OREGON
Targeted Monitoring Review of
School Improvement Grants (SIG) under section 1003(g) of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
March 5-8, 2012

BACKGROUND

Overview of FY 2009 SIG Schools in Oregon		
Tier	**Number of FY 2009 Eligible SIG Schools**	**Number of FY 2009 Served SIG Schools**
Tier I	6	5
Tier II	11	7
Tier III	66	0

FY 2009 Implementation of SIG School Intervention Models	
Models	**Number of Schools Implementing the Model**
Turnaround	0
Transformation	12
Restart	0
Closure	0

Overview of FY 2010 SIG Schools in Oregon		
Tier	**Number of FY 2010 Eligible SIG Schools**	**Number of FY 2010 Served SIG Schools**
Tier I	**5**	**3**
Tier II	**16**	**4**
Tier III	**59**	**0**

FY 2010 Implementation of SIG School Intervention Models	
Models	**Number of Schools implementing the Model**
Turnaround	**0**
Transformation	**7**
Restart	**0**
Closure	**0**

MONITORING TRIP INFORMATION
Monitoring Visits

LEA Visited	*Portland School District 1J*
School Visited	*Pursuit of Wellness Education at Roosevelt High School*
Model Implemented	*Transformation*
FY 2009 Funding Awarded (over three years)	*LEA Award (for 3 SIG schools): $7,635,950* *School-level funding (POWER): $4,502,615*
FY 2010 Funding Awarded	*LEA Award (for 2 SIG schools): $1,966,000*
LEA Visited	*Salem-Keizer School District 24J*
School Visited	*McKay High School*
Model Implemented	*Transformation*
FY 2009 Funding Awarded (over three years)	*LEA Award (for 4 SIG schools): $12,607,610* *School-level funding (McKay): $5,607,610*
FY 2010 Funding Awarded	*LEA Award: $0*
SEA Visited	*Oregon Department of Education*
FY 2009 SIG Award	*$5,310,408 ARRA $29,142,931*
FY 2009 SIG Awards to 7 LEAs	*$32,666,620*

FY 2010 SIG Award	$5,816,476
FY 2010 SIG Awards to 6 LEAs	*$5,500,000*

Staff Interviewed
➢ ***Oregon Department of Education:*** Director and Staff of ODE School Improvement and Accountability Team   ➢ ***Portland School District 1J:*** Superintendent, Special Assistant to the Chief Academic Officer, Regional Administrator for RHS, Executive Director of Teaching and Learning, Interim Director of RTI, and School Improvement Coach   ➢ ***POWER High School Staff:*** Principal, School Leadership Team, 9 Teachers, 8 Parents, Students**,** and 3 Classroom Visits   ➢ ***Salem-Keizer School District 24J:*** Assistant Superintendent, Director of Instructional Services   ➢ ***McKay High School Staff:*** Principal, School Leadership Team, 19 Members of the School Improvement Team, 4 Teachers, 7 Parents, Students, and 3 Classroom Visits

U.S. Department of Education Staff	
Group Leader	Carlas McCauley
Staff Onsite	Michael Wells, Mike Lamb

OVERVIEW OF MONITORING REPORT

The following report is based on U.S. Department of Education's (ED) on-site monitoring visit to Oregon from March 5-8, 2012, and review of documentation provided by the State educational agency (SEA), local educational agencies (LEAs), and schools. The report consists of three sections: *Summary and Observations, Technical Assistance Recommendations,* and *Monitoring Findings.* The *Summary and Observations* section describes the implementation of the SIG program by the SEA, LEAs, and schools visited, initial indicators of success, and outstanding challenges being faced in implementation. This section focuses on how the SEA, LEAs, and schools visited are implementing the SIG program with respect to the following five areas: school climate, teachers and leaders, instructional strategies and time, use of data, and technical assistance. The *Technical Assistance Recommendations* section identifies strategies and resources for addressing technical assistance needs. The *Monitoring Findings* section identifies areas where the SEA is not in compliance with the final requirements of the SIG program and indicates required actions that the SEA must take to resolve the findings.

Please Note: The observations and descriptions included in this report reflect the specific context of the limited number of classrooms visited and interviews conducted at a small number of schools and LEAs within the State. As such, they are a snapshot of what was occurring at the LEA and school levels, and are not meant to represent a school's, LEA's, or State's entire SIG program. Nor are we approving or endorsing any particular practices or approaches by citing them.

