

DEBORAH JEWELL-SHERMAN AND THE RICHMOND PUBLIC SCHOOLS:

A PROMISING START IS JUST THE BEGINNING^{1,2}

Case A

Reading the headline in the August 5, 2003, issue of the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, Dr. Deborah Jewell-Sherman realized that there would be no time to savor the successes of her first year as superintendent of Richmond Public Schools. Only five days into her second year, she had to contend with an e-mail message calling for her ouster. Did the anonymous sender expect her to turn around an entire school system in only one year?

The e-mail had been forwarded to members of the School Board and City Council by Stephen B. Johnson, the School Board's vice-chairman. The newspaper quoted Johnson as saying, "It didn't originate with me, but I did forward it to some people because I felt the public needed to know. It wasn't my intention to go after the superintendent, but I felt the issues needed to be addressed."

Jewell-Sherman had no illusions about the challenges facing her when she was sworn in as Richmond's seventh superintendent in 14 years. She had come to Richmond at the behest of Patricia Conn, a fellow doctoral student in Harvard's Urban Superintendents Program and superintendent of Richmond Public Schools from July of 1995 to March of 1997. Conn hired Jewell-Sherman to serve as associate superintendent for community engagement, a post that enabled her to learn a great deal about the public's concerns for its schools. Under Conn's successor, Albert Williams, Jewell-Sherman was moved to associate superintendent for accountability and instruction. In this role she came face to face with the school system's dismal academic track record.

¹ This case was authored by Professor Daniel L. Duke and Michael J. Salmonowicz of the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education and Partnership for Leaders in Education.

² This case was made possible through the generous financial support of the Wallace Foundation.

Only one of Virginia's 133 school divisions had a lower level of student achievement than Richmond Public Schools. Of Richmond's 55 schools, just five had attained full accreditation status in the fall of 2001 under Virginia's new educational accountability system. Full accreditation meant that at least 70 percent of a school's students passed the state's Standards of Learning (SOL) tests. The tests were administered in the third, fifth, and eighth grades as well as in selected subjects in high school. Twenty-nine Richmond schools were in the lowest category -- accredited with warning -- which indicated that their passing rates on SOL tests fell 20 or more percentage points below the 70 percent benchmark (see Exhibit I).

Low passing rates, however, were just the tip of the academic iceberg for Richmond Public Schools and its nearly 27,000 students. The school system's dropout (2.7% a year) and truancy rates (22%) were among the highest in the state. High school students took few advanced courses and scored poorly on the Scholastic Aptitude Tests (SAT). Some observers attributed these problems to Richmond's deteriorating school facilities, perennial financial difficulties, and problems with school violence. School principals recorded 10,961 disciplinary actions, including almost 9,000 suspensions, in 2001-2002. Others blamed teachers for inadequate instruction and low expectations for students. Still others pointed to the low level of parental involvement. Local politics and in-fighting among School Board members also were mentioned as reasons for the school division's lackluster performance. Deborah Jewell-Sherman's selection as superintendent, in fact, had resulted from a five-to-three vote. While her supporters argued that she had functioned in her role of associate superintendent as one of the "architects" of Albert Williams' plan to bring all the schools to full accreditation status, her critics on the School Board questioned her lack of experience in the role of superintendent. The director of the Richmond Education Association, which represented teachers in the school

system, registered his concern that three of the five board members who supported Jewell-Sherman's selection were not seeking re-election.

One matter on which School Board members agreed was the need for a performance-based contract for Deborah Jewell-Sherman. Believed to be the first such contract in Virginia, and possibly in the entire United States, Jewell-Sherman's two year, 11-month agreement tied her job security to student performance on state SOL tests. Three conditions had to be met or else she could be fired the following summer: 1) based on spring testing in 2003, at least 20 of Richmond's 55 schools had to be fully accredited; 2) no more than 12 schools could be accredited with warning; and 3) at least 16 of the city's elementary schools had to achieve passing rates of 70 percent or higher on the third grade SOL reading test. At the time she signed the contract, only three schools had attained this benchmark.

