LEADERSHIP, GOVERNANCE, MANAGEMENT, AND FINANCE TASK FORCE
COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS

Task Force on Urban School Leadership, Governance, Management, and Finance

2021-2022

Task Force Goals

To improve the quality of leadership in urban public education.
To improve the effectiveness of urban school boards
To lengthen the tenure of urban school superintendents
To enhance accountability, management, and operations of the nation’s urban public
To challenge the inequities in state funding of urban public schools.
To increase federal funding and support of urban public schools.
To pass new federal school infrastructure legislation to help repair, renovate and build
urban public school buildings.
To enhance the ability of urban schools to use Medicaid for health services to students.
school systems.

Task Force Chairs

Guadalupe Guerrero, Portland Superintendent
Megan Kerr, Long Beach School Board
Michael O’Neill, Boston School Committee
HARVARD-GREAT CITY SCHOOLS INSTITUTE
Council of the Great City Schools Leadership Institute:
A Harvard Business School Executive Education Program
July 17—20, 2022

Preliminary Information
Program Overview

Program Objective
• This custom-designed Executive Education program is being held by Harvard University and the Council of the Great City Schools to strengthen the competencies and capabilities of member school boards and superintendents. The program recognizes the essential role school boards play in improving and sustaining student outcomes and creating the conditions for urban school system success.

Target Participants
• Council Member School Board Chairs, New Board Members, and Other Board Members
• Council Member District Superintendents

Program Structure and Dates
• 4-day residential program, July 17-20, 2022
• Multiple plenary class sessions
• Daily breakout sessions and team time
• Networking lunches, receptions, and dinners

Program Location
• Harvard Business School Executive Education Complex, Boston, MA
About the Program

Classroom sessions will use the famous Harvard Business School (HBS) case study method along with opportunities to participate in small team discussions, simulations, and application exercises. The program will focus on three broad themes, including—

• Mission/Goal/Strategy Alignment
• What Success Looks Like
• How to Shape the Conditions for Success and Assess Progress

In addition to classroom sessions, you will experience dedicated small-group sessions to help you develop the skills you need to function better when you return home. Sessions will use the Student Outcomes Focused Governance Model developed by the Council of the Great City Schools that will leave you with tangible tools for immediately improved governance for your district.
Program Fees and Benefits

$4,000 per person (estimate)

What does this cover?

- Faculty instruction from professors from the Harvard Business School (HBS), Harvard Graduate School of Education (HGSE), and the Harvard Kennedy School of Government (HKS)
- Three-night single-occupancy bedroom per person
- Standard daily meal and beverage services, including breakfast, morning break, lunch, afternoon break, dinner, and opening and closing receptions
- Use of Harvard Business School facilities, including on-campus classrooms, breakout rooms for small group meetings, the HBS fitness center, and Baker Library
- Program materials including books, program notes and program binder, case studies, articles, program handouts, and evaluations
- Harvard certificate at the conclusion of the program
- Administrative support, including pre-program administration, mailings, and support during the program
- Program Web Site, which includes electronic access to case materials, faculty biographies, program logistics, and program schedule
- Bus transportation to the airport from HBS at the conclusion of the program
- HBS tote bag for each participant
- Group photo
- A one-year complimentary subscription to The Harvard Business Review for each participant
- Access to the HBS Working Knowledge site
- An invitation to join the LinkedIn Harvard Business School Executive Education Group, the official group for past participants and alumni of Harvard Business School Executive Education programs

Program Web Site, which includes electronic access to case materials, faculty biographies, program logistics, and program schedule
Program Fees and Benefits

What is not included and is the responsibility of the individual program participant?

- Participant travel to the Harvard Business School Campus
- Off-campus lodging before, during, or after the program
- Transportation from the airport to the Harvard Business School campus
- All food service and meals not previously stated above
- Non-standard food or beverage requirements, location changes, or entertainment
- Costs associated with any medical treatment (including emergency medical transportation) incurred by participants during the program
- Extra-program costs, outdoor activities, social & cultural events, off-campus meals or special items ordered
- All incidental charges such as telephone calls, laundry, dry-cleaning, etc.
How will my board benefit?

- Improved student achievement begins with strong and effective school board governance. Faculty from the Harvard Business School, the Graduate School of Education, and the Kennedy School of Government are internationally recognized as thought leaders on crucial governance issues, dynamic relations with high-performing urban school systems, non-profit organizations, and top organizations around the world. The challenges that urban school boards face are unique, but there is also much to be learned from other sectors and from each other.

- The Institute will provide a rare opportunity to interact with other big-city school board members and superintendents on the critical issues of improved governance and better student outcomes. Measurable outcomes for your board and your district should include—

  - Increased student academic outcomes over time
  - Increased use of board time to focus on student achievement
  - Improved relations between the board and the superintendent, leading to stronger governance and longer superintendent tenure
  - Better understanding of and targeted use of evidence and data to monitor district progress
  - Better management of conflict
  - Prioritization of district goals over individual needs
  - Enhanced two-way communications with the community in a way that reflects shared values
How to enroll?

Please email Ray Hart, Executive Director of the Council of the Great City Schools, at rhart@cgcs.org with the names of board members and superintendents who will attend. Please include the email addresses of all participants. Only one list of participants is needed per district; individuals need not respond separately.

We encourage both the board president and superintendent to attend as well as other board members. (This event is professional development, but we encourage you to consult with your legal counsel to ensure that “open meetings” requirements are met.)

There are a limited number of seats for this unique opportunity, so we encourage you to register as soon as possible.
CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS MEETING
# AGENDA

## Chief Information Officers Annual Conference

The Hyatt Regency – Atlanta, GA  
February 15-18, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Monday</strong></th>
<th><strong>February 14</strong></th>
<th><strong>Closed Session: KPIs, Benchmarking, Performance Management</strong></th>
<th><strong>TBD</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tuesday</strong></th>
<th><strong>February 15</strong></th>
<th><strong>Joint Session with All Attendees</strong></th>
<th><strong>Facilitator</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Bob Carlson</strong></th>
<th><strong>7:00 - 8:00 a.m.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Registration &amp; Breakfast</strong></th>
<th><strong>TBD</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:15 - 8:30 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Carlson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Shahryar Khazei</strong></th>
<th><strong>8:45 - 10:15 a.m.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Enterprise Governance and Managing the Complexities of 21st Century Technology</strong></th>
<th><strong>Tom Ryan</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:45 - 10:15 a.m.</td>
<td><strong>Presentation &amp; Discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Shahryar Khazei</strong></th>
<th><strong>10:30 - Noon</strong></th>
<th><strong>Interoperability Panel Discussion</strong></th>
<th><strong>TBD</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Noon - 1:00 p.m.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Lunch</strong></th>
<th><strong>TBD</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Shahryar Khazei</strong></th>
<th><strong>1:00 - 2:30 p.m.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cybersecurity Panel Discussion</strong></th>
<th><strong>TBD</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00 - 2:30 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>Cybersecurity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Jack Kelanic</strong></th>
<th><strong>2:30 – 3:45 p.m.</strong></th>
<th><strong>ARP/ESSER Spending Plans, Governance &amp; Accountability</strong></th>
<th><strong>TBD</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shahryar Khazei</strong></td>
<td><strong>3:45 – 4:00 a.m.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Break</strong></td>
<td><strong>TBD</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Jack Kelanic</strong></th>
<th><strong>4:00 - 5:00 p.m.</strong></th>
<th><strong>ERP/SIS/LMS Implementations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Ken Thompson</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shahryar Khazei</strong></td>
<td><strong>4:00 - 5:00 p.m.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Break</strong></td>
<td><strong>TBD</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ken Thompson</strong></th>
<th><strong>5:30 – 7:30 p.m.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reception</strong></th>
<th><strong>TBD</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Wednesday</strong></th>
<th><strong>February 16</strong></th>
<th><strong>Breakout Sessions with All Attendees</strong></th>
<th><strong>TBD</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TBD</strong></th>
<th><strong>7:00 - 8:00 a.m.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Breakfast</strong></th>
<th><strong>TBD</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:15 – 9:00 a.m.</td>
<td><strong>School District &amp; Sponsor Presentations</strong></td>
<td><strong>TBD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 - 9:45 a.m.</td>
<td>School District &amp; Sponsor Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:45 a.m.</td>
<td>School District &amp; Sponsor Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 11:45</td>
<td>School District &amp; Sponsor Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon – 1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>School District &amp; Sponsor Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 – 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>School District &amp; Sponsor Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 – 4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>School District &amp; Sponsor Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 – 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>School District &amp; Sponsor Presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 – 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thursday, February 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 - 8:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 8:15 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 – 9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Cloud Enterprise Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 – 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Disaster Recovery, Contingency &amp; Business Continuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Digital Divide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon – 1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Continuous Improvement in IT Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 – 3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>PMO Communication and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 – 3:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45 – 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>21st Century Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45 – 5:00</td>
<td>Wrap Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>Discover Atlanta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Friday, February 18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Digital Divide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Facilitator**

Bob Carlson

Don Wolff (TBD)

Vandhana Veerni

Tom Ryan (TBD)

Soheil Katal

Lenny Shad

TBD

Soheil Katal
MICHAEL CASSERLY LEGACY AWARD
Michael Casserly Legacy Award for Educational Courage and Justice

Draft Eligibility and Criteria for Award

For Consideration by the Executive Committee of the
Council of the Great City Schools
January 2022

Eligibility

Individuals who are in senior positions and able to affect the well-being of urban public education and improve its overall quality, direction, and reputation will be eligible for the award. This could include urban school superintendents, urban school board members, members of Congress or other federal, state, or city elected officials, cabinet officials, researchers, advocates, nonprofit organizational heads, scholars, legal experts, writers, foundation heads, teachers, and others.

Criteria

Winners of the award will be able to demonstrate a substantial number of the following—

- An initiative or track record of action resulting in the improvement of academic performance and student outcomes in urban schools over an extended period,
- Activity that demonstrates courage, audacity, or bravery on behalf of urban schools and urban school children,
- Activity that results in substantial additional funding or support for urban public schools and the children they serve,
- Sustained activity that improves the public’s confidence in urban schools and urban school children, the public’s understanding of the challenges facing urban public schools, or the public’s support of urban schools and urban schoolchildren,
- Consistent and lasting demonstration of and commitment to justice, equity, and opportunity for all urban school children,
- Reflect the highest standards and reputation of the Council of the Great City Schools.

Award

The award shall be given annually by the Council of the Great City Schools at its March legislative conference or such other time that the Executive Committee of the organization shall determine. If available, the U.S. Secretary of Education will be invited to make the award.

Selection

Nominations for the award may be made by any member of the Board of Directors of the Council of the Great City Schools. The selection of the awardee will be made annually by—

Option 1. A committee named by the Chair of the Board, the Executive Director, and Michael Casserly or

Option 2. The Chair of the Board, the Executive Director, Michael Casserly, and a representative of Curriculum Associates.

Scholarship

The awardee shall give a $10,000 scholarship funded by Curriculum Associates to a Great City School graduate who aspires to leadership in urban education.
Memo

Dr. Michael Casserly Legacy Award for Educational Courage and Justice
March 2021

To honor the legacy of Dr Michael Casserly, the longtime Executive Director of the Council of the Great City Schools, the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors voted in July 2020 to establish an annual award in his name.

This award will be given annually during the March Legislative Conference in DC, (the city Michael has worked in for 40+ years). As the Council already has awards specific to superintendents / board members / teachers / colleges of education, amongst others, this instead will be open to anyone in urban public K-12 education: heads of foundations and non-profits, district and city leaders, elected officials at a federal, state or urban level, district leadership, etc..

The common denominator is someone who has done something that personifies what Michael based his career on: taking a courageous and passionate stance on the issue of educational justice and equity. The history of the Council of the Great City Schools under Dr Casserly’s leadership includes numerous examples of the Council staking out positions that are often cutting-edge and potentially controversial for a national coalition, but are always focused on a moral core that puts all of the youth that we collective serve first.

For example, Dr. Casserly was the only head of a national education organization to support the 2002 No Child Left Behind legislation due to its emphasis on closing achievement gaps for specific at-risk student groups, as enacted under Education Secretary Rod Paige.

The Council also played a major role in initiating what became known as the Common Core State Standards, and was the first national membership group to endorse them.

Additionally, the Council was instrumental in the development of the Trial Urban District Assessment (TUDA) as part of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) to provide an assessment of educational progress by our member districts.

Each year, a national education official (Sec of Ed, Education Chair from House or Senate, etc.) will present the award. By focusing on the March conference, it stands alone from our other awards.

As with the Green Garner, there will be a scholarship attached. This will be awarded by the Casserly Legacy Award winner to a graduate of a Great City School system who is pursuing a graduate-level degree (masters or doctorate) in education. The award winner will select the scholarship winner.

Naturally, the first award winner for this new legacy award will be Dr Michael Casserly himself. This will be awarded on Monday, March 22, 2021, during the “virtual” legislative conference. The award will be presented by former United States Secretary of Education Arne Duncan. Curriculum Associates has graciously agreed to sponsor the scholarship award of $10,000.

For future years, an award committee will be established to review nominations and select a winner. This committee will include Dr Casserly. Additionally, a competition will be established amongst Council member districts for a student-artist designed award that will be given to award winners going forward.
GOVERNANCE REVIEWS
CGCS Governance Review
Process Overview

INTRODUCTION

Overview
The Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS) provides full governance team and governance process review services to member districts through its Governance Review Teams (GRT). The full governance review entails a major commitment from the school district as it requires the timely collection of important data and information, the participation of key officials and staff in phone-based and on-site interviews, the coordination of school board visits, and the completion of longitudinal governance and student performance data sets for the Council’s analysis. The Board Chair and Superintendent of the school district must request the review and all travel expenses of the team must be covered by the requesting district.

Scope
A team of experienced Superintendents and board members from urban districts is assembled to form the GRT that will examine the district’s program, materials and data in addition to conducting interviews and school visits. The review includes an extensive data analysis of longitudinal data sets regarding school board behaviors and overall student performance in the district. The GRT also conducts a comparative analysis of the school board relative to other school boards in the Council.

The final report is written for and is designed to be easily used by the school board, rather than the general public. Because the reports are focused exclusively on the school board, as opposed to the work of the Superintendent and administration, the Findings & Conclusions and Recommendations sections are organized into the same six research-based categories that the CGCS’ Student Outcome Focused Governance framework is divided into:

- **Vision & Goals**: evaluates the extent to which the Board will, in collaboration with the Superintendent, adopt a vision & goals that are student outcomes focused.
- **Values & Constraints**: evaluates the extent to which the Board will, in collaboration with the Superintendent, adopt or revise policies and constraints to be student outcomes focused.
- **Accountability & Monitoring**: evaluates the extent to which the Board will devote significant time monthly to monitoring progress toward the vision & goals.
- **Communication & Collaboration**: evaluates the extent to which the Board will lead transparently and include stakeholders in the pursuit of the vision & goals.
- **Unity & Trust**: evaluates the extent to which the Board will lead with one voice in its pursuit of the vision and goals.
- **Continuous Improvement**: evaluates the extent to which the Board will invest time and resources toward improving its focus on the vision and goals.
**PROCESS**

**Timeline**
The timeline for completion of this work typically takes between 4 and 6 months. This length of time allows for both the internal and external aspects of the review to be conducted. Internal aspects of the review include time for the district to submit requested documents and data, and time for interaction with Board Members individually and the Board collectively. External aspects of the review include time spent interacting with individuals and organizations outside of the school district in an effort to understand the local context in which the district operates. Finally, the timeline allows GRT members sufficient time to review the submission, conduct data analyses, conduct interviews/visits, and to write the report. Examples of the specific tasks included in the workplan are provided below.

**Research**
The GRT reads relevant portions of the district’s state education laws, board policy, administrative procedures, and reviews recent media to gain an appropriate understanding of the school board’s current context.

**Data Reviews**
The GRT pours over governance survey data, comparing it with responses from other Council districts, to begin understanding board member and superintendent perspectives and practices. The GRT analyzes district student performance data, comparing it with academic KPIs from other Council districts, to gain clarity regarding current areas of strength and weakness concerning student outcomes.

A significant part of data review is the viewing and coding of recent board meetings. The GRT will generally code between 3 and 12 months worth of board meetings.

**Phone Interviews**
The GRT visits with each board member, with the superintendent, and with select community and staff members identified by board members and the superintendent. The intention of these interviews is to deepen the GRT’s understanding of the school board’s needs and of collective willingness to engage in this work.

**Site Visits**
The GRT will, on occasion, conduct a site visit to observe board meetings, to interact with the board as a whole, and/or to interact with the superintendent’s cabinet as a whole.

**Preliminary Report**
Once a rough draft has been developed, it will be reviewed with the school board chair and superintendent and any necessary inaccuracies or misunderstandings can be addressed. To avoid it becoming a public document, it will not be given to the district.

**Final Report**
The deliverable is a comprehensive report with concrete recommendations. A final draft is delivered to the Board Chair and Superintendent for review prior to finalization for publication.

**Estimated Costs**
The GRT conducts governance reviews only for CGCS member districts at the request of the Board Chair and Superintendent. The cost for conducting these comprehensive reviews is a factor of the team’s size, the number of days required to conduct the site visit and interviews, and the related travel expenses. Council staff time and resources for conducting analyses and writing the report are mostly absorbed by the Council. Exact costs are negotiable.
What follows is one example of what the table of contents of the GRT final report might look like after the review process is complete.

**INTRODUCTION**
- Overview
- Summary

**PROCESS**
- Internal
- External

**FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS**
- Vision & Goals
- Values & Constraints
- Accountability & Monitoring
- Communication & Collaboration
- Unity & Trust
- Continuous Improvement

**RECOMMENDATIONS**
- Vision & Goals
- Values & Constraints
- Accountability & Monitoring
- Communication & Collaboration
- Unity & Trust
- Continuous Improvement

**APPENDICES**
- A. Relevant Sections of Board Policy
- B. Student Outcomes Data
- C. Recent Board Goals
- D. Relevant Sections of Governance Survey Results
- E. Board Time Use Results
- F. Recent Superintendent Contract
- G. Recent Board Self Evaluation Instrument
- H. Recommended Board Procedures
- I. Timeline of Proposed Next Steps
CGCS Governance Technical Assistance and Professional Development

Overview

The Council of the Great City Schools offers technical assistance and professional development to its member school boards and superintendents along with its proposed governance audits and its Harvard University program. The technical assistance and professional development are typically offered in a series of four-to-five all day sessions that are led by one or two Council staff members and consultants. Components include—

Why Some Urban School Systems Improve Faster than Others. This presentation and discussion summarize much of the Council’s years-long research on why and how some urban school systems improve faster than others do, and what the school board’s role in that improvement is.

School Board Survey. This discussion summarizes the results of an in-depth survey administered to the board of education and superintendent that covers basic board characteristics, information on how the board spends its time, and features of the board’s work. Comparisons are made to results from other major city school systems.

Roles and Responsibilities. This portion of the professional development covers roles and responsibilities of the school board and how they differ from the role of the superintendent and the administration. The discussion differentiates system inputs, outputs, and outcomes and describes what the roles of the board and superintendent are in each. The discussion features characteristics of functional and dysfunctional school boards. Finally, the professional development also includes a component on what the board’s role is in setting the culture of the district.

Goal-setting and Evidence. The technical assistance includes a major component that helps boards and superintendents jointly set or amend student-outcome focused goals. The exercises include the discussion and development of key performance indicators (KPIs) to assess progress on the goals. And the training includes defining various guard rails or constraints that the board does not want to see happen in the pursuit of the goals.

Goal Monitoring. This portion of the professional development focuses on the school board’s critical role in monitoring progress on the goals rather than on various programmatic inputs. The work includes calendaring board consideration of goals and KPIs at regular school board meetings throughout the year.

Board and Superintendent Evaluations. The sessions also include discussions on how the goals and progress on them inform the evaluation of the superintendent and the school board.

School Board Meetings. This portion of the technical assistance and professional development includes agenda setting and effective school board meetings.
CGCS 2022 Board Chair Cohort

INTENTION
School systems only exist to improve student outcomes; improving student outcomes is the “why” of this work. Student outcomes don’t change until adult behaviors change; changing adult behaviors in ways that align with improvements in student outcomes is the “how” of this work. In pursuit of the “why” as informed by the “how,” the Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS) (http://www.cgcs.org) is offering a cohort-based professional development opportunity for school board chairs, officers, and aspiring officers.

OVERVIEW
A cohort of no more than sixteen (16) board officers (all officers or those considering becoming officers, not just the current chair, though current senior officers will be given priority) from across the United States will participate in a nine-month training in Student Outcomes Focused Governance (SOFG) (http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Manual) that will support their effectiveness as leaders of large public school systems.

DETAILS
Participants will engage in three in-person retreats, virtual monthly cohort meetings, and bi-monthly quad meetings. They will also be assigned partners with whom they will work closely throughout the training. In addition, participants will receive one-on-one coaching support to complete the deliverables and requirements of the syllabus. (https://tinyurl.com/CGCS-2022-Chair-Syllabus). Participants should anticipate allocating an average of 12 hrs per month (in addition to the in-person sessions detailed below). Priority will be given to applicants where multiple officers from the same board are participating in the cohort, to applicants who are newly coming into the officer role, and/or applicants whose boards have already begun SOFG implementation. Participation costs $3500 per person (travel expenses and optional books not included); school systems typically cover these costs as part of professional development budgets. Applications are open until January 26. Applicants will be notified of their status by January 28. Questions can be emailed to: ajcrabill@cgcs.org.

CALENDAR
- Cohort Application Informational Session: January 12, 2pm central [ optional, virtual ]
- Applications Due: January 26, 8pm central
- Selection Announced: January 28
- Monthly Cohort Sessions: February-October: 1st Monday, 5pm-7pm central [ required, virtual ]
- Monthly Quad Sessions: February-October: date & time TBD by Quad [ required, virtual ]
- First session: CGCS Spring Conference, March 18 & 19, 9am-6pm local [ required, in-person: Washington, DC ]
- Second session: July 22 & 23, 9am-6pm local [ required, in-person: tentatively Los Angeles, CA ]
- Third session: CGCS Fall Conference, October 17 & 18, 9am-6pm local [ required, in-person: Orlando, FL ]
RESOURCES
- Application: https://tinyurl.com/2022-CGCS-Chair-Cohort-App
- Syllabus: https://tinyurl.com/CGCS-2022-Chair-Syllabus
- SOFG Cohort Reading List: https://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Cohort-Reading-List

rsistrhart@gmail.com (not shared) Switch account

* Required

Name *
Your answer

School System/District *
Your answer

Role *
Your answer

Will your board be supporting your application? If so, in what way? If not, why? *
Your answer

Mobile *
Your answer
Email *

Your answer

How much board officer experience do you have, and in which roles? *

Your answer

Why are you applying to participate in this cohort? *

Your answer

What do you hope to get out of completing this training? *

Your answer

As you read through the syllabus, on which of the “Prioritization” topics have you already received training? On which of the “Implementation” topics? *

Your answer

I understand that there are three required in-person sessions and that the costs for these trips are not included in the $3500 tuition. *

☐ Agree
Never submit passwords through Google Forms.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google. Report Abuse - Terms of Service - Privacy Policy
Intention
School systems only exist to improve student outcomes; improving student outcomes is the “why” of this work. Student outcomes don’t change until adult behaviors change; changing adult behaviors in ways that align with improvements in student outcomes is the “how” of this work. In pursuit of the “why” as informed by the “how,” the Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS) (http://www.cgcs.org) is offering a cohort-based professional development opportunity for school board chairs, officers, and aspiring officers.

Overview
A cohort of no more than sixteen (16) board officers (all officers or those considering becoming officers, not just the current chair, though current senior officers will be given priority) from across the United States will participate in a nine-month training in Student Outcomes Focused Governance (SOFG) (http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Manual) that will support their effectiveness as leaders of large public school systems.

Details
Participants will engage in three in-person retreats, virtual monthly cohort meetings, and bi-monthly quad meetings. They will also be assigned partners with whom they will work closely throughout the training. In addition, participants will receive one-on-one coaching support to complete the deliverables and requirements of the syllabus. Participants should anticipate allocating an average of 12 hrs per month (in addition to the in-person sessions detailed below). Priority will be given to applicants where multiple officers from the same board are participating in the cohort, to applicants who are newly coming into the officer role, and/or applicants whose boards have already begun SOFG implementation. Participation costs $3500 per person (travel expenses and optional books not included); school systems typically cover these costs as part of professional development budgets. Applications are open until January 26. Applicants will be notified of their status by January 28. Questions can be emailed to: ajcrabill@cgcs.org.

Calendar
- Cohort Application Informational Session: January 12, 2pm central [optional, virtual]
- Applications Due: January 26, 8pm central
- Selection Announced: January 28
- Monthly Cohort Sessions: February-October: 1st Monday, 5pm-7pm central [required, virtual]
- Monthly Quad Sessions: February-October: date & time TBD by Quad [required, virtual]
- First session: CGCS Spring Conference, March 18 & 19, 9am-6pm local [required, in-person: Washington, DC]
- Second session: July 22 & 23, 9am-6pm local [required, in-person: tentatively Los Angeles, CA]
- Third session: CGCS Fall Conference, October 17 & 18, 9am-6pm local [required, in-person: Orlando, FL]

Resources
- Application: https://tinyurl.com/2022-CGCS-Chair-Cohort-App
- Syllabus: https://tinyurl.com/CGCS-2022-Chair-Syllabus
- SOFG Cohort Reading List: https://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Cohort-Reading-List

Requirements
The work of Student Outcomes Focused board chairs is grounded in the idea that student outcomes don’t change until adult behaviors change. As such, the key work of Board chairs is to support school boards that
want to change their adult behavior in ways that are more likely to improve student outcomes. To do this, Board chairs must hone their abilities to help the Board prioritize and then implement their priorities.

Prioritization is about getting clear on the community’s vision, the community’s values, and what it looks like to intensely focus the Board’s time on these priorities.

Implementation is about addressing the relational barriers to change, collaboratively redesigning the Board’s work around the Board’s priorities, building Board member capacity to change, and building community capacity to change.

Participants will have completed the cohort when the following requirements are met:

- **Participation Requirements**
  1. Participate in all three in-person sessions
  2. Participate in at least 80% of monthly cohort sessions
  3. Participate in monthly quad check-ins as needed
  4. Collaborate with partner as needed

- **Prioritization Requirements**
  1. Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between high quality and low quality goals, guardrails, and monitoring calendars
  2. Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between high quality and low quality monitoring reports and goal monitoring practices
  3. Create a plan with calendar -- day 0 through adoption -- for a board to create goals, guardrails, and a monitoring calendar
  4. Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between owner service and customer service, between board work and superintendent work
  5. Watch the meetings of three approved Boards for a month and code their board meetings
  7. Conduct a quarterly self evaluation for your school system ([https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cZytgTdzosA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cZytgTdzosA))

- **Implementation Requirements**
  1. Complete at least 3 SOFG mindset practices
  2. Review The Policy Diet process ([http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-PolicyDiet-Guide](http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-PolicyDiet-Guide)), pick ten policies from your current policy manual and create a table that lists how you would apply the policy diet to each, and then discuss with your Quad Coach
  3. Create a plan with calendar -- day 0 through adoption -- for a board to migrate from its current policy manual to the sample SOFG policy manual ([http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Sample-Policy-Manual](http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Sample-Policy-Manual))
  5. Effectively facilitate or co-facilitate an SOFG Conversation (1-3hr) for your Board
  6. Effectively facilitate or co-facilitate an SOFG Conversation (1-3hr) for your community
CGCS 2022 New Board Member Cohort

INTENTION
School systems only exist to improve student outcomes; improving student outcomes is the “why” of this work. Student outcomes don’t change until adult behaviors change; changing adult behaviors in ways that align with improvements in student outcomes is the “how” of this work. In pursuit of the “why” as informed by the “how,” the Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS) (http://www.cgcs.org) is offering a cohort-based professional development opportunity for newly/recently selected school board members.

