August 31, 2017

Dear Colleagues and Partners:

As we begin the 2017-18 school year I am probably not the only one who has thought - where has the time gone? Seemingly in the blink of an eye, summer is over. Our school hallways are again filled with great young people returning for another year of academics, sports, art, music, learning and growth.

We are so privileged to do the work we do helping our students prepare for what is a truly limitless future. But as we celebrate the start of this new school year, we know there is a lot to do.

By the summer of 2018, all Orleans Parish public schools now overseen by the state Recovery School District will be back under local oversight for the first time in over a decade. That means the Orleans Parish School Board (OPSB) will go from overseeing 20 schools and 13,000 students in 2014, to overseeing more than 75 schools and 44,000 students by July 2018.

This is a historic moment. Soon New Orleans will again control her own destiny and the duly elected school board will be in the lead, always staying true to our guiding principles, which include:

- **High Standards:** Every child in every neighborhood should have access to great public schools;
- **Choice for Families:** Every family should have access to a diverse set of school options for their child through a clear and fair process;
- **Equity and Fairness:** Each individual student must be ensured a great education regardless of their background or needs;
- **School and Family Empowerment:** The teachers and parents closest to students should be empowered to make educational decisions for their kids.

Consistent with our obligations under Act 91, we will provide quarterly updates through July 2018 on our progress since implementing the Unification Plan. In submitting this fourth update, I am pleased to share that we have made significant strides and have met or are in the process of meeting the September Milestones set forth in the Unification Plan.

Please read the enclosed September Unification Milestone Report to learn about the important work my team has been engaged in over the past three months.

Sincerely,

Henderson Lewis, Jr., Ph.D.
Superintendent, Orleans Parish School Board
Unification Advisory Committee:
September Quarterly Milestone Update

September 6, 2017
Agenda for today

1. Vision & District Strategic Plan
2. Unification Milestone Update
3. Facilities Siting
4. Charter School Accountability Framework
One year into the unification process, we’ve made a lot of progress and are ready to engage in the remaining work of unification.

**Community Engagement**
- Engaged over 5,000 community members and students
- Hosted 10+ Town Halls and community meetings
- Convened 4 Task Forces with over 100 participants
- Conducted two citywide surveys

**Significant Accomplishments**
- Created Common Charter Contract
- Established Operator Enrollment Cap and Differentiated Funding formula
- Created Facilities Maintenance and Repair standards and Handbook
- Updated Facilities Lease
Where we are in the vision and strategic goal setting process

January-May
- Board working session to discuss potential mission and vision for OPSB
- OPSB convened Superintendent’s Student Advisory Committee and launched the Community Education Survey

May
- Board considered input from students and the community

June
- Meetings with school leaders, Board Chairs, parents, community organizations, and the broader community

July
- Administration drafted initial vision and strategic priorities document based on the feedback received in the previous 6 months

August
- Town Halls with the community
- Public release of draft vision and strategic goals to the public on August 15, 2017

September
- Final approval by the Board

We will discuss our proposed stakeholder engagement process for getting from today’s session to a final public document later in this meeting
We have sought to create multiple opportunities to hear from our community

**Parent & Community Voice**
- 3,800+ New Orleanians responded to citywide survey on public education. Survey was heavily advertised online and available in paper form at various locations.
- Meetings with education and community leaders and elders.
- Focus groups with diverse array of New Orleans teachers, parents and residents.

**Student Voice**
- Superintendent’s Student Advisory Committee – new group of students from all over the city convened for small group conversations with Superintendent
- New Orleans Student Survey – 750+ respondents

**Elected School Board**
- November Work Session
- January Board Retreat
- May Board Working Session
- August Board Working Session
Building A Vision: School Board, Student, & Community Voice
At our Board retreat, we discussed the following elements in shaping a five- to ten-year vision for public education in our city.

- **Community & Collaboration**
- **Adequate and Equitable Resources**
- **Public Education as a Vehicle for the City’s Progress**
- **Inclusive of the Whole City**

- “Overall, our public education can be the foundation for our students to successfully enter the next stages of their lives, whether that is pursuing higher education or the workforce.”

- “Schools are more future-focused, which benefits students as they prepare to compete nationally and internationally.”
Building A Vision: Initial Reflections from the Board: Areas of Focus

For the City’s Education Community
- Unity
- Talent
- Expanding services and supports
- Improving school quality
- Increasing investment

For District Leadership
- **Community engagement:** Inclusive decision-making, building broad support for public education
- **Accountability and effective regulation:** Clear and consistent expectations and enforcement, especially for students with unique needs
- **Resourcing:** Both maximizing existing resources and marshaling new funds
The Superintendent's Student Advisory Committee believes that every public school student should experience the highest quality education in inclusive and empowering schools throughout the city. These experiences should include:

- A Rigorous and Diverse Academic Experience
- Robust Extracurricular Opportunities
- Comprehensive Student Support Services
- Fair and Firm School Culture and Discipline
- Authentic Platforms for Student Voice and Representation
Public Schools in New Orleans must ensure that we have access to the highest quality teachers who personalize instruction and create rigorous learning environments and give us access to a variety of curricular options to support our passions and futures.

Public Schools in New Orleans should offer rich and varied extracurricular activities and opportunities that appeal to all of us, including sports, clubs, internships, service learning activities, and trips.

Every school must provide a support system for all of us, with caring and available staff members and updated resources to help ensure our social, emotional and physical needs are fully met. Above all else, we believe that every adult in our schools should care about the whole child, not just academic achievement.

Public schools in New Orleans should create a firm and respectful school culture that is most conducive to learning, while simultaneously allowing us to feel accepted, engaged and free to express ourselves as young people.

Our schools, and the district as a whole, must strive to include our voices, collectively and individually, in school affairs, academic choices, and school culture. We believe our voices should be at the center of key conversations about our city’s public schools.
The availability of high quality school options

- Most believe in the value of the choice system that New Orleans has adopted
- But many also feel dissatisfied with the choices they have, and want to see high quality schools in every neighborhood

Defining appropriate expectations for schools

- The community wants to see schools setting higher expectations for students
- But those higher expectations should reflect a broad set of skills and capabilities that prepare students for their futures

Access to diverse schools

- There is significant room for improvement in creating schools that are socio-economically and racially diverse, to which parents from all backgrounds want to send their students
In the new and unique public school system we are building, families and community members need to know what they can expect from the district.

We are focused on five key questions that help shape public education in the city:

- **As a regulator of schools, which schools are allowed to open, and which need to be closed?**
  - School Oversight and Planning

- **How do families and community members have a voice in decisions regarding public education?**
  - Community Affairs

- **How do students and families enroll in schools and access the services they need?**
  - Equity and Student Support

- **How do we invest to preserve and improve our school facilities?**
  - Facilities

- **How do we fund our schools and other citywide educational programs?**
  - Finance and Administration
Building A Vision: Citywide Survey
Additional implications for vision and priorities

- The vision that we articulate needs to be student-centered and focused on the success of the whole child. Academic achievement is critical, but can feel narrowly defined.

- Our strategic priorities for 2018 and beyond need to be simple and clear, so that the priorities themselves help the community understand our role and where families can expect from us.

- The community input suggests some potential areas of focus as we develop our strategic priorities:
  - High Quality Schools: families clearly feel that they need more high-quality options, with a greater focus on equity in under-served neighborhoods.
  - School Accountability: the community wants schools that embrace a broad definition of student success, and supports a growth-oriented approach to measuring results.
  - School Diversity: individuals throughout the city want access to diverse schools where more families from across the city are comfortable sending their students.
  - School Facilities: community members are proud of the investments that have been made in school facilities. We need to preserve and build on this progress so that all children are educated in a 21st century school.
Our Response: Draft Vision & District Strategic Plan
Elements presented to Unification Advisory Committee members today
- A Vision for Students
- Our Core Commitments, to guide our district’s work on behalf of students and families
- A detailed set of District Responsibilities, including district areas of focus, opportunities for partnership and community voice, and proposed progress measures

Elements to be presented to the School Board once framework is adopted
- Annual district action plan and metrics, aligned to the three year Strategic Priorities
- New School Development Priorities (formerly Charter Authorizer Priorities), to be presented to the Board in the fall as part of the Authorizing Approach milestone required by the Unification Plan
- Charter School Authorizing Framework (formerly School Performance Framework), to be presented to the Board in Fall 2017 as required by the Unification Plan

The Vision and Strategic Plan elements presented here are in draft form and will continue to be modified based on feedback from the board, UAC and community.
What OPSB heard from our community - vision & commitments

**Draft Vision Based on Community Feedback:**

Every student receives a high-quality education that fosters his or her individual capabilities, while ensuring that they thrive and are prepared for civic, social, and economic success

**Draft Commitments Based on Community Feedback:**

- **We advance equity**
  - for students and families, by viewing all decisions that we make through the lens of advancing opportunity and access for each child based on his or her unique abilities

- **We protect choice for families**
  - who know their children best by providing information so that they are able to make informed decisions, and by ensuring that there are high quality school options to choose from in every community in the city

- **We elevate student and community voice**
  - so that our work is informed by the needs and desires of those who are most directly affected by our public schools; including parents, families, and other voices in our community

- **We are transparent and efficient**
  - to deepen confidence among the public at large that resources for public education are being used wisely to serve children and to reduce the administrative burden on our school

- **We create opportunities for students to thrive**
  - reflecting the District's role as critical, but limited. We will work to see students succeed especially to realize high student achievement in our schools
Our District Responsibilities

We believe that it is the district office’s responsibility to enable high-quality life outcomes for all students in New Orleans, by serving as a strong and responsible regulator of schools and a responsible steward of public resources.

