

**Outline of Proposed
EDUCATION PLAN**

for

**Pulaski County Special School District
Desegregation Case Settlement**

Steven M. Ross
Deborah L. Lowther
The University of Memphis

Executive Summary

The following Education Plan is intended to meet the educational interventions required by the PCSSD Desegregation Case Settlement. The Plan is directed toward the attainment of specific goals which focus on the domains of student achievement, attendance, behavior/discipline, and academic remediation/enrichment. Initial implementation of the plan involves a Year 1 Pilot Program to occur during Spring and Summer 1999 and Year 2 Full Program start-up for 1999-2000.

The Education Plan involves six basic phases:

Establish District Goals for School-Wide Programs

A District Steering Committee comprised of key PCSSD stakeholders will specify operational components that every School-Wide Plan should include.

Require Each School to Develop a School-Wide Plan for Achieving District Goals

Plans should be developed by key stakeholders for each school and should incorporate appropriate externally- or locally-developed programs to meet the district goals.

Establish a District School-Restructuring Committee

The District Steering Committee or another representative group provides schools with information regarding possible restructuring programs, establishes the protocol for School-Wide Plans, and reviews/approves submitted Plans.

Implement School-Wide Programs

Schools with approved Plans implement fully and schools without approved Plans implement specific components which were approved. Each program must develop implementation benchmarks to ascertain progress.

Evaluate Processes, Outcomes, and Goal Attainment

District and school level evaluations will be conducted on a yearly basis. The district evaluation will be both formative and summative to determine progress, improvement needs and success. The school-level evaluations will be more formative in nature to assess progress and identify improvement needs.

School Improvement Planning

Evaluation data will be used to develop School Improvement Plans which will be reviewed by the District School-Restructuring Committee.

The Year 1 Pilot Program will initiate the implementation of an approved Education Plan for the Desegregation Case Settlement, establish baseline conditions at the pilot schools (six elementary and one middle or high school) to which outcomes from the full Education Plan can be compared longitudinally, and develop and refine procedures and instrumentation for systemic use in 1999-2000. The proposed timeline for the Pilot Program is listed below:

- District Goals for School-Wide Analysis (by February 28, 1999)
- School Level Needs Analysis (by February 28, 1999)
- Needs Analysis Review and Feedback (by March 31, 1999)
- Pilot Year Formative Evaluation (February - June, 1999)
- Formative Evaluation Analysis and Feedback (by August 1, 1999)
- Pilot Program Review/Full Program Start-up (September - October, 1999)

Outline of Proposed EDUCATION PLAN

for

Pulaski County Special School District Desegregation Case Settlement

Note: This plan deals with the education interventions only. It is drafted to invite commentary by the PCSSD and Joshua Case intervenors for revision and expansions.

EDUCATIONAL GOALS

- To improve educational achievement by all students, with special attention to African-American students and others who are at-risk of academic failure due to socioeconomic disadvantages, or other factors.
- To decrease the performance gap between white students and African-American students through the systematic design/selection and implementation of intervention programs that provide effective remediation and/or adaptation to individual or group needs.
- To increase the number and proportion of African American and disadvantaged students participating in extracurricular activities, gifted programs and honors, enriched, and advanced placement courses.
- To reduce the number of discipline problems and classroom disruptions caused by all students, regardless of race or background.
- To increase student attendance and reduce suspensions and grade retentions for all students, regardless of race or background.
- To establish an ongoing, systematic evaluation system at individual schools and the district level to:
 - ◊ assess the progress made at school and district levels in achieving the educational goals
 - ◊ provide direction for "Education Plan" and educational program improvements, where indicated.

PROCESS FOR OVERALL PLAN (STARTING SEPTEMBER, 1999)