Other candidates for superintendent might have shied away from such a contract, but Deborah Jewell-Sherman. She embraced the agreement and the sense of urgency it represented. At Harvard she had studied urban school systems that managed to improve despite the odds. Having spent time in Tidewater Virginia as a principal, she also was aware that Norfolk, Richmond's sister city, was making impressive strides with a school population similar to Richmond's. As associate superintendent, she already had taken steps to raise student achievement. These steps included implementing the highly acclaimed Voyager reading program in summer school and experimenting with a commercial benchmark testing service to track student progress on the state Standards of Learning. Still, there was only so much she could do. William Midkiff, one of her board members, noted that Jewell-Sherman's largest complaint as associate superintendent was that "she had all the responsibility and none of the authority." (*Richmond Times-Dispatch*, August 1, 2002)

No sooner had Jewell-Sherman assumed the superintendency than the results of her initial efforts during her predecessor's tenure began to be felt. On August 9, 2002, the *Richmond Times-Dispatch* announced that city schools had made their biggest gains on state SOL tests since the tests first were administered in 1998. The number of fully accredited schools doubled from five to 10, and the number of schools with the lowest rating -- accredited with warning -- fell from 29 to 19. Jewell-Sherman was well on her way to meeting her contract benchmarks, and she had only been in office nine days.

Buses and Budgets

Jewell-Sherman understood that raising student achievement was job one, and she clearly was committed to that aim. No sooner had she moved into her spacious office on the 17th floor of City Hall, however, than she was confronted with a series of issues that seemed peripheral to her priorities. She wondered whether she would be able to deal effectively with these issues and still maintain a laser-like focus on improved teaching and learning.

One of the first issues involved the School Board's decision to extend the residential zone within which students were expected to walk to school. The move, intended to reduce the costs of bus transportation, produced a torrent of complaints from parents worried about the safety of their children. Resolving the transportation issue took several months. Meanwhile, Jewell-Sherman also had to deal with a controversy over her chief financial officer's failure to report a 2.2 million dollar surplus. Questions also were raised about the school division's fleet of 241 vehicles (not counting buses). Angry parents wondered why school system employees should have access to publicly funded transportation while their children were compelled to walk to school.

Late October brought panic regarding the possible presence of the Washington, D.C.-area sniper in the vicinity of Richmond. Schools were closed as a precautionary measure. Then, in early November a report on the conditions of Richmond's schools by a local architectural firm indicated that as many as 14 of the city's schools might need to be closed in the coming years. The price tag for renovation and replacement of facilities was set at 350 million dollars. Some of the schools targeted for closure were among Richmond's most revered.

Raising revenue for capital improvements seemed a remote possibility in December when Governor Mark Warner announced that Virginia faced a 1.1 billion dollar revenue shortfall. The timing could not have been worse for Deborah Jewell-Sherman and Richmond Public Schools. She had just presented her funding priorities to a delegation of Virginia legislators. These included more money for literacy programs, alternative education programs, teacher salaries, and school-based police officers. With state funds in short supply, Jewell-Sherman knew that she had nowhere else to turn except the city. This would be the third year in a row that the school division had to beg for increased local funding. Without adequate funding, however, a school division turnaround was unlikely.

January and February found Jewell-Sherman and the School Board grappling with how to cut the budget. Ideas ranged from school closings to curtailing the division's early retirement incentive program. Nearly 12 percent of the budget was spent on employee health care, and almost one-third of this amount was spent on retirees. In the midst of the debates over the budget, the school division received a strongly worded report on its special education program from the state Department of Education. The report indicated that many children who were eligible for special education services, especially those transferring into Richmond schools, were not receiving services. March 21 was set as the date by which a plan on how the problem would

be corrected had to be submitted to the state. Few doubted that such a plan would entail increased expenditures at a time when ways to trim the budget were being sought. Not surprisingly the head of Richmond's special education department tendered her resignation in early March.

On March 27, Jewell-Sherman and the School Board learned that its efforts to reduce the budget were not sufficient for City Council. Several council members expressed concern that administrative costs for the school division were increasing while student enrollment was declining. They pointed to other city school systems that operated more efficiently than Richmond.

On June 2, City Council finally approved its allocation to Richmond Public Schools. The figure represented 3.2 million dollars less than had been requested, but it was enough to permit a modest increase in teacher salaries and to enable Jewell-Sherman to continue her initiatives aimed at raising student achievement.