We promote equity and fairness for students and families

by providing and advocating for a range of services and programs for some of New Orleans’ most vulnerable students.

We hold schools accountable to high standards for student achievement

through a rigorous school performance framework, ongoing performance oversight aligned to standards, and regular contractual review and renewal decisions.

We provide families with a choice of high quality schools

by operating EnrollNOLA fairly and transparently, conducting a robust new school development process, and curating schools that are representative of our community.

We are a responsible steward of public resources

by being transparent about how funds are used, preserving and improving our school facilities, and maintaining strong financial oversight.
From the wisdom imparted by thousands of teachers, students and New Orleanians, we’ve developed these ideas of a consensus and inclusive vision for OPSB. But the work is not yet done. We need more feedback.

- To this end, the OPSB will host a series of town halls throughout the city:
  - Wednesday, August 23 at Alice Harte
  - Thursday, August 24 at KIPP Central City Academy
  - Thursday, August 31 at Lake Forest Charter School
  - Thursday, September 7 at McDonogh 35 Senior High School

- Based on additional feedback, a revised version of vision will be presented to the School Board. Additional implementation details will be in the strategic plan framework that accompanies vision.

- The adopted vision and strategic plan framework will serve as the foundation for additional work through the Fall, including
  - Approach to Authorizing Schools and New School Development Priorities
  - Charter School Accountability Framework
  - 2017-18 School Year District Action Plan
Unification Update: Milestones
## September Milestone Progress

### We are on track to meet all September Unification Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Milestone Deliverables</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>On Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolio</strong></td>
<td>Develop the School Performance Framework</td>
<td>• Updated School Performance Framework</td>
<td>• OPSB continues to engage in several stakeholder conversations and will continue making revisions as necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update the School Performance Framework to incorporate the state's adjustment to ESSA</td>
<td></td>
<td>• State ESSA plan has been adopted and alignment with CSAF is ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citywide Services and Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>Clarify the future status of the New Orleans Therapeutic Day Program (NOTDP) within the New Orleans Community</td>
<td>• Process document for NOTDP transition plan</td>
<td>• NOTDP planning on becoming a nonprofit organization prior to July 1, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities</strong></td>
<td>Refine existing policy around the sale and access to surplus or vacant buildings and ensure alignment with the portfolio management process.</td>
<td>• OPSB Policy • Process Document</td>
<td>• Facility policies FE, HD, and FJ were approved at the March Board meeting • Siting process will launch by end of August</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance and Operations</strong></td>
<td>Develop a plan and mechanisms to ensure financial viability for both OPSB and RSD during the transition period leading to unification.</td>
<td>• Letters of Confirmation and approved 2018 budgets from OPSB and RSD</td>
<td>• OPSB and RSD’s FY18 budgets have been approved</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### December Milestone Overview

**Work on December milestones is underway**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citywide Services and Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>Identify which citywide services and resources will be funded within the expected revenues for the unified school district.</td>
<td>• FY18 Budget outlines all services that will be funded by the unified school district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determine the role of OPSB as a partner to non-profits that play critical roles in supporting citywide services.</td>
<td>• OPSB’s Equity and Student Services team are creating a process document for managing critical non-profit relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolio Management</strong></td>
<td>Ensure that facility and enrollment policies and processes are aligned with the portfolio management process.</td>
<td>• OPSB’s has convened a School Leader group to discuss and provide feedback on a draft Authorizing Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalized School Performance Framework and associated accountability processes will be aligned with all existing OPSB charter policies regarding student equity, emergency management, enrollment, and school authorization</td>
<td>• Stakeholders are providing feedback on policies associated with CSAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities</strong></td>
<td>Develop policies and processes to secure property insurance that meet insuring standards for adequate coverage.</td>
<td>• Insurance rates have been locked in through the 2018-19 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan for the development of the revolving facility loan fund and individual school facility accounts.</td>
<td>• Weekly OPSB/RSD meetings are being held to create a plan and process for establishing a revolving facility loan fund and individual school accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop and implement standards and policies for capital repairs and replacements funded through the School Facility Preservation Program.</td>
<td>• Facilities policies HD, FE, FJ work in concert to provide operators with transparency on the process for capital repairs and replacements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adjusted December Milestone

Based on feedback from stakeholders and a change in the timeline for facilities master planning, we have made a change to an upcoming facilities milestones

School Facility Preservation Program related Policies

- Facilities Master Planning will also impact the planning process for the Facilities Preservation Fund; in order to allow for ample time for additional school facility assessments, the incorporation of 10/1/17 student data and input from relevant stakeholders, OPSB will make this a March 2018 Milestone
Our responsibility is to give schools and the community a transparent process for facility siting decisions

Overview:
- OPSB will carry out a bi-annual facility siting process in August and January
- Available facilities listed based upon combination of facility condition and city needs
- Two types of leases will be available for buildings depending on building condition
- Facilities not claimed may be considered for surplus
- Request for a facility does not guarantee placement at such facility
Facilities Siting – Who can apply? Who can’t?

- No simultaneous awards of charters and facilities. Must have an approved charter to apply during the fall cycle.
  - Type 1 applicants – Cannot apply this cycle
  - Transformation applicants – Cannot apply this cycle

- Majority of facility space must be used for the explicit purpose of educating students

- Schools currently housed in a facility but looking to move to a different facility
The first round of facility siting process will begin in August

Timeline

1. **August 31, 2017**
   - Publish list of available properties on OPSB website and notify RSD and OPSB operators
   - Include assessment data, drawings, capacity information, and known issues
   - Decision criteria released

2. **September**
   - Open house visits for all facilities available through the fall process

3. **October 13, 2017**
   - Applications due along with prioritized rankings of sites if multiple sites are selected

4. **October 31, 2017**
   - Siting team to share recommendations with executive team
   - Executive team discusses and approves final siting decisions
   - Schools notified of final decisions

Operators awarded buildings in October of 2017 will receive a lease that commences July 1, 2018
The second round of facility siting decisions will begin in January

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 12, 2018</td>
<td>• Publish list of available properties on OPSB website and notify RSD and OPSB operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Include assessment data, drawings, capacity information, and known issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decision criteria released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>• Open house visits for all facilities available through the spring process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2, 2018</td>
<td>• Applications due along with prioritized rankings of sites if multiple sites are selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 15, 2018</td>
<td>• Siting team to share recommendations with executive team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Executive team discusses and approves final siting decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Schools notified of final decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operators awarded buildings in March of 2018 will receive a lease that commences July 1, 2018
Facility Siting - Criteria

### Criteria

1. **Community Support – 30%**
   - Evaluated based on letters of support from neighborhood organizations, businesses, and neighbors
   - Examples of community outreach exhibited by the school will also be considered
   - Tiered ranking system (0, 10, 20, 30)

2. **Commitment to Improvements – 30%**
   - Any stated commitments to repair the specific facility will be considered and evaluated
   - Tiered ranking system (0, 10, 20, 30)

3. **Utilization – 20%**
   - Current enrollment and future enrollment vs. program capacity will be considered and evaluated
   - Tiered ranking system (0, 10, 20)

4. **Strategic Priority – 20%**
   - Strategic priority of academic program shall be considered and evaluated
   - (0 - 20)
Facilities Assignment Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No evidence of engagement with neighborhood organizations, businesses, and neighbors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Evidence of minimal engagement with neighborhood organizations, business, and neighbors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Evidence of substantial engagement with neighborhood organizations, businesses and neighbors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Documented support from multiple stakeholders including neighborhood organizations, businesses, and neighbors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments to</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No evidence of commitment to improve the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Commitment to minimal facilities improvements. Commitments primarily aesthetic in nature. Application may or may not have shared proof of funding plans to support improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Commitment to substantial aesthetic improvements and/or minimal structural improvements with a realistic funding plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fully developed plan for substantial structural and aesthetic upgrades along with a realistic funding plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Realistic full enrollment projections of less than 50% of building capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Realistic full enrollment projections between 50% and 75% of building capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Realistic full enrollment projections between 75% and 100% of building capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Priority</td>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>Scoring based upon how well the proposed academic program aligns with administrative priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Two types of leases based on property assessment data

- **FCI** = Facility Condition index (Cost to repair/Cost to build new)
  - The higher the FCI, the worse shape the building is in

### Type A leases
- Will be aligned to charter term with the maximum lease expiring June 30, 2021.

### Type B leases
- Will allow for extended lease terms to be negotiated with OPSB upon assignment to allow for private investment.
- Place full liability for repairs and maintenance on the operator.
  - OPSB will not invest any money in Type B facilities
  - Operators will be fully liable for Repairs, Maintenance, and Capital investment

### Facility Assessment Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Available for Surplus Process</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>FCI</th>
<th>Investment Type</th>
<th>Lease Type</th>
<th>Program Capacity</th>
<th>SY17-18 Operator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Process - July 1, 2018 Lease</strong></td>
<td>Rosenwald</td>
<td>47.61%</td>
<td>Prior Refurbishment</td>
<td>Type A - Current Lease</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AP Tureaud</td>
<td>65.48%</td>
<td>None - Landbanked</td>
<td>Type B - Full Liability</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gentilly Terrace</td>
<td>56.21%</td>
<td>Prior Refurbishment</td>
<td>Type B - Full Liability</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Charter School Accountability Framework
In this presentation, we seek to:

- Provide an overview of the context and expectations OPSB has been charged with in revising its current accountability framework.