A. Establish District Goals for School-Wide Programs

1. These programs are conceived as school-wide models for addressing the above educational goals.
2. The district goals should specify the operational components that every school-wide program should include.
 - a. The components should be selected through consensus by representatives from key stakeholder groups having direct involvement with PCSSD and/or the Joshua Case. The *District Steering Committee* (Arkansas Dept. of Education, 1994, p. 9) proposed in the Extended COE Plan might be used for this purpose, and include:
 - ◆ Assistant Superintendent of Instruction
 - ◆ Assistant Superintendent of Desegregation
 - ◆ Teachers' Union
 - ◆ Title I
 - ◆ Principals
 - ◆ Teachers
 - ◆ Joshua Case Intervenors
 - ◆ University of Memphis Consultant(s).
 - b. A listing of suggested components will be provided by the University of Memphis (U of M) consultants as the basis for discussion/consideration. The selected components are based on (but not limited to) criteria for whole-school restructuring adopted by the Department of Education in the current Comprehensive School Restructuring Design (CSR Design or "Obey-Porter" legislation). Examples include:
 - ◆ An integrated, whole-school approach that focuses on all students in all grades
 - ◆ Programs/strategies that directly address the desegregation Educational Goals (see above) of the settlement, with focus on the domains of student achievement, attendance, behavior/discipline, academic remediation/enrichment
 - ◆ Research-based strategies for teaching and learning
 - ◆ Appropriate, ongoing professional development
 - ◆ Involvement of parents and the community
 - ◆ Whole-school support for the program (principal, teachers, staff, parents, and students)
 - ◆ Reallocation of resources to support the program
 - ◆ Partnering with external groups (e.g., universities, businesses) to support the program
 - ◆ Systematic, ongoing formative evaluation of program implementation and outcomes
 - c. The plans should incorporate existing district and state initiatives, such as the Arkansas Curriculum Frameworks and *Smart Start*. The ways in which those initiatives will be addressed and implemented should be explicitly described.

B. Require Each School to Develop a School-Wide Plan for Achieving District Goals

1. Plan may incorporate externally-developed comprehensive programs (e.g., Success For All) or targeted programs (e.g., Reading Recovery) with locally-developed programs
2. Plan should be developed with input and support from key stakeholders such as, school administrators, teachers, staff, and parents
3. Plan should be written according to a prescribed format and submitted to the district by a set date

C. Establish a District School-Restructuring Committee to Monitor, Review, and Approve School-Wide Planning

1. The *District Steering Committee* (Arkansas Dept. of Education , 1994, p. 9) proposed in the Extended COE Plan or some other appropriate and representative, district-wide group would serve in this capacity. The committee ensures that schools have access to information regarding possible restructuring designs, programs/interventions
 - a. Literature
 - b. Presentations by external design teams (“Design Fairs”); experts on curriculum and instruction, and experts on urban education and at-risk learners
 - c. Assistance with arranging visits to schools using different designs or School-Wide Programs (SWPs).
 - d. Presentations by internal experts from PCSSD
 - e. Exposure to formative evaluation strategies such as the U of M/AEL model
2. The committee establishes procedures and requirements for submission/review of school-wide plans
3. The committee reviews/approves submitted plans
 - a. Provides feedback for refinement
 - b. Approves plans considered satisfactory
 - c. Assists schools with the refinement/redevelopment of plans that are not accepted

D. Implement School-Wide Programs

1. Schools with approved plans implement programs
 - a. Must develop implementation “benchmarks”
 - Indicate what events or structures would be observed in a beginning phase, intermediate phase, and completed phase
 - Benchmark categories might include Organization, Curriculum, and Instruction
 - Benchmarks must explicitly show progress stages in addressing District Goals for School-Wide Programs (see “A” above)

2. Schools without approved plans are placed on "provisional" status for the year, but must show progress in:
 - a. Implementing approved, specific components of their originally proposed design (e.g., a reading program, after-school tutoring, discipline strategy, site-based decision making structure, etc.)
 - b. Demonstrating progress in refining/redeveloping school-wide plans

E. Evaluate Processes, Outcomes, and Goal Attainment

1. Evaluation should be at both the school and district level, occur yearly, and longitudinally
2. School-Level Evaluations
 - a. Should be "formative" in nature--to determine progress and improvement needs.
 - b. Should emphasize:
 - Implementation benchmarks
 - Principal/teacher reactions
 - School climate
 - Classroom observations
 - Student achievement
 - c. An evaluation format, including the elements described above, is outlined in the later section on *Pilot Program Formative Evaluation*. (see Section D of Pilot Project)
 - d. Final report is provided by U of M (see Pilot Program evaluation)
3. District-level Evaluations
 - a. Should be both formative and summative in nature--to determine progress, improvement needs, and success
 - b. Should include aggregate and school data on implementation progress, school climate indicators, and teacher, principal, parent, and student reactions
 - c. Should specifically address the desegregation Education Goals and District Goals for School-Wide Programs
 - d. Should analyze student outcomes using overall population and disaggregated data samples (based on race, poverty, programs selected, etc.)
 - Standardized achievement scores
 - Attendance
 - Drop-outs
 - Suspensions
 - Discipline reports
 - e. Should be longitudinal

F. School Improvement Planning

1. School leadership teams study final report (see E.2.d above).
2. Results disseminated to teachers and staff.
3. School Improvement Plans submitted to District School-Restructuring Committee (by early summer) for program refinement and continuation, based on the evaluation data.