Prelude to Progress

Reflecting on her first year as superintendent, Deborah Jewell-Sherman expressed pride that she had been able to maintain a focus on improved teaching and learning despite the variety of other issues that she and the school system had faced. In order to stick to her commitment, she had enlisted the support of key School Board members, community partners, and central office administrators. Turning around a school system, she realized, was not a solo undertaking.

Unlike some of her fellow superintendents of low-performing school systems, one thing Jewell-Sherman did not do was start off by dismissing principals of schools where student achievement was especially low. She explained her approach as follows:

The principals never had received the training they needed to be effective. So we trained them to understand data, to use data to lead their staff. But I don't believe in just working with principals. I believe in working with a school's entire leadership team. We work really hard at getting information out to a team -- empower the principal to lead, but to lead an instructional or leadership team at the school.

Jewell-Sherman did make one key personnel move, however. She promoted Dr. Yvonne Brandon to her former position of associate superintendent of accountability and instruction. Brandon had been a successful principal and director of instruction and she had a solid grasp of curriculum and instruction. When Jewell-Sherman and Brandon reflected on where to begin district-wide improvements, they both agreed that site-based management, where key decisions regarding curriculum and instruction were left to the discretion of each principal, was not serving the needs of the system. Brandon put it thusly:

We were working hard, but we weren't working hard on the right things. We had an extremely dedicated staff of teachers, instructional staff, principals, but we did not have a clear definition of how to connect the pieces. We had no centralized curriculum alignment. We did not have any means of assessing our children to determine where they were and what they needed to do to get to the next level. The first step that we took was to look at an inventory of reading and mathematics products throughout the schools. We had previously been experimenting with site-based management. As a result, instruction became very, very varied. Each principal did what they wanted -- it was varied in intensity and in product, which didn't quite match with having a 44% mobility rate.

Richmond students frequently moved around from one city school to another. To assure that no student was placed at a disadvantage based on his or her school assignment, site-based management would have to give way to greater centralization of decision making regarding curriculum content, instructional methods, and assessment practices. Jewell-Sherman and Brandon knew, of course, that centralization was likely to provoke resistance from school

administrators and teachers, but they also understood that system-wide improvements in student achievement were unlikely without such a drastic change.

When Brandon inventoried reading programs in use in Richmond schools, she found elements of 29 different programs. Not only was program consistency from school to school lacking, but often there was no consistency from grade to grade in the same school. Vendors persuaded principals to use their reading programs without offering convincing proof of program effectiveness. Brandon had no intention of continuing this practice.

So one of the things that we started to do was to research products. We developed a list of critical criteria that a product must have, which included being scientifically based, having embedded assessments, having continuous professional development, and having provisions for training central office and lead administrative staff on a regular basis so that we could monitor the implementation and use of the product. Fidelity to implementation was a big, big issue because, of course, teachers are sometimes territorial. So, when the classroom door was shut, we had to be sure that what needed to be taught was being taught.

Jewell-Sherman's and Brandon's had focus on inventorying and assessing reading and mathematics programs in their first year, was a major accomplishment, but they did not stop there. They had been in Richmond long enough to know that curriculum inconsistency was only one of many problems. Instructional practice also was inconsistent. What was required, they believed, was a common instructional model for all teachers. Once again, they knew they would encounter resistance, but they realized that curriculum consistency without quality instruction was unlikely to raise student achievement. After extensive research and consultation, a cogent model of instruction emerged and was mandated for the entire school system. Brandon described the model as follows:

The model follows some of the more respected instructional strategies. You have a snapshot in the beginning of the class. You do direct instruction based on the children's level of understanding.

You give guided practice. You give homework. You take the children through some of the steps of the homework. You give them an opportunity to ask questions. And then you do a maintenance moment to conclude the lesson. That's a question that ties the current instruction to previous learning.

Jewell-Sherman and Brandon recognized that they needed to address one more area of concern in order to launch a system-wide effort to raise student achievement. Many Richmond teachers possessed only a limited knowledge of Virginia's Standards of Learning. Without a clear understanding of these standards, teachers were at a disadvantage when it came to preparing their students to take state standardized tests. Passage of these tests governed promotion and eventual graduation.