- Share the objectives of the Draft Charter School Accountability Framework (CSAF) and OPSB’s commitments to schools and the community at large.

- Explain the process OPSB has undertaken to revise the framework, specifically:
  - The stakeholder groups who have been engaged.
  - The steps which have been taken to draft and revise CSAF components over time.

- Highlight elements of the draft CSAF which are still under significant deliberation and highlight the work that remains for OPSB to finalize the policy recommendations.
The Unification plan called for OPSB to revisit and revise its approach to school accountability.

As part of Act 91, passed in May 2016, and the Unification Plan, approved in August 2016, OPSB is required to revise its School Performance Framework in advance of Unification.

Our Primary Charge, per Act 91

- OPSB will present a new school performance framework and associated policies, which reflect the discussion and debate of stakeholders along with state-mandated ESSA obligations.

Policy Context

Revising the accountability approach, per Act 91 requires OPSB to:

- Navigate both OPSB’s and RSD’s past and proposed accountability frameworks as well as the gaps between those frameworks.
  - Policy HAB, HB and HC along with the “School Performance Framework” in OPSB
  - BESE Bulletin 126 and the Charter School Performance Compact (CSPC) in the RSD
  - Emerging revisions to the CSPC
- Consider the skill and capacity of its internal team to execute the work with fidelity, given allotted resources.
- Consider the potential future impact of an evolving state accountability system.
OPSB has worked most closely with the Accountability and Authorization Task Force but has also sought out and engaged with other groups formally as well.

### Accountability and Authorization Task Force
- Mix of school leaders, community advocates, and advocacy organizations
- Regular attendees include:
  - School and CMO leaders
  - Family, children, and community advocates (e.g., Stand for Children, LCCR, SPLC, Ed Navigator, Nuestra Voz, OPEN, TCA, etc.)
  - Policy and citywide partner organizations (e.g., Cowen Institute, NSNO)
- Have held 18 meetings over the course of the past 10 months
- Meetings have followed a specific scope and sequence initiated in late October
- All school leaders citywide were invited to formally participate (or send a representative) to the Task Force last fall

### Current New Orleans Charter School Parents
- Hosted two focus groups with New Orleans parents thus far
- Focus groups centered on
  - How families defined a high-quality school
  - What types of topics OPSB should prioritize in our oversight

### Various Citywide Advocacy Organizations
- Presented and gathered feedback from citywide organizations who invited OPSB to engage with membership
- Organizations include:
  - *Equity in All Places*: A coalition of community organizations working to end the School to Prison Pipeline
  - *One NOLA*: An organization comprised of current New Orleans Charter School teachers

### School Leader Policy Workshops
- Formal updates provided at Unification meetings
- This spring and summer, OPSB offered a series of policy workshops specifically for school leaders to review and provide feedback on draft proposals
- Drafts of the CSAF have been distributed directly to citywide school leaders
In order to produce a first draft of the CSAF, OPSB had to reconcile significantly divergent perspectives from across and within school leader, community, parent, educational organizations and advocate groups.
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Charter schools shouldn’t be experimenting with kids.

Schools need room for innovation and can’t have high stakes accountability looming all of the time.

Schools need longer charter terms as an incentive to improve, and longer terms will result in better teacher retention and financial planning.

Charter term lengths should be shorter, especially because performance fluctuates.

If a charter school drops significantly in performance at renewal, all of the schools in that CMO should be reviewed and reconsidered.

OPSBO has to act on poor performing schools. OPSB needs to close D and F schools.

OPSBO shouldn’t close D schools, especially those who are helping kids the most.

School performance will fluctuate – you need to give schools a chance to rebound before intervening.

OPSBO needs to act on low performing schools, not just at renewal but during the charter term.

OPSBO should just hold schools accountable during their term, albeit with reducing or revoking their charter if they are not performing up to academic standards.

In order to produce a first draft of the CSAF, OPSB had to reconcile significantly divergent perspectives from across and within school leader, community, parent, educational organizations and advocate groups.
The state’s new accountability system includes new additions that are vital to our local planning for accountability.

### Heightened Standards
- For SPS calculations, on state tests, Mastery will be scored at the same level that Basic was historically scored, and Basic will be scored at a lower level.
- With these new standards, Louisiana will transition Mastery to becoming the new Basic from now through 2025.

### Inclusion of a Growth Measure in SPS Calculations
- Student-by-student academic performance growth at a school will be included as a measure in the school’s SPS.
- As a result, the SPS and school’s letter grade will hold schools accountable to student progress as well as overall performance.

### Intervention in the Form of Academic Improvement Plans
- Schools that have student subgroups perform at a level equivalent to a D or F letter grade over multiple years may be labeled with “Urgent Intervention Needed”, “Urgent Intervention Required”, or “Comprehensive Intervention Required” by the state.
- Such labels can result in additional funding or the need for schools to submit consolidated plans to improve performance.
The Draft Charter School Accountability Framework (CSAF)

What is the CSAF?
- One of the OPSB’s core responsibilities, as a charter school authorizer, is to hold charter schools accountable to a set of expectations designed to ensure every student and family has access to a high-quality public school.
- The Charter School Accountability Framework (CSAF) outlines what those expectations are and summarizes how OPSB holds schools accountable to them at the point of charter renewal and annually.

How Can OPSB work diligently to ensure it meets its responsibilities related to school accountability?
- Clearly articulate a set of rigorous, fair, and transparent standards for charter schools that are aligned to excellence and equity and that incentivize and reward continued progress towards outcomes that best serve students;
- Establish systems to monitor school performance that can be implemented with fidelity and do not place undue burdens on schools; intervene when necessary; and make data-driven renewal and extension decisions that are implemented with transparency, consistency, and fidelity;
- Share how well schools perform against the standards that OPSB tracks and evaluates, in a clear and timely fashion, in order to support schools in their continuous improvement; and
- Provide families with easily accessible information to inform school choice decisions and increase their knowledge of each school’s performance
Draft Guiding Accountability Commitments

To build and implement an effective accountability system, OPSB has identified several commitments to guide its work. Specifically, OPSB is committed to:

- Assessing school performance across a comprehensive set of expectations that OPSB can monitor with fidelity and that do not result in unnecessary and burdensome reporting requirements for schools;

- Ensuring that our expectations for charter schools are equitable and can be consistently applied to all schools;

- Sharing information on school performance in a transparent and comprehensible manner for all relevant stakeholders – including charter school board members, school leaders, students and families, and the public at large;

- Respecting charter school autonomy in areas identified in partnership with charter school leaders; and

- Continuously improving the standards and processes utilized to evaluate school performance.
Evolution of Revised Framework
The scope and sequence identified four stages of development, each with its own set of specific objectives, and was responsive to simultaneous work underway at the state level to revise accountability standards.

The state presented its ESSA proposal in April, which was recently approved by the Federal government.
## Planning Phase Activities and Outcomes (Oct- Nov)

### Planning Phase Primary Questions

- How should we sequence our decision-making in light of state work on ESSA?
- What are our shared values when developing performance standards and systems of oversight?
- How are the OPSB and RSD frameworks similar and different? And what are the strengths and weaknesses under both systems currently?
- What can we learn from other systems and models?

### Primary Activities

- Discuss qualities that define a great school and how we can/should go about measuring such quality
- Review current OPSB and RSD accountability policies and tools to see similarities and differences and identify priorities for revisions
- Review other accountability systems across the country

### Key Takeaways/Deliverables

- Maintain overall approach to categories evaluated currently by both OPSB and RSD – Financial, Organizational and Academic
- Include and reward academic growth
- Consider and explore other measures that help assess school quality, beyond just test scores
- Simplify OPSB’s tools to measure only the most vital standards, and ensure they are transparent and comprehensible
- Consider a more holistic assessment of school performance at the point of renewal, beyond just one year of testing data
Cycle 1 Activities and Outcomes (Dec-February)

**Cycle 1 Key Questions**

- What are the financial performance measures and associated rating processes for those measures (i.e. targets related to meeting the District’s standards)?
- What are the organizational performance measures and the associated rating processes for those measures (i.e. targets related to meeting the district’s standards)?

**Primary Activities**

- Identify which financial measures are essential and set appropriate targets informed by charter CFO perspectives from across the city
- Identify which organizational measures are most relevant and can be monitored in specific, efficient, and non-burdensome ways at the school level

**Major Outcomes (in February)**

- Draft measures and method for evaluating Financial health (reduction from 9 to 6 measures)
  - Current Ratio
  - Cash on Hand
  - Enrollment Variance
  - Default
  - Unrestricted Net Assets
  - Unqualified Audit
- Draft measures and method for evaluating organizational effectiveness (reduction from 20 to 17 specific sub-measures, and increase in focus)
  - School Governance
  - Administrative Expectations
  - Family Communications
  - Student Enrollment and Privacy Practices
  - Special Populations
  - Data Integrity
  - Facility Maintenance and Safety
Continued feedback, reflection and work has resulted in further revisions to the organizational and financial measures and methods, as represented in the current draft CSAF dated 8.21.17.

Financial Expectations

- Further revisions to financial measures have resulted in a reduction by two to increase coherence and reduce duplicity in measures.
  - Current Ratio
  - Cash on Hand
  - Enrollment Variance
  - Default
  - Unrestricted Net Assets
  - Unqualified Audit

- Recent Feedback: Consider replacing Cash on Hand with Current Ratio

Organizational Expectations

- Refined organizational categories to improve clarity and reduce redundancy.
  - School Governance
  - Administrative Expectations
  - Family Communications
  - Student Enrollment and Privacy Discipline Practices
  - Special Populations
  - Data Integrity (moved to Admin. Expectations)
  - Facility Maintenance and Safety

Overall Monitoring Process

- Revised method to focus compliance monitoring on real-time response and oversight and eliminated any summative/cumulative rating on an annual basis, where schools are penalized long after issues have been remedied.