OVERVIEW
A cohort of no more than sixteen (16) newly and recently selected (within the prior 0-18 months) board members from across the United States will participate in a nine-month training in Student Outcomes Focused Governance (SOFG) (http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Manual) that will support their effectiveness as new leaders of large public school systems.

DETAILS
Participants will engage in three in-person retreats, virtual monthly cohort meetings, and bi-monthly quad meetings. They will also be assigned partners with whom they will work closely throughout the training. In addition, participants will receive one-on-one coaching support to complete the deliverables and requirements of the syllabus. (https://tinyurl.com/CGCS-2022-NewMember-Syllabus). Participants should anticipate allocating an average of 8 hrs per month (in addition to the in-person sessions detailed below). Priority will be given to applicants whose boards have already begun SOFG implementation. Participation costs $3500 per person (travel expenses and optional books not included); school systems typically cover these costs as part of professional development budgets. Applications are open until January 26. Applicants will be notified of their status by January 28. Questions can be emailed to: ajcrabill@cgcs.org.

CALENDAR
- Cohort Application Informational Session: January 12, 2pm central [optional, virtual]
- Applications Due: January 26, 8pm central
- Selection Announced: January 28
- Monthly Cohort Sessions: February-October: 1st Monday, 2pm-4pm central [required, virtual]
- Monthly Quad Sessions: February-October: date & time TBD by Quad [required, virtual]
- First session: CGCS Spring Conference, March 18 & 19, 9am-6pm local [required, in-person: Washington, DC]
- Second session: July 22 & 23, 9am-6pm local [required, in-person: tentatively Los Angeles, CA]
- Third session: CGCS Fall Conference, October 17 & 18, 9am-6pm local [required, in-person: Orlando, FL]

RESOURCES
- Application: https://tinyurl.com/2022-CGCS-NewMember-Cohort-App
Email *

Your answer

Why did you join your local school board (specificity)? *

Your answer

Why are you applying to participate in this cohort? *

Your answer

What do you hope to get out of completing this new board member training? *

Your answer

As you read through the syllabus, on which of the “Improving Student Outcomes” topics have you already received training? On which of the “Creating Alignment” topics? On which of the “Other Duties As Assigned” topics? *

Your answer

I understand that there are three required in-person sessions and that the costs for these trips are not included in the $3500 tuition. *

□ Agree
CGCS 2022 New Board Member Cohort Syllabus

Intention
School systems only exist to improve student outcomes; improving student outcomes is the “why” of this work. Student outcomes don’t change until adult behaviors change; changing adult behaviors in ways that align with improvements in student outcomes is the “how” of this work. In pursuit of the “why” as informed by the “how,” the Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS) (http://www.cgcs.org) is offering a cohort-based professional development opportunity for newly/recently selected school board members.

Overview
A cohort of no more than sixteen (16) newly and recently selected (within the prior 0-18 months) board members from across the United States will participate in a nine-month training in Student Outcomes Focused Governance (SOFG) (http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Manual) that will support their effectiveness as new leaders of large public school systems.

Details
Participants will engage in three in-person retreats, virtual monthly cohort meetings, and bi-monthly quad meetings. They will also be assigned partners with whom they will work closely throughout the training. In addition, participants will receive one-on-one coaching support to complete the deliverables and requirements of the syllabus. Participants should anticipate allocating an average of 8 hrs per month (in addition to the in-person sessions detailed below). Priority will be given to applicants whose boards have already begun SOFG implementation. Participation costs $3500 per person (travel expenses and optional books not included); school systems typically cover these costs as part of professional development budgets. Applications are open until January 26. Applicants will be notified of their status by January 28. Questions can be emailed to: ajcrabill@cgcs.org.

Calendar
- Cohort Application Informational Session: January 12, 2pm central [optional, virtual]
- Applications Due: January 26, 8pm central
- Selection Announced: January 28
- Monthly Cohort Sessions: February-October: 1st Monday, 2pm-4pm central [required, virtual]
- Monthly Quad Sessions: February-October: date & time TBD by Quad [required, virtual]
- First session: CGCS Spring Conference, March 18 & 19, 9am-6pm local [required, in-person: Washington, DC]
- Second session: July 22 & 23, 9am-6pm local [required, in-person: tentatively Los Angeles, CA]
- Third session: CGCS Fall Conference, October 17 & 18, 9am-6pm local [required, in-person: Orlando, FL]

Resources
- Application: https://tinyurl.com/2022-CGCS-NewMember-Cohort-App
- Syllabus: https://tinyurl.com/CGCS-2022-NewMember-Syllabus
- SOFG Cohort Reading List: https://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Cohort-Reading-List

Requirements
The work of Student Outcomes Focused boards is grounded in the idea that student outcomes don’t change until adult behaviors change. As such, the key work of effective boards is to change their adult behavior in ways that are more likely to improve student outcomes. For new board members, the buckets of learning
needed to grow in effectiveness include a focus on **Improving Student Outcomes**, **Creating Alignment**, and miscellaneous tasks that are necessary but that do not directly contribute to improving student outcomes -- a category of learning we refer to as **Other Duties As Assigned**.

Improving Student Outcomes details the board member behaviors that most create the conditions for improved student outcomes, highlights how feelings can be unreliable for creating student focused schools, and should be the foundation of all preboarding / onboarding work.

Creating Alignment describes board member behaviors that have a moderate impact and that tend to have a neutral impact, respectively, on creating the conditions that improve student outcomes.

Other Duties As Assigned is largely comprised of legal requirements and normative practices for public officials.

Participants will have completed the cohort when the following requirements are met:

- **Participation Requirements**
  1. Participate in all three in-person sessions
  2. Participate in at least 80% of monthly cohort sessions
  3. Participate in monthly quad check-ins as needed
  4. Collaborate with partner as needed

- **Improving Student Outcomes Requirements**
  1. Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between inputs, outputs, and outcomes ([https://tinyurl.com/Why-IOO-Matter](https://tinyurl.com/Why-IOO-Matter))
  2. Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between high quality and low quality goals, guardrails, and monitoring calendars ([https://tinyurl.com/Why-IOO-Matter](https://tinyurl.com/Why-IOO-Matter))
  3. Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between high quality and low quality monitoring reports and goal monitoring practices ([http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-ProgressMonitoring](http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-ProgressMonitoring))
  4. Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between owner service and customer service, between board work and superintendent work
  5. Watch the meetings of three approved Boards for a month and code their board meetings ([https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cZytgTdzosA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cZytgTdzosA))

- **Creating Alignment Requirements**
  2. Review The Policy Diet process ([http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-PolicyDiet-Guide](http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-PolicyDiet-Guide)), pick ten policies from your current policy manual and create a table that lists how you would apply the policy diet to each, and then discuss with your Quad Coach
  3. Complete at least 3 SOFG mindset practices

- **Other Duties As Required Requirements**
  1. Evaluate a proposed annual budget ([https://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Supt-Board-Budget](https://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Supt-Board-Budget))
  2. Request information ([http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-InfoTypes](http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-InfoTypes))
  3. Effectively utilize internal auditing ([https://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Internal-Auditing](https://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Internal-Auditing))
5. Distinguish between useful and useless research (https://tinyurl.com/Analyzing-Research)
CGCS 2022 Governance Support Cohort

INTENTION
School systems only exist to improve student outcomes; improving student outcomes is the “why” of this work. Student outcomes don’t change until adult behaviors change; changing adult behaviors in ways that align with improvements in student outcomes is the “how” of this work. In pursuit of the “why” as informed by the “how,” the Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS) (http://www.cgcs.org) is offering a cohort-based professional development opportunity for school board support staff.

OVERVIEW
A cohort of no more than sixteen (16) school system staff who support school board / governance work (job description identifies at least 50% of their responsibilities as being governance work) from across the United States will participate in a nine-month training in Student Outcomes Focused Governance (SOFG) (http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Manual) that will enable them to become more proficient in supporting their school boards and in implementing the SOFG framework.

DETAILS
Participants will engage in three in-person retreats, virtual monthly cohort meetings, and bi-monthly quad meetings. They will also be assigned partners with whom they will work closely throughout the training. In addition, participants will receive one-on-one coaching support to complete the deliverables and requirements of the syllabus. (https://tinyurl.com/C LCS-2022-Support-Syllabus). Participants should anticipate allocating an average of 8 hrs per month (in addition to the in-person sessions detailed below). Priority will be given to support staff who are recommended by both their school board chair and superintendent, and whose governance teams have already begun SOFG implementation. Participation costs $1000 per person (travel expenses and optional books not included); school systems typically cover these costs as part of professional development budgets. Applications are open until January 26. Applicants will be notified of their status by January 28. Questions can be emailed to: ajcrabill@cgcs.org.

CALENDAR
- Cohort Application Informational Session: January 12, 2pm central [optional, virtual]
- Applications Due: January 26, 8pm central
- Selection Announced: January 28
- Monthly Cohort Sessions: February-October: 2nd Monday, 2pm-4pm central [required, virtual]
- Monthly Quad Sessions: February-October: date & time TBD by Quad [required, virtual]
- First session: February 18 & 19, 9am-6pm local [required, in-person: Atlanta, GA]
- Second session: April 22 & 23, 9am-6pm local [required, in-person: tentatively Denver, CO]
- Third session: CGCS Fall Conference, October 17 & 18, 9am-6pm local [required, in-person: Orlando, FL]

RESOURCES
- Application: https://tinyurl.com/2022-CGCS-Support-Cohort-App
- SOFG Cohort Reading List: https://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Cohort-Reading-List

rsistrhart@gmail.com (not shared)  Switch account

* Required

Name *

Your answer

School System/District *

Your answer

Role *

Your answer

How long have you been an employee and in your current role with the school system? *

Your answer

Will your board be supporting your application? If so, in what way? If not, why? *

Your answer

* Request edit access
Mobile *

Your answer

Email *

Your answer

Why did you choose your current role? *

Your answer

Why are you applying to participate in this cohort? *

Your answer

What do you hope to get out of this training? *

Your answer

As you read through the syllabus, on which of the “Prioritization” topics have you already received training? On which of the “Implementation” topics? *

Your answer
I understand that there are three required in-person sessions and that the costs for these trips are not included in the $1000 tuition. *

 Agree

Never submit passwords through Google Forms.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google. Report Abuse · Terms of Service · Privacy Policy

Google Forms
CGCS 2022 Governance Support Cohort Syllabus

Intention
School systems only exist to improve student outcomes; improving student outcomes is the “why” of this work. Student outcomes don’t change until adult behaviors change; changing adult behaviors in ways that align with improvements in student outcomes is the “how” of this work. In pursuit of the “why” as informed by the “how,” the Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS) (http://www.cgcs.org) is offering a cohort-based professional development opportunity for school board support staff.

Overview
A cohort of no more than sixteen (16) school system staff who support school board / governance work (job description identifies at least 50% of their responsibilities as being governance work) from across the United States will participate in a nine-month training in Student Outcomes Focused Governance (SOFG) (http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Manual) that will enable them to become more proficient in supporting their school boards and in implementing the SOFG framework.

Details
Participants will engage in three in-person retreats, virtual monthly cohort meetings, and bi-monthly quad meetings. They will also be assigned partners with whom they will work closely throughout the training. In addition, participants will receive one-on-one coaching support to complete the deliverables and requirements of the syllabus. Participants should anticipate allocating an average of 8 hrs per month (in addition to the in-person sessions detailed below). Priority will be given to support staff who are recommended by both their school board chair and superintendent, and whose governance teams have already begun SOFG implementation. Participation costs $1000 per person (travel expenses and optional books not included); school systems typically cover these costs as part of professional development budgets. Applications are open until January 26. Applicants will be notified of their status by January 28. Questions can be emailed to: ajcrabill@cgcs.org.

Calendar
- Cohort Application Informational Session: January 12, 2pm central [ optional, virtual ]
- Applications Due: January 26, 8pm central
- Selection Announced: January 28
- Monthly Cohort Sessions: February-October: 2nd Monday, 2pm-4pm central [ required, virtual ]
- Monthly Quad Sessions: February-October: date & time TBD by Quad [ required, virtual ]
- First session: February 18 & 19, 9am-6pm local [ required, in-person: Atlanta, GA ]
- Second session: April 22 & 23, 9am-6pm local [ required, in-person: Denver, CO ]
- Third session: CGCS Fall Conference, October 17 & 18, 9am-6pm local [ required, in-person: Orlando, FL ]

Resources
- Application: https://tinyurl.com/2022-CGCS-Support-Cohort-App
- SOFG Cohort Reading List: https://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Cohort-Reading-List

Requirements
This cohort will create a Community of Practice amongst district professionals who support the governing board of their school district. This community will allow members to share problems of practice with fellow
professionals, learn from one another, and explore best practices in a range of board management and governance areas.

The SOFG framework is grounded in the idea that student outcomes don’t change until adult behaviors change. As such, the key work of individuals supporting governing boards and district governance is to support the functioning of school boards in ways that are more likely to improve student outcomes. To do this, governance support professionals must hone their abilities to help the Board **prioritize** and then **implement** their priorities.

Prioritization is about getting clear on the community’s vision, the community’s values, and what it looks like to intensely focus the Board’s time on these priorities.

Implementation is about addressing the relational barriers to change, collaboratively redesigning the Board’s work around the Board’s priorities, building Board member capacity to change, and building community capacity to change.

Participants will have completed the cohort when the following requirements are met:

- **Participation Requirements**
  1. Participate in all three in-person sessions
  2. Participate in at least 80% of monthly cohort sessions
  3. Participate in monthly quad check-ins as needed
  4. Collaborate with partner as needed

- **Prioritization Requirements**
  1. Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between high quality and low quality goals, guardrails, and monitoring calendars
  2. Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between high quality and low quality monitoring reports and goal monitoring practices
  3. Create a plan with calendar -- day 0 through adoption -- for a board to create goals, guardrails, and a monitoring calendar
  4. Watch the meetings of three approved Boards for a month and code their board meetings
  6. Conduct a quarterly self evaluation for your school system ([https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cZytgTdzosA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cZytgTdzosA))

- **Implementation Requirements**
  1. Complete at least 3 SOFG mindset practices
  2. Review The Policy Diet process ([http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-PolicyDiet-Guide](http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-PolicyDiet-Guide)), pick ten policies from your current policy manual and create a table that lists how you would apply the policy diet to each, and then discuss with your Quad Coach
  3. Create a plan with calendar -- day 0 through adoption -- for a board to migrate from its current policy manual to the sample SOFG policy manual ([http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Sample-Policy-Manual](http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Sample-Policy-Manual))
CGCS 2022 Aspiring Governance Coach Cohort

INTENTION
School systems only exist to improve student outcomes; improving student outcomes is the “why” of this work. Student outcomes don’t change until adult behaviors change; changing adult behaviors in ways that align with improvements in student outcomes is the “how” of this work. In pursuit of the “why” as informed by the “how,” the Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS) (http://www.cgcs.org) is offering a cohort-based professional development opportunity for aspiring school board governance coaches.

OVERVIEW
A cohort of no more than sixteen (16) experienced school board leaders from across the United States will participate in a nine-month training in Student Outcomes Focused Governance (SOFG) (http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Manual) that will enable them to be more highly effective school board leaders in their own communities. Completion of the cohort also meets the prerequisite to additional practicum training on the path to becoming a certified SOFG Coach, which will enable participants to actively support other school system governance teams across the nation.

DETAILS
Participants will engage in three in-person retreats, virtual monthly cohort meetings and bi-monthly quad meetings. They will also be assigned partners with whom they will work closely throughout the training. In addition, participants will receive one-on-one coaching support to complete the deliverables and requirements of the syllabus. (https://tinyurl.com/CGCS-2022-Coach-Syllabus). Participants should anticipate allocating an average of 30 hrs per month (in addition to the in-person sessions detailed below). Priority will be given to applicants who have completed prior CGCS cohorts or whose boards have already begun SOFG implementation. Participation costs $3500 per person (travel expenses and optional books not included); school systems typically cover these costs as part of professional development budgets. Applications are open until January 26. Applicants will be notified of their status by January 28. Questions can be emailed to: ajcrabill@cgcs.org.

CALENDAR
- Cohort Application Informational Session: January 12, 2pm central [optional, virtual]
- Applications Due: January 26, 8pm central
- Selection Announced: January 28
- Orientation session: February 5, 10am-1pm central [required, virtual]
- First session: February 18 & 19, 9am-6pm local [required, in-person: Atlanta, GA]
- Monthly Cohort Sessions: March-October: 2nd Monday, 5pm-7pm central [required, virtual]
- Monthly Quad Sessions: March-October: date & time TBD by Quad [required, virtual]
- Second session: April 22 & 23, 9am-6pm local [required, in-person: tentatively Denver, CO]
- Third session: August 26 & 27, 9am-6pm local [required, in-person: tentatively Washington, DC]
- Opportunity to facilitate: CGCS Fall Conference, October 17 & 18, 9am-6pm local [optional, in-person: Orlando, FL]

**RESOURCES**
- SOFG Cohort Reading List: [https://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Cohort-Reading-List](https://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Cohort-Reading-List)

rsistrhart@gmail.com Switch account

* Required

**NOTE:**
This cohort has an EXTREMELY challenging syllabus that requires a great deal of reading, group work, document generation, and independent study. Completing the cohort ([https://tinyurl.com/CGCS-2022-Coach-Syllabus](https://tinyurl.com/CGCS-2022-Coach-Syllabus)) will provide you with the skills to be a more effective school board member and serves as the prerequisite for earning a professional SOFG Coach Certification. If you choose to pursue certification, the practicum elements of certification typically require an additional 6 to 12 months to complete. Please carefully consider whether or not this is right for you.

This is a highly competitive cohort with many more applicants than spaces available. Please take your time and be thoughtful in your application.

**Name**

Your answer

**District**

Your answer
Role *
Your answer

Mobile *
Your answer

Will your board be supporting your application? If so, in what way? If not, why? *
Your answer

Email *
Your answer

What prior experience do you have with coaching leaders? *
Your answer

Why are you applying to participate in this cohort? *
Your answer
What do you hope to get out of becoming a certified SOFG Coach?

Your answer

As you read through the syllabus, on which of the “Knowledge” topics have you already received training? On which of the “Skill” topics? On which of the “Mindset” topics?

Your answer

I understand that there are three required in-person sessions and that the costs for these trips are not included in the $3500 tuition.

☐ Agree

I understand that this cohort could require a minimum average of 30 hours per month in cohort sessions, reading, group work, document generation, and independent study that is rigorous and academic in nature (https://tinyurl.com/CGCS-2022-Coach-Syllabus).

☐ Agree

Submit

Clear form

Never submit passwords through Google Forms.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google. Report Abuse - Terms of Service - Privacy Policy
Intention
School systems only exist to improve student outcomes; improving student outcomes is the “why” of this work. Student outcomes don’t change until adult behaviors change; changing adult behaviors in ways that align with improvements in student outcomes is the “how” of this work. In pursuit of the “why” as informed by the “how,” the Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS) (http://www.cgcs.org) is offering a cohort-based professional development opportunity for aspiring school board governance coaches.

Overview
A cohort of no more than sixteen (16) experienced school board leaders from across the United States will participate in a nine-month training in Student Outcomes Focused Governance (SOFG) (http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Manual) that will enable them to be more highly effective school board leaders in their own communities. Completion of the cohort also meets the prerequisite to additional practicum training on the path to becoming a certified SOFG Coach, which will enable participants to actively support other school system governance teams across the nation.

Details
Participants will engage in three in-person retreats, virtual monthly cohort meetings and bi-monthly quad meetings. They will also be assigned partners with whom they will work closely throughout the training. In addition, participants will receive one-on-one coaching support to complete the deliverables and requirements of the syllabus. Participants should anticipate allocating an average of 30 hrs per month (in addition to the in-person sessions detailed below). Priority will be given to applicants who have completed prior CGCS cohorts or whose boards have already begun SOFG implementation. Participation costs $3500 per person (travel expenses and optional books not included); school systems typically cover these costs as part of professional development budgets. Applications are open until January 26. Applicants will be notified of their status by January 28. Questions can be emailed to: ajcrabill@cgcs.org.

Calendar
- Cohort Application Informational Session: January 12, 2pm central [ optional, virtual ]
- Applications Due: January 26, 8pm central
- Selection Announced: January 28
- Orientation session: February 5, 10am-1pm central [ required, virtual ]
- First session: February 18 & 19, 9am-6pm local [ required, in-person: Atlanta, GA ]
- Monthly Cohort Sessions: March-October: 2nd Monday, 5pm-7pm central [ required, virtual ]
- Monthly Quad Sessions: March-October: date & time TBD by Quad [ required, virtual ]
- Second session: April 22 & 23, 9am-6pm local [ required, in-person: tentatively El Paso, TX ]
- Third session: August 26 & 27, 9am-6pm local [ required, in-person: tentatively Des Moines, IA ]
- Opportunity to facilitate: CGCS Fall Conference, October 17 & 18, 9am-6pm local [ optional, in-person: Orlando, FL ]

Resources
- Application: https://tinyurl.com/2022-CGCS-Coach-Cohort-App
- SOFG Cohort Reading List: https://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Cohort-Reading-List
Requirements
The work of SOFG Coaches is grounded in the idea that student outcomes don’t change until adult behaviors change. As such, the key work of SOFG Coaches is to support school board members who want to change their adult behavior in ways that are more likely to improve student outcomes. SOFG Coaches focus on three key drivers of adult behavior change: knowledge, skill, and mindset.

Knowledge is about what we know. Knowledge is the smallest of the three drivers; knowing the latest governance research is valuable in catalyzing adult behavior change but it is also completely insufficient to do so in the absence of the other two drivers.

Skills are about how we are able to employ what we know. As we gain more facility with the knowledge we possess, our adult behaviors can change even more. Having tools with which to use effective governance research is valuable. Skills are a larger driver than knowledge but their impact is still small compared to the third driver of adult behavior change.

Mindset is about how we view the world and how we make meaning of the circumstances unfolding around us. Mindset is the most powerful of the three drivers of adult behavior change. In the context of a disempowering mindset, knowledge and skills become impotent; in the context of an empowering mindset, knowledge and skills become powerful tools for improving student outcomes.

Participants will have completed the cohort when the following requirements are met:

● Participation Requirements
  1. Participate in all three in-person sessions
  2. Participate in at least 80% of monthly cohort sessions
  3. Participate in monthly quad check-ins as needed
  4. Collaborate with partner as needed

● Knowledge Requirements
  1. Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between high quality and low quality goals, guardrails, and monitoring calendars
  2. Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between high quality and low quality monitoring reports and goal monitoring practices
  3. Demonstrate the ability to distinguish between owner service and customer service, between board work and superintendent work
  4. Observe at least 20 public school board meetings from at least 5 different boards from at least 2 different states than your own, summarize learnings in a 1-3 page paper, and then discuss with your Quad Coach
  5. Observe at least two SOFG Workshops (or Lead Coach-approved student outcomes-focused workshops), summarize learnings in a 1-3 page paper, and then discuss with your Quad Coach
  6. Review the Cohort Reading List (https://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Cohort-Reading-List), summarize learnings in a 1-3 page paper, and then discuss with your Quad Coach
  7. Read the SOFG Instrument (http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Manual), create a table that identifies Reference Lit (by title and page number) that corresponds with each of the six pages of the Instrument, and then discuss with your Quad Coach
  8. Review The Policy Diet process (http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-PolicyDiet-Guide), pick ten policies from your current policy manual and create a table that lists how you would apply the policy diet to each, and then discuss with your Quad Coach
9. Review your state’s accountability system and the state legal framework regarding school boards, do the same for one of the other states where you watched a school board meeting, summarize learnings in a 1-3 page paper, and then discuss with your Quad Coach

- **Skill Requirements**
  1. Create a sample implementation timeline for a target district
  2. Create a plan with calendar -- day 0 through adoption -- for a board to create goals, guardrails, and a monitoring calendar
  3. Create a sample monitoring report of a sample goal for a target district
  4. Create a plan with calendar -- day 0 through adoption -- for a board to migrate from its current policy manual to the sample SOFG policy manual ([http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Sample-Policy-Manual](http://tinyurl.com/SOFG-Sample-Policy-Manual))
  5. Calibrate on the Board Monthly Time Use Evaluation with 95%+ accuracy for a target district
  6. Calibrate on the Board Quarterly Self Evaluation with 95%+ accuracy for a target district
  7. Complete an SOFG Coach Knowledge & Skill Workshop
  8. Monitor the meetings of three approved Boards for three months, code their board meetings, and write a 1-3 page memo of coaching recommendations to the Board Chair and Superintendent
  9. Participate on at least three support teams for school boards led by an SOFG Coach
  10. Effectively facilitate at least two SOFG Conversations (1-3hr)

- **Mindset Requirements**
  1. Complete at least 5 SOFG mindset practices within 14 days
  2. Complete an SOFG Coach Mindset Workshop

  [The following is required for SOFG Coach Certification, but not for cohort completion]

  3. Effectively co-facilitate one SOFG Workshop (2 day) or three SOFG Overviews (5+hrs) with your Quad Coach. The three elements evaluated during the co-facilitation are:
     - Integrity: Being your word
     - Content: Being an expert of the material
     - Challenge: Being a safe but firm guide to support participant self-reflection.
The journey toward this framework began in 2014 when a
group of rambunctious CGCS board members and
superintendents came together with the intention of defining
and supporting effective governance throughout the CGCS
family of member school systems. Referring to themselves as
“TeamRogue” -- a designation intended to describe the break
from existing governance doctrine they believed necessary to
position boards as entities capable of driving improvements in
student outcomes -- they began by reviewing existing
research and asking a great number of questions. After
conducting what was, at that time, the nation’s most
comprehensive survey of urban board members and
superintendents on the topic of improving governance
effectiveness, the group began formulating a series of
workshops geared toward new board members, board chairs,
and whole board teams. Those early efforts have since
evolved into this framework. None of this would be possible
without significant contributions from each of the following:

Michael Casserly (CGCS), Darienne Driver (Milwaukee),
Cindy Elsbernd (Des Moines), Eric Gordon (Cleveland), Leslie
Grant (Atlanta), Ray Hart (CGCS), Jumoke Hinton (Oakland),
Pamela Knowles (Portland), Larry Nyland (Seattle), Michael
O'Neill (Boston), Moses Palacios (CGCS), Ashley Paz (Fort
Worth), Josh Reimnitz (Minneapolis), Miguel Solis (Dallas),
Teri Trinidad (CGCS), Airick Leonard West (Kansas City),
Steve Zimmer (Los Angeles)
Overview
Student outcomes don’t change until adult behaviors change. Or said differently when placed in the context of governing, patterns of behavior that are exhibited in the boardroom can reasonably be expected to be found paralleled in the classroom. This concept, which offers a summation of the current literature on board behaviors and their relationship to improving student outcomes, is as simple as it can be confounding. The intention of the Council of the Great City Schools’ (CGCS) Student Outcomes Focused Governance framework is to translate existing research and the collective experience of dozens of CGCS board members and superintendents into a set of tools that boards can use to identify their strengths and weaknesses as well as to track progress along their journey toward improving student outcomes.

The framework is built around six research-informed competencies that describe school board behaviors and the degree to which they create the conditions for improvements in student outcomes: Vision & Goals, Values & Guardrails, Monitoring & Accountability, Communication & Collaboration, Unity & Trust, and Continuous Improvement.

How To Use
This document is best used by the full board and superintendent with guidance from a facilitator specifically trained in its application. After receiving an orientation to the framework, each individual board member and the superintendent should fill out the Board Quarterly Self Evaluation. Using the self evaluation instrument will reveal a score between 0 and 100, where a 0 indicates that the Board is not at all focused (yet) on its goals for student outcomes and a 100 which indicates that the Board has mastered the behavior of focusing on its goals for student outcomes. Then the facilitator should lead the board through a process of collectively completing the self evaluation for the first time. This will create the Board’s starting point data which, in addition to providing a measurable score, provides the board with clarity about its strengths and weaknesses relative to being focused on improving student outcomes.