Brandon realized that the school system could kill two birds with one stone if model lessons were developed for every standard in the state's Standards of Learning. The task was enormous, but if each model lesson was based on the newly developed instructional model, then teachers who used the lessons would gain practice with the instructional model at the same time that they were focusing instruction on the required state standards. Developing the model lessons also provided an opportunity for classroom teachers to become directly involved in the process of turning around the school system. Teachers were paid stipends to work with instructional specialists on lesson development. Brandon described the process as follows:

Lesson plans for each SOL include a breakdown of the objective -- spiraling objectives. And those were objectives that perhaps were taught in the previous grade that were related to this objective. We have vocabulary terms, technology integration such as Web sites that the teacher could go to. We have field trips that were related to SOL objectives. We have critical terms that the teacher needed to concentrate on. Basically we created a well-organized book of lesson plans for each SOL objective in each subject, K-12.

Looking back on the work accomplished during the 2002-2003 school year, Jewell-Sherman and Brandon could not help but feel a great deal of satisfaction. Crucial steps toward curriculum alignment and instructional improvement had been taken. Still, any feelings of satisfaction had to be mixed with anxiety. Much of the first year's work focused on research and development. The stage clearly had been set for a turnaround, but would the lead actor be allowed to perform? That decision was contingent on the results of state testing in the spring of 2003. As summer approached, Richmond's superintendent awaited notification of preliminary results.

Mixed Signals

In July of 2003, the state released the preliminary results of the previous spring's school testing program. Richmond educators were pleased that 11 of the 55 schools achieved full accreditation status. For the first time since the SOL tests were introduced, two Richmond high schools met the highest standard. Passing rates in English rose for all high schools. Words of praise for the new superintendent were heard from many quarters.

No one knew better than Jewell-Sherman, however, that much work remained to be done. Her performance-based contract had specified that at least 20 schools would be fully accredited. Middle school parents were displeased that no Richmond middle school had achieved full accreditation. Concern also was expressed that one out of four Richmond students had been suspended from school the previous year. Almost 500 members of the Class of 2004, the first class to face Virginia's new graduation requirements, were at risk of not graduating because they had failed to acquire the necessary "verified credits" by passing state tests. Persistent problems addressing the needs of special education students also had to be faced.

There was no doubt in Deborah Jewell-Sherman's mind that she had set Richmond Public Schools on the right course and that continued attention to curriculum alignment, regular assessment of student progress, timely instructional intervention, and targeted staff development would yield benefits. While preliminary results from the spring 2003 tests produced only one additional school in the fully accredited category, there was reason to believe that the "official" results to be released by the state in November might yield better news. But would Jewell-Sherman be around in November to receive it? There was the matter of her performance-based contract and that e-mail calling for her removal. And if she were around, would she and Yvonne Brandon be able to maintain the momentum to move from site-based management to greater centralization? Would teacher resistance to a system-wide instructional model be overcome? Could agreement be reached in the central office about a preferred reading and mathematics curriculum? If so, would principals in Richmond's lowest achieving schools embrace them?

Exhibit I

**DEBORAH JEWELL-SHERMAN AND THE RICHMOND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
A PROMISING START IS JUST THE BEGINNING**

Richmond Public Schools: Pass Rates on SOL Tests, 1998-2003

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003*
3 Reading	35	40	37	40	54	72
5 Reading	46	40	43	52	57	82
8 Reading	45	37	45	49	48	68
HS Reading	56	53	55	65	77	94
3 Math	40	41	44	50	60	83
5 Math	22	20	37	39	50	74
8 Math	23	29	31	38	42	73
HS Algebra I	14	20	21	42	54	78

* Spring 2003 tests occurred at the end of Jewell-Sherman's first year as superintendent.

Exhibit I.