PLAN AND TIMELINE FOR 1998-1999: PILOT IMPLEMENTATION

Due to the limited time remaining in the present (Year 1: 1998-1999) school year, it is proposed that the Education Plan be piloted, using a sample consisting of 6 elementary schools and 1 high school (or middle school). In Year 2 (1999-2000), all schools will fully participate.

School Selection (January, 1999)

The selection of schools will be at the discretion of the Assistant Superintendents of Desegregation and of Instruction. It is recommended, however, that the selection favor schools serving the highest proportions of disadvantaged students.

PURPOSES OF PILOT PROGRAM

There will be three main purposes of the Year 1 Pilot Program:

- Purpose 1: To initiate formally PCSSD's implementation of an approved Education Plan for the Desegregation Case Settlement.
- Purpose 2: To establish baseline conditions at the pilot schools to which outcomes from the full Education Plan can be compared longitudinally.
- Purpose 3: To develop and refine procedures and instrumentation for systemic use in 1999-2000.

PROCESSES/PROCEDURES

A. District Goals for School-Wide Analysis (by February 28, 1999))

- A District Steering Committee is formed to identify goals that address the Educational Goals (see p. 1) of the Desegregation Case Settlement. For Year 1, the goals will be considered preliminary, to be reevaluated and refined, if needed, in Year 2. Dr. Ross will attend the initial meeting to serve as a facilitator and monitor.
- The District Steering Committee selects members for the District School-Restructuring Committee.

B. School Level Needs Analysis (by February 28, 1999)

- Principals and two teacher leaders (appointed by the principal) from each of the 6 pilot schools will meet with the District Steering Committee/District School-Restructuring Committee to discuss the components/requirements of the Pilot Implementation. Dr. Ross will attend this meeting.
- Schools will be asked to:
 - ⇒ analyze and evaluate their present programs with regard to addressing the District Goals (including State programs and policies; e.g., *Smart Start*).
 - ⇒ identify needs and preliminary plans for addressing the District Goals.
 - ⇒ document the analysis and submit to the District School-Restructuring Committee for review by specified date (see Proposed Timeline and Table 1).

C. Needs Analysis Review and Feedback (by March 31, 1999)

- District School-Restructuring Committee and U of M will:
 - ⇒ review analyses
 - ⇒ meet with leadership team from each pilot school
 - ⇒ provide feedback

D. Pilot Year Formative Evaluation (February - June, 1999)

- Each pilot school will participate in formative evaluation to establish baseline data. Elements of the formative evaluation will consist of:
 - ⇒ Principal Interview (February, 1999): One-hour structured interview directed around needs analysis, desegregation Education Plan goals, and preliminary plans for addressing those goals. (Interview protocol will be drafted by U of M).
 - ⇒ Teacher Survey (by June 1, 1999): Closed-ended and open-ended items directed around reactions toward current school initiatives and the degree to which goals of the desegregation Education Plan are being achieved. (Survey protocol will be drafted by U of M). Note: The teacher survey and School Climate Inventory (see below) will be administered at a faculty meeting at each school.
 - ⇒ Teacher Focus Group (by June 1, 1999): One-hour structured group interview with 5-7 randomly selected teachers will address similar areas as teacher survey, while focusing more on the needs assessment outcomes and perspectives on strategies for addressing needs/goals.
 - ⇒ School Climate Inventory (by June 1, 1999): This is the standard SCI instrument developed by Butler et al. (1989) for the Center for Research in Educational Policy at The University of Memphis. In the past 9 years, it has been used for school-based planning in schools nationally. The inventory consists of 49 items, with 7 items comprising each of the following seven scales: Order, Leadership, Environment, Involvement, Instruction, Expectations, and Collaboration. Scores on each scale can be compared against national and regional norms, as well as individual school outcomes collected over multiple years.
 - ⇒ School Observation Measure (SOM) (from February - May, 1999): Classroom visits by trained observers are proposed to provide baseline data in the pilot program, and longitudinal data as the schools address desegregation Education Plan goals over time, regarding classroom instructional practices. The SOM instrument was developed as a modification of the Classroom Observation Measure (COM) used by U of M in research on Title I schoolwide programs and school restructuring. The SOM was purposely designed to provide a more practical instrument for formative evaluation, which allows for a greater number of classrooms to be visited and requires less extensive training of observers than the COM.