Once a baseline has been set, the board should schedule time during a public meeting every three months to complete the self-evaluation again as a means of monitoring the board’s progress over time. Ideally each quarter the board’s focus on improving student outcomes meaningfully increases -- a process tracked for the first two years using the Board Continuous Improvement Evaluation.
VISION & GOALS: The Board will, in collaboration with the Superintendent, adopt goals that are student outcomes focused.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Student Outcomes Focused (0)</th>
<th>Approaching Student Outcomes Focus (10)</th>
<th>Meeting Student Outcomes Focus (25)</th>
<th>Mastering Student Outcomes Focus (35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Board is Not Student Outcomes Focused if any of the following are true:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board has not adopted goals.</td>
<td>The Board has adopted goals, in collaboration with the Superintendent.</td>
<td>The Board’s goals all pertain to desired student outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board has not consistently demonstrated the ability to distinguish between inputs, outputs, and outcomes.</td>
<td>The Board has adopted only SMART goals that include a specific measure, population, starting point, an ending point, a starting date, and an ending date.</td>
<td>In addition to the goal ending points, the Board has adopted annual targets, goal ending points for each year leading up to the ending dates. The Superintendent has provided interim goal ending points for each year leading up to the ending date.</td>
<td>The Board used a process that included students, parents, staff, and community members in a way that leads them to express ownership of the adopted goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board has not hosted opportunities to listen to the vision of the community during the previous thirty-six month period.</td>
<td>The Board has adopted no fewer than one and no more than five goals. Fewer goals allow for greater focus; more allow for less.</td>
<td>All interim goals pertain to student outputs or student outcomes, not inputs or adult outputs.</td>
<td>All of the interim goals are predictive of their respective goals, and are influenceable by the Superintendent (and the Superintendent’s team). Predictive suggests that there is some evidence of a correlation between the interim goal and the goal. Influenceable suggests that the Superintendent -- and through them, the staff -- has authority over roughly 80% of the inputs the interim goal is measuring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Superintendent has adopted, in collaboration with the Board, one to three interim goals to progress monitor each goal, and each interim goal is SMART.</td>
<td>The Board included students, parents, staff, and community members in the goal development process.</td>
<td>The Board relied on a root cause analysis, comprehensive student needs assessment, and/or similar research-based tool to inform identification of and prioritization of potential goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The status of each interim goal is able to be updated multiple times during each school year.</td>
<td>All Board goals last from three to five years; all interim goals last from one to three years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Board publicly posted the goals for public comment prior to adoption.</td>
<td>The goals and interim goals will challenge the organization and will require change in adult behaviors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VALUES & GUARDRAILS: The Board will, in collaboration with the Superintendent, adopt guardrails.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Student Outcomes Focused (0)</th>
<th>Approaching Student Outcomes Focus (5)</th>
<th>Meeting Student Outcomes Focus (10)</th>
<th>Mastering Student Outcomes Focus (15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Board is Not Student Outcomes Focused if any of the following are true:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board has not adopted goals.</td>
<td>No items from the Not Student Outcomes Focused column, and:</td>
<td>All items from the Approaching Student Outcomes Focus column, and:</td>
<td>All items from the Meeting Student Outcomes Focus column, and:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board has not hosted opportunities to listen to the values of the community during the previous thirty-six month period.</td>
<td>The Board has adopted, in collaboration with the Superintendent, <strong>guardrails</strong> based on the community’s values and that do not hinder pursuit of the goals. Each guardrail describes a single operational action or class of actions the Superintendent may not use or allow in pursuit of the goals.</td>
<td>The Superintendent has provided interim guardrail ending points for each year leading up to the ending date.</td>
<td>The Board used a process that included students, parents, staff, and community members in a way that leads them to express ownership of the adopted guardrails and, if applicable, theories of action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Board has adopted no fewer than one and no more than five guardrails. Fewer guardrails allow for more focus; more allow for less.</td>
<td>All interim guardrails pertain to <strong>outputs</strong> or outcomes, not inputs.</td>
<td>All of the interim guardrails are predictive of their respective guardrails, and are influenceable by the Superintendent (and the Superintendent’s team). Predictive suggests that there is some evidence of a correlation between the interim guardrail and the guardrail. Influenceable suggests that the Superintendent -- and through them, the staff -- has authority over roughly 80% of whatever the interim guardrail is measuring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Superintendent has adopted, in collaboration with the Board, one to three <strong>interim guardrails</strong> for each guardrail, and each interim guardrail is SMART.</td>
<td>The Board included students, parents, staff, and community members in the guardrail development process.</td>
<td>In addition to the guardrails on the Superintendent's authority, the Board has adopted one to five guardrails on its own behavior and evaluates itself against them at least quarterly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The status of each interim guardrail is able to be updated multiple times during each school year.</td>
<td>The Board has considered adoption of one or more <strong>theories of action</strong> to drive the school system’s overall strategic direction. If there is a permanent Superintendent, that person was included in the theory consideration process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Board publicly posted the guardrails for public comment prior to adoption.</td>
<td>All Board guardrails last from three to five years; all interim guardrails last from one to three years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The guardrails, interim guardrails, and theories of action will challenge the organization and require change in adult behaviors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monitoring & Accountability

The Board will devote significant time monthly to monitoring progress toward the goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Student Outcomes Focused (0)</th>
<th>Approaching Student Outcomes Focus (10)</th>
<th>Meeting Student Outcomes Focus (20)</th>
<th>Mastering Student Outcomes Focus (30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Board is Not Student Outcomes Focused if any of the following are true:</td>
<td>All items from the Approaching Student Outcomes Focus column, and:</td>
<td>All items from the Meeting Student Outcomes Focus column, and:</td>
<td>The Board invests no less than 50% of its total Board-authorized public meeting minutes into effectively monitoring its goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board has not adopted goals.</td>
<td>The Board invests no less than 25% of its total Board-authorized public meeting minutes monitoring its goals.</td>
<td>No more than two goals are monitored per month.</td>
<td>Only Board work was discussed and/or acted on during Board-authorized public meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board does not schedule each goal to be monitored at least four times per year.</td>
<td>Every goal is monitored at least four times per year.</td>
<td>Every guardrail is monitored at least once per year.</td>
<td>The Board modifies its goals, guardrails, and monitoring calendar no more than once during the span of the Board’s adopted goals (unless they are met sooner). A longer period allows for more focus; shorter allows for less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board does not schedule each guardrail to be monitored at least once per year.</td>
<td>The Board has been provided copies of -- but, unless required by law, did not vote to approve / disapprove -- the Superintendent’s plan(s) for implementing the Board’s goals and worked to ensure that the plan included both an implementation timeline and implementation instruments.</td>
<td>The Board has consistent demonstrated the ability to distinguish between customer service/issues and owner service/issues.</td>
<td>The school system has achieved at least half of its interim goals during the previous twelve month period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board has not adopted a monitoring calendar.</td>
<td>The most recent annual Superintendent evaluation took place no more than twelve months ago.</td>
<td>The Board has received monitoring reports in accordance with its monitoring calendar.</td>
<td>If the Board approves an annual budget, it does so only after determining that the Board’s goals are the first priority for resource allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board does not track its use of time in Board-authorized public meetings.</td>
<td>The Superintendent led the interim goals/guardrails and monitoring calendar development processes while working collaboratively with the Board.</td>
<td>The Board has a Board-adopted monitoring calendar.</td>
<td>The Superintendent is evaluated only on performance regarding the Board’s goals, guardrails, and interim goals/guardrails. The Board considers Superintendent performance to be indistinguishable from school system performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board has not consistently demonstrated the ability to distinguish between customer service/issues and owner service/issues.</td>
<td>The Board’s monitoring calendar spans the length of the Board’s goals. A longer span allows for more focus; shorter allows for less.</td>
<td>The Board has received copies of -- but, unless required by law, did not vote to approve / disapprove -- the Superintendent’s plan(s) for implementing the Board’s goals and worked to ensure that the plan included both an implementation timeline and implementation instruments.</td>
<td>The Board has modified its goals, guardrails, and monitoring calendar no more than once during the span of the Board’s adopted goals (unless they are met sooner). A longer period allows for more focus; shorter allows for less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school system has not achieved any of its interim goals during the previous twelve month period.</td>
<td>The Superintendent led the interim goals/guardrails and monitoring calendar development processes while working collaboratively with the Board.</td>
<td>The Board has been provided copies of -- but, unless required by law, did not vote to approve / disapprove -- the Superintendent’s plan(s) for implementing the Board’s goals and worked to ensure that the plan included both an implementation timeline and implementation instruments.</td>
<td>The Board has consistent demonstrated the ability to distinguish between customer service/issues and owner service/issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**COMMUNICATION & COLLABORATION:** The Board will lead transparently and include stakeholders in the pursuit of the goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Student Outcomes Focused (0)</th>
<th>Approaching Student Outcomes Focus (1)</th>
<th>Meeting Student Outcomes Focus (5)</th>
<th>Mastering Student Outcomes Focus (10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Board is Not Student Outcomes Focused if any of the following are true:</strong></td>
<td><strong>No items from the Not Student Outcomes Focused column, and:</strong></td>
<td><strong>All items from the Approaching Student Outcomes Focus column, and:</strong></td>
<td><strong>All items from the Meeting Student Outcomes Focus column, and:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board has not adopted goals.</td>
<td>All consent-eligible items were placed on the consent agenda and all but a few were voted on using a consent agenda.</td>
<td>There are no more than four Board-authorized public meetings per month and none lasts more than three hours.</td>
<td>There are no more than two Board-authorized public meetings per month and none lasts more than two hours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The Board did not receive the final version of materials to be voted on at least three calendar days before the Board-authorized public meeting during which the materials would be considered. | The Board tracks its use of time in Board-authorized public meetings, categorizing every minute used as one of the following:  
- **Goal Setting:** reviewing, discussing, and/or selecting goals  
- **Goal Monitoring:** reviewing, discussing, and/or approving/not approving goal monitoring reports  
- **Guardrail Setting:** reviewing, discussing, and/or selecting guardrails  
- **Guardrail Monitoring:** reviewing, discussing, and/or approving/not approving guardrail monitoring reports  
- **Leadership Evaluation:** Board self eval, Board time use eval, and Superintendent eval  
- **Voting:** debating and voting on any item (these activities are never a form of goal/guardrail monitoring)  
- **Community Engagement:** two-way communication between the Board and community members  
- **Other** | The Board schedules no more than five topics for discussion during any one Board-authorized public meeting. | The Board has adopted few enough policies that the full Board as a whole is able to review every policy at least once during every length of time equal to a Board Member’s term of office. |
| There were more than six Board-authorized public meetings in a single month during the previous twelve month period (Board committees are counted in this total). | | The Board limits its adoption of Board policies regarding school system operations to matters that are 1) required by law or 2) an appropriate exercise of the Board’s oversight authority as defined by the Board’s adopted goals and/or guardrails. Existing policies that do not meet one of these criteria have been removed from the Board’s policy manual (though the Superintendent may retain them as administrative policy/regulation). | The Board received the final version of materials to be voted on at least seven calendar days before the Board-authorized public meeting during which the materials would be considered. |
| Any meeting of the Board lasted more than eight hours during the previous twelve month period. | | The Board made no edits to the Board’s regularly scheduled meeting agenda during the meeting and during the three business days before the meeting unless a state of emergency was declared. | The Board used a process that included students, parents, staff, and community members in a way that led them to express ownership of the adopted goals and guardrails. |
| The Board does not use a consent agenda. | | | |
UNITY & TRUST: The Board will lead with one voice in its pursuit of the goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Student Outcomes Focused (0)</th>
<th>Approaching Student Outcomes Focus (1)</th>
<th>Meeting Student Outcomes Focus (3)</th>
<th>Mastering Student Outcomes Focus (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Board is Not Student Outcomes Focused if any of the following are true:</strong></td>
<td><strong>No items from the Not Student Outcomes Focused column, and:</strong></td>
<td><strong>All items from the Approaching Student Outcomes Focus column, and:</strong></td>
<td><strong>All items from the Meeting Student Outcomes Focus column, and:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board has not adopted goals.</td>
<td>Attendance at all regularly scheduled Board meetings was over 80% during the previous three month period.</td>
<td>The Board has included language in its Ethics &amp; Conflicts of Interest Statement requiring that Board Members do not give operational advice or instructions to staff members.</td>
<td>The Board unanimously agreed during the most recent self-evaluation that all Board Members adhered to all policies governing Board operating procedures during the previous evaluation period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board has not adopted policies that establish Board operating procedures.</td>
<td>The Board has adopted a policy or procedure requiring that information provided by the Superintendent to one Board Member is provided to all Board Members.</td>
<td>The Board has included language in its Ethics &amp; Conflicts of Interest Statement requiring that Board Members are responsible for the outcomes of all students, not just students in their region of the school system.</td>
<td>All Board Members and the Superintendent agreed during the most recent self-evaluation that none of the Board Members have given operational advice or instructions to staff members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Board Member voted on an item on which they had a conflict of interest, as defined by law, during the previous three month period.</td>
<td>The Board reviews all policies governing Board operating procedures at least once during every length of time equal to a Board Member’s term of office.</td>
<td>The Board has included language in its Ethics &amp; Conflicts of Interest Statement requiring that Board Members fully recuse themselves from matters involving individuals or organizations who made campaign contributions to them or who appointed them.</td>
<td>All Board Members have memorized all of the Board’s goals and the current status of each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Members serve on committees formed by the Superintendent or staff without approval of the Superintendent and a majority of the Board.</td>
<td>The Board has adopted an Ethics &amp; Conflicts of Interest Statement and all Board Members have signed the statement during their current term of office.</td>
<td>The Board has included language in its Ethics &amp; Conflicts of Interest Statement requiring that Board Members have honored the three aforementioned ethical boundaries during the previous evaluation period.</td>
<td>The Board conducted a quarterly self-evaluation during the previous three month period -- or annually if the most recent score was 80 or higher -- and unanimously voted to adopt the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Board Members agree that if the Board has committees, their role is only to advise the Board, not to advise the staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT: The Board will invest time and resources toward improving its focus on the goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Student Outcomes Focused (0)</th>
<th>Approaching Student Outcomes Focus (1)</th>
<th>Meeting Student Outcomes Focus (3)</th>
<th>Mastering Student Outcomes Focus (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Board is Not Student Outcomes Focused if any of the following are true:</td>
<td>No items from the Not Student Outcomes Focused column, and:</td>
<td>All items from the Approaching Student Outcomes Focus column, and:</td>
<td>All items from the Meeting Student Outcomes Focus column, and:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board has not adopted goals.</td>
<td>The Board tracks its use of time and reports monthly the percentage of Board-authorized public meeting time invested in monitoring the Board’s goals and interim goals.</td>
<td>The most recent Board annual self-evaluation took place no more than 45 days before the most recent Superintendent evaluation.</td>
<td>The Board included students as presenters in at least one of the Student Outcomes Focused Governance training sessions during the previous twelve months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board has not conducted a self-evaluation during the previous twelve month period.</td>
<td>The Board tracks the average annual cost of staff time invested in governance during its annual self-evaluation. This includes the time of any staff members invested in preparing for, attending, and debriefing after meetings. This includes all Board-authorized public meetings as well as all closed sessions and all hearings.</td>
<td>The Board has hosted and the Board Members have led or co-led at least one training session on Student Outcomes Focused Governance during the previous twelve month period.</td>
<td>Prior to being selected, all newly selected Board Members received training on Student Outcomes Focused Governance from fellow Board Members on their Board or from a certified Student Outcomes Focused Governance Coach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board has conducted a self-evaluation during the previous twelve month period but did not vote to adopt the results.</td>
<td>The Board has provided time during regularly scheduled Board-authorized public meetings to recognize the accomplishments of its students and staff regarding progress toward goals and interim goals.</td>
<td>The Board has continuously updated the status and targets of all goals, guardrails, and interim goals/guardrails, and publicly displays them in the room in which the Board most frequently holds regularly scheduled Board meetings.</td>
<td>The Board conducted the most recent quarterly self-evaluation -- or annually if the most recent score was 80 or higher -- and unanimously voted to adopt the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Board has not participated in a governance team training or retreat where all members of the governance team were present, during the previous twelve month period.</td>
<td>The most recent Board self-evaluation took place no more than 12 months ago using this instrument or a research-aligned instrument.</td>
<td>The Board conducted the most recent self-evaluation and voted to adopt the results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Outcomes</strong>: A measure of school system results that are not student results; outcomes that are not student outcomes. [ see Outcomes, Student Outcomes definitions ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Outputs</strong>: The adult experiences resulting from a particular set of inputs that are usually knowable in the midst of a cycle and that are a measure of the adults’ role in the implementation of the program or strategy. Outputs that are not student outputs. [ see Outputs, Student Outputs definitions ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Targets</strong>: Goal/interim goal ending points for each year leading up to the ending dates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board-authorized Public Meeting</strong>: Any non-privileged meeting authorized by the Board or Board Chair including, but not limited to, Board workshops, Board hearings, and Board committees. Legally mandated hearings are exempted from this definition. Trainings led by a certified Student Outcomes Focused Governance Coach may be exempted from this definition. [ see Board Work definition ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Work</strong>: Items that are discussed and/or acted on during Board-authorized public meetings because either state or federal law/rule requires the Board to do so or because the items directly pertain to the Board’s adopted goals or guardrails. Items that are not legally required and that the Board has not designated as Board work through the Board's goals or guardrails are, by default, Superintendent work. [ see Board-authorized Public Meeting, Superintendent Work definitions ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Engagement</strong>: Time invested by the Board in two-way communication between the Board and community members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consent-Eligible Items</strong>: Matters on the Board agenda that include, but that are not limited to, personnel actions, contract renewals, previous meeting minutes, policy updates, construction amendments, non-monitoring administrative reports, committee reports, enrollment updates, and regular financial reports where financial activities remained within budgetary parameters. [ see Board-authorized Public Meeting, Board Work definitions ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customers</strong>: The organization’s recipients of services and/or transactional beneficiaries -- such as students and staff -- for whom the staff is better positioned to address and/or resolve issues in a timely and effective manner. In a school system, customers and owners can be the same people, and therefore care must be taken to distinguish customer issues from owner issues. [ see Owner definition ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Date</strong>: The month/year by when the goal will reach the ending point. In goal setting, the ending date can be no less than one and no more than five years away. The ending date is often represented by the ‘Z’ in sample goals: “the measure will move from W% on X to Y% by Z.” [ see Ending Point, Goal Setting, SMART definitions ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Point</strong>: The goal’s desired number/percentage at the time of the ending date. The ending point is often represented by the ‘Y’ in sample goals: “the measure will move from W% on X to Y% by Z.” [ see Ending Date, Goal Setting, SMART definitions ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals: Policy statements that are SMART, that are student outcomes focused, and that describe the Board’s top priorities during the timeline for which they are adopted. The first priority for resource allocation in the school system should be toward achieving the Board’s goals. Once those allocations are complete, remaining resources may be allocated in a manner that addresses the additional needs and obligations of the school system. Goals generally are set for a three to five year period. Goals generally take the form of “student outcome will increase from X to Y by Z.” [see Goal Examples section; see SMART, Student Outcome definitions]

Goal Monitoring: Time invested by the Board in reviewing, discussing and/or accepting/not accepting goal monitoring reports. No fewer than 50% of the minutes spent in Board-authorized public meetings should be invested in goal monitoring or goal setting. Debating and voting on Board items is never a form of goal monitoring. [see Board-authorized Public Meeting, Goal, Goal Setting, Interim Goal, Monitoring definitions]

Goal Setting: Time invested by the Board in reviewing, discussing, and/or selecting goals. No fewer than 50% of the minutes spent in Board-authorized public meetings should be invested in goal monitoring or goal setting. [see Board-authorized Public Meeting, Goal, Goal Monitoring, Interim Goal, Monitoring definitions]

Governance Team: All Board Members and the Superintendent. The Superintendent is not a member of the Board, but is a member of the governing team.

Guardrail: An operational action or class of actions, usually strategic not tactical, the Superintendent may not use or allow in pursuit of the school system’s student outcome goals. Guardrails are based on the community’s values and should not undermine the school system’s ability to meet the goals — though guardrails will often require the Superintendent to accomplish the goals in a different way. [see Examples section; see Guardrail Monitoring, Guardrail Setting, Interim Guardrail, Theory of Action definitions]

Guardrail Monitoring: Time invested by the Board in reviewing, discussing and/or accepting/not accepting guardrail monitoring reports. [see Guardrail, Interim Guardrail, Monitoring definitions]

Guardrail Setting: Time invested by the Board in reviewing, discussing, and/or selecting guardrails. [see Guardrail, Interim Guardrail, Theory of Action definitions]

Implementation Instruments: Measures that describe the quality of effort that goes into execution of inputs or outputs. This document is an example of an implementation instrument for the governing team’s outputs.

Inputs: Resources and activities invested in a particular program or strategy that are usually knowable at the beginning of a cycle and that are a measure of effort applied. [see Outcomes, Outputs definitions]

Interim Goals: A measure of progress toward a defined goal that can be expressed as a number or percentage. [see Goal Examples section]

Interim Guardrail: A measure of progress toward a defined guardrail that can be expressed as a number or percentage. [see Guardrail Examples section]
Leadership Evaluation: The Board conducting routine self-evaluations and Superintendent evaluations. It is recommended to include months during which leadership evaluation will take place on the monitoring calendar.

Measure: The instrument, assessment, or other means used to quantify something. In the context of goals, this is often an evaluation of student performance such a school system or state exam. [ see Goal Setting, SMART definition ]

Monitoring: A Board process that includes the Board receiving monitoring reports on the timeline indicated by the monitoring calendar, discussing them, and choosing to accept or not accept them. The intention of monitoring is to determine whether reality matches the Board's goals / guardrails.

Monitoring Calendar: A Board-adopted multi-year schedule that describes months during which goals, interim goals, guardrails, and interim guardrails are reported to the Board.

Monitoring Report: A report that provides evidence of progress to the Board regarding their adopted goals and guardrails. Each monitoring report must contain 1) the goal/guardrail being monitored, 2) the interim goals/guardrails showing the previous three reporting periods, the current reporting period, and the annual and ending point numbers/percentages, 3) the Superintendent's evaluation of performance (“red/yellow/green” or “on track/partially off/off track” or “compliant/partially compliant/non-compliant” or whatever other status labels the school system uses for progress monitoring), and 4) supporting documentation that shows the evidence and describes any needed next steps.

Outcomes: The impact of the program or strategy that is usually knowable at the end of a cycle and that is a measure of the effect on the intended beneficiary. [ see Adult Outcomes, Inputs, Outputs, Student Outcomes definitions ]

Outputs: The result of a particular set of inputs that is usually knowable in the midst of a cycle and that is a measure of the implementation of the program or strategy. [ see Inputs, Outcomes definitions ]

Owners: The organization’s moral and legal authority -- such as residents and taxpayers -- for whom the board is better positioned to address and/or resolve issues in a timely and effective manner. In a school system, owners and customers can be the same people, and therefore care must be taken to distinguish customer issues from owner issues. [ see Customers definition ]

Population: The group of students who will be impacted and/or who are being measured. [ see Goal Setting, SMART definition ]

SMART: An acronym for “specific, measurable, attainable, results-focused, time-bound.” Goals and interim goals partially accomplish SMART-ness by having a specific measure, population, starting points, ending points, starting dates, and ending dates. [ see Ending Date, Ending Point, Measure, Population, Starting Date, Starting Point definitions ]

Starting Date: The month/year that the goal is set. The starting date is often represented by the ‘X’ in sample goals: “the measure will move from W% on X to Y% by Z.” [ see Goal Setting, SMART, Starting Point definitions ]
**Starting Point:** The goal’s current number/percentage at the time of adoption. The starting point is often represented by the 'W' in sample goals: “the measure will move from W% on X to Y% by Z.” [see Goal Setting, SMART, Starting Date definitions]

**Student Outcomes:** A measure of school system results that are student results rather than adult results; outcomes that are a measure of what students know or are able to do. Student outcomes are distinct from adult outcomes. [see Adult Outcomes, Goals, Outcomes definitions]

**Student Outputs:** The student experiences resulting from a particular set of inputs that are usually knowable in the midst of a cycle and that are a measure of the students’ role in the implementation of the program or strategy. Student outputs are distinct from adult outputs. [see Adult Outputs, Outputs definition]

**Superintendent Work:** Items that are not legally required and that the Board has not designated as Board work through the Board’s goals or guardrails. [see Board Work definition]

**Theory of Action:** A set of high level strategies to which all school system inputs and outputs must be aligned. Unlike other guardrails, theories of action do not have interim guardrails. [see Examples section; see Guardrail definition]

**Values:** The shared understanding of what the community considers important but that is not the vision. Where the vision describes what the community wants to see happen, values describe what the community does not want to see happen. Values describe protections the community wants to see put into place. It is not appropriate for the Board to allow the community’s values to be violated, even if doing so would support the accomplishment of the vision. The values are most often expressed as a guardrail or a theory of action. Guardrails generally are set for a three to five year period; theories of action generally are set for a five to ten year period.

**Vision:** The shared understanding of what the community ultimately desires to accomplish for all students. Where values describe what the community does not want to see, vision describes what the community does want to see happen. Vision describes the direction the community wants to see the school system go. A vision is most often expressed as an aspirational policy statement that describes what the Board understands the community’s desire for the future to be. Vision statements generally are set for a five to ten year period.

**Voting:** Time invested by the Board in debating and voting on any item. Unless indicated elsewhere in this document, these activities are never a form of goal monitoring or guardrail monitoring.
### GOAL EXAMPLES

**Sample Goals:**
- Many of these examples are drawn from current or proposed goals from CGCS member school systems (or adaptations of their policy that meet the goal definition).
- The percentage of kindergarten students who will enter kindergarten school-ready on a multidimensional assessment will increase from \( W\% \) on \( X \) date to \( Y\% \) by \( Z \) date
- The percentage of graduates who are persisting in the second year of their post-secondary program will increase from \( W\% \) on \( X \) to \( Y\% \) by \( Z \)
- The percentage of free and reduced lunch-eligible students in kindergarten through 2nd grade who are reading/writing on or above grade level on the school system’s summative assessment will increase from \( W\% \) on \( X \) to \( Y\% \) by \( Z \)
- The percentage of students at underperforming schools who meet or exceed the state standard will increase from \( W\% \) on \( X \) to \( Y\% \) by \( Z \)
- The percentage of males of color who graduate with an associate’s degree will increase from \( W\% \) on \( X \) to \( Y\% \) by \( Z \)

**Sample Interim Goals:**
- Many of these examples are drawn from CGCS’ “Academic KPIs” work.
- The percentage of students successfully passing abc semester long course by the end of ninth grade will increase from \( W\% \) on \( X \) to \( Y\% \) by \( Z \)
- The percentage of students showing growth from one formative assessment to the next will increase from \( W\% \) on \( X \) to \( Y\% \) by \( Z \)
- The percentage of students earning at least three IB, AP, or college credits each semester will increase from \( W\% \) on \( X \) to \( Y\% \) by \( Z \)

### GUARDRAIL EXAMPLES

**Sample Guardrails:**
- Many of these examples are drawn from current or proposed guardrails from CGCS member school systems (or adaptations of their policy that meet the guardrail definition).
- The Superintendent will not allow underperforming campuses to have principals or teachers who rank in the bottom two quartiles of principal or teacher school system-wide performance
- The Superintendent will not propose major decisions to the Board without first having engaged students, parents, community, and staff
- The Superintendent will not operate without a system that uses student growth data to identify, retain, and place highly effective staff
- The Superintendent will not allow the inequitable treatment of students

**Sample Interim Guardrails:**
- Many of these examples are drawn from CGCS’ “Managing for Results” work.
- The percentage of People Incidents per 1,000 Students at underperforming schools will decline from \( W\% \) on \( X \) to \( Y\% \) by \( Z \)
- The Employee Separation Rate for principals and teachers in the top quartile of school system-wide performance will decline from \( W\% \) on \( X \) to \( Y\% \) by \( Z \)
THEORY OF ACTION EXAMPLES

Sample Theories of Action:

● Some of these examples are drawn from current or proposed Theories of Action from CGCS member school systems (or adaptations of their policy that meet the Theories of Action definition).