Data gathered from: <http://www.richmond.k12.va.us/indexnew/sub/statistics/statistics.cfm>

RPS Academic Record of SAT I

SAT I-Verbal Score (%)	2001	2002	2003
600 or above	23	24	21
500 to 599	15	15	15
400 to 499	25	25	27
below 400	37	35	37

Mean	2001	2002	2003
All students	470	474	467
Males	462	481	488
Females	474	470	453
Top tenth high school rank	542	507	490
Second tenth high school rank	483	448	421
Second fifth high school rank	439	427	414
Third fifth high school rank	393	399	387

Median (50th Percentile)	2001	2002	2003
All students	440	450	440

SAT I-Math Score (%)	2001	2002	2003
600 or above	19	22	19
500 to 599	14	12	13
400-499	26	26	28
below 400	42	39	40

Mean	2001	2002	2003
All students	452	458	450
Males	458	478	478
Females	448	446	433
Top tenth high school rank	527	492	481
Second tenth high school rank	457	439	414
Second fifth high school rank	427	396	406
Third fifth high school rank	375	386	359

Median (50th Percentile)	2001	2002	2003
All students	430	430	430

Truancy Rates

School Year 2002-2003			
School	Membership	Students Missing 10 or More Days	Percentage
Elementary	13818	1147	8%
Middle	5751	1068	19%
High	5586	2236	40%
TOTALS	25155	4451	17%

School Year 2001-2002			
School	Membership	Students Missing 10 or More Days	Percentage
Elementary	14201	200	1.40%
Middle	5845	583	9.97%
High	5992	1396	23.29%
TOTALS	26038	2179	8.36%

School Year 2000-2001			
School	Membership	Students Missing 10 or More Days	Percentage
Elementary	14858	2075	14%
Middle	5834	2259	39%
High	6361	3591	56%
TOTALS	27053	7925	29%

School Year 1999-2000			
School	Membership	Students Missing 10 or More Days	Percentage
Elementary	15412	3230	21%
Middle	6102	1969	32%
High	6336	3227	51%
TOTALS	27850	8426	30%

Dropout Rate Comparison

Year	Rate	% Change
1996-1997	6.50%	--
1997-1998	5.47%	+1.03%
1998-1999	4.34%	+1.13%
1999-2000	3.54%	+0.80%
2000-2001	2.81%	+0.73%
2001-2002	2.71%	+0.10%
2002-2003	12.14%	+9.43%

Ethnic Statistics 2001-2002

Membership Totals

Date	Black	White	Asian	Indian	Hispanic	TOTAL
9/04/01-9/28/01	24,602	1,853	192	15	522	27,184
3/15/02	24,329	1,830	155	13	491	26,818

Ratio

Date	Black	White	Asian	Indian	Hispanic
9/04/01-9/28/01	91.00	7.00	1.00	0	2.00
3/15/02	90.72	6.82	.58	.05	1.83

Other

Date	A.D.A.	A.D.M	E1 E2-R3	% Attend.	Male	Female
9/04/01-9/28/01	25,018	26,245	27,664	95.95	13,578	13,606
3/15/02					13,400	13,418

Elementary Schools Totals

School	Black	White	Asian	Indian	Hispanic	TOTAL
Bellevue	279	1	0	0	2	282
Blackwell	332	3	0	0	2	337
Blackwell Annex	236	0	0	0	4	240
Broad Rock	356	25	3	0	4	240
Carver, G.W.	632	1	0	0	0	633
Cary, John B.	331	11	7	0	3	352
Chimborazo	571	14	0	0	0	585
Clark Springs	407	8	1	0	2	418
Fairfield Court	379	3	0	0	1	383
Fisher, J.B. Model	256	105	4	2	4	371
Fox, William	144	252	13	1	8	418
Fracis, J.L.	479	24	6	0	15	524
Ginter Park Annex	613	0	0	0	1	614
Greene, E.S.H.	397	77	0	1	64	473
Henry, Patrick	349	11	0	1	64	473
Holton, Linwood	447	100	4	0	2	553
Mason, George	414	0	0	0	1	415
Maymont	259	3	1	0	3	266
Miles Jones	402	29	12	0	28	471
Munford, Mary	161	286	12	1	8	427
Norrell, A.V.	422	2	2	0	1	427
Norrell Annex						
Oak Grove	437	15	0	0	4	456
Overby-Sheppard	427	2	0	0	5	434
Redd, Elizabeth D.	443	17	6	0	14	480
Reid, G.H.	588	42	4	1	38	673
Ruffin Road	101	12	0	0	12	126
Southampton	380	33	4	0	11	428
Stuart, J.E.B.	515	1	0	0	1	515
Summer Hill	332	39	6	0	21	398