- Schools are consistently in a state of Good Standing or Not in Good Standing, and will be notified through system of compliance notifications.

- Notifications include time-bound steps to remedy non-compliance, which OPSB will monitor. Such steps may include formal Corrective Action Plans.

- In line with current policy, any severe non-compliance may lead to immediate revocation if deemed appropriate.
Cycle 2 Activities and Outcomes (March - July)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle 2 Key Questions</th>
<th>Primary Activities</th>
<th>Key Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - What academic and other measures should be tracked and evaluated over time? | - Develop academic standards to hold schools accountable to, annually and at the point of renewal | - Guidance on Organizational Expectations  
  - School leaders requested clarity on what type of compliance concerns would lead to Level 1 or Level 2 notices, so additional guidance was developed; version 1.0 distributed in May; version 2.0 distributed in August |
| - What level of performance will be required to gain renewal and for how long? | - Determine priorities for alternative school renewal standards | - Version 1.0 of the CSAF released 5.30.17, with focus on annual oversight activities |
| - How will alternative schools be evaluated at the point of renewal? | - Identify renewal policy priorities and standards for eligibility and term lengths | - Version 2.0 of CSAF released 6.19.17, with adjustments based upon feedback on Version 1.0 and with the inclusion of initial renewal recommendations, in light of ESSA:  
  - Revised set of school profile topics  
  - Standards for renewal  
  - Specifics on annual oversight activities |
As a result of stakeholder feedback, OPSB established priorities as it revised the OPSB School Performance Framework and developed versions 1.0 and 2.0 of the CSAF.

### Annual Oversight

- Broaden definition of school success by annually reviewing a more comprehensive data set on school performance
- Ensure that while broadening our definition of school success, we do not contradict or compete with state SPSs
- Clearly communicate how schools are performing annually across factors that can more readily inform differentiated oversight, school reflection and parent choice
- Ensure measures focus on outputs, and are rigorous, reliable, and can be implemented with relative ease and/or no significant cost to schools

### Renewal and Extension

- Rely on multiples years of school performance, as one data point is insufficient to the charge at hand
- Reward and incentivize schools helping students make meaningful growth, year in and year out
- Reconsider term lengths and rationale for schools to receive additional years
The initial renewal proposal are intended to ensure OPSB can responsibly oversee a citywide system of charter schools with consistency and fidelity while allowing schools the opportunity to show their impact in a stable and fair way.

Renewal and Extension

- Determine if, and for how long, a charter school operator should be allowed to continue to operate a school, based upon past performance
- Rely on multiples years of school performance, as one data point is insufficient to the charge at hand
  - Leading the initial proposal to rely on a multi-year weighted average of SPS and a Progress Index, which reflects multiple years
- Reward and incentivize schools helping students make meaningful growth, year in and year out
  - Leading the initial proposal to renew D schools that are having a significant and positive impact on student growth, as evidenced through the school’s Progress Index
- Reconsider term lengths and rationale for schools to receive additional years
  - Leading the initial proposal to simplify and standardize renewal term lengths based upon absolute level of performance of C or higher for 5 years and D with high growth for 3 years
  - Leading the initial proposal to set maximum term length at five years with only option to loose years, not gain them for organizational or financial compliance
The school quality profile is a tool intended to address various stakeholder perspectives and local priorities and share information on school quality in a transparent manner.

**Annual School Performance Profile**

- Ensure OPSB has a sound, current understanding of school performance based upon a predetermined set of criteria
- Offer schools timely information to drive their own reflection and planning
- Provide families with current information on school performance to inform school choice decisions.

- Broaden our definition of school success by annually reviewing a more comprehensive data set on school performance
  - Leading the initial profile to focus on academic progress readiness, equity impact and school environment.

- Ensure that while broadening our definition of school success, we do not contradict or compete with state SPSs
  - Leading the initial profile to refrain from creating another summative rating of school quality that would be confused with the state’s accountability system.

- Clearly delineate how schools are performing annually across factors that can more readily inform differentiated oversight, school reflection, and parent choice
  - Leading the initial profile to emphasize comparing school-level outcomes with citywide averages on a percentile basis, wherever it makes sense to do so.

- Ensure measures focus on outputs, and are rigorous, reliable, and can be implemented with relative ease and/or no significant cost to schools
  - Leading the initial profile to emphasize the use of existing measures and focus on measures best suited to capture a range of school performance outcomes in the most efficient and effective ways.
Feedback received after Version 2.0 of the CSAF identified specific areas for continued conversation and revision that grounded our Cycle 3 meetings.

| Annual Oversight | Feedback indicated that the draft CSAF required specificity to clarify annual oversight process (i.e. what will be expected of schools during annual oversight activities and how OPSB will execute these activities).  
  |  |  
  |  | E.g., What does “differentiated oversight” mean within the CSAF, will any corrective action plans be required, etc.  
| Annual Reporting | Overall feedback was positive re the new approach of reviewing a more robust set of information beyond just the SPS score.  
  |  | Outstanding: How will the district approach making citywide comparisons (e.g., Should selective-admissions schools be included with non-selective admission schools? How will the comparisons be displayed within annual reviews?)?  
| Renewal Term Lengths | Overall feedback on proposed term length approach varied: Some supported the proposal, while others preferred longer term lengths for schools based upon their performance.  
  |  | Opinions varied regarding the type of actions OPSB should be able to take within a term, outside of routine oversight activities.  
| Renewal Eligibility Methodology | Overall positive feedback on proposed methodology of using multiple years of performance data for renewal, with most stakeholders preferring two years of data over three.  
  |  | Greater discussion needed on how average should be calculated (e.g., straight two-year average, weighted average over time, and/or by student count).  
| Eligibility for D Schools | Positive feedback on the proposal to grant D schools with high growth a 3 year term.  
  |  | However, bar for what type of growth is good enough and whether or not a school should be able to qualify more than once at this performance level were questioned. |
Cycle 3 Activities and Outcomes (July-August)

**Cycle 3 Key Questions**
- What adjustments need to be made to the current proposal?
- How can the draft be more specific regarding the purpose and details of annual oversight?
- How long should a charter term be and what level of accountability should occur within the term?
- How many years and in what manner should we average multiple years of performance?
- What level of growth is appropriate for a school who has an average of a D for renewal?
- Should a D school with high growth be renewed repeatedly?

**Primary Activities**
- Review of rationale for draft proposals
- Review of any data from the state regarding the impact of the ESSA formula on schools, in particular those at the D level of performance
- Review of data on alternative school renewal standards and criteria
- Constant reflection and discussion

**Key Takeaways/Deliverables**
- Version 3.0 of the CSAF released on 8.21.17

*Summary of Primary Revisions:*
- Refined Org. and Fin. Expectations and method for evaluating those areas annually
- Targeted annual academic impact tracking
- Continued revision to the School profile, especially in the area of school comparisons citywide
- Method for averaging 2 years of performance for majority of schools
- For schools in Turnaround, Slow Growth or Merger status, renewal eligibility decisions made on 1 year of data

*Major Items Outstanding:*
- Length of charter terms schools are eligible for
  - Significant variation among stakeholders
- Growth standard for a D school and eligibility in terms of multiple renewals under the D standard
  - Essential data from the state outstanding
Feedback received as of last Friday continues to inform our thinking and what revisions should be made to the draft CSAF.

Sample of Specific Feedback Requesting Changes to Current Version of the CSAF

- Term Lengths
  - Include 10 year option
  - Differentiate terms lengths among A, B, and C schools (such as, 4, 5, 6; 5, 6, 7; etc.)
  - Increase D term length to 4 years

- Automatic Renewal and the Renewal Process
  - Consider multiple years of SPS absolute performance (not an average)
  - Reconsider requiring any submissions from schools who are not eligible for automatic renewal

- Renewals for schools in their initial terms
  - Simplify expectation from Turnaround and Slow growth to be all schools in an “Initial Term”

- Financial Measures
  - Replace Cash on Hand with Current Ratio
Next Steps
Over the next several weeks OPSB will revise the CSAF and prepare policy for review by all stakeholders in advance of the October OPSB Board Meetings.