● Managed Instruction:
  ○ If instructional materials and methods are directed by the central office to ensure that students experience consistency and quality of instructional delivery across a system of campuses;
  ○ Then central office will be responsible for accomplishing the Board’s goals while operating within the Board’s other guardrails.

● Earned Autonomy:
  ○ If the central office directly operates some schools and grants varying levels of autonomy to other schools; and
  ○ If the central office clearly defines operational thresholds that deserve higher levels of autonomy, and the specific autonomies earned, consistent with Board goals and guardrails;
  ○ Then responsibility for accomplishing the Board’s goals while operating within the Board’s guardrails will vary between central office and school leaders based on school-level operational capacity and student outcomes.

● Performance Empowerment:
  ○ If the central office devolves autonomy to schools; and
  ○ If the central office empowers parents to make choices among schools operated by differing partners; and
  ○ If the central office creates performance contracts with schools, annually evaluates performance of and demand for schools, and makes strategic decisions regarding growing access to high performing schools and addressing low performers;
  ○ Then school performance contracts will require the school to accomplish the Board’s goals while operating within the Board’s other guardrails.
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PROGRESS MONITORING STUDENT OUTCOMES

What Is Progress Monitoring?
Progress monitoring is a conversation between the school board and superintendent that provides boards the opportunity to evaluate the alignment between the community’s vision (goals towards student outcomes) and the school district’s reality (current student performance/growth). While student outcome goals and current student performance may not match perfectly, it only becomes problematic when there is no evidence of student growth and progress. And even if students aren’t yet growing and making progress, that’s only catastrophic if the superintendent doesn’t have sufficiently aggressive strategies in place for increasing growth and helping students make progress. These are the fundamental concerns of monitoring: 1) does reality match the vision, 2) is there growth toward the vision, and 3) is there a strategy and plan sufficient to cause growth toward the vision?

- If the answer to all three is yes, then the board can accept the monitoring report confident that the superintendent is performing.
- If the answer to only one or two of these questions is yes, the board may opt to table the matter (see Keep the Conversation Going below).
- If the answer to all three is no, the board may opt to reject the report and reflect on how to respond to the superintendent’s non-performance.

UNDERSTANDING PROGRESS MONITORING

How Is Monitoring Beneficial?
In addition to clarifying student and superintendent performance, monitoring -- when done well -- confers several other organizational benefits:

- **Lead by Example**: What happens in the boardroom is more likely to be echoed in the classroom. Board behavior sets the culture for an institution. If board members want a culture where teachers are open and reflective in their craft, they set the stage for that by demonstrating what it looks like for the board and superintendent to be open and reflective -- grounded in student outcomes data -- in their craft as well.

- **Clarify Strategies**: When the board receives monitoring reports from the superintendent, the report should include how the superintendent will respond to the data. If the data says things are slightly off track, the superintendent’s strategy should reflect that. If the data says that performance is completely off track, the superintendent’s strategy should reflect the urgency that the current reality demands.

- **Communicate Expectations**: By investing at least 50% of the board’s time each month into monitoring progress toward the vision, the board makes clear what the priorities of the entire organization are expected to be. This is a powerful tool for creating organizational alignment.

- **Formative Evaluation**: With each monitoring report the board is conducting a micro assessment of superintendent performance which creates an opportunity for the superintendent to make adjustments. As a continuous improvement strategy, providing this regularly recurring feedback loop is a superior approach to the outdated concept of merely conducting annual performance evaluations.

Tips For Effective Monitoring
- **Do Your Homework**: Board members should arrive at board meetings having already read the monitoring report and having already come
up with at least three or four questions each regarding the "who", "what", "why", and "how" of the monitoring report (see During Monitoring below).

- **Understanding Reality**: The desired result of monitoring is to understand the current reality for your students as compared to the vision you’ve adopted for them (goals). Whether you enjoy the current reality isn’t the point of monitoring; whether or not you fully know the current reality is.

- **Keep the Conversation Going**: If the superintendent presents a monitoring report that is missing the prerequisites (see Before Monitoring below) or that fails to clarify for board members the extent to which reality matches the goals, consider tabling the conversation and giving the superintendent a chance to fix it and re-offer it at a subsequent meeting, instead of choosing not to accept it and ending the discussion.

- **No Gotcha Governance**: Adopt a monitoring calendar that describes which goals will be monitored during which months. The ideal monitoring calendar will span the full term of the goals -- if they are five year goals, the calendar should cover five years.

- **Don’t Offer Advice**: Monitoring is never an opportunity for board members to provide advice to the superintendent regarding what should/shouldn’t be done about student outcomes. It’s also not about liking/not liking the superintendent’s strategies.

### PRACTICING PROGRESS MONITORING

#### Before Monitoring

Here are four issues to ask about the 1-5 page monitoring report before you can begin progress monitoring (if the answer to any of these is “no”, hand the report back to the Superintendent and have them complete it before proceeding -- likely at the next regularly scheduled board meeting):

1. Does it clearly show what is being monitored (which specific policy / end / goal / interpretation / etc)?
2. Does it clearly show data for the 3 previous reporting periods (preferably on a line graph)? Does it clearly show the current reporting period? Does it clearly show the target reporting periods (annual targets and deadline target)?
3. Does it clearly show the Superintendent’s evaluation of performance?
4. Does it clearly show supporting documentation that evidences the Superintendent’s evaluation? If the district is not at target or the Superintendent’s evaluation indicates implementation is not on track, does the monitoring report clearly describe any needed next steps?

#### During Monitoring

Monitoring is about understanding the extent to which reality matches policy -- and in this case, the Board’s adopted goals / ends. Monitoring is never about offering advice or recommendations. The Board’s curiosity is focused on what’s true for students, not on what adults are/aren’t doing. Here are observations to look for / questions to ask (and the order in which to ask them) that support progress monitoring. Notice that none of these questions offer advice concerning which inputs/outputs the Superintendent should select; these are monitoring questions, not managing questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which students are the data talking about?</td>
<td>Which circumstances surrounded the data for</td>
<td>Which phenomenon helps describe what happened?</td>
<td>Which changes will happen based on the data?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## After Monitoring

Once the Board has completed the task of monitoring and chosen to accept or not accept the report (and only after), then it is appropriate to ask: is this still the right policy?

### IMPROVING PROGRESS MONITORING

#### Evaluating The Quality Of Monitoring

Once the Board has completed monitoring, it would be wise to reflect on its performance. Using the following rubric, identify which column most describes the completed monitoring session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ineffective Monitoring</th>
<th>Approaching Effective Monitoring</th>
<th>Effective Monitoring</th>
<th>Highly Effective Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation</strong></td>
<td>Any Board members have not read the monitoring report prior to the meeting.</td>
<td>Some Board members have read parts of the monitoring report prior to the meeting and have begun developing potential questions.</td>
<td>Every Board member has read the monitoring report prior to the meeting and has shared potential questions with the Superintendent.</td>
<td>Every Board member read the monitoring report and shared potential questions with the Superintendent three working days prior to the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data &amp; Opinions</strong></td>
<td>Any conversation is focused on Board member opinions of school system performance.</td>
<td>Conversation is focused on Board member opinions of school system performance.</td>
<td>Conversation is focused on understanding the data presented in the monitoring.</td>
<td>Conversation is focused on understanding the data presented in the monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions &amp; Statements</td>
<td>Any conversation is focused on Board member opinions and recommendations for what the school system should do. Mostly yes/no inquiry.</td>
<td>Conversation is largely statements of opinion but includes some questions about the data presented in the monitoring report.</td>
<td>Conversation is mostly focused on questions about the data presented in the monitoring report. Mostly multiple choice or open ended inquiry.</td>
<td>Conversation is exclusively limited to questions about the data presented in the monitoring report. Mostly open ended inquiry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past &amp; Future</td>
<td>Most or all of the monitoring conversation is focused on future action rather than reflection on past action.</td>
<td>The plurality of the monitoring conversation is focused on future action rather than reflection on past action.</td>
<td>The large majority (⅔+) of the monitoring conversation is focused on reflecting on past action.</td>
<td>The super majority (¾+) of the time spent monitoring is focused on reflecting on past action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Monitoring &amp; Project Management</td>
<td>Any conversation is focused on offering advice concerning school system operations or programs. Questions are about technical or tactical issues.</td>
<td>Conversation is a blend of offering advice, discussing programs, and understanding performance.</td>
<td>Conversation is mostly focused on understanding performance rather than discussing school system operations or programs.</td>
<td>Conversation is exclusively focused on understanding performance specific to the monitoring report. Questions are about strategic issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# BOARD QUARTERLY SELF-EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Date</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Votes For/Against</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>January -March</th>
<th>April -June</th>
<th>July -September</th>
<th>October -December</th>
<th>January -March</th>
<th>Total Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision &amp; Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values &amp; Guardrails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity &amp; Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Directions**

1. You will enter five sets of evaluation results: three previous quarters, most recently completed quarter, and the next quarter estimate.
2. **Enter** the self-evaluation results for the previous three completed quarterly self-evaluations. (For example, if it is currently January then enter the self-evaluation results for Jan-Mar, Apr-Jun, and Jul-Sep.)
3. **Conduct** the quarterly self-evaluation for the most recently completed quarter and vote to adopt the results. (Continuing the example, conduct the quarterly self-evaluation for Oct-Dec.)
4. **Compare** the quarterly self-evaluation results with the estimated self-evaluation results from the previously completed self-evaluation. (Continuing the example, compare the self-evaluation results for Oct-Dec with the estimated Oct-Dec self-evaluation results that were entered during the Jul-Sep self-evaluation.)
5. **Enter** the self-evaluation results. (Continuing the example, enter the self-evaluation results for Oct-Dec.)
6. **Estimate** the self-evaluation results the Board can achieve during the next quarter. (Continuing the example, estimate the self-evaluation results for Jan-Mar.)
7. **Enter** the estimated self-evaluation results for the next quarter. (Continuing the example, enter the estimated self-evaluation results for Jan-Mar.)
8. **Update** the Board Continuous Improvement Evaluation to ensure meaningful progress toward focusing on improving student outcomes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mins Used</th>
<th>% of Total Mins Used</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision &amp; Goals</td>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewing, discussing, and/or selecting goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewing, discussing, and/or approving/not approving goal monitoring reports in accordance with the monitoring calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values &amp; Guardrails</td>
<td>Guardrail Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewing, discussing, and/or selecting guardrails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guardrail Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewing, discussing, and/or approving/not approving guardrail monitoring reports in accordance with the monitoring calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Accountability</td>
<td>Superintendent Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual evaluation of Superintendent/school system performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board debating and/or voting on any item (voting on goal/guardrail adoption and/or scheduled monitoring reports &amp; evals are counted elsewhere, not here; all other incidents of debating/voting are never a form of goals/guardrails “monitoring”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Collaboration</td>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two-way communication opportunity where Board Members listen for and discuss the vision/values of their staff and community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student / Family Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two-way communication opportunity where Board Members listen for and discuss the vision/values of their students and family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>Board Self Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly and/or annual Board self-evaluation using the Student Outcomes Focused Governance instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Time Use Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting evaluation using this time use instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training for the Board on Student Outcomes Focused Governance and related topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board-led Community Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board-hosted and Board Member-led or co-led training on Student Outcomes Focused Governance and related topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Closed Session</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time spent in non-public meetings, consistent with open meetings laws; this time is not calculated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any time spent on an activity that is not one of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Student Outcomes-focused Mins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal Setting &amp; Goal Monitoring combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Public Meeting Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All minutes in Board-authorized public meetings combined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# BOARD CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT EVALUATION

**Quarter 0**
The first time a Board uses the Board Quarterly Self-Evaluation; the Board’s ‘starting point’ for their two year continuous improvement process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Quarter Total</th>
<th>Current Quarter Total</th>
<th>Growth From Last to Current Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter 1</th>
<th>Quarter 2</th>
<th>Quarter 3</th>
<th>Quarter 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board’s 2nd Quarterly Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>Board’s 3rd Quarterly Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>Board’s 4th Quarterly Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>Board’s 5th Quarterly Self-Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Quarter Total</td>
<td>Current Quarter Total</td>
<td>Growth From Last to Current Quarter</td>
<td>Last Quarter Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total at least 30?</td>
<td>Growth at least 25?</td>
<td>Growth at least 45?</td>
<td>Growth at least 15?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If either question is ‘yes’, did the Board meet its quarterly continuous improvement goal</td>
<td>Did Not Met</td>
<td>Did Not Meet</td>
<td>Did Not Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter 5</th>
<th>Quarter 6</th>
<th>Quarter 7</th>
<th>Quarter 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board’s 6th Quarterly Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>Board’s 7th Quarterly Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>Board’s 8th Quarterly Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>Board’s 9th Quarterly Self-Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Quarter Total</td>
<td>Current Quarter Total</td>
<td>Growth From Last to Current Quarter</td>
<td>Last Quarter Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total at least 75?</td>
<td>Growth at least 5?</td>
<td>Growth at least 80?</td>
<td>Growth at least 15?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If either question is ‘yes’, did the Board meet its quarterly continuous improvement goal</td>
<td>Did Not Met</td>
<td>Did Not Meet</td>
<td>Did Not Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Goal or Guardrail's performance is **Met Standard** if:

- The Actual Ending Point $\geq$ Desired Ending Point
- OR
- At least two thirds of the Interim Goals'/Guardrails' Actual Ending Points $\geq$ their respective Desired Ending Points

Otherwise the Board must consider growth and performance and vote to determine whether or not a Goal or Guardrail's performance **Met Standard** or **Did Not Meet Standard**.

Overall School System/Superintendent performance is **Met Standard** if:

- At least two thirds of the Goals are **Met Standard**

AND

- At least half of the Guardrails are **Met Standard**

Otherwise the Board must consider growth and performance, and vote to determine whether or not overall school system/Superintendent performance **Met Standard** or **Did Not Meet Standard**.

---

**Goal 1: Percentage of students meeting passing standard on the state assessment in reading will increase from 60% in July 2017 to 68% by July 2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interim Goal 1.1:</th>
<th>Management Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Ending Point:</td>
<td>Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Goal 1.2:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Ending Point:</td>
<td>Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Goal 1.3:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Ending Point:</td>
<td>Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SY17/18 Evaluation**

Met Standard: ☐  Did Not Meet Standard: ☐
### Goal 2: Percentage of schools meeting passing standard on the state assessment in math will increase from 60% in July 2017 to 68% by July 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Ending Point</th>
<th>Desired SY17/18 Ending Point</th>
<th>Actual SY17/18 Ending Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interim Goal 2.1:</strong></td>
<td>Management Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Ending Point:</td>
<td>Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
<td>Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interim Goal 2.2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Ending Point:</td>
<td>Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
<td>Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interim Goal 2.3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Ending Point:</td>
<td>Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
<td>Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SY17/18 Evaluation**

Met Standard: ☐  Did Not Meet Standard: ☐

### Goal 3: Percentage of students who are more than a grade level behind and who show at least 1.5yrs academic growth during a single school year in reading will increase from 60% in July 2017 to 68% by July 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Ending Point</th>
<th>Desired SY17/18 Ending Point</th>
<th>Actual SY17/18 Ending Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interim Goal 3.1:</strong></td>
<td>Management Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Ending Point:</td>
<td>Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
<td>Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interim Goal 3.2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Ending Point:</td>
<td>Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
<td>Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interim Goal 3.3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Ending Point:</td>
<td>Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
<td>Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SY17/18 Evaluation**
Guardrail 1: Superintendent will not allow the most underperforming campuses to have principals or teachers who rank in the bottom two quartiles of principal or teacher school system-wide performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interim Guardrail 1.1:</th>
<th>Management Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Desired SY17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Point:</td>
<td>Actual SY17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interim Guardrail 1.2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interim Guardrail 1.3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SY17/18 Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Standard:</th>
<th>Did Not Meet Standard:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guardrail 2: Superintendent will not operate schools without a system that uses student growth to identify, retain, and inspire placement of highly effective educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interim Guardrail 2.1:</th>
<th>Management Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Desired SY17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Point:</td>
<td>Actual SY17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interim Guardrail 2.2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interim Guardrail 2.3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SY17/18 Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met Standard:</th>
<th>Did Not Meet Standard:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardrail 3: Superintendent will not propose major decisions without engaging impacted stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interim Guardrail 3.1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Ending Point:</td>
<td>Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interim Guardrail 3.2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Ending Point:</td>
<td>Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interim Guardrail 3.3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Ending Point:</td>
<td>Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SY17/18 Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Met Standard:</strong> ☐</td>
<td><strong>Did Not Meet Standard:</strong> ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CYBERSECURITY
Cybersecurity Attacks and What They Mean for the Member Districts of the Council of the Great City Schools

➢ The surge in cyber security attacks, which started a couple of years ago, has accelerated since early 2020. The attacks have caused both greater frequency and severity ransom payments made under cyber insurance policies.

➢ Beyond the cost of the extortion payments themselves (when paid), the attacks have triggered other losses and expenses including breaches of personal information, business interruption and extra expense, data recovery, regulatory investigations, fines and penalties, and the failure of products or services.

➢ In response, cyber insurers have increased their premiums, in many instances exceeding 100% or the premium doubling in cost. In many cases, insurers have imposed coverage limitations, including sublimits on certain key coverages and even outright exclusions, based on vulnerabilities to specific high-profile breaches.

➢ Insurers have also identified vulnerabilities commonly exploited in successful attacks. This has driven insurers to identify what Gallagher has identified as the minimum security controls and points of clarification that need to be in practice to prevent, detect and remediate malicious activities as the basis to offer bindable terms that include:

- Governance and Controls, including—
  - Multifactor Authentication (MFA) for remote access, privileged access, backup access, vendor access, cloud resources, and email access without exception.
  - Endpoint Detection and Response tool (EDR) and/or Next Generation Anti-Virus (NGAV) with the ability to isolate and contain host machines deployed on 100% of endpoints and servers.
  - Security Information and Event Management for log collection in conjunction with an in-house or outsourced SOC (Security Operations Center) via an MSSP.
  - Remote access via VPN with MFA implemented especially when utilizing RDP/VDI including network level authentication and honeypots.

1 The Council recommends member districts use this checklist to determine if they would meet the terms required for cybersecurity insurance.
o **End of Life/unsupported software** segregated from the network, isolated from internet access, and plans to decommission timely with extended support purchased where applicable.

o **Demonstrated capacity to apply critical security patches immediately**, particularly in response to high profile zero-day exploits (Microsoft Exchange, SolarWinds, Kaseya, Accellion, etc.).

o **Prudent backup and encryption policies for sensitive data and critical applications.**

- **Privileged Access security measures ideally through an integrated PAM tool (e.g. CyberArk or Beyond Trust).**
  
  o **Password management** through a vault or randomizer with limited access, complex alphanumeric strings, rotation requirements, and check in/out with MFA, etc.

  o **Limit local admin rights** by default and where available, compensating controls in place such as LAPS, separate daily driver accounts, and MFA etc.

  o **Domain/service account restrictions** across the environment and separate from day-to-day accounts. Service accounts in the DA group only when absolutely necessary.

- **Employee Training**
  
  o **Social Engineering/Phishing Simulations**, tracked campaigns and follow up training for repeat offenders

  o **Role based training** for executives, management, privileged users, and other High Value Targets

  o **Privacy/data handling**, and regulatory compliance training

  o **Security and threat awareness** training

- **Incident Response/Testing, and Regulatory**

  o **Documented Disaster Recovery/Incident Response plan** in place in the event of a cyber security incident that is tested and updated yearly with key stakeholders

  o **Proper consent and encryption** are in place if Biometric information is collected on employees and/or third parties

  o **Compliance with applicable state, federal, and international privacy laws** where applicable including but not limited to: GDPR, CCPA/CPRA, BIPA, VCDPA, ColoPA, etc.

  o **Password management** through a vault or randomizer with limited access, complex alphanumeric strings, rotation requirements, and check in/out with MFA, etc.

- **Exposure to High Profile Zero-Day Vulnerabilities & Breach Events**

  **Microsoft Exchange Server**

  — The district currently runs a version of Microsoft Exchange Server 2010 though to 2019 vulnerable to the 0-day exploits being targeted.

  — The district has run a version of Microsoft Exchange Server 2010 though to 2019 vulnerable to the 0-day exploits being targeted.

  — The district has taken measures to investigate for potential malicious activity in our system
The district can confirm there is no evidence of malicious activity as a result of this vulnerability on your system. The district has implemented PowerShell best practices as outlined by Microsoft.

SolarWinds
The district has not implemented SolarWinds Orion Product(s) in the last 365 days. If so, the district has installed the latest software release that patches the documented vulnerabilities. The district can confirm it has found no indicators of compromise. The district has remediated the indicators of compromise that were found.

Accellion
The district has used or is currently using the Accellion FTA product. The district was notified of data being exposed as a result of a breach. If so, the district installed the latest software release that patches the documented vulnerabilities (version FTA_9_12_432 or later). The district reviewed its environment for indicators of compromise and confirmed that none were found. If indicators of compromise were found, the district took steps to remediate the compromise.
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Introduction

Internal audit adds value by evaluating and improving the effectiveness of risk management, control, and governance processes.

An internal audit function offers school boards and senior management an independent and objective source of information that can help them identify some of the most significant financial, operational, compliance, and technology risks that may prevent the organization from achieving its goals. An internal audit function can provide a school district with risk mitigation oversight and value-added recommendations to support the achievement of strategic initiatives, such as student outcomes and racial equity advancement.

The objective of this white paper is to describe leading practices in internal auditing and demonstrate the value an internal audit function brings to a school district.

The Council of the Great City Schools and the task force of urban school internal audit experts that assembled this document suggest that it is time to deploy internal audit resources to more effectively address high-risk areas affecting urban school districts.

The Internal Audit Function

According to The Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA), internal audit is “an independent, objective assurance and consulting activity designed to help an organization accomplish its objectives by bringing a systematic, disciplined approach to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of risk management, control, and governance processes.”

The roles and objectives of an internal audit function vary across the nation’s large urban school districts. This variation largely occurs because districts have different needs. District internal audit functions are often mainly focused on accounting and compliance audit activities versus performing as a forward-looking partner focused on adding value and improving operations.

The internal audit function is often equated with or mistaken for an external audit function. While there are similarities between the two processes, the scope of an internal audit function goes well beyond the financial statements that are the focus of an external auditor. Internal auditors also primarily evaluate governance, risk management procedures and internal controls while making recommendations with a focus on continuous improvement. Internal auditors can also serve as on-staff consultants and can work on almost anything at management’s request, so long as independence is not compromised.

The purpose of this document is not to duplicate resources already available through the US Government Accountability Office (GAO) or The Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA), but rather to provide guidance on leading practices of internal auditing functions in school districts.

The task force describes leading practices for school district internal audit functions and the value of each in the following sections:
• Auditing Standards
• Internal Audit Reporting Structure
• Audit Committee Structure
• Risk Assessment and Audit Plan
• Data Analytics and Continuous Monitoring
• Fraud
• What Internal Auditors Do Not Do
• Non-audit Services
• Follow-up Activities
• Quality Assurance

Auditing Standards

The US Government Accountability Office (GAO) and The Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) are two reputable organizations recognized for issuing professional auditing standards that provide a framework for conducting audits.

Standards generally require that the auditor must:
• Perform the work in accordance with basic ethical principles
• Maintain independence in both fact and appearance
• Use professional judgment in the planning, conduct, and reporting of audit results
• Possess the professional competence needed to address the audit objectives
• Provide adequate quality control

Leading Practices

The Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS), issued by the GAO and commonly referred to as the “Yellow Book,” articulates requirements for financial audits, performance audits, and attestation engagements in government, including school districts, which receive federal funds.

The Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) has also issued standards in its International Professional Practices Framework (IPPF), commonly referred to as the “Red Book,” which are often implemented along with the performance audit requirements of GAGAS.

The Council does not promote one set of standards over another, but it does recommend each school district follow a professionally recognized set of auditing standards.

Value

By following a professionally recognized set of auditing standards, an internal audit function adds value to its district. Senior management and the school board will have a greater appreciation for an internal audit function knowing it is following prescribed auditing standards.
Internal Audit Reporting Structure

The Institute of Internal Auditor’s International Professional Practices Framework (IPPF) recommends that a Chief Audit Executive (CAE), that is, the internal audit function’s executive leader or Director of Internal Audit, report functionally to the organization’s board (preferably an Audit Committee) and administratively to the organization’s Chief Executive Officer or other appropriate executive.¹ These reporting lines are meant to ensure an auditor’s work is independent, impartial, and objective so decision-makers can trust the auditor’s findings and recommendations.

To functionally report to an organization’s board, the CAE should submit the Internal Audit Charter and Annual Risk Assessment and Audit Plans to the board for approval. The CAE should also communicate all internal audit function activity results to the board. The CAE should be appointed and/or removed by the board and the CAE’s salary should be determined by the board.

Administrative reporting, on the other hand, entails the relationship within the organization’s management structure that facilitates the day-to-day operations of the internal audit department. In accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS), internal auditors who work under the direction of an audit entity’s management are considered independent for the purposes of reporting internally if the head of the internal audit organization meets the following criteria:²

- Is accountable to the head or deputy head of the government entity or to those charged with governance
- Reports engagement results both to the head or deputy head of the government entity and to those charged with governance
- Is located organizationally outside the staff or line-management function of the unit under audit (i.e. a manager or employee is not auditing their own team’s work)
- Has access to those charged with governance, and
- Is sufficiently removed from political pressures to conduct audits and report findings, opinions, and conclusions objectively without fear of political reprisal.

Leading Practices

The Council of the Great City Schools recommends that the Chief Audit Executive and the internal audit function report functionally to the school board, ideally through an audit committee. If functional reporting to the school board is not possible, a less preferable, but acceptable, reporting structure entails having the Chief Audit Executive report to the Superintendent or Deputy Superintendent, with access to those charged with governance (school board). In either

¹ Examples of major urban school districts where the internal auditor reports functionally to the school board include Orange County (Orlando), Fresno, Charleston, Miami-Dade County, Seattle, and others. (The Council conducted a survey of its members to determine which ones have internal auditors and to whom they reported. See appendix)
² Government Auditing Standards, 2018 Revision with Technical Update from April 2021, Section 3.56
case, the Council recommends that school districts maintain an independent internal audit function.

Value
A reporting structure that preserves the internal audit function’s independence adds value to a school district by ensuring that the auditor’s’ work is impartial and objective, so decision-makers and other key stakeholders can trust internal audit findings and recommendations.

Audit Committee Structure

The primary role of an Audit Committee is to provide independent review and oversight of the government’s financial reporting processes, internal controls, and independent auditors. An audit committee also provides a forum separate from management in which auditors and other interested parties can candidly discuss concerns. Audit committee members should possess appropriate qualifications for their responsibilities. An Audit Committee can also act as a liaison between the school board and the Chief Audit Executive. Examples of roles and responsibilities of a school district Audit Committee include:

- Reviewing and approving an Internal Audit Charter
- Providing expertise on risks affecting the school district and approving an annual internal audit plan
- Ensuring that internal auditors have unrestricted access to school district personnel, facilitates, vendors, data, and documents
- Assisting in preventing management from restricting the scope of internal audits and investigations
- Receiving completed internal audit reports, investigations, and other communications deemed necessary by the Chief Audit Executive
- Monitoring follow up on reported internal audit findings to ensure corrective actions are taken
- Engaging and overseeing the work of external auditors
- Reviewing audit findings by state and federal agencies to determine the school district’s action on recommendations
- Reviewing the effectiveness of systems for monitoring compliance with laws and board policies and regulations
- Reviewing and making recommendations to the school board on matters affecting the adequacy of internal controls, accounting procedures, technology systems, and financial reporting in accordance with laws and regulations
- Approving all decisions regarding the appointment or removal of the Chief Audit Executive
- Providing input on the Chief Audit Executive’s evaluation
- Approving the annual salary and compensation adjustments of the Chief Audit Executive
- Serving on behalf of the school board to oversee the internal audit function
- In conjunction with the Chief Audit Executive, providing an annual report to the school board
- Performing other oversight responsibilities as assigned by the school board
Leading Practices

To promote the success of an internal audit function, an Audit Committee should ensure individual school board members, the superintendent, and other school district staff do not impair, prevent, or prohibit internal audit staff from initiating, carrying out, or completing independent and objective audits and investigations. To accomplish this, an Audit Committee should ensure that the internal audit function is free of political pressure and other impairments to independence.