The basic SOM procedure involves observers' visiting 10-12 randomly selected classrooms, for 15 minutes each, during a 3-hr. visitation period. The observer examines classroom events and activities descriptively, not judgmentally. Notes are taken relative to the use or nonuse of 21 instructional strategies, such as cooperative learning, direct instruction, or tutoring. At the conclusion of all

classroom visits, the observer uses a 5-point rubric to rate the frequency with which each of the strategies was used across all classes in general.

It is proposed that for the pilot program, 5 SOMs be conducted at each school. At least 2 of the 5 should be performed by U of M observers; the remaining 3 may be conducted by external observers (i.e., not members of the school staff) from the school district or local agencies (e.g., local university faculty, state education staff, desegregation office staff, etc.). All observers will be trained by U of M.

E. Formative Evaluation Analysis and Feedback (by August 1, 1999)

- Data analyzed by U of M for each pilot school (summer, 1999)
- Report prepared by U of M assessing strengths and weaknesses (by August 1, 1999)
- School leadership team reviews report and develops School Improvement Plan for 1999-2000 (by October 1, 1999)

F. Pilot Program Review/Full Program Start-up (September -October, 1999)

- U of M staff and District Steering Committee meet to review pilot program results
- Plans for Full Program (all PCSSD schools) written, reviewed/refined.

PROPOSED TIMELINE

- A. District Goals for School-Wide Programs
- Committee formed.....by February 28, 1999
 - Meetings to identify goalsJanuary - February, 1999
- B. Pilot Program Implemented
- School-level needs analysisby February 28, 1999
 - Needs analysis review/feedbackby March 31, 1999
 - Pilot year formative evaluation.....February - June, 1999
 - Pilot Program Report.....by August 1, 1999
 - Pilot Program review/recommendationsSeptember, 1999
- C. Full Program (all PCSSD schools initiated)
- Orientation meeting.....September, 1999
- D. Development of School-Wide Plans.....September - December, 1999
- E. School Restructuring Process
- District School-Restructuring Committee Formed.....October, 1999
(Can be the same as for District Goals; see A above)
 - Provide information/support for plansOctober.- December, 1999
 - Receive plans by the deadline date.....by November 1, 1999
 - Review plans/provide feedback.....by December 15, 1999
- F. Implement School-Wide Programs
- Initial professional development.....January -February, 2000
 - Programs implemented.....January - June, 2000
- G. Evaluate Processes, Outcomes, and Goal Attainment
- Formative evaluationJanuary - June, 2000
 - School Evaluation Reportsby August 1, 2000
- H. School Improvement Plans.....by September 15, 2000
- I. Overall Evaluation Report (by U of M).....by September 1, 2000

Consulting Assistance By University of Memphis

- A. Facilitating District Education Goals meeting/process
- B. Implementing Pilot Program (Year 1)
- C. Assisting School Restructuring Committee with program selection process
- D. Assisting Committee with review of School-Wide Plans
- E. Providing instrumentation and data analysis for school formative evaluations and summative evaluation
- F. Providing additional consulting where needed

Table I: Proposed Format for Needs Analysis Document

(A more detailed, final version will be developed in consultation with the Steering Committee.)

I. SCHOOL DESCRIPTION

(a brief statement about size, students served, number of teachers, etc.)

II. SCHOOL-WIDE GOALS

(The major goals of the school, vision, themes, emphases, etc.)

III. PRESENT PROGRAMS

(A description of programs already in place to address the major goals)

IV. NEEDS ANALYSIS

(What are the areas of greatest need for goal fulfillment? Where are the gaps between achievements and goals the greatest? Where are the needs the greatest with regard to the Education Goals of the Desegregation Plan.)