SUMMARY AND OBSERVATIONS

School Climate

Portland School District 1J (PSD)
As summarized in the LEA application, Pursuit of Wellness Education at Roosevelt (POWER) High School is one of three small schools operating on the Roosevelt High School campus along with the Arts, Communication and Technology (ACT) High School and the Spanish-English International School (SEIS). All three schools are current SIG-funded schools. ACT and SEIS are being merged with POWER during the 2012-2013 school year. According to students and members of the leadership team the three schools were previously seen by many as the African-American School, the White School and the Hispanic School. Students reported that they are pleased that the merger creates a single school with increased racial and ethnic diversity. Students noted that the integration makes the student body feel more like a family and that prospective students are encouraged by the changes. The school leadership team, teachers, parents and students all noted that in past years POWER High School was not a school that many wanted to attend.

According to those interviewed, the school is more orderly and welcoming and families are more involved than in years past. The principal, teachers and parents also maintain that the community is more engaged, in part, because the principal reports spending significant time and effort in reaching out to community organizations. The school has hosted more events at the school to which the entire community is invited. The principal spoke specifically about a number of culturally themed events held in the last two years that have been very well attended.

Salem-Keizer School District 24J (SKSD)
All groups interviewed agreed that during the past two years McKay High School (MHS) has become a safe, orderly, and well-functioning campus. Previously MHS experienced numerous fights due in part to gang activity, and the unsafe environment extended into sporting events and the school campus during non-school hours. Parents noted that they are now reassured by the additional security, which is present even for evening or Saturday events.

Parents are grateful for the increased written and electronic communications from the school and believe these communications reflect the school's increased expectation for children and concern for parents. Still, the principal, parent engagement specialist, and teachers indicated that they need to do more to engage parents and community members. Parents explained that the school needs to further engage with parents for whom English is not their primary language, especially for non-English speaking parents who speak languages other than Spanish.

Teachers and Leaders

Portland School District 1J (PSD)
As part of the transformation, POWER High School and the accompanying two SIG high schools on the Roosevelt High School campus reorganized their leadership structure. The POWER principal is currently serving as principal for all three campuses and will continue that role when the three schools officially merge during the 2012-2013 school year. The two assistant principals are functioning as administrative and instructional leads for the other two campuses this school year. Principals at all SIG schools were hired the year before SIG as part of those schools' overall reform efforts.

As outlined in its approved SIG application, the district committed to hiring key staff to support implementation of the transformation model including providing extra administrative support, instructional and classroom management coaches, additional counselors and social services staff, and a parent and a family involvement coordinator. While the district promised to provide teachers with opportunities for leadership roles, such as instructional coaches, Roosevelt campus teachers indicated no clear understanding of the manner in which coaches were chosen or how they would be selected in future years.

The district was still developing the school's new teacher evaluation system at the time of the monitoring visit and stated that the OAKS (Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills) would be used in the evaluation and rewards system. Teachers were not aware that the OAKS data would be a factor in determining teacher rewards.

Teachers explained that collaboration and cooperation have increased at the schools over the last two years. Prior to SIG implementation, teachers rarely shared practices with one another or received feedback from others. Now teachers receive more observations and feedback and collaborate with one another through common planning time.

Since beginning SIG implementation, external providers and school-based coaches have been providing professional development to teachers, counselors, and others. Teachers explained that

this professional development has been relevant and effective. The leadership team stated that the staff needs further professional development on strategies to increase student attendance and to develop sustainability plans.

Salem-Keizer School District 24J (SKSD)
McKay High School (MHS) in Salem hired a new principal as part of the transformation model. The district hired him based partly on his experience helping to produce strong student achievement gains at a similar school. The district did not replace the principals in the other SIG-awarded schools because those principals were hired as part of reform efforts started the year before SIG implementation. The district provided additional support for principals, such as hiring an additional assistant principal to assist with school administrative duties at a school where the principal needed more time to address issues of classroom instruction.

With the support of the district, the MHS principal negotiated with non-SIG high school principals to transfer teachers identified as effective to MHS and transfer some MHS teachers to other schools. Those transferred teachers were placed on improvement plans (known as goals) so that receiving principals could use those plans to induce improvement. The district staff reported that several teachers placed on these improvement plans have improved to the point that they no longer require the plans. The principal reported that the union supported, and agreed to, the teacher transfer process. The district supported MHS's staffing strategy but reported that recruiting effective teachers continues to be a challenge.

Leadership and teachers reported that MHS is implementing a rewards system, based on its Teacher Incentive Fund grant that takes into account student achievement. It is not clear, however, whether student achievement is part of the teacher evaluation system: district staff indicated that the OAKS test is factored into the evaluation system, but both teachers and school leadership were not certain if or how that assessment was included.