To effectively perform its oversight of the internal audit function, the Council recommends that a school district’s Audit Committee be comprised of individuals who are independent of the school district and collectively have auditing finance, information technology, risk management, and governance experience. An Audit Committee comprised of experienced professionals who have no authority over the school district’s operations or decision-making processes can shield the internal audit staff from actual or perceived pressure that would compromise their objectivity and independence. This structure is also supported by The International Institute of Internal Auditors.

Value

An Audit Committee structured with appropriately qualified members will help ensure the internal auditors are free to conduct their work without fear of retaliation, retribution or political pressure so the internal audit function is effective, independent and objective and the audit results are fair and impartial and can be relied upon by the school board, schools district management, and the public.

Risk Assessment and Audit Plan

The IPPF requires an organization, such as a school district, “establish a risk-based plan to determine the priorities of the internal audit (function)...”

Depending on the size and structure of a school district and its internal audit function, the Council recommends a comprehensive risk assessment be performed at a minimum of every three years. Regardless of how often an internal audit office conducts it, the risk assessment and audit plan should be modified or updated as needed to reflect new or changing risks affecting the school district.

The risk assessment process should entail identifying district-wide risks that goals and or objectives will not be achieved. Once risks are identified, they should be consistently ranked on a scale ranging from low to high risk. The annual audit plan should focus the internal audit function’s resources on the areas deemed highest risk throughout this process. Leading Practices

The risk assessment should cover all district departments and processes. Risk assessments of this sort are known as enterprise-wide risk assessments. This list of auditable items is usually referred

---

3 Some large urban school districts have audit committee comprised solely of school board members and some also include external experts.

4 The auditing standards followed by the internal audit function may require more frequent risk assessments.
to as the audit universe. The audit plan should reference the risk assessment and audit universe and should detail the method by which the planned audit activities were decided upon. Risk ratings are typically based on the likelihood a risk event will occur and the impact the risk event would have. Other factors used to determine an auditable item’s risk level include: risks to the district’s reputation, time since last audit, results of compliance or monitoring activities performed by other internal departments or external parties perceived qualities of internal controls, information system changes, process complexity and requests and expectations of the governing board.

The audit plan should describe what audit and non-audit activities (described below) are to be performed, the scope of work, and the time and staffing resources required to complete the work. An audit plan should be flexible enough to accommodate minor mid-plan adjustments and, if a substantial adjustment is required (e.g., based on a senior management request), the changes should be approved by the school board and/or Audit Committee.

Common and emerging areas for audit and non-audit services that might be included in the plan include:

- Performance audits (to assess cost-beneficial internal controls, efficiency, effectiveness, contract oversight, and compliance)
- School internal fund and school-based audits (could include student FTE and tangible personal property work)
- Charter school audits and fiscal oversight (the IA function is uniquely qualified to add value in this significant and growing sector)
- Cycle audits (e.g., procure to pay, payroll)
- Third party audits
- Cybersecurity audits
- Facilities construction and maintenance audits and oversight
- Contract audits
- Information technology audits
- Forensic accounting and investigative audits
- Healthcare insurance-related audits (especially for large self-insured districts)
- Acting as a liaison for external audit entities (if all high risk areas are covered and sufficient resources are available)
- Identifying emerging risks (adding value by alerting the school board and management of audit findings and trends occurring at similar entities)
- Recurring work such as promoting awareness of fraud policies and internal controls and following up on open recommendations from previous audits

Value

An objective risk assessment by an internal audit function provides the school board and senior management value by communicating risks associated with the school district’s various business and operational functions. An audit plan based upon a comprehensive risk assessment ensures internal audit function resources will be strategically allocated to address the most significant
and likely risks affecting the school district. The results of completed audits will provide management with actionable recommendations to meet its goals and objectives and will provide the school board with valuable information to assist in its governance.

Data Analytics and Continuous Monitoring

Data analytics can be used by the internal audit function to extract and evaluate information from systems to identify trend information useful in decision making and for strategic planning purposes. Data analytics is also a large component of continuous monitoring. Continuous monitoring involves live evaluation of information by means of structured queries designed to identify transactions in need of audit function or management review, to identify samples of certain types of transactions that merit periodic testing, and other information as needed. Data analytics, coupled with continuous monitoring, assist in risk assessments that identify transactions that could present potential risks of fraud in financial and operational areas, including accounts payable, purchasing, payroll, and benefits. It is important that the school district has clear policies about fraud and its consequences, and that an internal audit function has an effective fraud risk assessment program to address the risks in these operating areas and to ensure public trust.

Leading Practices

The Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE), The Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA), and the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) advocate data monitoring and analysis to guide risk assessment and direct the annual audit planning process.

The use of data analytics also allows for continuous monitoring of district-wide transactions with the potential for identifying fraudulent transactions. When employees are aware that all transactions in the district’s data systems are monitored, it serves as an incentive for employees to follow procedures and as a deterrent of fraudulent or careless behavior. This is particularly important since business processes, which have become more reliant on IT systems and automation, have significantly reduced human oversight, which previously acted as a main operational control and fraud deterrent.

When using data analytics, it is critical that appropriate security protocols be put in place during the extraction and analysis of data to protect the integrity and confidentiality of source information.

Value

Performing data analysis is an effective way to help auditors be more proactive in the detection of transactions possibly in need of review and in the reduction of fraud, waste, abuse. Data analytics can also guide a school district’s risk assessment and audit planning processes to ensure the internal audit function resources are directed toward areas with the greatest materiality and risk for the district. With appropriate planning and consultation, school districts can employ
technology tools that help their audit staff provide greater audit coverage in a more efficient manner.

What Internal Auditors Do Not Do

As noted in the Department Reporting Structure section of this white paper, maintaining independence is imperative for an effective and credible internal audit function. In addition to having the proper reporting structure, internal audit functions must avoid even the appearance of a lack of independence by refraining from performing certain functions. Internal Auditors cannot be a part of the management of any function they audit, which means they should not:

▪ Take responsibility for the district’s financial statements
▪ Authorize or execute transactions on behalf of any department other than their own
▪ Approve district budgets
▪ Prepare or make changes to source documents
▪ Assume custody of district assets, including maintenance of bank accounts
▪ Establish or maintain internal controls, including the performance of ongoing monitoring activities as part of the control process
▪ Supervise employees other than their own in the performance of normal recurring activities
▪ Report to the school board on behalf of management
▪ Serve as a general counsel
▪ Sign payroll tax returns on behalf of their district
▪ Approve vendor invoices for payment, other than those for their own department
▪ Design a district’s financial management system or make modifications to source code underlying that system
▪ Hire or terminate employees, other than for their own department

This list is not all-inclusive. But, in short, internal auditors may not assume the role and duties of management or implement anything they will ultimately audit.

In addition, the school district should not expect the internal audit function to:

▪ Analyze or reconcile accounts
▪ “Close the books”
▪ Locate invoices, etc., for testing
▪ Prepare confirmations for mailing
▪ Select accounting policies or procedures
▪ Prepare financial statements or footnote disclosures
▪ Determine estimates included in financial statements

5 Adapted for school districts from materials prepared by Gelman, Rosenberg & Freedman Certified Public Accountants.
http://www.grfcpa.com/resources/publications/auditor-responsibilities
- Determine restrictions of assets
- Establish value of assets and liabilities
- Maintain permanent records, such as loan documents, leases, contracts and other legal documents
- Prepare or maintain minutes of school board meetings
- Establish account coding or classifications
- Determine retirement plan contributions
- Implement corrective action plans

Non-Audit Services

Non-audit services are advisory in nature and are generally performed at the specific request of a client, which could include the school board, the audit committee, senior management, or the management of a particular unit or function within the district. The Chief Audit Executive should consider accepting proposed non-audit service requests based on the service’s potential to improve management of risks, add value, and improve the district’s operations. The Institute of Internal Auditors International Professional Practices Framework and Government Accountability Office’s Government Auditing Standards recommend an internal audit function maintain its independence and objectivity and not assume management responsibilities when it provides non-audit advisory services. Both groups also recommend that advisory services be performed free of political pressure or perceived conflict of interest.

Leading Practices

The nature and extent of non-audit services to be performed by the internal audit function should be included in the Internal Audit Charter and non-audit engagements accepted should be included in the annual audit plan. The school board acts to safeguard and protect the objectivity and independence of the internal audit function, in conjunction with the Chief Audit Executive, to ensure requests are suited to and appropriate for the internal audit function and that non-audit services do not take away from completion of the risk based annual audit plan. Examples of advisory services that can be provided by the internal audit function include counsel, advice, facilitation, and training.

For instance, internal auditors can analyze risks and evaluate internal controls, thereby assisting management in better-informed decision making. These types of services can facilitate benchmarking and the identification of leading practices that could enhance operational performance. Internal auditors can also support the school district in promoting ethical behavior and employee awareness of and commitment to effective internal controls and fraud prevention.

Value

In performing non-audit services, an internal audit function can provide just-in-time advice to school district management in cost effective ways, and improve the district’s governance, risk
management, and control processes. Non-audit services can also enhance relations with other district departments and provide internal auditors with greater exposure and enriched career opportunities.

**Follow-up Activities**

Government Auditing Standards and The Institute of Internal Auditors International Professional Practices Framework set standards for monitoring audit issues and findings and determining whether management takes appropriate corrective action to address them or accepts the risk of not acting. Specifically, auditors:

- Should evaluate whether the audited entity has taken appropriate corrective action to address findings and recommendations from previous engagements. (*Yellow Book 6.36 Previous Audits and Attestation Engagements*)
- Must establish and maintain a system to monitor the disposition of results communicated to management. (*Red Book 2500-Monitoring Progress*)
- Must establish a follow-up process to monitor and ensure management actions have been effectively implemented or senior management has accepted the risk of not acting. (*Red Book 2500.A1*)

**Leading Practices**

Chief Audit Executives should collaborate with senior management to determine the timing and nature of corrective actions that will address issues and items identified in audit findings. Regardless of the methods used to monitor and assess the status of these corrective actions, leading internal audit functions use dashboards to indicate the nature of audit findings (e.g., by level or risk or criticality) and prepare reports highlighting management’s progress towards resolving past audit findings and recommendations.

**Value**

Internal Audit’s follow-up activities provide assurance to senior management, the school board, and other stakeholders that audit findings are taken seriously, and corrective actions are implemented in a timely manner. Follow-up activities also provide a measure of accountability to the community that any noted weaknesses are being addressed and the district is committed to operating and using public funds in an efficient and effective manner.

**Quality Assurance**

Internal auditing is a value-added proposition that provides assurances, advisory services, efficiency audits, and strategic consultations to school boards and management. Increasingly, internal auditing is expected to take on more strategic, collaborative, and advisory roles without
impairing objectivity and independence. The value-added proposition can be measured from a quantitative and qualitative perspective.

**Leading Practices**

Leading internal audit departments are designing balanced scorecards using key performance indicators (KPIs) to set goals, measure performance, and provide information to stakeholders. School boards and senior managers are creating environments where expectations among various stakeholders are clearly defined and communicated. Common KPIs are also included in the Council’s Performance Measurement and Benchmarking Project, which analyzes internal audit performance and provides a quality check on work being done across districts.

Some examples of KPIs include:

- Customer (Board, Management, Auditees) Satisfaction Survey Results
- Peer Review Results
- Number of Audits Planned vs Number of Audits Executed
- Number and Quality of Reports Over Time
- Number of Recommendations and Completed Management Action Plans
- Budgeted Hours vs Actual Hours
- Cycle Time from Fieldwork to Report
- Completion of Mandated Coverage
- Timely Disclosure of Audit Issues
- Percentage of Audit Plan Complete
- Risk Coverage
- Training Hours
- # of Management Requests for Additional Work

**Value**

Adoption of KPIs helps to demonstrate the effectiveness and value of the internal audit function to stakeholders such as the school board, management and the public.

---

6 Shooting straight, How internal auditors can be strategic and collaborative — while maintaining independence and objectivity, Journal of Accountancy, Ken Tysiak, December 2013 - See more at: http://www.journalofaccountancy.com/issues/2013/dec/20138669.html#sthash.DYdBm39r.dpuf
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7 Based on self-reported data from 39 school districts as of May 5, 2017
Dr. Sito Narcisse, Superintendent of the East Baton Rouge Parish School System (EBR), requested that the Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS) provide a high-level management review of the district’s Human Resources Department. Specifically, he asked that the Council1 --

- Identify opportunities to streamline processes, implement industry best practices, improve existing procedures and internal controls within the department, and strengthen internal and external communications to enhance customer service, and

- Develop recommendations to help the Human Resources Department (HR) achieve greater managerial effectiveness and efficiencies, and increase its strategic value to the district.

In response to this request, the Council assembled a Strategic Support Team (the team) of senior managers with extensive experience in human resources and operations from other major urban city school systems across the country. The team was composed of the following individuals. (Attachment A provides brief biographical sketches of the team members.)

Robert Carlson, Project Director  
Director, Management Services  
Council of the Great City Schools (Washington, D.C.)

David Palmer, Principal Investigator  
Deputy Director (Retired)  
Los Angeles Unified School District (California)

Aimee Green-Webb  
Chief of Human Resources  
Jefferson County Public Schools (Kentucky)

1 The Council has conducted over 320 organizational, instructional, management, and operational reviews in over 65 big city school districts over the last 20 years. The reports generated by these reviews are often critical, but they also have been the foundation for improving the operations, organization, instruction, and management of many urban school systems nationally. In other cases, the reports are complimentary and form the basis for identifying “best practices” for other urban school systems to replicate. (Attachment G lists the reviews that the Council has conducted.)
The team reviewed documents provided by the district prior to a four-day site visit to Baton Rouge, Louisiana, on November 9-12, 2021. The general schedule for the site visit is described below, and the complete working agenda for the site visit is presented in Attachment B.

The team met Superintendent Narcisse, Chief of Staff Caren Smith, and Chief Operations Officer Frank Chester during the evening of the first day of the site visit to discuss expectations and objectives for the review and make final adjustments to the work schedule. The team used the second and third days of the site visit to observe operations, conduct interviews with key staff members (a list of individuals interviewed is included in Attachment C), and examine additional documents and data (a complete list of documents reviewed is included in Attachment D). The final day of the visit was devoted to synthesizing and refining the team’s findings and recommendations.

The Council sent the draft of this document to the team members for their review to affirm the report’s accuracy and obtain their concurrence with the final recommendations. This management letter contains the findings and recommendations that the team has designed to help improve operational efficiencies and effectiveness, and increase the strategic value of the East Baton Rouge Parish School System Human Resources Department.

**Prior Human Resources Department Studies**

The team reviewed two (2) previous external studies that examined the Human Resources Department. Specifically, a March 2021 “Transition Report” that contained ten (10) specific HR

---

2 One team member participated remotely via video conference.

3 The Council’s reports are based on interviews with District staff and others, a review of documents, observations of operations, and professional judgment. The team conducting the interviews must rely on the willingness of those interviewed to be truthful and forthcoming but cannot always judge the accuracy of statements made by interviewees.
Department recommendations and a May 2019 “Comprehensive Review” that included three (3) specific recommendations for the HR department.

Attachment E lists the recommendations and a department’s status report on implementing the thirteen recommendations. In brief, the department reported six (6) recommendations had been fully implemented, six (6) recommendations were “in progress” of being fully implemented, and one (1) recommendation not implemented.

In reviewing the fully implemented recommendations, the team found areas that still need to be addressed since conditions identified in these two studies still exist in some form today.

The recommendations provided in this review and in the two previous studies noted above can be used as a roadmap to implement change that would enhance the value of the Human Resources Department in assisting the East Baton Rouge Parish School System in meeting its mission and strategic goals.

**East Baton Rouge Parish School System**

The East Baton Rouge Parish School System is the second largest school district in Louisiana. The district operates 74 schools covering a geographic area of over 400 square miles. The district serves a diverse Pre-K–12 student population of nearly 41,400 students, supported by 5,900 full time employees, of which approximately 2,900 are classroom teachers. In addition, the district employs approximately 400 part-time employees. Exhibit 1 below displays eight (8) years of enrollment history and projected enrollment through FY2027, and Exhibit 2 below displays EBR staffing history back to 2015.

---

4 Source: EBR, HR department.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
7 Source: EBR, HR department.
8 Source: 2019-2020 Comprehensive Annual Fiscal Report, p. 134 and p. 136. The team requested data for FY21 and FY22, but this data was not provided.
Exhibit 1. East Baton Rouge Schools Enrollment History and Projections

Source: CGCS, Using Data Provided by EBR.

Exhibit 2. East Baton Rouge Schools FTE Staffing History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Equivalents (FTE) Employees</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CERTIFICATED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Instructors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>2,978</td>
<td>3,034</td>
<td>3,001.9</td>
<td>3,012.4</td>
<td>3,054.7</td>
<td>2,893.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist/Specialist/Counselor - Instructional Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical Leave - Instructional Programs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Certified - Instructional Programs</td>
<td>2,994.0</td>
<td>3,058.0</td>
<td>3,033.3</td>
<td>3,013.3</td>
<td>3,065.6</td>
<td>2,915.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Certified - Instructional Support</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>576.3</td>
<td>548.5</td>
<td>600.2</td>
<td>589.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Certified - Support Services</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>182.7</td>
<td>174.1</td>
<td>199.2</td>
<td>185.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Certified</td>
<td>3,781</td>
<td>3,828</td>
<td>3,792.3</td>
<td>3,753.9</td>
<td>3,865.0</td>
<td>3,690.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-CERTIFICATED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Certified - Instructional Programs</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>724.3</td>
<td>691.3</td>
<td>733.4</td>
<td>776.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Certified - Instructional Support</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>138.4</td>
<td>118.3</td>
<td>117.5</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Certified - Support Services</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>1,466.2</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>1,519.5</td>
<td>1,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Certified</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>2,328.9</td>
<td>2,298.6</td>
<td>2,370.4</td>
<td>2,372.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Regular Employees (Certificated and Non-Certificated)</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>6,080</td>
<td>6,121.2</td>
<td>6,052.5</td>
<td>6,235.4</td>
<td>6,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENROLLMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40,250</td>
<td>40,504</td>
<td>40,949</td>
<td>40,696</td>
<td>41,041</td>
<td>41,637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FTE vs. ENROLLMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE Increase/(-Decrease) From Previous Year</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16</th>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY20 Increase/(-Decrease) From Previous Year</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>-0.62%</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The East Baton Rouge Parish School Board governs the district and is responsible for policymaking and oversight that is consistent with the laws of the State of Louisiana. The Board is comprised of nine (9) members, each elected for four-year concurrent terms. The Board appoints the Superintendent of Schools, who is responsible for the efficient and effective management and operation of the school system and its resources.

The EBR Mission reads: The East Baton Rouge Parish School System, in partnership with our community, educates all students to their maximum potential in a caring, rigorous and safe environment, and the EBR Vision reads: All East Baton Rouge Parish School System students will graduate with the knowledge, skills and values necessary to become active and successful members of a dynamic learning community.

The EBR proposed total general fund expenditure budget for FY22 was $489.44 million. East Baton Rouge Parish Schools’ revenue is funded through a combination of local sources (58 percent of total revenue), state sources (39 percent of total revenue), and federal resources (3 percent of total revenue).

Exhibit 3 below displays the current organizational structure of the Office of the Superintendent and the ten direct reports.

**Exhibit 3. Office of the Superintendent Organizational Chart**

![Organization Chart](https://example.com/organization_chart.png)

Source: CGCS, Using Data Provided by the East Baton Rouge Parish Schools

---

9 Source: [https://ebrschools.org/CAPS/EastBatonRougeCAPS.htm](https://ebrschools.org/CAPS/EastBatonRougeCAPS.htm).
10 Source: [https://ebrschools.org/about/](https://ebrschools.org/about/).
Human Resources Department

The Chief Human Resources Officer (CHRO) leads the Human Resources department and has primary authority and accountability for all district human resources functions. The CHRO is responsible for directing and coordinating recruitment, selection, placement, development, transfer, evaluation, and dismissal procedures according to board-approved policies and federal, state, and judicial mandates. In addition, the CHRO also manages all aspects of employee relations and advises the Board, Superintendent, and staff on personnel policies, organizational development, and training policies.\(^{13}\)

The Human Resources Department Mission reads: The mission of the East Baton Rouge Parish School System Office of Human Resources is to recruit, develop, retain, and support all personnel for the purpose of fulfilling the District’s central mission: academic success for all students, and the department’s Vision reads: East Baton Rouge Parish School System personnel will maintain a service-oriented culture of excellence where success for students and all relationships reflect our District’s core values: Vision, Respect, Professionalism, Character, Relationships, Service, Teamwork, Responsibility, Attention to Detail and Customer Focus.

Under the current organizational framework, the CHRO reports to the Chief Operations Officer. Organizationally, the Director for Human Resources is the only direct line position reporting to CHRO.\(^{14}\) A one-to-one reporting relationship is generally recognized as a poor use of resources, funds, and bloated staffing layers. However, since the department is under new leadership, it is suggested that the Director for Human Resources position remain in place for at least one year to assist the new CHRO through a transitional period. Exhibit 4 below presents an overview of the department’s current organizational structure.

---

\(^{13}\) Source: EBR Chief Human Resources Officer Job Description, dated August 19, 2010.

\(^{14}\) The HR organizational chart provided to the team indicated a direct report from the Chief Officer for Human Resources to an Executive Director for Human Resources position. None of the documents provided to the team indicated an official title of Executive Director for Human Resources existed. However, the team did locate a job description for Director for Human Resources.
The Human Resources Department’s core functions include the timely recruitment, selection, onboarding, and retaining highly qualified teachers, administrators, and support staff. The department is also responsible for position classification, maintaining personnel records, and substitute management; processing leaves and internal transfers; and timely and responsive customer service. Lastly, the office is responsible for exit transition services, including employee separation, resignation, and exit surveys.

The Chief Human Resources Officer is also responsible for HR staffing and budget. The office is staffed with 21 general-funded positions. The FY21-22 department office budget is

---

15 The function of placing substitute is currently contracted out.
16 Source: https://ebrschools.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/2021-2022-PROPOSED-GFB-APPROVED.pdf, p. 100. The team was told that some “additional” positions were non-general funded. The tram requested a full roster, but none was provided.
$2,075,828,\textsuperscript{17} which was 0.42 percent of the district’s total general fund expenditure budget. Exhibit 5 below displays the Human Resources Department budget history.

**Exhibit 5. Human Resources Department General Fund Budget Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>1,149,535</td>
<td>1,101,067</td>
<td>1,075,934</td>
<td>1,005,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Empl</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>565,727</td>
<td>536,821</td>
<td>562,963</td>
<td>516,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Empl</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPS</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Empl</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Associate Teacher J-1 Visa</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Empl</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Services</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>127,793</td>
<td>88,524</td>
<td>92,993</td>
<td>162,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Empl</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs/Maintenance Contract Services</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Empl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>8,690</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Empl</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expense Reimbursement</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>93,284</td>
<td>93,030</td>
<td>77,542</td>
<td>20,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Empl</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Supplies/Printing &amp; Technology</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>65,500</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>55,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Empl</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies - Technology Related</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>12,350</td>
<td>13,350</td>
<td>24,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Empl</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Empl</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenditures - Drug Screening/OFAT</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,170</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Empl</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Services - Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Empl</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>2,074,254</td>
<td>1,943,517</td>
<td>1,947,896</td>
<td>1,828,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Empl</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CGCS, using data from the EBR Approved Annual Budgets

**Findings**

The Council’s Strategic Support Team findings are organized into four general areas: Commendations, Leadership and Management, Organization, and Operations. These findings are followed by a set of related recommendations for the district.\textsuperscript{18}

**Commendations**

- The request for this review is evidence that the district’s senior leadership recognizes that talent acquisition, development, and the retention of human capital are critical factors in the role the Human Resources Department has in the district’s ability to meet its strategic goals.

- Based on the most current average teacher salary reports on the Louisiana Department of

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{18} Review teams often identify areas of concern that may go beyond the intended scope of the project. As a service to our member districts, any concern that rises to a high-level is included in the report.
Education web page.\textsuperscript{19} EBR ranked highest in the average teacher salary category of the three districts in the state with the largest enrollment.

- The team acknowledges and appreciates department leadership who provided clarifying information and data when requested.
- Several HR staff members interviewed demonstrated resilience and a commitment to continuous improvement. This can be a solid foundation to build upon.

**Leadership and Management**

- Turnover and instability at the most senior levels within the district have negatively affected the Human Resources Department’s ability to set a cohesive direction, contributing to many of the conditions described in these findings.
- The Human Resources Department lacks a strategic direction with goals, objectives, and priorities that key performance indicators (KPI) can measure. In addition, the department lacks basic management tools to take corrective action to move the department forward. For example --
  - Department-identified initiatives, business-case justifications with benchmarks, performance measures and accountabilities, or the use of industry analytics and metrics for department initiatives are not standard practice.
  - Actionable plans with roadmaps on how to implement, measure, and report on the performance of priorities are generally missing.
  - The department lacks formal internal training programs to develop the leadership, management, or technical competencies of its employees.
  - There appears to be some robust conversations about strategy, but there are no set objectives, no evidence of planning, or commitment to an actual action plan.
- The Team found few department priorities or strategic pathways that specifically embrace and articulate clear objectives and direction to support the Board and Superintendent’s Strategic Plan, commitments, and objectives.\textsuperscript{20} The team --

\textsuperscript{19} Source: https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/workforce-attributes.

\textsuperscript{20} See: https://scorecard.ebrschools.org/.
• Questioned if the right people with the right skill sets were in the right positions in this mission-critical function.

• Did not hear any reference to a vision of what a 21st-century K-12 school district HR department should look like or the steps needed to implement the vision; and

• Noticed a significant lack of customer service focus, both outwardly and inwardly.

• The team was told there was little adherence to a comprehensive staffing formula for schools or offices. It was unclear what guidelines were consistently and equitably used for staffing assignments. To illustrate --

• The team was told of inconsistencies and inequities of staffing from site to site;

• There was a belief that some schools and offices were overstaffed, but it was unclear whether there had been any thought or action taken to correct the problem;

• HR staff could not articulate if they were appropriately staffed, and no study had taken place to identify how the EBR HR department compares with other districts of comparable size and demographics;

• The department lacks the internal support needed to assist and handle issues related to certification. For example --

  ▪ A part-time person works two days a week resolving certification issues;

  ▪ Action is only taken when the part-time person is available; and

  ▪ As a result, there are delays in the teacher certification process that impact both incoming and current teachers.

• It was unclear who owned performance management at the enterprise level and if there was a defined rationale for why and how performance evaluation was used in the district.