**Upcoming Milestones – Cycle 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Today</td>
<td>• Present latest CSAF and progress to the UAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1</td>
<td>• Request written feedback on latest CSAF from the AA Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Sept. 8</td>
<td>• Share draft policy that represents core aspects of the CSAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 13</td>
<td>• Policy Workshop from 3:00pm-4:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 10</td>
<td>• Goal: Present policy to the OPSB Board at its October meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ongoing Work – Cycle 3**

- **Await Data from the State on Impact of Growth Metric and New ESSA Standard:** OPSB will continue to work to collect as much information from the state to inform policy recommendations
- **Listen and Respond to the OPSB’s Vision and Strategic Priorities:** Participate in community forums and ensure the CSAF aligns to vision for city and strategic priorities
OPSB is already planning how it can test out aspects of the CSAF to ensure it can be implemented in a fair, rigorous way and move research forward to continually improve our local system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Stream to Carry Out in 2017-2018</th>
<th>Overview of the Work to Be Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Test Oversight Processes and Tools** | • Carry out annual oversight activities this school year for currently authorized schools.  
  • E.g., School visits, performance data reviews, special education and organizational compliance reviews, etc. |
| **Test Oversight Communication Tools** | • Communicate with schools that OPSB currently authorizes and the public as OPSB executes oversight activities this year.  
  • I.e. Notifications of non-compliance and annual school quality profiles. |
| **Research to Inform Future Revisions and Additions** | • Reflect throughout the 2017-2018 school year with core focus including ongoing reviews of  
  • Organizational and financial expectations and compliance oversight.  
  • Data reporting practices related to discipline and attendance to assess the reliability of data.  
  • Conduct research to evaluate the possibility and impact of developing and including the following in accountability activities beyond the 18-19 School Year:  
  • Social and emotional learning measures.  
  • ACT growth over time. |
Questions and Discussion
Appendix
Develop the School Performance Framework

Milestone Progress

The Office of School Performance with support from the Accountability and Authorization Task Force has proposed revisions to the existing school performance framework. The new framework is called the Charter School Accountability Framework and it has received the following updates:

- Financial, Organizational and Academic standards
- Monitoring, Intervention and Renewal policies
- Alternative School framework

Next Steps

- Additional stakeholder feedback
- Preparing to present policy revisions to the Orleans Parish School Board in October for 1st reading
- Implementation planning
- Pilot of measures and development of additional tools
The Orleans Parish School Board (OPSB) and Recovery School District (RSD) have collaboratively designed a future operating plan for the New Orleans Therapeutic Day Program (NOTDP) to become its own non-profit organization that ensures its future success in meeting the needs of its students, families, and schools.

Next Steps

• NOTDP to become a nonprofit organization before July 1, 2018
Refine existing policy around surplus or vacant buildings to align with the portfolio management process.

Milestone Progress

The bi-annual facility siting process provides new school operators, utilizing OPSB facilities, site assignments approximately 15 months prior to the start of school. This lead time allows new school operators to build support for their school in their community.

Next Steps

• Fall 2017 Facility Siting process to begin by August 31
Develop a plan and mechanisms to ensure financial viability for both OPSB and RSD during the transition to Unification

**Milestone Progress**

The Orleans Parish School Board (OPSB) and Recovery School District (RSD) have had their 2017-2018 fiscal year budgets approved. Both organizations are projected to remain financially viable through the transition period to Unification.
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New Orleans Therapeutic Day Program Future Plan

The Orleans Parish School Board (OPSB) and Recovery School District (RSD) have collaboratively designed a future operating plan for the New Orleans Therapeutic Day Program (NOTDP) to become its own non-profit organization that ensures its future success in meeting the needs of its students, families, and schools. The NOTDP was developed as a joint initiative between the RSD, OPSB, and Tulane University Medical School’s Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry as a result of the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement (CEA) between the two school districts in 2014. The NOTDP’s future plan improves upon the great strides it has made since opening in 2015. As a result, it intends to become a program through a non-profit organization that best meets the needs of students with the most severe behavioral health concerns.

The future operating plan laid out in the subsequent pages highlights the NOTDP’s:

- History
- Mission
- Accomplishments
- Non-profit Transition Plan
- Expansion Timeline

Included in the proposed expansion plans are a day treatment program, which opened its doors this year, as well as homebound services and an open-enrollment, trauma-informed, school. At this time, it is important to note that a proposed school in Orleans Parish is contingent upon approval through the new school application process.

The below document is intended to showcase the services being offered by the Therapeutic Day Program through the non-profit 501(c)(3) organization Center for Resilience to ensure its continued future success and outreach to students, families, and schools.
NON-PROFIT TRANSITION TIMELINE

HISTORY
The New Orleans Therapeutic Day Program (NOTDP) was founded in response to the lack of out-of-school services, supports, and placements for children with mental and behavioral health needs in New Orleans. Launched in 2015, NOTDP is a collaboration among the Recovery School District, Orleans Parish School Board, and Tulane University Medical School’s Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry. NOTDP is a separate setting serving RSD and OPSB students in grades K-8 with the most severe diagnosed behavioral health disabilities. NOTDP provides a caring, therapeutic milieu with positive behavioral supports, trauma-informed approaches, evidence-based mental health practices, small-group classroom instruction, and therapeutic recreation activities.

NOTDP MISSION
By providing evidence-based, individualized mental health services and placement to students whose mental and behavioral health needs cannot be met in a traditional school setting, the New Orleans Therapeutic Day Program:
- Better approximates the services required to support students with severe behavioral disabilities;
- Enhances the continuum of alternative placements available to schools and students with disabilities;
- Empowers families to be active partners in their children’s mental health treatment team;
- Enables students with behavioral disabilities to successfully transition back to the home school environment; and
- Reduces the incidence rate of hospital and out-of-city placements for behavioral health needs

ACCOMPLISHMENTS
a. NOTDP Expansion
In the 2017-18 school year, our program will differentiate service delivery models to ensure all children admitted to the Therapeutic Day Program receive the appropriate supports, in the appropriate setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Child Profile</th>
<th>Therapeutic Day School</th>
<th>Day Treatment Program</th>
<th>Homebound Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>New Orleans Creative Center for the Arts (NOCCA)</td>
<td>Children’s Hospital</td>
<td>Home/Community Setting (Short Term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Profile</td>
<td>Children with moderate behavioral and mental health needs</td>
<td>Children with moderate to severe behavioral and mental health needs</td>
<td>Children whose needs cannot be addressed in a day school or program setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children in need of small-group instruction and able to focus on instructional tasks for at least 15 minutes at a time</td>
<td>Children unable to persist on academic tasks for any sustained period of time</td>
<td>Children transitioning into NOTDP building relationships before receiving services on-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Model</td>
<td>50% Instruction / 50% therapeutic activities</td>
<td>20% Instruction / 80% therapeutic activities</td>
<td>4 hours of instruction / 90 minutes of therapy per week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Enrollment & Referrals
To date, NOTDP has served 19 unique students and has fielded 66 referrals, with a 61 percent acceptance rate. The length of stay varies by individual student, but falls between 1 – 1.5 years. We are excited to double in size during the 2017-18 year to respond to the demand.

2016-17 Enrollment & Referral Data, by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016-17 NOTDP Referral Data</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>RSD</th>
<th>OPSB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Referrals</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acceptances</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted &amp; Enrolled</td>
<td>7; 7 more to start Fall 2017</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted, Did Not Enroll</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejections</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Needing More Restrictive Placement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Referrals, June 1, 2017</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two referred students are in need of specialized services (for autism spectrum disorders and children with significant cognitive disabilities, respectively) but were not appropriate candidates for NOTDP.

c. Academic Progress
NOTDP tracks student academic growth in reading and math. Students come to NOTDP having made little to no academic progress during their previous year in a traditional school setting. As a result, we have refined our instructional goal to be: Students at NOTDP will double the academic progress they made in their previous year at their home school site. This goal has been refined over the past two years, and will be tracked beginning in Fall 2017.

In the meantime, data from the 2016-17 school year indicates the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Band</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st – 3rd class</td>
<td>2.25 (measured by STEP assessment)</td>
<td>1.25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th – 5th class</td>
<td>Comprehension increased by 45 percentage points (as measured by Fountas &amp; Pinnell)</td>
<td>.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th – 8th class</td>
<td>Comprehension increased by 25 percentage points (as measured by Fountas &amp; Pinnell)</td>
<td>.25 years (Inconclusive due to end of year testing validity concerns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Measured by iReady assessment

In addition, across the program students demonstrated a 250 percent increase in their mastery of grade level standards, as measured by standards-based assessments during the 2016-17 school year.

d. Transition to Home Schools
At the end of NOTDP’s first year of operation, just one student transitioned back to his home school. By the end of the 2016-17 school year, six students had transitioned back to their home schools, with two more students engaged in the transition process. The average length of stay for a child at NOTDP from enrollment to transition is 16 months.
e. Other Quality Indicators

i. Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Annual Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOTDP Attendance, 2015-16</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTDP Attendance, 2016-17</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16 Attendance Rate, All Students with Disabilities, RSD &amp; OPSB*</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range: 72.9 – 98.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that this attendance data is not broken down by disability category, but is the aggregate of all disabilities, including Speech/Language and Specific Learning Disability.

ii. Behavioral Incidents

Incidents By Month, August 1, 2016 – July 5, 2017

Note: Students began attending school on August 22, 2016.
iii. Hospitalization Rates, Pre- and Post-Enrollment at NOTDP

The following timeline reflects the current projected expansion timeline for the Center for Resilience:

| School Year 2018-19 | • Add 9th grade to therapeutic programming  
|                    | • Secure more permanent space for therapeutic day school  
|                    | • Launch experiential, open-enrollment, trauma-informed pk-8 school (grades K-2)  |
| School Year 2019-20 | • Add 10th grade to therapeutic programming  
|                    | • Add grade 3 to pk-8 school  |
| School Year 2020-21 | • Add 11th grade to therapeutic programming  
|                    | • Add grades pk and 4 to pk-8 school  |
| School Year 2021-2022 | • Add 12th grade to therapeutic programming  
|                      | • Launch trauma-informed Early Learning Center, Birth – 6  
|                      | • Add grade 5 to pk-8 school  |
FACILITIES PLANNING

It shall be the policy of the Orleans Parish School Board to ensure that school facilities support learning in the context of the total community. A School Facilities Master Plan, including an implementation plan, is a vital component of comprehensive facilities planning and shall be periodically monitored and updated by the Superintendent and staff as needed.