Swansboro	325	6	0	2	4	337
Westover Hills	349	18	2	1	16	386
Whitcomb Court	369	2	0	0	0	371
Woodville	653	1	0	0	0	654

Middle School Totals

School	Black	White	Asian	Indian	Hispanic	TOTAL
Binford	449	87	2	1	2	541
Boushall	761	53	2	1	19	863
Brown, Lucille	537	24	12	0	7	580
Chandler	511	5	0	0	0	516
Elkhardt	429	23	9	0	38	499
Henderson	640	5	3	0	5	653
Hill, Albert	372	94	3	0	3	472
Minnis, Onslow	476	9	0	0	2	487
Mosby	511	1	0	0	1	487
Thompson	714	31	2	0	9	756

High School Totals

School	Black	White	Asian	Indian	Hispanic	TOTAL
Armstrong	622	15	0	0	0	637
Franklin Military	153	6	0	0	1	160
Huguenot	1041	86	9	0	60	1205
Jefferson, Thomas	647	99	8	1	7	762
Kennedy, J.F.	713	5	0	0	1	719
Marshall, John	831	44	0	0	4	879
Open High	124	53	1	0	2	180
Richmond	171	45	2	0	1	219
Community	171	45	2	0	1	219
Wythe, George	985	44	0	0	9	1038

Alternative / Exceptional School Totals

School	Black	White	Asian	Indian	Hispanic	TOTAL
ACDC	483	16	4	0	7	510
Amelia Street School	74	7	1	0	2	84
Federal Programs	99	1	1	0	1	102
Mosby Elementary	90	0	0	0	0	90
Preschool Dev. Cen.	56	1	0	0	0	90
Real School	34	2	0	0	0	36
Thirteen Acres	23	2	0	0	0	25

RICHMOND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST, NINTH EDITION
MEAN PERCENTILE RANKS

GRADE 4, FALL 1999-00 AND GRADE 4, FALL 2000-01

	READING TOTAL		MATHEMATICS TOTAL		LANGUAGE TOTAL		PARTIAL BATTERY	
	GRADE 4	GRADE 4	GRADE 4	GRADE 4	GRADE 4	GRADE 4	GRADE 4	GRADE 4
	FALL 1999-00	FALL 2000-01	FALL 1999-00	FALL 2000-01	FALL 1999-00	FALL 2000-01	FALL 1999-00	FALL 2000-01
NATIONAL NORM	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
RICHMOND	27	30	35	39	41	42	35	37
BELLEVUE	27	39	44	49	50	51	39	48
BLACKWELL	18	24	26	39	30	36	25	35
BROAD ROCK	37	32	40	30	47	44	44	35
CARVER	22	18	28	29	32	29	28	26
CARY	24	43	25	45	38	51	29	46
CHIMBORAZO	17	18	18	28	24	25	21	25
CLARK SPRINGS	19	20	30	46	34	46	29	36
FAIRFIELD	11	9	13	16	26	20	17	15
FISHER	70	62	65	61	69	70	67	63
FOX	67	78	62	78	76	83	66	77
FRANCIS	28	29	35	37	45	45	36	36
GINTER PARK	24	25	31	29	38	34	31	31
GREENE	32	30	64	60	45	50	48	47
HOLTON	33	42	32	52	39	58	36	51
JONES	20	25	30	34	38	36	29	32
MASON	21	20	30	29	37	35	29	29
MAYMONT	20	29	23	29	36	38	26	33
MUNFORD	63	69	78	74	73	73	71	71
NORRIELL	22	25	35	39	35	41	32	35
OAK GROVE	23	22	24	28	40	29	29	27
OVERBY SHEPPARD	18	30	32	50	22	41	27	42
PATRICK HENRY	20	32	35	34	39	43	32	37
REDD	29	41	46	54	46	47	39	48
REID	32	39	41	49	49	44	41	46
SOUTHAMPTON	45	45	63	60	63	62	57	55
STUART	30	30	30	33	44	43	35	35
SUMMER HILL	17	18	23	23	26	32	24	24
SWANSBORO	21	22	25	30	30	35	26	29
WESTOVER	26	25	25	32	41	29	31	30
WHITCOMB	9	13	15	14	22	20	15	16
WOODVILLE	12	16	19	28	27	30	19	25