• There were no clear communication channels up-and-down and side-to-side within and between offices and departments, which has led to silos and information islands. The team was told that --

• There were no formal scheduled meetings between the personnel managers and the executive directors. As a result, there was little connection between the HR support teams and the executive directors who supervise school site principals;
There were no regularly scheduled meetings and a lack of collaboration between HR and the budget office to ensure adherence to staffing norms and position control;

HR department “subject matter experts or users” were not always at the table or consulted when the RFP\(^{21}\) was developed for the new ERP;\(^{22}\)

There was a lack of communication with school sites related to teacher transfers (in and out), teacher discipline, and other staffing issues;

Take-aways from staff meetings do not include documented minutes of discussions, decisions, or follow-up activities;

There appeared to be a lack of partnerships between HR and other essential district partners, including IT and communications and public relations, which has negatively impacted service delivery to customers;

The team heard an alarming number of inconsistencies and contradictory interpretations of current practices, which indicate a significant lack of effective communication and knowledge sharing within and between departments and units.

For example --

- The team was told that EBR does not offer financial incentives for hard-to-fill teacher positions (exceptional student services, math, science). However, the team was provided documentation verifying the positions mentioned above, as well as other stipend opportunities were paid to teaching staff.\(^{23}\)

- The team heard differing opinions as to EBR HR involvement with charters. Some interviewed shared that HR is not involved whatsoever with charters, while another interviewee stated that EBR HR provides professional development, verifies teaching authorizations for teaching staff and substitutes, and certificate updates.

- The team heard differing opinions about whether professional development was

\(^{21}\) A request for proposal (RFP) is a document that an organization, often a government agency or large enterprise, posts to elicit a response -- a formal bid -- from potential vendors.

\(^{22}\) Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) manages and integrates distinct software modules such as finance, budget, procurement, HR, and materials management. When information is updated in one module, data is sent to a central database, which shares the appropriate information with other modules.

\(^{23}\) The team was told that only relocation costs were covered in certain cases.
centrally coordinated districtwide or bifurcated throughout the district.

- Depending on which department was interviewed, the team heard that finance determines compensation, while others shared that HR determines compensation, and finance pays what HR determines.

- The team heard differing opinions regarding the frequency and quality of staff meetings.

- It was unclear who “owned” the new ERP project or position control (the new ERP project and position control are further elaborated on in this document).

- The team heard different opinions regarding dashboard utilization in the department to measure staffing levels, performance, goal tracking, and decision making.\(^\text{24}\)

- Many staff interviewed shared they were unaware of the *Unlock Your Potential* paraprofessional training pipeline program.

- The team was provided an employee handbook to review, but several staff shared that they were not aware it even existed.

- It was unclear whether employee performance evaluations were linked to the responsibilities described in the job descriptions.\(^\text{25}\)

- The team identified multiple areas of concern as the district migrates to a new (and desperately needed) enterprise resource planning (ERP) software program. These concerns include --

  - An unrealistic assumption is that a seamless deployment of a new ERP that would maintain business continuity and improve HR and related business operations could be achieved in nine months. Ultimately, this transition could be the bellwether for this administration.

  - There was little evidence of an enterprise-wide program management function, strategy, or governance structure to coordinate strategic priorities or resolve conflicts.

\(^{24}\) *Some* dashboard data was shared with the team. The team requested a full set of the dashboard data, but no additional data was provided.

\(^{25}\) Board policy, GBI, Evaluation, reads: Performance evaluations shall be based on an employee’s job classification and the School Board’s adopted standards for the work performed.
There appears to be an absence of appropriately trained, certified staff that have the experience and understanding to use a standardized set of processes, tools, and techniques to ensure the start-up, maintenance, and enhancements to the new Enterprise Resource Planning system will be completed on time, and on budget.

It was unclear who the business owner and executive sponsor would be for successfully implementing the new ERP. It appeared that the Chief Information Officer (CIO), by default, may be the “de facto” executive sponsor and solely held accountable for implementation. The ERP will cross multiple divisions with many business owners.

There are no apparent controls in place to ensure the district’s leadership team has complete, accurate, and timely information to make appropriate management decisions for strategic planning.

It was unclear whether the new ERP would replace both the current HR and finance software systems.

- Currently, multiple software systems do not “talk” to each other, resulting in workarounds and programming attempts to bridge these shortcomings. This condition has resulted in:
  - Payroll software not seamlessly interfacing with HR software;
  - Principals’ master scheduling software is not effectively linked to HR software that maintains the list of teachers for each campus. Teacher names provided from HR software often do not match current/actual employees on campuses; and
  - The high volume of manual data entries raises concerns about the accuracy, integrity, and accountability of the data.

- It was unclear whether penetration tests have been run on all EBR systems to ensure the security of the employee and student information systems.

- The current EBR financial software system relies on an outdated and unsafe web-based application to access this data.

[26] The team was told that the programmer who codes these bridges would soon be leaving the district.
• There are multiple standalone HR-related systems currently used in the department that are not interconnected.

• There is a nominal use of technology to streamline HR processes, partly because the staff did not know or were not trained on the full functionalities of existing software to maximize efficiencies.

• Even with the significant turnover of HR staff, especially in leadership positions, the team found very little evidence of proactive succession planning, capacity building, or cross-training in critical functions to ensure continuity in the event of an absence, leave, retirement, promotion, or resignation of critical department staff.

• The team was told that the district historically “transfers” problem employees instead of correcting, retraining, holding them accountable, or disciplining these employees.

• There appeared to be little consistency between job descriptions, levels of responsibilities, and wages.

• The team recognizes and appreciates the East Baton Rouge Parish School Board’s fiduciary responsibility and hiring authority. Current Board policy requires Board approval prior to making changes to job descriptions.27 Board policy also requires the Superintendent to maintain a comprehensive and up-to-date set of job descriptions of all positions in the school district. Since the Board meets only once a month, there are limited opportunities to seek Board review and approval. As a result --

  o More than 5,000 job descriptions were currently bound in binders, most of which were not reviewed or updated since they were issued.

  o Most job descriptions did not reflect currently assigned responsibilities and duties, which can increase risk and liability to the district.

  o Not all job titles on job descriptions were aligned with current job titles found on the organizational charts provided to the team.

• HR department staff appear to lack the knowledge to fully leverage ESSER28 funds, Title 2 funds for professional development, or Title 4 funds for recruitment of hard-to-fill

27 Source: https://ebrschools.org/CAPS/EastBatonRougeCAPS.htm , Section G, File GBB.
The team found little evidence of a coordinated districtwide professional development plan. Consequently, multiple departments develop and deliver their own training.

The team identified or was told of concerns regarding recruitment planning for new employee candidates. To illustrate --

- The team requested a copy of the current EBR teacher recruitment plan and timeline, but none was provided.

- The team could not locate salaries for open positions or salary schedules on the Human Resources Department’s webpage. In addition, not all open positions reviewed by the team had job descriptions attached. As a result --
  - Prospective applicants are effectively applying for positions without knowing the salary ranges and often not knowing the typical duties and responsibilities of a position the applicant may be interested in.

- There is a lack of enhanced candidate pools for designated positions, e.g., food service.

- The team was told that the recruitment budget was reduced even though the recruitment effort had been expanded.

- The department provided minimal evidence of viable partnerships with selected non-local universities in the development of teacher pipelines.

- Recruitment staff were unable to articulate the value proposition of joining the EBR team, and the online employment application process similarly did not communicate the value proposition for applying to EBR.

- There is no system in place to identify, track, and timely recruit highly effective student teachers and substitute teachers for regular teaching assignments.

- Recruitment of non-teaching personnel, including principals, central office professional staff, and support staff, is hampered by the lack of a “grow your own pipelines program.”
Organization

- The hierarchal placement of the Human Resources Department within the organization is undervalued and misaligned with current best practices. For example, -
  - The department’s organizational placement fails to recognize that the HR function performs an enterprise-wide strategic role that should report to the Office of the Superintendent.
  - Relegating the department to a second-tier position in the organizational structure marginalizes the department’s ability to advance organizational development and effectiveness.

- The current HR department’s organizational structure and functionalities do not support the strategic alignment and service delivery throughout the employee life cycle. Specifically, the HR department was not organized around the critical functions of --
  - Onboarding, including recruitment, vetting, selection, and placement;
  - Employee Services, including performance assessment, employment verification, leaves, employee retention, position classification, highly competitive compensation, and employee misconduct and discipline; and
  - Exit Transition, including retirement, resignation, non-renewal, exit interviews, and exit trending.

- The absence of classification and (possibly) compensation (class and comp) role(s) on the HR organizational chart reflect a lack of importance the department places on this strategic function.

- The HR organizational chart does not include all positions currently assigned to the department.

- Retirement, a critical HR function of the employee lifecycle, resides in payroll, not HR.

- The team saw no evidence that the HR organizational structure and workflows were examined and if staff or positions could be repurposed to achieve operational efficiencies and effectiveness.
Operations

• There was a lack of clarity about who owns the district’s position control process, and
  the team questions whether the district may even have a functional, working position
  control system. As a result --

  o The team could not identify a position control system in place that integrated the
    Human Resources Department for HR information, the Budget Department for
    budget development, the Payroll Department for payroll-related data, and the
    Finance Department for salary and benefit projections.

  o Positions can be added before budget approval has occurred, which disregards the
    intent of position control and is clearly not a best practice.

  o Worksite staffing rosters provided by HR were often inaccurate.

• The panel of principals interviewed rated (1-10, with 10 being high) HR’s “overall” level
  of service an average of 5.6. Although some comments were favorable, many comments
  were not. The panel shared that their ratings were based on --

  o HR customer service levels, which appears to be dependent on the requester’s position
    and seniority. For example --

    ▪ Veteran principals appeared to enjoy more information access than junior
      principals, teachers, and other staff;

    ▪ Seniority was a factor in the ability to secure information and resolve HR-related
      problems;

  o Principals shared they were responsible for “good” customer service to parents and
    students, and they deserve to have “good” customer service provided to them by the
    HR department, which often was not the case. Principals also shared --

    ▪ “There are people (in HR) who are rude and not willing to assist those who need
      help”;

    ▪ Onboarding is slow, and principals have to keep asking about the status of new
      hires since they do not have access to candidates status in the onboarding process;

    ▪ “I have had some bad experiences (during my years of employment with the
      district), but I do know how to maneuver through,” said one principal on the panel;
▪ Paperwork to and from the HR department often gets “lost;”

▪ School site employees experience frustration due to underpayment (including principals), experience not calculated correctly, or benefits not started in a timely manner;

▪ There is a lack of effective and timely communication and information from the department;

▪ HR telephones are not promptly answered, and callbacks are not timely; and

▪ There is no written guide or handbook from HR to help principals handle various (HR-related) issues.

• Customer support programs are generally geared for certified staff, providing minimal support for classified employees.

• The team identified or heard concerns regarding the HR department’s use or non-use of technology. To illustrate --

  o In addition to principals, other district staff interviewed reported the onboarding process was “convoluted and disjointed.” This was due, in part, because many of the technical aspects of onboarding are fraught with unnecessary and slow manual processes, which increases delays;

  o The team found the department’s work overly transactional, labor-intensive, often redundant, and not focused on efficiency;

  o For payroll purposes, the exporting of exception reports for time and attendance purposes is a manual process, which increases the chances of unnecessary errors and miscalculations;

  o Many current processes are manually and paper-dependent, creating opportunities for human error. For example --

    ▪ The department’s files, including personnel files, mainly are still paper and not digitized;

    ▪ Data is taken out of one software system and hand-entered into another software system; and
The team was told that IT owns and controls who access the HR databases. However, HR staff shared that they do not have the required access levels needed to do their job correctly, negatively impacting customer service.

- The department lacks a “call center” as a single point of contact in HR to track call volume, resolution turn time, identify trends to make course corrections, and design future training to address trends.

- It was unclear to the team who is responsible for employee investigations or allegations of employee misconduct.

- The department lacks written processes and procedures, documented workflows, standard operating procedures (SOPs), and timely access to data necessary to create “an effective and efficient operation with quality control standards.” As a result –
  - Operating procedures, systems, and processes are unnecessarily complicated, redundant, slow, and cumbersome.

- The Team heard that the contracted service that manages and places substitute teachers is ineffective, not cost-effective, and likely not worthwhile.

**Recommendations**

The CGCS Strategic Support Team developed the following recommendations\(^\text{29}\) to improve the East Baton Rouge Human Resources Department’s strategic value to the district.

1. Realign the HR department as a direct report to the Office of the Superintendent to reflect the department’s role and value as an enterprise-wide strategic partner in the management and leadership of the school district.

2. Obligate the Human Resources department leadership to set a clear focus on *customer service* and accept responsibility for identifying, developing, owning, and articulating priorities that support the EBR Mission, Strategic Plan, commitments, and objectives. These priorities should include --
   
a. Shifting emphasis away from transactional activities to a vision of proactivity and becoming a strategic organizational resource;

\(^29\) Recommendations are not listed in any specific order or priority.
b. Convening, with a sense of urgency, ongoing meetings to analyze the findings and recommendations identified in the previous reviews and in this management letter. This work should incorporate and merge relevant recommendations from the three reviews into one document that would use the “combined” recommendations as a “road map” to develop, prioritize, and assign “project owners” to move the recommendations forward;

c. Developing and setting appropriate benchmarks, goals, service level plans and standards, employee productivity expectations and measures, and ensuring empowerment and accountability across the office;

d. Developing a realistic five-year HR department strategic plan laser-focused on customer needs. The plan, developed and refreshed annually by the HR staff and other stakeholders, should include short, intermediate, and long-term process improvement opportunities, quantifiable goals, performance measures, accountabilities, targets, metrics, and timelines;

e. Developing comprehensive HR department-wide policies and procedure guides (SOPs) and flowcharts to ensure that HR employees know what to do and how to do it;

f. Transitioning to a data-driven organization that relies upon fact-based and analysis-centric justifications for decisions, including the use of benchmarks and techniques such as --

i. Basic HR metrics and dashboard management information (e.g., turnover rates, absentee rates, substitute fill rates, vacancy rates, time to fill vacancies, recruitment rates, and retention rates).\(^{30}\)

ii. Cost-benefit analyses, risk assessments, and business-case justifications to continually move the office forward, including the consideration of --

\begin{itemize}
  \item Alternatives to current delivery methods, such as outsourcing (e.g., substitute recruitment and replacement);
  \item Providing and funding paid internships to EBR high school students to improve
\end{itemize}

\(^{30}\) The department should consider utilizing and participating in the CGCS Managing for Results platform, which is a performance measurement and benchmarking project that identifies performance measures, key indicators, and best practices that can guide improvement in urban school districts. Attachment F contains a complete list of the CGCS Human Resources key performance indicators tracked annually;
labor pipeline opportunities;\textsuperscript{31}

iii. Root-cause analysis to address operational challenges;

iv. Ongoing, on a rotating basis, salary and benefit surveys to measure competitiveness;

v. Define performance measures, industry best practices, standards for all primary functions of the office that hold all HR staff accountable for achieving these measures; and

g. Learning about and recognizing funding and grant programs by attending training and workshops to fully leverage these opportunities.

3. Reorganize the Human Resources Department to optimize efficiency and effectiveness, sharpen its focus, improve internal communication, eliminate silos, and promote clear lines of responsibility, authority, and accountability. Exhibit 6 below illustrates a potential high-level functional reorganization for the department.\textsuperscript{32} Under this organization --

\begin{footnotesize}
\textbf{Exhibit 6. Proposed Human Resources Functional Reorganization}
\end{footnotesize}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics{Exhibit6.png}
\end{center}

\begin{footnotesize}
Source: CGCS Review Team
\end{footnotesize}

a. The Chief Human Resources Officer’s span of control is simplified, permitting appropriate oversight and monitoring service metrics and dashboards while focusing on completing Recommendation #2 above. In addition, the core functions and workflows of the HR department should be reorganized and customer-focused on --

\textsuperscript{31} The team was told of the EBR program, \textit{Committed to Teach}, but the program could not be found when using the EBR webpage search bar.

\textsuperscript{32} The team recommends leaving the Director of Human Resources in place for at least one transitional year.
i. Onboarding (including recruiting, selection, applicant tracking, vetting, and the timely placement of new and promoted employees);

ii. Employee Services (including performance assessment, organizational development, employee retention, position classification and compensation, job description management, leaves, labor management, employee accountability, investigations, department technology, and employment verification);

iii. Exit Transition (including retirement, resignation, and other separation processing, including terminations and exit interviews);

b. Ensure that individuals in leadership positions in the new functional organization have the appropriate skills, expertise, experience, and ongoing training to be successful;

c. Fill positions, as necessary, in the new organization with individuals who are able and willing to perform required duties and provide staff the autonomy and opportunity to perform their work; and recognize staff when they display quality work products, and hold all staff accountable for results;

d. Conduct a comprehensive study to determine appropriate staffing levels for all functions within every section in the new HR organization; and

e. Develop concise reporting relationships with clearly defined job titles, roles, and job descriptions to provide a realistic portrayal of duties, responsibilities, expectations, accountabilities, and reporting lines that represent the core functions of the new HR organization and its focus on customer service.

4. Establish a subject matter expert task force to review, update, or retire job titles and job descriptions. This process shall ensure that --

a. Job titles are accurate and reflect what is in the EBR position control system;

b. The job descriptions provide a realistic portrayal of duties, responsibilities, use of current technologies, workplace enhancements, and recent innovations;

c. Expectations, accountabilities, and reporting lines and relationships are clearly defined; and

d. A focus on customer service is evident in the job descriptions.
5. Evaluate the opportunity to update or retire job descriptions with the Board temporarily assigning “delegated authority” to the Superintendent for this project. Request that the Board reevaluates returning full authority to the Board in 18-24 months.

6. Implement a systematic review, evaluation, and reconstruction of the office’s teacher recruitment program. Ensure that a representative group of school site administrators and labor partners are at the table, and that the following activities are incorporated into the reconstructed program --

   a. Identification and filling of appropriate seasonal staffing levels to ensure that EBR is well-represented at job fairs and university/college recruitment opportunities. This team shall be appropriately trained and held accountable for results;

   b. Establishment of annual marketing and recruiting master plans designed to meet the needs of the district and aligned with changing market demands;

   c. An annual recruiting calendar that is coordinated with, but not in conflict with, the district’s master calendar that allows for recruiting to begin earlier than other districts competing for the same candidates. Vacation scheduling for staff needs to be factored into the calendar to ensure appropriate HR staffing levels are in place during peak recruiting and onboarding periods;

   d. Development of annual goals and the utilization of previous results to guide ongoing recruitment activities;

   e. Clearly defined and updated procedures and processes are in place for the timely recruitment, selection, fast-track placement of candidates, and the expedited (early) offering of contracts;

   f. Identification of previous, or anticipating potential, “bottlenecks” or “chokepoints” in the recruitment and onboarding process and proactively taking corrective action well in advance of annual recruitment efforts;

   g. Identification and tracking of highly effective substitutes, student teachers, and paraprofessionals throughout the year for full-time placement opportunities;

   h. Ensuring that specific strategies and funding are in place to fill hard-to-staff and critical positions with top talent;

   i. Establishing substitute placement rate goals that meet or exceed the CGCS national median;
j. Building an ongoing relationship and communication with pipeline programs with local university and non-local university partners;

k. Ensuring communication between applicants, principals, and HR staff is timely, accurate, and meaningful to preclude teacher candidates from seeking employment elsewhere;

l. Creating processes for the ongoing reporting of staffing and vacancy levels to stakeholder groups;

m. Updating the HR webpage to include applicant access to all job descriptions and salary schedules; and

n. Tracking all costs associated with recruiting and onboarding; and leverage this data for future budgeting justification to demonstrate that financial and human resources are efficiently utilized for maximum return on investment.

7. Convene a team of appropriate stakeholders (i.e., Human Resources Department for HR information; Budget Department for budget development; Payroll Department for payroll-related data; and the Finance Department for salary and benefit projections) to clarify and document the district’s position control process. This documentation should include flowcharts and who “owns” each step in the process.

8. Build a strategic and coordinated districtwide professional development plan to increase organizational coherence. This plan, to be championed by the Human Resources Department, should have all impacted stakeholder groups at the table, and together this effort should --

   a. Design and implement districtwide professional development plans that engage new and continuing employees, including --

      i. A well-planned and documented orientation and onboarding process, incorporating --

         · A welcoming environment for new employees,

         · A well-defined and structured orientation to and about the district and its culture,

         · Clear communication of the onboarding process so that potential employees are not lost in the complexities of recruitment, selection, job offers, vetting, background, drug test clearance, and joining the EBR family,
ii. Job-specific onboarding and training for new hires,

iii. Ongoing professional development to enhance job skills and promotional opportunities for current employees,

b. Develop strategies to “grow your own pipeline” for principals, and

c. Create an organizational change management component to address and manage adverse impacts on employees due to altering organizational structures (reorganization) and changing processes.

9. Strengthen external stakeholder communication activities to enhance HR services by implementing meaningful communication outreach with regular meetings with school principals (or a representative group), appropriate budget and payroll staff, appropriate region staff, appropriate IT staff, and operations leadership to address staffing formulas implementation, and to identify opportunities for improved communication to address policy misunderstandings described in this document.

10. Develop or hire leaders who will lead by example to champion knowledge sharing, collaboration, and inclusion. Ensure regular staff meetings take place throughout the department with specific agendas, documented minutes of discussions, decisions, and follow-up activities, so employees know --

a. The district’s and the HR department’s goals and objectives and how they will be achieved;

b. That intraoffice and interdepartmental collaboration is taking place with all appropriate departments, offices, stakeholders, and subject matter experts at the table;

c. How personnel will be held accountable and evaluated using performance-monitoring metrics;

d. Why changes are being made that may impact the team along with expected outcomes;

e. That the HR leadership is held responsible for ensuring that information and feedback is disseminated up-and-down and side-to-side within and between offices and departments; and

f. That employee feedback and suggestions are welcomed and considered, so team members know there is an ongoing process improvement program in place to encourage innovation.
11. Develop succession planning and cross-training within the office to ensure knowledge transfer and the orderly transition of responsibilities.

12. Create an alliance between the CHRO and the Chief Information Officer to resolve the interdepartmental operational, technical, and training issues that marginalize HR’s ability to leverage the district’s current HR software and the new Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) software. Together, this team should address appropriate access levels to HR-related data for central office and school site staff, create timelines, assign project owners, develop accountabilities and possible solutions for the following --

   a. Maximizing available modules in current and future systems to increase efficiency and significantly reduce existing manually intensive processes;

   b. Integrating and reducing the number of software systems currently utilized by the department;

   c. Expanding existing dashboards to monitor and manage core HR department functions and metrics;

   d. Developing an in-depth HR employee training program that promotes an understanding of how existing or new modules can streamline functions to gain efficiencies;

   e. Creating HR user-driven report generation utilities for development of needed management information and data; and

   f. Determining what data will be “owned” by HR and what data should be “owned” by others (budget, information technology, etc.).

13. Establish, for all classified employees, evaluation and performance assessment instruments and processes that incorporate expectations, performance measures, and professional growth strategies consistent with Board policies. This work should include—

   a. Educating administrators, managers, and supervisors on the effective use of classified employee evaluations and conduct evaluation conferences.

   b. Tracking and ensuring all classified employees are assessed annually.

14. Create opportunities to invite and confer with internal and external stakeholders to provide input and analyze potential outcomes for at least the following activities --
a. Establishing and staffing with cross-functionally trained personnel, a “one-stop” HR customer information walk-in and telephone service center to provide same-day responses to all requests from internal (both certified and classified district employees) and external customers;

b. Partnering with career technical education and industry programs to increase the pipeline for skilled trades candidates;

c. Streamlining the online application procedure to make the process more user-friendly, especially for entry-level positions, to assist applicants who are not computer savvy or may not be English proficient with navigating the required online application process; and

d. Implementing programs to measure the degree to which the HR department provides responsive, results-oriented services and meets the needs of its customers. At a minimum—

   i. Continue to use customer satisfaction surveys and focus groups to identify areas of concern.

   ii. Solicit input from school site administrative staff, teaching staff, support staff, central office staff, and all applicants, and use this input to establish future priorities, training opportunities, and process improvements.

15. Monitor turnover rates, establish exit interview protocols for all employees that voluntarily separate from EBR, and identify and track the causes of leaving to make or recommend policy changes.

16. Develop a comprehensive plan to boost employee retention and provide opportunities for employees at all levels to enhance their skills and learn industry best practices through --

   a. Continuing efforts to ensure the retention of new teachers are in place and fully leverage and track safety-net programs including, but not limited to, mentoring and staff development,

   b. Participation in professional organizations,

   c. In-depth new employee orientation,

   d. Cross-functional teaming and training, and
e. Visiting peer districts to gather best practices, recruitment strategies, performance metrics, customer service, and technology leveraging strategies.
Robert Carlson

Robert Carlson is Director of Management Services for the Council of the Great City Schools. In that capacity, he provides Strategic Support Teams and manages operational reviews for superintendents and senior managers; convenes annual meetings of Chief Financial Officers, Chief Operating Officers, Transportation Directors, and Chief Information Officers and Technology Directors; fields hundreds of requests for management information; and has developed and maintains a Web-based management library. Prior to joining the Council, Dr. Carlson was an executive assistant in the Office of the Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools. He holds doctoral, and master degrees in administration from The Catholic University of America; a B.A. degree in political science from Ohio Wesleyan University; and has done advanced graduate work in political science at Syracuse University and the State Universities of New York.

David M. Palmer

David Palmer, Deputy Director (retired), Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD), is a forty-year school business operations administration veteran. Mr. Palmer’s executive responsibilities included managing and overseeing operations, strategic planning and execution, budget development and oversight, and contract administration. In addition, Mr. Palmer led the design and implementation of performance standards, benchmarks, and accountabilities for staff. He advised the Council of Great City Schools on the Key Performance Indicator project. Mr. Palmer was also an instructor in the School Business Management Certificate Program at the University of Southern California. After retirement, Mr. Palmer continues working with LAUSD as a professional expert with the HR Division in grievance resolution and guiding administrators on contract interpretation and employee disciplinary matters. Mr. Palmer also advised the LAUSD Office of Labor Relations on negotiation strategy and impacts on proposed contract language changes. Mr. Palmer currently provides consulting services for school districts and other governmental agencies, is a very active member of the Council’s Strategic Support Teams, and has served as the CGCS’s Principal Investigator on numerous management and operational reviews.

Aimee Green-Webb

Aimee Green-Webb is the Chief of Human Resources for Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS). As the product of, and former leader in Kentucky’s only district-based alternative route to certification program, she has a unique perspective of teacher workforce complexities. Dr. Green-Webb taught at the elementary level and provided district and state instructional leadership in the area of elementary education and literacy for nine years, then joined the JCPS HR team. Her HR leadership experience includes the areas of teacher induction, mentoring, evaluation, recruitment
and retention, union negotiations, and alternative routes to certification. Her research interests include new teacher job satisfaction, teacher retention, and workforce diversity.

Paul Idsvoog

Paul Idsvoog is the Chief of Human Resources and Labor Relations for Fresno Unified School District. Mr. Idsvoog has extensive experience in both private business and public education as prior to returning to Fresno as the Chief Executive of Labor Relations for Fresno Unified where he served as the chief negotiator for the District’s seven bargaining units, he was the Vice President and owner of a food service contract company headquartered in Milwaukee, WI. His duties as Vice President required him to serve on all bargaining teams as the chief negotiator as well as responsible for all departments within the organization including Human Resources, Operations, Finance, Sales and Marketing. Mr. Idsvoog has a Master’s Degree in Business Administration (MBA) from Colorado State University and was selected as the 2017 Administrator of the Year in the Personnel and Human Resources Division by the Association of California School Administrators Region IX Chapter.

Christopher Miller

Christopher Miller is an educator with twenty-two years of experience in the field. He serves as the Chief of Human Capital for the Rochester City School District (NY) and was the Chief Human Resources Officer for the Syracuse City School District (NY). Prior to his work in human capital leadership, Dr. Miller served in public schools as a social studies teacher, assistant principal, director of social studies, and director of guidance. Dr. Miller earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in history and secondary education from Nazareth College, a Master’s degree in Educational Administration from St. John Fisher College, certification as a school district administrator from the University of Rochester, and a Doctorate in Education from Saint John’s University. Dr. Miller is a certified Professional Human Capital Leader in Education (pHCLE) from Battelle for Kids and the American Association of School Personnel Administrators.