SCHOOL FACILITIES MASTER PLAN

A school facilities master plan that describes a strategy to address the need for facility improvements and capital investments to support current and future educational programs shall be developed every five years and approved by the School Board. The School Facilities Master Plan may be revisited in the intervening years if unforeseen circumstances, such as a fire or damaging storm, occur. The facilities master plan shall assess the needs for repairs, modernization, upgrades, and/or new construction, and shall identify the availability of federal, state, and local funding and other sources to finance improvements and capital investments.

The School Facilities Master Plan shall include the following:

1. Enrollment Projections

A professional demographer shall be hired to develop a demographic analysis and 10-year enrollment projections. Enrollment projections shall be developed for each of the ten (10) years for each school and for each catchment area, as well as district-wide.

2. Educational Adequacy Assessment

A. Capacity

The capacity of each building to adequately house students based on the schools’ enrollment patterns or district boundaries.

B. Utilization

The extent to which the current capacity of each school facility is utilized to support learning for enrolled students and to accommodate those programs generated by the needs of the students attending.

C. Educational Program Requirements

The ability of the district’s facilities to meet educational program requirements, such as universal early childhood education, career and
technical education, hands-on learning, etc.

3. Facility Condition Assessment

An evaluation of the physical condition of the building systems and materials.

4. Standards

Revisions of the District-Wide Educational Specifications to include capacity models, space requirements, adjacency diagrams, and room descriptions, and revisions of the District-Wide Design Standards incorporating “lessons learned” from prior construction projects and current best practice for construction.

5. Implementation Plan

The School Facilities Master Plan shall include scenarios for each catchment area that address the combination of enrollment, educational adequacy, and facility condition needs. The scenarios may call for facility renovation, construction of new schools, additions to existing buildings, capital repair/replacement of building systems, and site and/or facility acquisition and/or disposition. The implementation plan shall address all needs with identification of potential funding sources where possible. The Implementation plan shall be reviewed and adjusted annually, if needed, to align funding sources with projected needs. An implementation progress report shall be presented to the School Board annually, along with modifications that are driven by construction market conditions.

SELECTING THE SCHOOL SITE

The School Facilities Master Plan identifies areas where construction of new schools may be needed. Planning staff shall identify potential sites for new or replacement schools.

Staff shall consider issues such as age and grade range of student body, educational program requirements, drop-off and pick-up, parking, accessibility, cost, hazards, noise, and size when recommending a site to the School Board for purchase. School Board approval is required for site purchases.

PROJECT PLANNING AND DESIGN

To ensure that the school construction program is receptive to community needs, supports the instructional programs, and proceeds as smoothly and rapidly as possible, the processes listed below for planning the construction of future facilities shall be utilized.

At the time the School Board determines a future school facility is to be planned, the
School Board shall authorize the Superintendent to provide public notice to the community and establish the (specific site) School Planning Committee. The School Planning Committee shall be comprised of stakeholder representatives, including students (for high schools), educators, and community members. Staff will work with the School Planning Committee to develop a site-specific educational specification based on the district-wide educational specification for that school level.

Following the development of the educational specifications, the architect contracted by the School Board will work with staff and the School Planning Committee to develop the design and construction documents. Community meetings shall be held during educational specification development, at the end of Design Development, and immediately prior to construction to obtain community input and feedback.

A contractor will be hired based on school board procurement policy. Meetings will be held periodically with the School Planning Committee throughout design and construction to update committee members on the progress of the project and receive feedback.
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ORLEANS PARISH SCHOOL FACILITY PRESERVATION PROGRAM

The Orleans Parish School Facilities Preservation Program shall be established by the Orleans Parish School Board pursuant to La. Rev. Stat. Ann. §17:100.11. This program is designed to provide emergency and planned capital repairs and replacements for public school facilities in Orleans Parish.

It is the desire of the Orleans Parish School Board that this policy recognizes and provides equitably for all public school facilities in Orleans Parish, regardless of which governing authorities oversee the schools operating in those school facilities. The School Board also intends that in the further development, revision, or implementation of this policy, every effort shall be made to collaborate with the Recovery School District and charter school operators to ensure unified requirements and procedures.

For the purposes of this policy, a public school facility shall be defined as a school building owned by the Orleans Parish School Board and controlled by either the School Board or the Recovery School District and all facilities otherwise part of the school, recognized as part of the facilities, and typically available to the school, its students, faculty, and staff.

For the purposes of this policy, an emergency shall be defined as damage to or a malfunction in buildings or property which involves an emergent and imminent necessity for repair, reconstruction or maintenance in order to permit the safe continuation of a necessary public use or function, to protect the property of the School Board, and/or to protect the life, health, or safety of facility occupants.

The Superintendent shall administer the program as set forth below until all bonds held by the School Board and in existence as of July 1, 2014 are retired. Prior to the retirement of such bonds, the School Board shall amend this policy to address the additional elements of the program that will come into effect upon the retirement of the bonds.

1. Funding

The School Board shall dedicate a portion of sales and ad valorem taxes to the Orleans Parish School Facility Preservation Program in accordance with applicable state law, designated as facility funds.

Each year, the School Board shall determine the total number of students attending school at each public school facility in Orleans Parish. For the purposes of this policy, the total number of students attending each public school facility shall be based on the most recent official state February 1st total student enrollment count for each public school facility, excluding the following students:
• Students paying tuition to attend a preschool program;
• Students attending a preschool program at a Type III Early Learning Center in partnership with a public school; and
• Students who do not reside in Orleans Parish.

Based on these enrollment counts, the School Board shall transfer to the Recovery School District a proportion of the facility funds equal to the proportion of students attending school at public school facilities that are controlled by the Recovery School District to the total number of students in public schools.

2. Facilities Office

The School Board and the Recovery School District shall each create a facilities office. The facilities funds generated shall be used to fund the following activities of the facilities office:

• Inspect and monitor facilities to ensure that they are being maintained and that each campus is in compliance with maintenance and inspection requirements; and
• Manage building leases, handle emergency repair needs, and administer the revolving facility loan fund and school facility repair and replacement accounts.

The facilities office may provide additional facility services to charter schools, including emergency and capital repairs or replacements, procurement services, and technical assistance, and charge fees for such services pursuant to a written agreement with the school.

A total amount of facility funds equal to no more than fifteen dollars ($15.00) per pupil for the total number of students attending public school facilities controlled by the Orleans Parish School Board, based on the student enrollment counts set forth above, shall be used to fund the operations of the facilities office. The School Board may adjust this per pupil amount on an annual basis by the lesser of the most recent annual increase in the Consumer Price Index published by the United States Department of Labor or in the minimum foundation program funds.

After funding the operations of the facilities office, the remaining facility funds shall be used to provide for emergency repairs, replacements, no more than 10% of project costs for project administration, and planning for the full implementation of the School Facility Preservation Program upon expiration of the bonds identified in La. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 17:100.11.
3. Implementation

The Superintendent and/or his/her designee shall be responsible for developing administrative regulations and procedures for implementation of this policy.

4. Reporting

Annually, the School Board shall report the amounts, by source, of facility funds, the amount retained by the School Board, the amount transferred to the Recovery School District, and the student counts used in such calculations. This report shall be included as a schedule to the annual financial statements of the School Board, audited by its certified public accountant, and submitted to the Louisiana Department of Education, all in a manner substantially similar to that provided in La. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 17:1990(C)(2)(a)(iii)(dd).

The School Board and the Recovery School District shall annually prepare and issue a joint public report on the Orleans Parish School Facility Preservation Program that includes, at a minimum, the following:

- the amount allocated to fund the facilities office(s); and
- the cost and type of each emergency repair or other expense made by the facilities office.

The report shall be presented to the Orleans Parish School Board and the Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education.
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CHARTER SCHOOL FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

PURPOSE AND APPLICABILITY

It shall be the policy of the Orleans Parish School Board to require that school buildings and grounds be maintained in good physical and sanitary condition. The School Board, therefore, shall instruct the Superintendent to assure that all normal building and grounds maintenance, repairs and improvement functions are an integral part of the administration of the school system, including the regular evaluation for any safety hazards.

The Superintendent shall be vested with a broad range of administrative and supervisory authority relative to the properties owned by the School Board. The Superintendent shall ensure that the care of such property complies with applicable laws, ordinances and regulations, including building and fire safety code regulations, until such property is sold, leased or otherwise disposed of by the School Board.

The provisions of the policy listed below shall be intended to apply to charter schools that occupy School Board-owned properties. The provisions do not apply to those in non-owned buildings, unless otherwise provided in charter agreements, leases, or state law. The School Board reserves the right to oversee and intervene in cases where the health and safety of public school students may be compromised in non-owned school facilities.

The School Board’s Facility Procedures Handbook details the processes and procedures concerning the care and maintenance of school buildings that charter schools shall follow.

ASSIGNMENT OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

In accordance with state law, the School Board shall make available to an approved charter operator any vacant school facility, or any facility slated to be vacant, for lease or for purchase on an “as-is” basis. Charter operators will not be required to correct deficiencies or make improvements beyond the condition that existed when the charter operator first occupied the building(s). The charter operator shall be required to return the property to the School Board at the end of the lease in at least as good condition as existed when the property was first occupied by the charter operator. The School Board cannot guarantee the availability of vacant, usable facilities for charter operators.

DEFINITIONS

1. Preventive Maintenance - Preventive maintenance is activity that is regularly performed on a piece of equipment to lessen the likelihood of it failing; is performed while the equipment is still working so that it does not break down
unexpectedly; is planned so that required resources are available; is scheduled based on a time or usage trigger; and/or is typically performed on equipment that has a critical operational function.

