes	37.2	No	37.3	No
English Learners	19.6	No	12.2	No	22.1	No	34.8	Yes	32.4	No	33.2	No
Students with Disabilities	12.0	--	7.0	--	14.9	--	14.3	--	10.9	--	10.6	--

Board of Education Executive Summary
Accountability Office
December 16, 210

Sacramento
City Unified
School District

Short-term Indicators of Improvements in the Turnaround Process

Father Keith B. Kenny

Indicator	Evidence	First Quarter 09-10 (September to November)	First Quarter 10-11 (September to November)
Student Discipline	Days of Principal Suspensions	35	11
Attendance	Monthly Attendance Rate	(93.68%) (92.67%) (92.46%)	(94.94%) (94.59%) (93.88%)
Learning Progress	Quarter grades: # and % receiving at least 1 Far Below Basic or Below Basic mark	Not available	201 (71.8%)
Use of Time	Changed instructional schedule	None	30 minutes per day
	Common Planning Time	None	27 hours
Physical Environment	Parking and lawn		$27,937.77 Budget
	Exterior buildings		$31,900.19 Budget
	Interior classrooms and offices		$71,574.33 Budget
Family and Student Satisfaction	Parent surveys		In progress
	Student surveys		In progress

Jedediah Smith

Indicator	Evidence	First Quarter 09-10 (September to November)	First Quarter 10-11 (September to November)
Student Discipline	Days of Principal Suspensions	54	34
Attendance	Monthly Attendance Rate	(96.46%) (95.58%) (95.87%)	(96.08%) (95.39%) (93.05%)
Learning Progress	Quarter grades: # and % receiving at least 1 Far Below Basic or Below Basic mark	Not available	200 (73.3%)
Use of Time	Changed instructional schedule	None	30 minutes per day
	Common Planning Time	None	27 hours
Physical Environment	Parking and lawn		$27,606.96 Budget
	Exterior buildings		$81,320.45 Budget
	Interior classrooms and offices		$106,196.79 Budget
Family and Student Satisfaction	Parent surveys		In progress
	Student surveys		In progress

Board of Education Executive Summary
Accountability Office
December 16, 210

Sacramento
City Unified
School District

Short-term Indicators of Improvements in the Turnaround Process

Oak Ridge

Indicator	Evidence	First Quarter 09-10 (September to November)	First Quarter 10-11 (September to November)
Student Discipline	Days of Principal Suspensions	53	15
Attendance	Monthly Attendance Rate	(94.48%) (93.68%) (93.22%)	(95.27%) (95.24%) (95.35%)
Learning Progress	Quarter grades: # and % receiving at least 1 Far Below Basic or Below Basic mark	Not available	366 (85.1%)
Use of Time	Changed instructional schedule	None	30 minutes per day
	Common Planning Time	None	27 hours
Physical Environment	Parking and lawn		$32,924.69 Budget
	Exterior buildings		$92,857.49 Budget
	Interior classrooms and offices		$96,837.20 Budget
Family and Student Satisfaction	Parent surveys		In progress
	Student surveys		In progress

Fern Bacon

Indicator	Evidence	First Quarter 09-10 (September to November)	First Quarter 10-11 (September to November)
Student Discipline	Days of Principal Suspensions	304	62
Attendance	Monthly Attendance Rate	(96.40%) (95.04%) (94.72%)	(96.97%) (96.46%) (95.74%)
Learning Progress	Quarter grades: (# and % receiving at least 1 D or F grade)	471 (66.1%)	171 (28.0%)
Use of Time	Changed instructional schedule	None	30 minutes per day
	Common Planning Time	None	27 hours
Physical Environment	Parking and lawn		$61,354.95 Budget
	Exterior buildings		$109,910.10 Budget
	Interior classrooms and offices		$131,871.69 Budget
Family and Student Satisfaction	Parent surveys		In progress
	Student surveys		In progress

Accountability Office 13

Board of Education Executive Summary
Accountability Office
December 16, 210

Sacramento
City Unified
School District

Short-term Indicators of Improvements in the Turnaround Process

Will C. Wood

Indicator	Evidence	First Quarter 09-10 (September to November)	First Quarter 10-11 (September to November)
Student Discipline	Days of Principal Suspensions	462	111
Attendance	Monthly Attendance Rate	(96.98%) (96.07%) (95.58%)	(97.16%) (96.58%) (95.6%)
Learning Progress	Quarter grades: (# and % receiving at least 1 D or F grade)	387 (51.1%)	376 (52.2%)
Use of Time	Changed instructional schedule	None	30 minutes per day
	Common Planning Time	None	27 hours
Physical Environment	Parking and lawn		$52,540.41 Budget
	Exterior buildings		$108,550.93 Budget
	Interior classrooms and offices		$122,164.30 Budget
Family and Student Satisfaction	Parent surveys		In progress
	Student surveys		In progress

Hiram Johnson

Indicator	Evidence	First Quarter 09-10 (September to November)	First Quarter 10-11 (September to November)
Student Discipline	Days of Principal Suspensions	746	194
Attendance	Monthly Attendance Rate	(94.48%) (93.19%) (92.55%)	(95.26%) (94.47%) (93.44%)
Learning Progress	Quarter grades: (# and % receiving at least 1 D or F grade)	1,402 (71.2%)	1,159 (67.8%)
Use of Time	Changed instructional schedule	None	
	Common Planning Time	None	27 hours
Physical Environment	Parking and lawn		$28,779.34 Budget
	Exterior buildings		$126,368.95 Budget
	Interior classrooms and offices		$220,580.76 Budget
Family and Student Satisfaction	Parent surveys		In progress
	Student surveys		In progress

Board of Education Executive Summary
Accountability Office
December 16, 210

Sacramento
City Unified
School District

Yearly Evaluation Plan

Outcome Measure	Data Collection	How often it will be collected	What we expect to learn from it
Are changes in the academic program apparent?	School Quality Review	Baseline Spring 2010 Spring 2012	Improvement in the six domains on each set of criteria to an "established" or "exemplary" ranking.
To what extent have perceptions changed about the performance of this school?	Perception Surveys	Baseline January 2011 Spring of each succeeding year	Improvement in how parents, staff and students perceive the school is performing.
To what extent is student work improving?	External Student Work Reviews Teacher comments on student work Portfolios	October, March and May each school year Baseline October 2010	Improvement in the quality of student work
Are students/schools making steady academic progress?	California Standards Tests District benchmarks Classroom formative assessments	Baseline Spring, 2010 Conducted each Spring. Results available in August Quarterly each year Beginning in 2011-12 On-going	Improvement in % proficient in each tested area of 10% per year Individual student growth.