Leslie Stephens

Leslie Stephens currently serves as the Chief of Human Capital for Austin Independent School District. Ms. Stephens has served in a variety of roles over her career to include instructional coach, director of various departments, Executive Director and Assistant Superintendent of School Leadership where the work focused on cyclical human resource issues such as staffing, leveling and budget. Ms. Stephens earned her Bachelor’s degree at Kansas State University and her Master’s at the University of Texas at San Antonio. She has worked in San Antonio ISD, Edgewood ISD, Dallas ISD and currently Austin ISD. This is her 36th year in the field of education.
## ATTACHMENT B. WORKING AGENDA

### CGCS Strategic Support/Technical Assistance Team
**Human Resources Review**
**East Baton Rouge Parish School System**
**November 9-12, 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday, November 9, 2021</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time and Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30 pm</td>
<td>Team Meeting</td>
<td>Dr. Sito Narcisse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Superintendent</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caron Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chief of Staff</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Chester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chief Operations Officer</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday, November 10, 2021</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time and Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am to 8:45 am</td>
<td>Team Continental Breakfast</td>
<td>CGCS Strategic Support/Technical Assistance Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am to 10:00 am</td>
<td>Team Interviews</td>
<td>Nichola Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chief Officer for Human Resources</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beanka Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Director for Human Resources</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 am to 10:45 am</td>
<td>Team Interview</td>
<td>Amy Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Technology Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am to 12:00 pm</td>
<td>Team Interview</td>
<td>Beanka Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director for Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Luncheon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 pm to 1:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm to 1:45 pm</td>
<td>Team Interviews</td>
<td>Kelly Lopez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wykeisha Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor of Payroll/Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management/Title IX Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm to 3:00 pm</td>
<td>Team Interviews</td>
<td>Allison Brown-Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinator for Support Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mynesha Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 pm to 3:45 pm</td>
<td>Team Interviews</td>
<td>James Bell, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adm. Director of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Howle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Nadine Mann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Chief, Child Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monique Scott-Spaulding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Team Members/Positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm to 5:00 pm</td>
<td>Team Interviews</td>
<td>Terri Lockwood, Amber Boyd, Thaddeus Sam, Shana Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisors of Personnel Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 pm to 6:00 pm</td>
<td>Team Interviews</td>
<td>Vanessa Pero, Andrea Cosey, Tanisha Frazier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor of Support Personnel Management, Coordinator of Data, Personnel Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Team Discussion of Work Plan</td>
<td>6:15 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and Location</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Responsible Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am to 8:45 am</td>
<td>Team Continental Breakfast</td>
<td>CGCS Strategic Support/Technical Assistance Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am to 9:45 am</td>
<td>Team Interview</td>
<td>Dr. C. Michael Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chief Academic Officer</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am to 10:45 am</td>
<td>Team Interviews</td>
<td>Eliza Jacques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Patricia Donald</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Danyale Davis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Christine Olivier</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Personnel Specialists</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am to 11:45 am</td>
<td>Team Interview</td>
<td>Dana Morrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Recruitment Manager</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working Luncheon</td>
<td><strong>Working Luncheon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 pm to 1:00 pm</td>
<td>Team Interview</td>
<td>Dr. Sharon Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chief of Schools</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm to 1:45 pm</td>
<td>Team Interview</td>
<td>Tobrina Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Karri Larose</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Professional Development Specialists</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm to 2:45 pm</td>
<td>Team Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm to 4:30 pm</td>
<td>Team Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and Location</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Responsible Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 am to 7:30 am</td>
<td>Team Continental Breakfast</td>
<td>CGCS Strategic Support/Technical Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 am to 12:00 pm</td>
<td>Team Working Session-Synthesis of Findings and Recommendations</td>
<td>CGCS Strategic Support/Technical Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 pm to 1:00 pm</td>
<td>Team Working Luncheon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjournments and Departures
ATTACHMENT C. DISTRICT PERSONNEL INTERVIEWED

- Dr. Sito Narcisse, Superintendent
- Caron Smith, Chief of Staff
- Frank Chester, Chief Operations Officer
- Nichola Hall, Chief Officer for Human Resources
- Beanka Williams, Director for Human Resources
- Amy Jones, Chief Technology Officer
- Kelly Lopez, Chief Financial Officer
- Wykeisha Richard, Supervisor of Payroll/Benefits
- Andrew Davis, Director of Risk Management/Title IX Coordinator
- Allison Brown-Lands, Coordinator for Support Programs
- Mynesha Williams, Data Specialist
- James Bells, Jr., Administrative Director of Transportation
- Robert Howle, Supervisor of Transportation
- Dr. Nadine Mann, Administrative Chief, Child Nutrition
- Monique Stott-Spaulding, Director of Facilities
- Terri Lockwood, Supervisor of Personnel Management
- Amber Boyd, Supervisor of Personnel Management
- Thaddeus Sam, Supervisor of Personnel Management
- Shana Wilson, Supervisor of Personnel Management
- Vanessa Pero, Supervisor of Support Personnel Management
- Andra Cosey, Coordinator of Data
- Tanisha Frazier, Personnel Specialist
- Dr. C. Michael Robinson, Chief Academic Officer
- Eliza Jacques, Personnel Specialist
- Patricia Donald, Personnel Specialist
- Danyale Davis, Personnel Specialist
- Christine Olivier, Personnel Specialist
- Dana Morrison, Recruitment Manager
- Dr. Sharon Williams, Chief of Schools
- Karri Larose, Professional Development Specialist
- Building Principals:
  - Terrie Junda, Twin Oaks Elementary School
  - Karla Johnson, Capitol Elementary School
  - David DeBerry Sr., Clarborne Elementary School
  - Shawona W. Ross, Northeast High School
  - Jamie Noel, Sherwood Middle Academic Magnet
o Aaron Sinclair, Scotlandville Pre-Engineering Magnet Academy
o Alesha Cavanaugh, Westdale Heights Academic Magnet
o Zane Whittington, Jefferson Terrace Academy
ATTACHMENT D. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- Organizational Charts:
  - Office of Human Resources Organization Chart
  - Organizational Plan 2021
- EBR Strategic Plan for Educating, 2021-2025, dated July 22, 2021
- Budgets/Finance Reports:
  - Proposed General Fund Budget, 2021-2022, approved June 17, 2021
  - Proposed Special Revenue Budgets, 2021-2022, approved June 17, 2021
  - Special Revenue Budgets, 2021-2022 Proposed Budgets, approved June 17, 2021
  - Budget Timeline, 2020-2021
  - Proposed General Fund Budget, 2020-2021, approved July 16, 2020
  - Proposed Special Revenue Funds, 2020-2021, approved dates July 16, 2020, and August 20, 2020
  - Proposed General Fund Budget, 2019-2020, approved July 18, 2019
  - Proposed Special Revenue Budgets, 2019-2020, approved July 18, 2019
  - Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, 2019-2020
  - Budget Timeline, 2019-2020
  - Proposed General Fund Budget, 2018-2019, approved June 21, 2018
  - Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, 2018-2019
  - Revised General Fund Budget, 2017-2018, approved May 17, 2018
  - Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, 2017-2018
  - Human Resources 2018-2019 to 2021-2022
- Policies:
  - Duties, functions, and responsibilities of Board, LA Law RS 17:7
  - HR Policies and Procedures:
    - Generic Employee Observation Form (Certificated Professional Personnel and Classified Employees)
    - Multi-Position Evaluation Form (Management, Content Trainers, Curriculum & Instruction Coaches, School/Parent Liaisons, and Other Appropriate Certified and Professional Personnel)
    - Important Facts and Information for EBRPS System Employees, 2021-2022
    - Reassignment/Transfer and New Hire Online Processing, April 2020
    - Reassignment/Transfer and Hew Hire Online Processing, Instructions for Principals and Hiring Managers, April 2020
    - Recruitment and Hire User Training Manual, April 2020
    - Hiring Process Information for Senior Cabinet and District, June 2021
    - Creating RIVS One-Way Interview with AppliTrack, 2017
    - Manual Inviting Candidates with AppliTrack, 2017
    - Processing New Digital Recommendations to Hire, Reassignments, and Transfers, 2020
- New Employee Policy Manual
- Field Experience, Student Teaching, and Internship Handbook, 2015-2016
- HR Manual Processing of Sick Leaves in Perfect Forms Portal
- Sick Leaves Presentation
- Emergency Family and Medical Leave (EFMLA) and Emergency Paid Sick Leave (COVID-19 Pandemic)
- COVID-19 Absence Reporting Procedures, updated May 15, 2020
- How to Use Timekeeper, effective April 21, 2020
- Inactive Files – Active Files in the Office of Human Resources
- Information Links to Verifications of Employment and Educator Certifications
- Steps for Submitting Non-Budgeted Requested Forms
- COVID-19 Resources and Tools:
  - Social Distancing Guidelines at Work
  - Distance Learning/Telework Statement of Understanding
  - Employee Return Protocols, 2020
  - Phase I, Employee Guidance Resource Packet, May 18, 2020
  - Quick Links, Employee Return to Work – Phase I
  - Phase II, Employee Guidance Resource Packet, May 18, 2020
  - Quick Links, Employee Return to Work – Phase II
  - Aquaponics Additional Responsibilities Agreement, Brookstown Middle School
  - Employee Return to Work/School Guidance, 2020-2021
  - K-12 Educator and Support Staff COVID-19 Vaccination Day
  - Face Covering Exemption Request Form-Employees
  - EBRPSS – Related Possible Responses, March 12, 2020
  - Emergency EBR COVID-19 Leave
  - Letter to Full Time Employees for Closure of Schools, March 16, 2020
  - Letter to Day-by-Day Substitute for Closure of Schools, March 16, 2020
  - Emergency EBR COVID-19 Leave – 2021
  - Requested Information
- Human Resources Staffing Allocations for 2019-2021
  o Elementary Staffing Formulas, 2021-2022
  o Secondary Staffing Formulas, 2021-2021
  o HR Staffing Division by Supervisor, draft March 6, 2021
  o HR Staffing Division by Supervisor, draft June 22, 2020
- Previous Audits:
  o Transition Report, March 2021
- Strategic Planning: Recruitment and Retention, March 26, 2021

Job Descriptions:
- Chief Human Resources Officer, approved August 19, 2001
- Building Receptionist, revised 1995
- Coordinator for Support Programs, revised 1995
- Coordinator for Substitute and Applications, approved 1998
- Coordinator for Data and Records, Human Resources, revised 1995
- Director for Personnel Services, revised 1995
- Network Administrator, revised 1995
- Personnel Assistant I, II, and III, revised 1995
- Professional Development Specialist, approved 2006
- Recruitment Manager
- Steno Clerk III, revised 1995
- Supervisor for Personnel Management, Staffing, and Certification, approved March 2008
- Supervisor of Payroll and Employee Benefits, approved August 2006
- Supervisor for Human Resources/Support Personnel, approved March 2008
- Support Programs Specialist – No Child Left Behind, approved May 19, 2005
- System Analyst, revised 1995
- Systems Manager Student Data Systems, approved July 2004

Facilities Study, Region 4 Community Meeting, Liberty High School, October 13, 2021
### ATTACHMENT E. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PREVIOUS REVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Fully Implemented</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Not Implemented</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition Report (TR) - March 2021</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-1 Give principals the right to make staffing decisions within the guidelines of required positions.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why: Certain positions (e.g. parent liaisons, math and literacy coaches, physical education teacher, guidance counselor) should be required at every building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-2 Restructure the principal and administrative salary schedules.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>A compensation study will start in January</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why: It appears that administrative pay - especially principals - is arbitrary and unfair. The potential for discrimination based on gender or ethnicity is obvious. A new pay scale should be developed for principals and Central Office administrators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-3 Create a training and development pipeline for principals.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why: Currently, there are not enough educators or administrators on the tract to becoming a principal, which is likely to cause shortages due to future retirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-4 Implement an annual performance review for all instructional and administrative staff, consider implementing merit-based pay as appropriate across the organization to incentivize high performance and increase retention of highly effective teachers.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Implemented for teachers, but not for all other instructional and administrative staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why: A student-centered approach must be taken to staffing, especially in instructional positions. Annual reviews offer an opportunity for staff to self-reflect, receive feedback, and improve their performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-5 Review and revise teacher recruitment and retention strategies so that EBR may staff its classrooms with high quality teachers who have access to the resources they need.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why: The use of long-term subs is damaging to student learning and morale. EBR should focus on recruiting a qualified workforce and improve retention by offering increased responsibilities and investing in professional development opportunities that match staff desires.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-6 Review the District's existing teacher transfer policy.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>We have the annual transfer period, but employees are allowed to put in for a transfer during the year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why: There should be clear teacher transfer policies in place that is implemented fairly. Policies should work to prevent significant annual transfers from disproportionately impacting schools, particularly those that serve low-income populations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-7 Reevaluate placement of principals after they have served at one location for five (5) to seven (7) years.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Chief of Schools working on implementation for the 2022-23 school year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why: Principals’ sustained periods of consistent service on one campus site is actually shocking. While there are clear exceptions, most school leaders experience declining effectiveness after five (5) years on the same campus. Ongoing transfers of administrators should be the norm with logical exceptions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-8 Place a great deal more emphasis on teacher recruitment and professional development.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>HR interviewed and selected another recruitment manager to assist with recruitment and the position was denied by leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why: At least one or two staff members in the Human Resources department should be devoted exclusively to recruitment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-9 Develop a virtual employee handbook.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why: The only employee handbook provided to the Consultants was entitled “New Employee Handbook.” It is not a really a handbook, but instead a collection of random policies, many of which have not been updated in years. Producing a real handbook should be a priority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR-10 Strive to maintain consistent leadership, particularly in the role of superintendent, to establish stability and positively impact employee morale.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why: Morale has suffered from frequent leadership changes and instability but can be turned around with consistency in leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Review (ER) - May 2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER-1 Address Human Resources Compliance Opportunities.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>SOP’s for the department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why: A review of department processes identified compliance issues, which leaves the school system open for potential liability. FMLA notification standards were not being followed and records are kept in a manner that could create vulnerabilities for additional liabilities should the system be subject to an audit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER-2 Address Low Substitute Fill Rates.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Partnered with ESS a third party for subs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why: According to the data provided, substitute fill rates are low. Based on the process described, the focus is on hiring substitutes on a regular schedule and the number of substitutes on record. EBPRSS should be able to fulfill substitute needs if absenteeism is similar to peer systems. However, there is no focus at the central level on ensuring these substitutes are available and working as needed. Substitutes are not required to work a minimum amount of days annually to continue to stay on the active substitute list and no incentives are provided for working at hard-to-staff schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER-3 Automate Manual Human Resources Processes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Transaction forms, leaves, onboarding, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why: The predominant method of employee life cycle processing is paper-based and highly transactional, which leads to additional labor. Current systems are neither fully utilized nor integrated, resulting in duplication of work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CGCS, From Data Provided by EBR
1. Substitute Place Rate
2. Teacher Absences per Teacher
3. Teacher Retention – Average for 1-5 Years
4. Teacher Vacancies on First Day of School
5. Exit Interview Completion Rate
6. Substitute Placement with a BA/BS or Higher
7. Teacher Retention – Remaining After 1 Year
8. Teacher Retention – Remaining After 2 Years
9. Teacher Retention – Remaining After 3 years
10. Teacher Retention – Remaining After 4 Years
11. Teacher Retention – Remaining After 5 Years
12. Teacher Highly Qualified in All Assignments
13. Teachers with National Board Certificate
14. Time to Fill Vacancies – Instructional Support
15. Time to Fill Vacancies – Non-School Exempt
16. Time to Fill Vacancies – Non-School Non-Exempt
17. Time to Fill Vacancies – School-Based Exempt
18. Time to Fill Vacancies – School-Based Non-Exempt
19. Time to Fill Vacancies – Teachers
20. Employee Relations – Discrimination Complaints per 1,000 Employees
21. Employee Relations – Misconduct Investigations per 1,000 Employees
22. Employee Separation Rate
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27. Employee Separation Rate – School-Based Non-Exempt Staff
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Earlier this year, Dr. Mark Bedell, Superintendent of the Kansas City Schools, asked the Council of the Great City Schools to provide a high-level review of its information technology (IT) operations and, specifically, to review the implementation of a new Student Information System (SIS) that has created significant challenges caused, in part, because the system has not been fully implemented.¹

In response to this request, the Council assembled a Strategic Support Team (SST) of highly experienced former and current school district information technology and research executives from major city school districts to conduct the review. The team was composed of the following individuals. (Attachment A provides brief resumes of the Team members.)

Robert Carlson, Project Director
Director, Management Services
Council of the Great City Schools

Thomas Ryan (Principal Investigator)
Chief Information Officer (Retired)
Albuquerque Public Schools

Raymond Hart
Executive Director
Council of the Great City Schools

Shahryar Khazei
Chief Information Officer (Retired)

¹ The Council has conducted nearly 350 organizational, instructional, management, and operational reviews in over 70 big-city school districts over the last 20 years. The reports generated by these reviews are often critical, but they also have been the foundation for improving the operations, organization, instruction, and management of many urban school systems nationally. In other cases, the reports are complimentary and form the basis for identifying “best practices” for other urban school systems to replicate. (Attachment F lists the reviews that the Council has conducted.)
The Team conducted its fieldwork for the project during a four-day site visit to Kansas City on September 28-October 1, 2021. The general schedule for the site visit is described below. (The Working Agenda for the site visit is presented in Attachment B.)

The Team met with the Superintendent on the first day of the site visit to understand his expectations and objectives for the review and to make any final adjustments to the schedule. The Superintendent expressed concerns with the new Student Information System (SIS) that went live over the past summer. The SIS, which had not been fully implemented, was launched with the start of summer school, and created significant challenges that have continued into the current school year. Although staff who “figured it out” like the system, there is still a significant amount of frustration being expressed by staff, parents, school board members, and teachers.

The Team used the second and third days of the site visit to interview staff members (The list of interviewees is presented in Attachment C) and to review documents, reports and data provided by the district (The list of documents is presented in Attachment D). The final day of the visit was devoted to synthesizing and refining the Team’s findings and briefing the Superintendent on the Team’s preliminary conclusions.

The Council sent a draft of this document to the Team members for their review to ensure the accuracy of the report and to obtain their concurrence with the final recommendations. This management letter contains the findings and recommendations that have been designed by the team to help improve the operational efficiencies and effectiveness of the district’s Information Technology operations.²

² Team’s effort to glean information was impacted by the unavailability or unwillingness of the SIS implementor and its project manager to be interviewed.
Findings and Observations

The specific findings and observations of the Council’s Strategic Support Team are organized into three general areas: Commendations, IT Leadership and Management, and SIS Implementation.

Commendations

- IT staff are motivated and passionate about their work, especially considering the significant challenges they have faced over the last 25 months with the pandemic, leadership turnover, and several significant projects to be completed.
- The IT department has dedicated a significant amount of work to access control policies and systems to meet the network security needs of the district.
- The district’s network access provides internet access and appears to be sufficient to meet current demand.

Strategy is Easy, Execution is Difficult

Earlier this year, the district began transitioning to a new student information system (SIS) which is a web-based student information management system designed to allow staff, teachers, parents/guardians, and students to access academic information and other records, including schedules, attendance, behavior, assignments, progress reports, grades, school-related fees. Users will be able to access school email messages which were hosted on the prior system as well as all information which will be added and updated in the new system.

Successful implementation of major software applications, such as a student information system, typically involves many inter-related tasks that need to be conducted in an appropriate sequence moving from purchase to use of the software and hardware. The implementation process requires scope analysis, customizations, systems integrations, user policies, user training and delivery which is overseen by a project manager using project management methodologies and enlisting professional advice when required.

It is often the lack of adequate consultation and communication, multiple tasks, poor planning, and inadequate resources, however, that cause problems with an implementation project. A SIS system is utilized by staff across many divisions in the district and all divisions share a role in the implementation of the system. Understanding those roles is critical to a successful implementation. These are many factors the Team found as root causes for the problems the district has had in its implementation of the new student information system.

IT Leadership and Management

- Until taking on another position as the Chief Information Officer in another district, the district’s Executive Director of Technology reported to the Chief Finance and Operations Officer and was not positioned as a cabinet member in the Office of the Superintendent.
No cabinet member took ownership or accountability for the implementation of the new enterprise-wide student information system (SIS), and the Executive Director became the de facto sponsor and lead for the project.

- It is unclear what decision-making processes and business case justifications were used so the district’s senior leadership team had complete, accurate and timely information to obligate the district to proceed with the conversion to the new SIS system.

- It is also unclear what formal communication channels were used to win the approval of key district departments, functional teams, and other stakeholders to ensure this major initiative would be implemented correctly and on time. The district owns communication systems, such as Let’s Talk, but there is no evidence these tools were used during the implementation. As a result,
  
  o The Team heard that several district leaders were unaware of the executive approval process, which raises questions about how engaged, aware, and cross-departmental participation works for major decisions.
  
  o There was a siloed organizational culture and a lack of collaboration and cooperation between and among key stakeholders when critical decisions were made, such as proceeding with a summer school go-live during the SIS roll-out when the system was not fully built for use in the field.

- While the department’s organizational chart (Figures 1a and 1b) is not intuitive and the job titles make it difficult to determine and understand job responsibilities, the overall staffing levels seem reasonably balanced. For example,
  
  o The service desk has a lead, four service desk staff and two contractors, which seems reasonable when compared with other districts of comparable size.
  
  o The building support lead has 15 building support technicians which may be slightly larger than other districts of similar size.
  
  o Educational Technology, however, may be slightly under resourced with four staff that have the additional responsibility of overseeing the print shop.

- Vacancies and changes in assignments, which have occurred since the turnover in IT leadership, have impacted continuity of support and eroded staff confidence, especially among those who are new to their positions, do not have ownership over their work, or do not understand why and how decisions are made (e.g., understanding the rationale for changing the student information system).
Figure 1a. KCPS Department of Technology (2020-2021) Organizational Chart
• The Assistant Director of Technology, who managed enterprise systems (including the SIS initiative), network and operations, was subsequently appointed as the Interim Executive Director of Technology and inherited responsibilities for managing the Assistant Director who manages the Service Desk, and Logistical and Building Technical Support Specialists, Educational Technology, and an Analyst and Specialist responsible for Security.\(^3\)

\(^3\) Although the Executive Director was reassigned as a direct report to the Superintendent, the Team is not clear whether the position will continue to be a direct report in the future and positioned as a strategic contributor at the enterprise level. If the Executive Director, or preferably titled as the Chief Information Officer, is not positioned at the district’s enterprise level, IT will be unable to forecast the need for district-wide technology services and the district will not understand or be able to leverage the new technologies that can impact business and instructional improvements and achieve its goals and objectives.
• It is not clear to the team that the current IT leadership has the foresight and experience to identify and build stakeholder support to mitigate the political and strategic issues that are often associated with major initiatives and projects. For example,

  o The interim Executive Director indicated the issues that surfaced during the SIS implementation were not challenges but were “largely incorrect perceptions.”
  o While staff indicated that prior leadership was passionate and effectively communicated a vision of IT, the Interim Executive Director has not yet articulated his vision.

• The IT department lacks a comprehensive technology plan with a vision and mission statement including goals and objectives that are aligned to the KCPS Blueprint 2030.

• There is no comprehensive list of all technology related projects including projections of acquisition and implementation, life cycle management, replacement costs, and estimated cost-benefits and return on investments from key enterprise systems that are linked to instructional goals and objectives, academic gains, or business efficiencies and effectiveness.

• The department does not have an overall project management methodology with ownership and accountabilities for decisions, and processes for overseeing the initiation, planning, execution, monitoring and controlling, and closing of projects that have significant consequences for schools and staff when not implemented efficiently or effectively. For example—

  o The Team heard in interviews that the initiation, planning, execution, controlling, and closing of multiple complex IT projects in a short period of time (e.g., the student information system, an on-line assessment system, a new network, and a Mobile Device Management system) are managed by “project managers” who are system analysts. The individuals do not appear to be trained, certified or familiar with the use of the standardized set of processes, tools, and techniques developed by the Project Management Institute (PMI).
  o The new timecard system that was bought and paid for has not been implemented.
  o The team heard that “This Infinite Campus implementation has brought out what has been under the radar for many years. At what point are they going to stop blaming a [IT] system? At what point will it be recognized as an operational/management issue and not a [new IT] systems issue?”
• The district lacks an enterprise data architecture and rules and processes have not been developed to ensure source data within the SIS systems are accurate, complete, and consistent. The lack of these processes and plans was exposed in the SIS conversion. For example,
  
  o There is no evidence of an enterprise information policy that sets basic guidelines, standards, and regulations defining how data is entered, accessed, processed, stored, and transferred.
  o There is no evidence of regular data quality audits and improvement projects when data quality is insufficient.
  o During the SIS data conversion process, the district did not have formal procedures to allow for effective and efficient data validation, clean-up, and import. The result was a very reactive and inefficient data conversion process which the district is still remediating.
  o The duplication of student records in the new SIS is still causing problems for the district.

• The district does not appear to have a formal service management framework with appropriate procedures and processes that are used to support IT services and projects. For example—
  
  o Staff referred to Service Level Agreements (SLA), but these SLAs are not documented, communicated, or developed with input of key stakeholders. For example, IT staff told the Team the SLA of a one-day deployment of chrome books, but school staff shared that it takes three days for a device to arrive and three more days to make it usable for teachers and students.
  o The Team could not find published Key Performance Indicators (KPI) that are used to measure performance.
  o Although IT techs are confident schools are satisfied with their support, there are no quantitative or qualitative measures to provide evidence of that confidence.

• The Service Desk team does not enter tickets for all calls received which significantly undermines data collection, the development of performance metrics, and effective management of the unit.
  
  o The Team was surprised to hear that call volume was at 100 tickets per agent per day, which is a significantly higher call volume than other districts of similar size.
• The staff reported they only create tickets for incidents that take longer than 10-15 minutes to resolve. Consequently, the true call volume and issue resolution is impossible to know.

• The service desk ticket categories are not understood by staff and stakeholders. For example, the team heard that stakeholders are told to “Pick one and we’ll figure it out.”

• Different password formats are contributing to higher call volume to the service desk and significant down time for students.

• The department does not have end-to-end processes to maintain an integrated life-cycle mobile device management process and system(s) including procurement, device ownership, asset tagging, device tracking, distribution, break fix, and device retirement. For example,

  • There is no budget or forecast for devices and infrastructure equipment.
  • Fees for lost or damaged devices are entered into a records system, but it is unclear if the fees are collected and how they are used.
  • It was reported that 10% of the devices distributed to students cannot be located but there is not a complete end-to-end process to validate the claim.

• There are no documented processes that would allow the district to continue to operate in a calamity such as storms, tornados, fires, or the loss of personnel who have key roles in their operations, and there is no Disaster Recovery (DR) program which identifies how the district would maintain the functions that are vital to its daily operations in the event a calamity occurs.

• Staff reported the ERP system has not been fully implemented and is underutilized, heavily reliant on paper-based processes, and the users are resistant to change resulting in inefficiencies (e.g., position control). This was also reported in the Council’s November 2016 review.

• It was clear to the Team that district views cyber security as an IT concern, so there is not the level of oversight which should be required to mitigate vulnerabilities and risks. For example,

4 There has been significant investment in technology recently, but the lack of these processes exposes a significant financial risk and may create a negative impact to instruction for the upcoming school year.
There was no evidence of documented incident response plans, which leads to a lack of confidence that IT and the district could effectively mitigate cyber security risks.

It is unclear which of the 31 recommendations and findings from the district’s cyber security incident have been addressed.

A review of the district’s cybersecurity profile, including vulnerability assessments and penetration testing, has not been conducted by an independent company since the cyber incident.

The Information Security Analyst has requested funds in the IT budget for penetration testing and is waiting for approval to move forward.