2. **Capital Improvement** - A capital improvement creates an addition, physical enlargement or expansion of a building; creates an increase in capacity, productivity or efficiency; rebuilds property after the end of its economic useful life; replaces a major component or structural part of the property; improves the quality of the property; and/or adapts property to a new or different use. All capital items such as boilers, chillers, roofing systems, air handlers, etc., have an average useful life. The durations of useful life for each system are based on industry standards, such as the American Society of Heating, Refrigeration, and Air Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) and the Chartered Institute of Buildings (CIOB). The replacement of those systems that have exceeded their useful life shall be identified as needed capital improvement.

3. **Capital Expenditure** - The amount spent on a capital improvement.

4. **Minor Repair** - A minor repair is considered an improvement that keeps property in efficient operating condition; restores the property to its previous condition rather than improving the quality of the property; and costs **less than $10,000** per occurrence. For example, repairing a leaking faucet would be a minor repair. Replacing all of the drain lines and plumbing fixtures in on a campus would be a capital improvement.

5. **Major Repair** - A major repair is considered an improvement that keeps property in efficient operating condition; restores the property to its previous condition rather than improving the quality of the property; and costs **more than $10,000** per occurrence. For example, repairing a section of a roof would be a major repair item if the cost were more than $10,000. Replacing the entire roof would be a capital improvement.

6. **Funding Availability (Capital Improvement Project)** - Availability of revenues to undertake a capital improvement project or a program of projects. In the case of projects to be budgeted by the proceeds of bonds or other types of debt, funding availability shall also mean the availability of a revenue stream to retire the debt, including principal, interest, and issuance costs and the proportionate sharing of any newly incurred, associated debt service for the designated capital improvement project to the extent not provided in existing Charter Funding statutes. Funding availability shall also include consideration of restrictions on the use of potential funds.

7. **Facilities Condition Assessment** - A facilities condition assessment describes the process of a qualified group of trained industry professions performing an analysis of the physical condition of a facility or group of facilities. The facilities condition assessment evaluates the condition of major building systems and
rates those systems, as well as the entire facility, in comparison to the typical useful life of each system and the potential replacement cost of the facility. A facilities condition assessment shall be the basis for determining the condition, including the extent of deferred maintenance, of School Board buildings prior to occupancy by charter schools (“pre-existing”). The School Board shall periodically update the Facilities Condition Assessment in order to inform the School Facilities Master Plan for Orleans Parish.

8. **Facilities Alteration** - Alteration includes, but is not limited to changes in site outdoor features; facilities configuration; fabrication, modification, removal, or installation of hardware and equipment; adding or removing signs; erection, relocation, or removal of partitions, doors, and windows; changes in color and types of finishes and flooring materials; structural/physical changes to interior space such as installation of fixed equipment or furniture requiring utility, electrical, laboratory exhaust or HVAC connections; BAS Software or programming changes that effect an engineer’s sequence of operations; and any other changes that have implications for the health and safety of occupants.

**RESPONSIBILITIES**

Preventive maintenance shall be a charter school responsibility, regardless of the cost. Charter schools housed in School Board facilities shall be responsible for Minor Repairs with a cost of less than $10,000 per occurrence. Charter schools shall be responsible for Major Repairs with a cost of more than $10,000 per occurrence, if said repair is the result of inadequate or neglectful maintenance on the part of the charter school lessee or their contractors/subcontractors. The School Board shall be responsible for Major Repairs (cost of more than $10,000 per occurrence) that are not the result of inadequate or neglectful maintenance on the part of the charter school lessee, subject to the availability of funding.

Charter schools may request, through the Superintendent or Superintendent’s designee, Capital Improvement Projects for inclusion in the School Board’s Capital Budget, capital improvement programs, and revisions to the Master Plan. Such project requests shall be considered in accordance with funding availability, the Master Plan and capital budgeting priorities, the critical need for projects so requested, age and condition of buildings, educational adequacy, and other appropriate considerations, regardless of school operators. Priority shall be given to projects where the work is required for the schools to serve as safe and healthy learning environments.

In the event that the School Board obtains capital funds through insurance proceeds or disaster relief, such funds shall be utilized to the extent available and feasible to return damaged facilities to their original conditions. If a damaged facility is beyond feasible repair, or if funds are not sufficient to restore the facility to its original condition, the School Board cannot guarantee that the damaged facility will be restored or replaced.
A charter school shall promptly notify the Superintendent or his/her designee if it receives a citation from a regulatory agency (such as the Office of the State Fire Marshal, the Office of Public Health, the Department of Environmental Quality, Department of Safety & Permits, etc.) which would disrupt operations or close the building.

In the event that new or replacement systems and materials are covered by a manufacturer’s warranty, the charter school shall be responsible for understanding and adhering to the warranty’s operations & maintenance requirements so that valid claims can be made for issues that occur during the warranty period. If an issue arises with a system or material that is under warranty, the charter school shall immediately notify School Board facilities staff. School Board facilities staff shall work with the charter school to develop the most appropriate approach for to resolve the issue.

Movable and fixed assets, e.g. technology items, furnishings, and equipment, owned by the School Board with an original purchase price greater than $5,000 shall be inventoried, and inventories shall be tracked. When a charter is terminated and/or when a charter school relocates from one building to another, the School Board and the charter operator shall work together to verify the accuracy of the inventory. The charter operator shall be held accountable for safeguarding all contents that were conveyed as a part of the lease agreement.

The School Board shall secure insurance for any OPSB-owned facility and contents leased to a charter operator. The charter operator shall pay the cost of such insurance pursuant to the terms of its facility lease with the School Board. If a building is damaged beyond the point that rebuilding is reasonable, and if the capacity of that building is needed to satisfy enrollment demands, the School Board shall construct a new facility for that capacity following district design and educational adequacy standards.

FACILITY ALTERATIONS

Facility alterations shall enhance and support educational activities and must not compromise the safety, structural integrity or design flexibility of the facility and learning environment. Alterations may not diminish in any way the monetary value of the facility, its grounds, or other property.

A charter school may fund and implement Capital Improvement Projects through its own self-generated revenues, subject to the following: (1) prior School Board approval for any changes that cost $500,000 or more, and (2) completion to be at charter school's own expense and risk. All improvements made to School Board owned property by charter schools shall become the property of the School Board, unless otherwise agreed to by the parties in writing.

All facilities alterations shall comply with procedures identified in the Facility Procedures Handbook.
Contracts for architectural and engineering design and for construction of Capital Improvement Projects, whether implemented by the School Board or by a charter operator, shall include insurance requirements indemnifying both the School Board and the respective charter operator as additional named insureds.

PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

All charter schools shall develop and present for approval by the Superintendent or his/her designee a Preventive Maintenance Plan (PMP) for all building systems and materials in accordance with the manufacturer’s specifications and requirements. The PMP shall specify corrective action that will be taken to ensure peak efficiency and minimize deterioration through compliance with manufacturers’ recommendations for all building systems and materials. The PMP shall be designed to maximize the usable economic life and the performance of all building components.

The PMP shall be developed and submitted to the School Board annually and shall be implemented in compliance with all procedures identified in the Facility Procedures Handbook.

Each charter school shall implement the PMP at its own risk and expense and provide reports (as outlined in the Facility Procedures Handbook) detailing activities performed as well as any deficiencies identified on a periodic basis. Records regarding PMP activities, as well as all other maintenance and repairs, shall be maintained by all charter schools and made available for audit at the request of the School Board.

Failure to maintain an adequate PMP shall result in the charter school assuming financial responsibility for any repairs and capital improvement projects caused by its inadequate repairs, maintenance, and/or execution of the PMP.

FACILITY INSPECTIONS

A physical inspection of facilities to identify deficiencies in the PMP, other repairs, needed capital/major maintenance projects, and or code/regulatory concerns shall be performed jointly by representatives of the School Board and the charter school on a periodic basis with follow-up inspections as needed to ensure that all deficiencies have been remedied.

SMOKING/TOBACCO USE ON SCHOOL BOARD PROPERTY

The use of any tobacco product, smokeless tobacco, and any smoking object/device, including electronic cigarettes and similar devices, shall be prohibited on and in all School Board property and vehicles and at all school-sponsored functions. School Board property shall include any elementary or secondary school building or other buildings on a school campus, any portable buildings, field houses, stadiums, equipment
storage areas, vacant land, or any property owned, operated, or leased by the School Board. This prohibition shall not apply to any outdoor area proximate to the School Board Central Office building that is within twenty-five feet of any entrance to the building, as long as no portion of such building is used as a school facility.

Tobacco advertising shall also be prohibited in school buildings, at school functions, and in all school publications.

**ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES**

The School Board shall prohibit the use, sale, possession or consumption of alcoholic beverages on any School Board property, except as otherwise provided in policy *KF, Use of School Facilities*.
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August 17, 2017

Superintendent Henderson Lewis
Orleans Parish School Board
3520 General DeGaulle Drive, Suite 5055
New Orleans, Louisiana 70114

Dear Superintendent Lewis,

Per your request, and in support of the milestones included in the Unification Plan, I am writing this letter to describe the RSD’s current financial position as it relates to unification. The Unification Plan directs OPSB to “develop a plan and mechanisms to ensure financial viability for both OPSB and RSD during the transition period leading to unification.”

At this time, the RSD projects that it will remain financially viable for the 2017-2018 fiscal year without additional or special mechanisms or procedures. On Wednesday, August 16, 2017, the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) approved the 2017-2018 budget enclosed in this letter. This budget is based on a number of revenue sources, including transfers from OPSB to partially support citywide initiatives such as EnrollNOLA, the Student Hearing Office, the Facility Preservation Program, and select projects under the School Facility Master Plan. Barring unforeseen shifts in revenues or expenditures, the RSD anticipates it will be able to remain financially viable through the 2017-2018 fiscal year. Should these circumstances change in a way that would threaten the RSD’s ability to effectively support transition and unification, I will notify you.