**BUDGET FOR YEAR 1
(1/99-7/99)****A. PERSONNEL**

1. S. Ross
@\$1,200 per day
Estimated: 9 days meetings in LR (and 1 visit per pilot school)
3 days program management/writing
Total = 12 days \$14,400
2. D. Lowther
@\$480 per day
Estimated: 4 days meeting in LR
2 days writing/instrument refinement
Total = 6 days 2,280

A. FORMATIVE EVALUATION

1. Staff, instruments, and data processing.
(includes 2 visits per school by U of M staff)
@\$3,500 per school 21,000

C. INDIRECT COSTS (15% of B only) 3,150

TOTAL \$40,430

Education Plan for PCSSD Desegregation Case Settlement:

Addendum to to March, 1999 Agreement

Steven M. Ross

The University of Memphis

March 1, 2000

The goals, rationale, and strategies for the desegregation education plan proposed by Dr. Steven M. Ross and the Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP) at The University of Memphis are detailed in the document titled, "Education Plan for PCSSD Desegregation Case Settlement." This addendum to that document summarizes work initiated to date and a revised timetable for implementing the full plan in the 2000-2001 school year.

Rationale

The rationale for the present education plan, in brief, is that all children are likely to benefit from educational programs that are research-based, mutually supported and understood by teachers and administrators, and coordinated within a school to operate in harmoniously. This concept is the foundation for the 1994 reauthorization of Title I which emphasized the establishment of school-wide programs as opposed to isolated "pull-out" programs to raise academic performance of disadvantaged and at-risk children. It is also the basis for the current Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRSD) initiative (or "Obey-Porter" legislation) which awards supplemental federal funding of at least \$50,000 for each of three years to selected schools implementing whole-school reform programs. Unfortunately, typical schools that serve disadvantaged and minority

students often lack a coordinated whole-school program, while perpetuating the use of ineffective isolated interventions that frequently change as administrators change, and that lack systematic evaluations to support continuous improvement. The present plan strives to engage Title I schools in Pulaski Co. (those that serve the highest numbers of at-risk and minority students) and eventually all schools in developing, documenting, and continuously evaluating and improving school-wide programs that focus on raising academic achievement of all students and providing interventions that address special needs of minority and disadvantaged students.

Work Completed (March, 1999-February, 2000)

- April, 1999: Dr. Ross met with district administrators and Title I principals discuss proposed plan
- May: Dr. Ross interviewed each Title I principal ($n = 7$) individually to determine school goals and needs, and to discuss the evaluation plan
- May-June: District staff administered School-Wide Program Teacher Questionnaire (SWPTQ) and School Climate Inventory to Title I schools
- July: U of M sent data summary reports to schools
- September: Dr. Ross and Dr. Lowther met with principals to discuss results and review the evaluation plan. Ideas were discussed for “benchmarking” Title I school-wide program components
- November: Dr. Ross and Dr. Alberg conducted benchmarking workshop session for seven school teams

- Nov.-Feb., 2000: Dr. Ross and Dr. Alberg provided technical support for benchmark development. Benchmarks submitted to Ms. Brenda Bowles by Feb. 15, 2000
- Feb.-March: U of M provides feedback on benchmarks; schools complete final versions; Dr. Ross meets with Dr. Smith, Dr. Fox, and Mr. Bowles to discuss revised plan for 2000-2001

Proposed Schedule for 2000-2001 Plan

- Feb.-Mar, 2000: Meet with Dr. Smith, Dr. Fox, and Mr. Bowles to refine original plan to accommodate new district initiatives
- March-April: Meet with principals to discuss proposed changes, solicit feedback and recommendations, and generate buy-in
- by Sept. 30: Review/refinement of benchmarks
- by Oct. 31: U of M researchers conduct principal interview; meet with School Leadership Team; Conduct 1 School Observation Measure (SOM)
- Oct.-Nov. 30: U of M researchers conduct 4 additional SOMs at each school
- by December 15: U of M researchers conduct 1 additional SOM and teacher focus group; administer SWPTQ (teacher survey) and School Climate Inventory
- *by December 15: Dr. Ross (Dr. Lowther/Dr. Alberg) meets individually with school leadership teams to review and identify progress on each benchmark.
- Jan.-Feb., 2001: U of M performs data analysis and report writing
- February 28th: Reports sent to schools
- *by March 31: Dr. Ross (Dr. Lowther/Dr. Alberg) meet individually with school leadership teams to discuss reports.
- March-June: School improvement plans developed based on evaluation data and other district initiatives and accountability data

*Notes

The University of Memphis contract for 1999-2000 will be revised to accommodate the above timetable. The contract cost (approximately \$24,000 per year) will remain the same and cover the instrumentation/material costs, communications, data collection, travel, report writing, and overseeing of the project by Drs. Ross and Alberg. The contract does not cover the December benchmark session or the March review session by Dr. Ross (and senior staff) or additional consulting time by these individuals.