Conversion to a new network domain, which is one of the cyber security incident vulnerabilities, is delayed because several departments and users are resisting the change who prefer to remain on the old domain.

There are a large number of outdated end user devices, which is a known security problem that have not been resolved and create serious security problems for the district.

ERP and SIS system permissions are not annually audited and permissions to elevated rights to perform key tasks are not reviewed to identify when these rights should be ended.

There was no evidence of a formal district-wide cyber awareness campaign to engage staff, students, and parents in the steps they should take to protect themselves, as well as the district.

There was no evidence the district has adequate cyber insurance policy.

**SIS Implementation**

The lack of adequate consultation, poor communication, the number of tasks, poor planning and inadequate resources were all manifested in the implementation of the new student information system (SIS). For example,

- There was an apparent lack of clarity or awareness of the executive approval process associated with the new SIS which raised questions about how much district leaders were engaged or involved in major decisions.

- It does not appear that the Superintendent received actionable information or on-going risk assessments, so he had a minimal understanding about the causes for problems which limited his ability to make informed decisions to quickly mitigate risks associated with the SIS implementation.
• There were no apparent functional owners or leads who would be responsible and accountable for planning and implementing the SIS.5

• There was, and continues to be, limited collaboration and cooperation among key stakeholders in central office, especially on critical decisions.

• The SIS implementation went “live” even though surveys showed end users had significant concerns about the validation of data.

• Several district and school-based staff identified there was a minimum effort to provide direct face-to-face professional development and the reliance on virtual training undermined the capacity and functionality of the SIS. The PD format was a major impediment to a successful rollout.
  
  o IT staff indicated that it lacked the ability to hold staff accountable during the SIS implementation, such as attending virtual training and meetings. One Chief level individual stated that SIS project meetings had 42 district-level individuals invited, but only two people attended in addition to five IT staff, signaling a problem with the implementation.
  
  o Principals stated training for the SIS was not effective and was not required for all staff.
  
  o The Team heard that the virtual training for secretaries and other staff was insufficient.
  
  o The go-live of the SIS was conducted while staff were working remotely causing an additional hindrance in effectively utilizing the Train-the-Trainer model.

• The lack of district rules to ensure source data within enterprise systems are accurate, complete, and consistent was exposed in the SIS conversion. For example,
  
  o The Team saw no evidence of an enterprise information policy that sets basic guidelines, standards, and regulations defining how data is entered, accessed, processed, stored, and transferred.
  
  o The Team heard no evidence of regular data quality audits and improvement projects when data quality is insufficient.

5 The team did not hear that other department leadership took ownership of decisions which allowed them to bow out of responsibility for SIS implementation and lead to a belief that IT was the “de facto” owner and solely responsible for the implementation which contributed to further implementation challenges.
The Team did not see evidence of formal processes to allow for effective and efficient data validation, clean-up, and import, which resulted in a very reactive and inefficient data conversation process which is still being remedied.

The Team heard that duplication of student records in the new SIS is still causing problems.

- The start of school was described by some principals as “one of the worst starts in 30+ years”. For example,
  - They did not have access to data and reports that were critical for the reopening of the school year (e.g., schedule, attendance, and transportation).
  - Prior to the start of the school year, in July, they could not see their students in the new SIS, preventing them from sending communications to families contributing to an unstable reopening of schools.
  - School level data management is restricted to secretaries leading schools to supplement with paper processes.
  - Court order and birth certificates were not available for the opening of school.
  - Counselors have to print transcripts from the legacy SIS system which does not include summer courses.
  - Historical data has not been loaded into the new system.

**Recommendations**

The Council offers the following recommendations to address the operational and related issues identified in this report.

**IT Operations**

➢ Create an enterprise governance structure in the Office of the Superintendent that reviews, prioritizes, and approves all major district initiatives to ensure they are aligned with the district’s vision, mission, goals, and objectives.

➢ Create an Enterprise Project Management Office (EPMO), which reports directly to the Superintendent, that -
  - Uses a project management methodology to ensure the start-up, maintenance, and enhancements to major district initiatives are completed on time and on budget.
  - Maintains a project portfolio providing timelines, one time and ongoing costs, alignment to district goals and priorities, and metrics that are regularly published.
• Ensures that major initiatives are led by managers who have been trained by the Project Management Institute (PMI).

➢ Elevate the Executive Director of IT to the strategic level as the Chief Information Officer (CIO/CFO) as a permanent member of the Superintendent’s cabinet and as a direct report to the Superintendent, to ensure—

• There are open horizontal and vertical communication channels to foster collaborative interdepartmental relationships.
• IT has a platform and authority to affect decisions that impact key district goals and objectives and increase efficiencies and effectiveness in other instructional and business operations.
• Cabinet level leaders are engaged as owners and partners in the planning, adoption, acquisition, and implementation of major district programs, projects, and initiatives that require IT systems and software support, such as the Student Information System (SIS).
• There is enforcement of technology policies and standards and proper vetting and approval of technology equipment, applications, and services which departments and schools might consider purchasing.

➢ Fill critical IT leadership positions with individuals who represent the diversity of the district, have strong IT and communication skills, understand the complexities of K-12 learning environments, and have a strong vision for the future.

➢ Develop a multi-year technology plan⁶ that—

• Aligns and supports the KCPS Blueprint 2030 plan.
• Includes an enterprise system architecture and published systems and network infrastructure standards.
• Lists comprehensive initiatives and projects with timelines, metrics for a conversion to digital instruction, and business practices for improved instructional outcomes in classrooms and increased effectiveness and efficiencies in district school offices.
• Identifies the appropriate equitable distribution of funds for the acquisition and anticipated growth and life-cycle management of systems and devices, and professional development and Service Level Agreements that support the needs of IT.

---

⁶ The National Education Technology Plan https://tech.ed.gov/netp/ provides a good starting point for the development of a comprehensive plan.
staff and users. The district should develop Service Level Agreements that support the needs of IT staff and users.

➢ Adopt a formal service management framework that includes processes and procedures used by the Service Desk to provide customer support based on the Information Technology Infrastructure Library’s (ITIL) set of best practice processes for delivering IT services to organizations that --

- Requires IT staff attend ITIL training and become certified to understand and implement best practices related to help desk processes and procedures.
- Requires help desk staff to join the Help Desk Institute (HDI), a nationally recognized organization that provides help desk teams (private and public) industry best practices, latest trends, and most importantly access to colleagues.
- Defines work order update protocols to ensure the ticket history, actions taken, and tickets reassigned to new IT staff members are recorded and completed promptly.
- Requires the entire IT department utilize the ticketing platform to track tickets and resolutions.
- Uses data from the service desk to develop Service Level Agreements and communicate performance to stakeholders.

➢ Implement an end-to-end life-cycle management process that clearly defines ownership, asset tagging, device tracking, distribution, break fix, and retirement of devices and includes—

- Staffing and training requirements,
- Integrated tracking, transportation, repair, and storage requirements of mobile devices, and
- Sustainable long-term financing.

➢ Develop and empower a cross-functional Data Governance Committee that—

- Establishes data quality standards,
- Implements procedures for identifying and escalating critical data issues,
- Defines rules to ensure source data are accurate, complete, and consistent,
- Oversees regular data quality audits and interoperability of data between systems,
- Documents, publishes, and maintains a data dictionary,
- Addresses policies, processes, and protocols for appropriate data use by key stakeholders, and
• Defines all purposes for data collected and stored with processes for accurately managing and executing the uses of the data over time.

➢ Analyze current and future data management platforms and create a plan that meets existing and projected business needs.

➢ Complete, test, and publish a disaster recovery (DR)/business continuity plan to minimize the risk of a catastrophic data loss and protect the integrity of systems and resources that are critical to the district’s business continuity and 24/7 operations.

➢ Create a Business Governance Team that leads enterprise business systems lifecycle support and –

  • Assesses systems performance and identifies and eliminates workflow inefficiencies (e.g., paper-processes, ad-hoc reporting).
  • Identifies long-term system enhancements and the business case for upgrades, including the cost-benefits and returns on investments to justify the expenditure.

➢ Require the Office of the Superintendent, including the Chief of Staff, Chief Financial and Operations Officer, Chief Legal Counsel, Executive Director of Research and Accountability, Executive Director of Human Resources, Executive Director of Technology, and others as needed, to develop a comprehensive assessment of, and a plan to mitigate, cybersecurity risks that includes—

  ● Assigning specific responsibilities to district staff and external technical contractors with cybersecurity expertise
  ● Financial and system audits, incident response plans, employee awareness campaigns, cyber insurance, and updated data sharing agreements.
  ● Vulnerability assessments, penetration testing, network architecture review, and monitoring, managing, and tracking threats.

➢ Create a SIS Governance Committee that –

  • Establishes the authority, roles, and responsibilities for overall lifecycle management.
  • Identifies the cross-functional owners at the cabinet level who will address strategic issues and the leads from departments who will address day-to-day operations.
  • Publishes timelines for remediating strategic and operational issues that is based on stakeholder needs and priorities (e.g., transcript production, reopening school).
• Clearly articulates the authority and responsibilities of those who own district modules.
• Identifies Project Manager(s) who are responsible for creating project plans and the timelines for remediating strategic and operational issues.
• Creates an Organizational Change Management process based on user feedback.

➢ Develop a detailed workplan that identifies the status and steps to be taken for complete SIS conversion that includes--

• Elements of the SIS system infrastructure that are complete and those that are not.
• Elements such as staging, production, and test environments, as well as backup and recovery.
• Status of data entry, cleanup, validation, import, and access to legacy system data and archiving.
• A plan to effectively train all SIS users that organizes, manages, and monitors performance that would indicate—
  o Ongoing training schedules,
  o Users who have not been adequately trained,
  o Feedback on the effectiveness of training for end users, and
  o The plan to address any problems which surface.
• Modules in the SIS system that have not been implemented and the schedule for training and implementation.
• Data used to measure the system performance and the experience of the individual departments and school sites that use the system.
• Ownership responsibility of individual departments to support various modules within the system, the workflow to escalate incidents to the appropriate owner, and the process to document and support end users such as a user accessible knowledge base.

➢ Develop and test disaster recovery (DR)/business continuity plans to minimize the risk of a catastrophic data loss and protect the integrity of systems and resources that are critical to the district’s business continuity and 24/7 operations.

➢ Require cabinet level participation, including the finance, IT, instruction, legal, risk management, and academics to develop a comprehensive assessment of, and plan to mitigate, cybersecurity risks that includes—

• Assigned responsibilities for district staff and external sources that have cybersecurity technical expertise.
• Financial and system audits, incident response plans, employee awareness campaigns, cyber insurance, updated data sharing agreements
• Vulnerability assessments, penetration testing, network architecture review, and monitoring, managing, and tracking threats.


ATTACHMENT A. STRATEGIC SUPPORT TEAM

Ray Hart

Ray Hart, Ph.D. is currently the Executive Director of the Council of the Great City Schools where he serves as a multi-disciplinary leader to impact change for the Council’s 77-member districts, and he served as the director of research for the organization for eight years. Prior to joining the Council, Hart was a Fellow at ICF International where he led the Analytic Technical Support Task Force for the Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory (REL). His role focused heavily on strengthening administrator and teacher effectiveness throughout districts in Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. Hart previously served as an executive director for the Atlanta Public Schools (APS) where he led the redesign of the research and assessment division. He also oversaw the district’s Title I, Race to the Top, and grant programs such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Effective Teacher in Every Classroom initiative. Prior to APS, Hart worked as an independent consultant following a series of academic and director-level roles at four different universities. Ray earned his Doctor of Philosophy degree in research, measurement, and statistics at Kent State University, Master of Education degree in curriculum and instruction at Cleveland State University, and Bachelor of Industrial and Systems Engineering at the Georgia Institute of Technology.

Robert Carlson

Robert Carlson is Director of Management Services for the Council of the Great City Schools. In that capacity, he provides Strategic Support Teams and manages operational reviews for superintendents and senior managers; convenes annual meetings of Chief Financial Officers, Chief Operating Officers, Human Resources Directors, and Chief Information Officers and Technology Directors; fields hundreds of requests for management information; and has developed and maintains a Web-based management library. Prior to joining the Council, Dr. Carlson was an executive assistant in the Office of the Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools. He holds an Ed. D. and an M.A. degree in administration from The Catholic University of America; a B.A. degree in political science from Ohio Wesleyan University; and has done advanced graduate work in political science at Syracuse University and the State Universities of New York.

Thomas Ryan

Tom Ryan Ph.D. is co-founder of K-12 Strategic Technology Advisory Group (K12STAG), which is led by public school chief information officers who understand the challenges school leaders face. He served as Chief Information & Strategy Officer for the Santa Fe Public Schools in New Mexico.
for five years. He also served as the CIO for the Albuquerque Public Schools for CIO for 11 years, leading all IT efforts for the largest public-school district in New Mexico. Dr. Ryan was a high school principal and teacher and has a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction. He is an education professional with 40+ years of K-12 experience and expertise in teaching, leadership, technology, technology integration and blended/online learning program development. He works with school leadership on strategic planning and leadership, designing digital learning environments, technology infrastructure reviews, and the shift to digital tools.

Dr. Ryan has a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction. He was served as a CIO (16 years), as well as a high school principal and teacher for districts in New Mexico. He has proven leadership and experience leading teams of 100+ employees and administering multimillion-dollar budgets and projects. Dr. Ryan has designed and implemented innovative online and blended school models at both the state and district level.

He is engaged in leadership activities in several state and national organizations including Chairmen of the Board for the Consortium of School Networking (CoSN). He also is active in ISTE, and the Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS). Work with the CGCS includes: large school district IT reviews of infrastructure, strategic planning, instructional technology, and digital transformation efforts. He also helps coordinate of the Councils annual CIO conferences. Dr. Ryan is a Senior Fellow for the Center of Digital Education and presents at several International, national, and state conferences throughout the year.

**Shahryar Khazei**

Shahryar Khazei recently retired from the Los Angeles Unified School District, the second largest school district in the United States, after 34 years of service. He was the Chief Information Officer at LAUSD from July 2015 - May 2019. The LAUSD Information Technology Department has over 700 employees and a total budget of over $350 million. Over the last 34 years, Mr. Khazei held a variety of leadership positions in LAUSD, including deputy Chief Information Officer responsible for district’s network and systems infrastructure operations and support and Chief Director of Software development and support, managing a staff of 300 and focusing on student information and business data. During his tenure at LAUSD, he successfully completed a large portfolio of IT projects including the District’s network infrastructure and data center modernization, the enterprise reporting and dashboards, student information system and the SAP enterprise resource planning system. Mr. Khazei serves as a member of the board of trustees of the Consortium for School Networking (CoSN). Mr. Khazei graduated from Washington State University with a Bachelor of Science degree in Mechanical Engineering.
Kenneth J. Thompson

Kenneth J. Thompson, Ed.D. is the Chief Information Technology & Accountability Officer for the San Antonio Independent School District (SAISD). SAISD serves approximately 45,000 students in more than 90 locations. He joined the SAISD team in 2018 with more than 20 years’ experience in leading complex IT service delivery organizations and leveraging IT resources to assist K-12 organizations in achieving organizational goals. Throughout his years as an IT executive, he has continued to maintain an ongoing focus on creating strategies to assist with the advancement of 21st century education in urban school districts; while simultaneously building a cohesive and competent IT team. He is most comfortable when he is combining his technical expertise with strong business and financial acumen to build and create an IT environment conducive for achieving student success. Ken is most noted for enhancing the educational environment by working with stakeholders at different levels -- recommending, managing, and validating the appropriate technology resources and enterprise systems to facilitate learning while improving student performance by utilizing the appropriate technology tools and processes.

Lenny Schad

Lenny Schad is an accomplished CIO, bringing technology to the strategic planning table. He has transformed IT departments from afterthoughts into critically strategic and integral players in business strategy—all to empower industry-leading innovation and sustainable company growth. His track record encompasses companies of diverse sizes, from start-ups and joint ventures to mature global enterprises—sometimes leading multinational operations—and multiple business sectors, including investment banking, education, government, energy, and hospitality. At every company, he has played the same role: The Change Leader. He inspires leaders on all levels to embrace innovation and contribute their unique skills to accomplish our vision.

Mr. Schad led Houston ISD to become a nationwide best-practice model for technology integration and digital transformation with multi-year initiatives, including: (1) mobile device deployment, (2) digital content conversion, (3) strategic partnership with mobile provider for free MiFi Internet, and (4) new digital content repository and LMS systems. He has designed and implemented ERP systems that integrate BI, finance, HR, payroll, purchasing, budgeting, and maintenance functions and reduces staffing needs, enhances efficiency, consolidates data sources, and streamlines cross-functional workflows.

Glen VanDerwater

Glen VanDerwater is the Chief Technology Officer for the Rochester City School District leading the Division of Information Management and Technology. As the Rochester City School District
CTO, Glen oversees all aspects of the District network infrastructure, telecom, internet connectivity, business enterprise applications, student management systems, Help Desk, print shop, school technology support, and Instructional Technology.

Glen has served the Rochester City School District for the past 27 years. Glen began his career as a classroom teacher at Dr. Charles T. Lunsford School 19. He received a master’s degree in Educational Administration from St. John Fisher College and has served as an assistant principal at what is now Anna Murray-Douglass Academy School No. 12 and Edison Technical High School.

Glen made a transition to technology by becoming Associate Director of Instructional Technology where he initiated Rochester's first online credit recovery program and learning management system that now supports the Virtual Academy of Rochester. Most recently, Glen has served as the Executive Director of Instructional Technology, where he continued to supervise the growth of the Virtual Academy of Rochester, the deployment of over 52,000 student, staff, and classroom devices, the design of modern learning spaces, and was personally involved with classroom design through the Facilities Modernization Program.

Rochester has experienced a significant shift in the availability and use of technology to support instruction in the classroom, with the attendant change in attitudes required by all stakeholders. Glen has anticipated trends, planning for enterprise business and instructional applications, and ultimately aiding the classroom teacher at the final leg of implementation. Rochester’s Digital Transformation has occurred under Glen’s supervision including retaining 1:1 devices for all students in grades K-12 along with free Sprint 1Million Project hotspots and T-Mobile 10Million hotspots for students that lack reliable internet access.

Glen has presented on Educational Technology in several venues, ranging from regional EdTech conferences in New York State to the Council of Great City Schools, SAANYS, ISTE and was also recognized in Education Week in March 2016 as one of the country’s leading educational technology experts, and again in EdTechK-12 in the Fall of 2018.

Mark Racine

Mark Racine is the Chief Information Officer for the Boston Public Schools. Mark joined the Boston Public Schools in 2007 as a classroom teacher before joining the central administration in 2012 where he has served as the CIO for the last 9 years. Mark serves on the Governance Board for the Ed-Fi Alliance, the National Advisory Council for Cybersecurity, and the peer review team for the Council of Great City Schools.
## ATTACHMENT B. WORKING AGENDA

Strategic Support/Technical Assistance Team

Kansas City Public Schools  
Information Technology Review  
September 28-October 1 (Tuesday-Friday)  
Contacts:  
**Sandra Fette**  
Executive Assistant to the Superintendent/Office Manager  
sfette@kcpublicschools.org  
Cell: 816.582.7318

**David Anson**  
Interim Executive Director of Technology  
danson@kcpublicschools.org  
Cell: 816-588-5622

### Working Agenda  
Subject to Change as Required

| **Tuesday, September 28** | Team Arrival | Dinner Meeting | **Dr. Mark Bedell**  
Superintendent |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Wednesday, September 29</strong></th>
<th>Team Interview</th>
<th>Continental Breakfast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 - 7:45 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 9:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 - 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 11:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tuesday, September 28</strong></th>
<th>Team Interview</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:15 - 12:00 Noon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Contact</strong></th>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th><strong>Email</strong></th>
<th><strong>Phone</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Fette</td>
<td>Executive Assistant to the Superintendent/Office Manager</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sfette@kcpublicschools.org">sfette@kcpublicschools.org</a></td>
<td>816.582.7318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Anson</td>
<td>Interim Executive Director of Technology</td>
<td><a href="mailto:danson@kcpublicschools.org">danson@kcpublicschools.org</a></td>
<td>816-588-5622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mark Bedell</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Anson</td>
<td>Interim Chief Information Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyson Bell</td>
<td>Asst. Director, Educational Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Driscoll</td>
<td>Manager, Technology Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuri Van Dierendonck</td>
<td>Senior Technology Intelligence Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Roberts</td>
<td>Information Security Analyst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlon Andrews</td>
<td>Technology Security Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Quinley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chief Financial and Operations Officer
Erin Thompson
Exec. Director, Business and Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12:15 - 1:00 p.m. | Working Luncheon | Charles Coats  
Enterprise Data Services Manager  
Cindy Jackson  
Lead TSS (Service Desk)  
Jerad Bernard  
Senior Systems Engineer  
Jeff Hearrell  
Lead TSS (Building Support) |
| 1:15 - 2:00 a.m. | Team Interview | Dr. Holiday Scott  
Dir., Ed. Systems & Charter Schools  
Derald Davis  
Asst. Supt., Equity, Inclusion & Innovation  
David Rand  
Executive Director, R&D  
Jermone Williams  
Accountability, Research & Assessment |
| 2:15 - 3:00 p.m. | Team Interview |  
Nicole Haley  
Education Project Specialist  
Computer Information Concepts (CIC)  
Building Principals  
(Randomly Selected from Zones & Across Grade Levels) |
| 3:15 - 4:00 p.m. | Team Interview |  
David Anson  
Jodie Powell  
David Rand  
Infinite Campus Project Managers |
| 4:15 - 5:00 p.m. | Team Interview |  
12:15 p.m. | Team Departure |
| 4:15 p.m. | Team Discussion of Work Plan for Balance of Site Visit |  
Thursday, September 29  
Continental Breakfast  
Team Interview  
Team Interviews  
Team Interview  
Team Interview  
Team Interview  
Team Discussion of Work Plan for Balance of Site Visit  
Team Departure  
Team Discussion of Work Plan for Balance of Site Visit  
Team Departure  
Team Discussion of Work Plan for Balance of Site Visit  
Team Departure |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>Team Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Discussion of Work Plan for Balance of Site Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, October 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 - 7:45 a.m.</td>
<td>Continental Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 - 11:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Team Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 - 1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Working Luncheon &amp; Debriefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Mark Bedell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Adjournment &amp; Departures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT C. DISTRICT PERSONNEL INTERVIEWED

- Dr. Mark Bedell, Superintendent
- David Anson, Interim Chief Information Officer
- Tanya Ellis, Ed Tech Ops Specialist
- Liliana Reyes, Ed Tech Ops Specialist
- Tyson Bell, Asst. Director, Educational Technology
- Shawn Driscoll, Manager, Technology Support
- Yuri Van Dierendonck, Senior Technology Intelligence Coordinator
- Marlon Andrews, Technology Security Specialist
- Doug Mason, Contractor
- Charles Coats, Enterprise Data Services Manager
- Cindy Jackson, Lead TSS (Service Desk)
- Michael Boyd, Technology Support Specialist 1
- Nolan Flores, Technology Support Specialist 2
- Michael Cody Presko, Technology Support Specialist 1
- Julie Fahrni, Technology Support Specialist 2
- Rudy Lawson, Technology Support Specialist 2
- Jerad Bernard, Senior Systems Engineer
- Greg Wright, Senior WAN/Network Engineer
- Jeff Hearrell, Lead TSS (Building Support)
- Kevin Jones, Technology Support Specialist 1
- Michael Paul, Technology Support Specialist 2
- Connie Aiello, Technology Support Specialist 2
- Sam Copeland, Contractor
- Nouredine Aliane, Contractor
- Dr. Holiday Scott, Dir., Education Systems & Charter Schools
- Jodie Powell, Infinite Campus Project Managers
- David Rand, Executive Director, R&D
- Jermone Williams, Accountability, Research & Assessment
- Linda Quinley, Chief Financial and Operations Officer
- Brenda Syrus, Director of Human Resources
- Derald Davis, Asst. Supt., Equity, Inclusion & Innovation
- Harrison Neal, Administration Central MS
- Kristian Foster, Administration Lincoln High School
- Jaqueline Tanner, Administration Garcia ES
- Simone Chambers, Administration SE High School
- Julie Lynch, Administration Hale Cook
- Kathlene Snipes, Administration Faxon
ATTACHMENT D. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- KCPS Blueprint 2030
- 2018-2019 Cyber-Attack Remediation
- 2021-09-29-Analytics-Export (1).pdf
- 2021-22 Start Up Checklist - KCPS MO as of 7 26_21.xlsx
- Executive Summary.pdf
- Extreme Maps
- FY21 and FY22 Expenditure Detail.xlsx
- Kansas City Public Schools Technology Support Services Group ...
- Kansas City Public Schools Wired Network Infrastructure
- KCMO Schools Network Topology Map-012920_v3.pdf
- KC MOSD SPB Diagram.pdf
- KCPS Appendix C1 Policy & Procedure.xlsx
- KCPS Infinite Campus Implementation Checklist.xlsx
- KCPS Infinite Campus implementation Plan.docx
- KCPS Org Chart Exec.docx
- KCPS School Network Address2.pdf
- SpearTip and Kansas City Public Schools.pdf
- Working Agenda 9.7.2021.docx
- 2021-09-29-Analytics-Export (1).pdf
- 2021-22 Start Up Checklist - KCPS MO as of 7_26_21.xlsx
- FY21 and FY22 Expenditure Detail.xlsx
- Kansas City 2021 CGCS.xlsx
- Kansas City Public Schools Technology Support Services Group Process
- Kansas City Public Schools Wired Network Infrastructure.docx
- KCPS Appendix C1 Policy & Procedure.xlsx
- KCPS Infinite Campus Implementation Checklist.xlsx
- KCPS Infinite Campus implementation Plan.docx
- Kansas City Public Schools Discovery Analysis
- KCPS Digital Transformation Operational Assessment
HISTORY OF COUNCIL SST REVIEWS
**HISTORY OF STRATEGIC SUPPORT TEAMS**

The following is a history of the Strategic Support Teams provided by the Council of the Great City Schools to urban school districts over the last 20+ years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>Facilities and Roofing</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2005 &amp; 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math Instruction</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities Operations</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classified Staffing</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Operations</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport</td>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward County (FL)</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities Operations</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>Superintendent Support</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities and Operations</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance II</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities Operations</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caddo Parish (LA)</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte-Mecklenburg</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Warehouse Operations</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education I</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education II</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Student Assignments</td>
<td>1999, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities Financing</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities Operations</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme Schools</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>Superintendent Support</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities Financing</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance and Treasury</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing Levels</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing Levels</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>Superintendent Support</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Superintendent Support</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Core Implementation</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Des Moines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Finance</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Levels</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detroit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Assessment</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook Procurement</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Budget</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulus planning</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>El Paso</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fresno</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guilford County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hawaii</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Operations</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Operations</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough County</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Operations</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Facilities Operations</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capitol Program</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance and Budget</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson (MS)</td>
<td>Bond Referendum</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>Organization and Management</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities operations</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget and finance</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Implementation</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stimulus Planning</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Budget and Finance</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>Management Information</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffing Levels</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade County</td>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Operations</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>Research and Testing</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Board Support</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Education</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Programs</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hurricane Damage Assessment</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>Testing and Assessment</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities Operations</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>Buildings and Grounds Operations</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach County</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Programs</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Department/Program</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Services and Finance</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities Operations</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Finance and Budget</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George’s County</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>Business Operations</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIS and Technology</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Hurricane Damage Assessment</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>Facilities Management</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Police</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Programs</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Operations</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Department(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>Finance and Technology</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Facilities Operations</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IT Operations</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance Operations</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Programs</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textbook Procurement</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget and Finance</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance and Operations</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Services</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Finance and Procurement</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilities Management</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal and General Counsel</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIS and Technology</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget and Finance</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Core Implementation</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>