Thank you for your partnership and continued efforts to successfully achieve the milestones described in the Unification Plan.

Sincerely,

Kunjan Narechania
Chief Executive Officer
Recovery School District

Enclosures
## Budgeted Expenditures by Means of Finance (MOF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOF</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State General Fund (SGF)</td>
<td>$458,594</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Transfer (IAT*)</td>
<td>$194,483,251</td>
<td>82.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; Self-Generated Revenues**</td>
<td>$40,226,716</td>
<td>17.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Dedications</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$235,668,561</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interagency Transfer (IAT)- is a combination of IAT - Charter Admin, state or federal Grants, and Construction.

** Fees and Self-Generated Revenues - is a combination of private grants such as Harrah's, New Market Tax Credit, QSCB, and Lexington Insurance Settlement.

## Budgeted Expenditures by Line Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Compensation</td>
<td>$5,674,625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Benefits</td>
<td>$2,446,662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personal Services</td>
<td>$8,121,287</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Services</td>
<td>$1,570,441</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>$36,579,872</td>
<td>15.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Charges</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions</td>
<td>$5,400,000</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Repairs</td>
<td>$180,996,024</td>
<td>76.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$235,668,561</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## RECOVERY SCHOOL DISTRICT
### Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Compensation</td>
<td>These charges are defined as the unclassified salaries for the RSD staff and teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Services</td>
<td>These charges are defined as printing, insurance for fire and extended coverage, maintenance fees for property and equipment, janitorial fees, equipment rentals, dues and subscriptions, telephone services or data lines and circuits, utilities and security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Charges</td>
<td>These charges are defined as Charter School payments for MFP, Scholarships, tuition reimbursements, professional services, and student activity insurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions</td>
<td>These charges are defined as the purchase of autos, equipment, or software with a cost greater than $5,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Repairs</td>
<td>These charges are defined as repairs, renovations, or new construction of schools in Orleans Parish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Transfers (IAT)</td>
<td>These charges are a combination of IAT - Charter Admin, state or federal Grants, and Construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Interagency Transfers (IAT)- Revenue vs. Expenditures | **IAT Revenue**- are those dollars received by the RSD from the Department of Education in the form of grants or Charter Admin from the MFP.  
**IAT Expenditures**- are those dollars expended by the RSD in payment to other agencies for operating costs. For example, the payment to the Louisiana Legislative Auditors for audit fees, the payment to the Division of Administration for data processing, or payment for risk management to the Office of Risk Management. |
RSD FY18 BUDGET SUMMARY

- **State General Fund (SGF)**: 82.40%
- **Interagency Transfer (IAT)**: 0.34%
- **Fees & Self-Generated Revenues**: 17.04%
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RSD FY18 BUDGET SUMMARY EXPENDITURES BY LINE ITEM

MAJOR REPAIRS 77%

INTERAGENCY TRANSFER 1%

TOTAL PERSONAL SERVICES 3%

OPERATING SERVICES 1%

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES 16%

ACQUISITIONS 2%
## Recovery School District - Seven Year Funding History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recovery School District - Operating</th>
<th>FY11-12 Actual</th>
<th>FY12-13 Actual</th>
<th>FY13-14 Actual</th>
<th>FY14-15 Actual</th>
<th>FY 15-16 Actual</th>
<th>FY 16-17 Executive Operating Budget</th>
<th>FY17-FY18 Recommended</th>
<th>Change from FY17 to FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State General Fund</td>
<td>$11,500,117</td>
<td>$3,530,937</td>
<td>$299,862</td>
<td>$2,551,941</td>
<td>$2,661,207</td>
<td>$727,351</td>
<td>$458,594</td>
<td>($268,757)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAT-MFP/Grants*</td>
<td>$288,017,203</td>
<td>$288,185,667</td>
<td>$38,053,428</td>
<td>$9,597,484</td>
<td>$10,468,591</td>
<td>$11,574,167</td>
<td>$11,436,687</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAT-Construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees, Self-Generated</td>
<td>$9,224,748</td>
<td>$10,915,099</td>
<td>$6,350,000</td>
<td>$7,750,217</td>
<td>$6,409,216</td>
<td>$7,724,517</td>
<td>$6,409,216</td>
<td>$3,315,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Dedications</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>$4,301,818</td>
<td>$4,301,818</td>
<td>$2,757,207</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$321,943,886</td>
<td>$306,935,607</td>
<td>$64,376,998</td>
<td>$20,899,025</td>
<td>$20,899,025</td>
<td>$18,510,734</td>
<td>$18,241,977</td>
<td>($268,757)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recovery School District - Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recovery School District - Construction</th>
<th>FY11-12 Actual</th>
<th>FY12-13 Actual</th>
<th>FY13-14 Actual</th>
<th>FY14-15 Actual</th>
<th>FY 15-16 Actual</th>
<th>FY 16-17 Executive Operating Budget</th>
<th>FY17-FY18 Recommended</th>
<th>Change from FY17 to FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State General Fund</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAT-MFP/Grants*</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAT-Construction</td>
<td>$219,888,831</td>
<td>$199,536,616</td>
<td>$112,764,728</td>
<td>$163,963,134</td>
<td>$165,369,269</td>
<td>$223,107,990</td>
<td>$183,046,584</td>
<td>($40,061,406)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees, Self-Generated</td>
<td>$6,008,955</td>
<td>$2,751,701</td>
<td>$27,156,037</td>
<td>$19,892,451</td>
<td>$18,486,317</td>
<td>$33,880,000</td>
<td>$33,880,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Dedications</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$225,897,786</td>
<td>$202,288,317</td>
<td>$139,920,765</td>
<td>$183,855,585</td>
<td>$183,855,586</td>
<td>$256,987,990</td>
<td>$217,426,584</td>
<td>($39,561,406)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recovery School District - Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recovery School District - Total</th>
<th>FY11-12 Actual</th>
<th>FY12-13 Actual</th>
<th>FY13-14 Actual</th>
<th>FY14-15 Actual</th>
<th>FY 15-16 Actual</th>
<th>FY 16-17 Executive Operating Budget</th>
<th>FY17-FY18 Recommended</th>
<th>Change from FY17 to FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State General Fund</td>
<td>$11,500,117</td>
<td>$3,530,937</td>
<td>$299,862</td>
<td>$2,551,941</td>
<td>$2,661,207</td>
<td>$727,351</td>
<td>$458,594</td>
<td>($268,757)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAT-MFP/Grants*</td>
<td>$288,017,203</td>
<td>$288,185,667</td>
<td>$38,053,428</td>
<td>$9,597,484</td>
<td>$10,468,591</td>
<td>$11,574,167</td>
<td>$11,436,687</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAT-Construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees, Self-Generated</td>
<td>$9,224,748</td>
<td>$10,915,099</td>
<td>$6,350,000</td>
<td>$7,750,217</td>
<td>$6,409,216</td>
<td>$7,724,517</td>
<td>$6,409,216</td>
<td>$3,315,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Dedications</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>$4,301,818</td>
<td>$4,301,818</td>
<td>$2,757,207</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$547,841,872</td>
<td>$509,223,924</td>
<td>$204,297,763</td>
<td>$204,754,610</td>
<td>$204,754,611</td>
<td>$275,488,724</td>
<td>$235,668,561</td>
<td>($39,830,163)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Interagency Transfer (IAT) is a combination of IAT - Charter Admin, state or federal Grants, and Construction.

### Significant Budget Changes from FY17 to FY18 - Reductions

**Reduction**

**682 - RSD**

2% Reduction (-$9,939) in SGF in accordance to the La Const., Article 7, Section 11(A). This is an across the board reduction taken by all agencies to meet the deficit gap.

Net decrease ($259,398) in SGF in statewide costs. Note: this reduction is primarily ORM costs, based upon information provided from ORM.

---
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August 25, 2017

Dr. Henderson Lewis, Jr.
Superintendent
Orleans Parish School Board
3520 General DeGaulle Drive, Suite 5055
New Orleans, Louisiana 70114

Dear Superintendent Lewis,

In support of the milestones included in the Unification Plan, please find this letter to describe the current financial position of the Orleans Parish School Board (OPSB). The Unification Plan directs OPSB to “develop a plan and mechanisms to ensure financial viability for both OPSB and RSD during the transition period leading to unification.”

OPSB will remain financially viable for the 2017-2018 fiscal year, while reducing its use of one time revenue by $1.6 million or 33% and reducing general fund balance allocation by 25% without additional or special mechanisms or procedures. On June 15, 2017, the School Board adopted the 2017-2018 General Fund Budget.

Thank you for your partnership and continued efforts to successfully achieve the milestones described in the Unification Plan.

Sincerely,

Eric Seling,
Chief Operating Officer
Orleans Parish School Board
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY17</th>
<th>FY18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$51.5M</td>
<td>$51.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$46.1M</td>
<td>$46.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.4M</td>
<td>$2.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.5M</td>
<td>$0.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.0M</td>
<td>$1.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.3M</td>
<td>$3.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.9M</td>
<td>$4.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$46.7M</td>
<td>$46.7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$51.6M</td>
<td>$51.6M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Revenues**

**District-Operated Schools' Revenue**

**General Fund Only**

FY17 to FY18 Budget Summary