RICHMOND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST, NINTH EDITION
MEAN PERCENTILE RANKS

GRADE 4, FALL 1999-00 AND GRADE 4, FALL 2000-01

	READING TOTAL		MATHEMATICS TOTAL		LANGUAGE TOTAL		PARTIAL BATTERY	
	GRADE 4	GRADE 4	GRADE 4	GRADE 4	GRADE 4	GRADE 4	GRADE 4	GRADE 4
	FALL 1999-00	FALL 2000-01	FALL 1999-00	FALL 2000-01	FALL 1999-00	FALL 2000-01	FALL 1999-00	FALL 2000-01
NATIONAL NORM	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
RICHMOND	27	30	35	39	41	42	35	37
BELLEVUE	27	39	44	49	50	51	39	48
BLACKWELL	18	24	26	39	30	36	25	35
BROAD ROCK	37	32	40	30	47	44	44	35
CARVER	22	18	28	29	32	29	28	26
CARY	24	43	25	45	38	51	29	46
CHIMBORAZO	17	18	18	28	24	25	21	25
CLARK SPRINGS	19	20	30	46	34	46	29	36
FAIRFIELD	11	9	13	16	26	20	17	15
FISHER	70	62	65	61	69	70	67	63
FOX	67	78	62	78	76	83	66	77
FRANCIS	28	29	35	37	45	45	36	36
GINTER PARK	24	25	31	29	38	34	31	31
GREENE	32	30	64	60	45	50	48	47
HOLTON	33	42	32	52	39	58	36	51
JONES	20	25	30	34	38	36	29	32
MASON	21	20	30	29	37	35	29	29
MAYMONT	20	29	23	29	36	38	26	33
MUNFORD	63	69	78	74	73	73	71	71
NORRIELL	22	25	35	39	35	41	32	35
OAK GROVE	23	22	24	28	40	29	29	27
OVERBY SHEPPARD	18	30	32	50	22	41	27	42
PATRICK HENRY	20	32	35	34	39	43	32	37
REDD	29	41	46	54	46	47	39	48
REID	32	39	41	49	49	44	41	46
SOUTHAMPTON	45	45	63	60	63	62	57	55
STUART	30	30	30	33	44	43	35	35
SUMMER HILL	17	18	23	23	26	32	24	24
SWANSBORO	21	22	25	30	30	35	26	29
WESTOVER	26	25	25	32	41	29	31	30
WHITCOMB	9	13	15	14	22	20	15	16
WOODVILLE	12	16	19	28	27	30	19	25

RICHMOND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST, NINTH EDITION
MEAN PERCENTILE RANKS

GRADE 6, FALL 1999-00 AND GRADE 6, FALL 2000-01

	READING TOTAL		MATHEMATICS TOTAL		LANGUAGE TOTAL		PARTIAL BATTERY	
	GRADE 6	GRADE 6	GRADE 6	GRADE 6	GRADE 6	GRADE 6	GRADE 6	GRADE 6
	FALL 1999-00	FALL 2000-01	FALL 1999-00	FALL 2000-01	FALL 1999-00	FALL 2000-01	FALL 1999-00	FALL 2000-01
NATIONAL NORM	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
RICHMOND	31	33	32	35	33	35	34	38
BINFORD	54	58	52	57	54	57	55	59
BOUSHALL	28	25	32	29	31	28	32	29
BROWN	33	39	33	40	35	37	35	43
CHANDLER	24	27	25	28	28	29	28	32
ELKHARDT	32	32	31	39	32	34	35	38
HENDERSON	28	28	29	32	31	33	31	33
ALBERT HILL	36	41	39	39	35	38	38	43
MINNIS	32	29	26	35	29	35	34	36
MOSEBY	20	22	23	23	23	24	24	25
THOMPSON	30	31	33	32	32	34	34	36