ODE embedded school-improvement coaches in SIG schools, and SKSD provided professional development to improve data-driven decision making in the classroom. The school improvement coaches help plan and facilitate school-wide professional-development activities, as well as through MHS's professional learning communities (PLCs). Teachers and leadership requested additional technical assistance for parent/community engagement, sustainability planning, and teacher rewards and incentives.

Oregon Department of Education (ODE)
ODE staff hopes that SIG schools can lead the way for changes in teacher and principal evaluations for all the state's schools. They believe that each school was using or planning to use OAKS test data as part of the teacher evaluation process. ODE staff further noted that they were aware that many schools are not implementing reward systems and have provided that feedback to schools during monitoring visits.

Instructional Strategies and Time

Portland School District 1J (PSD)

Teachers and leadership team members indicated that the three schools were in the process of merging their curricula so that all students will have the same course opportunities. In doing so, the district is attempting to coordinate instruction across the campus and within the small schools themselves. Teachers at POWER High School reported having a strong voice in the SIG planning process and mentioned that this was a critical piece of the success of the reform thus far.

The district staff conducted an analysis of SIG schools' courses that compared them to courses at non-awarded SIG-eligible schools: it found that SIG schools had significantly higher levels of course rigor than did non-awarded SIG-eligible schools. This finding informed the district's decision to provide support for curriculum planning and add professional development to address lack of rigor.

The school was not implementing a longer school day or school year. Through the district's SIG application, the Roosevelt campus schools (including POWER High School) committed to increasing learning time by enhancing relationships with after-school partners; blending the school day with after-school resources and activities; offering summer school, including incoming 9th graders; and allowing students to access night school and a fully-staffed online learning lab for credit recovery and advanced courses. According to school leadership, while changes to the daily school schedules were made, the school was not implementing a longer school day or school-year. However, teachers reported that some instructional time was reduced to gain time for additional professional development and double-block scheduling. The result was less time for some other classes including advanced placement classes.

Salem-Keizer School District 24J (SKSD)
Leadership at McKay High School (MHS) reported that a critical component of the reform effort is aligning the curriculum to the school-wide vision for the implementation of the transformation model. Teachers reported that in previous years there were many reform efforts underway and there was little coordination. Similarly, teachers reported that there was good teaching and learning going on prior to SIG but the school leadership used SIG as a way to create a consistent vision and direction for the school.

MHS is also taking steps to accelerate student skills by enrolling struggling students in intensive core classes called workshops. Students take these classes in place of electives, and may continue in these classes through their senior year if they continue to score low on the OAKS. Students and teachers both stated that they supported this effort, noting that the emphasis was on helping students catch up and moving them out of workshops as soon as possible (allowing students to take the OAKS at the end of each semester and move out of a workshop class into an elective at that point).

The MHS school leadership stated that the school was not implementing a longer school day or school year schedule. They had made no changes to the regular school day, but offered after-school activities and Saturday school.

Use of Data

Portland School District 1J (PSD)
Though POWER High School's leadership team emphasized the use of data during the monitoring trip, it was unclear how teachers were using data to inform their instruction. POWER's Leadership team members noted that ODE included use of data as an issue of concern during last year's school visit. The district staff reported sending a weekly data report to SIG schools on achievement and leading indicators.

Salem-Keizer School District 24J (SKSD)
MHS has built a customized excel data system that includes various achievement and behavioral indicators and is using data to offer interventions for students and improve classroom instruction. For example, teachers reported that they are using data to revise lesson plans and curriculum maps as part of their professional learning communities (PLC). The leadership team also indicated that it enrolls students in workshop classes based on OAKS results and assigns SIG-funded mentors to students based on discipline and achievement data.

The district staff had not established goals for SIG schools, but had developed a robust data system that leadership in SIG schools can customize for their needs.

Oregon Department of Education (ODE)
ODE staff reported that it will begin using Indistar, a web-based system to track and support school-improvement activities during the 2012-2013 school-year.

Technical Assistance

Portland School District 1J (PSD)
The district developed a SIG leadership team to coordinate the district's turnaround efforts and is supporting SIG implementation through the Chief Academic Officer's office, which is coordinating other district offices' efforts by identifying people in each of several offices (Human Resources, Finance, etc.) to provide a SIG focus. The district also hired a school-improvement coach and located the coach on the Roosevelt High School campus.

District staff explained it focused its SIG technical assistance efforts on data collection and use of data to inform instruction. The district staff is interested in learning more about how effectively implement incentives and rewards for teachers and how to continue to improve labor-management collaboration.

Salem-Keizer School District 24J (SKSD)
The district has primarily provided support to SIG schools by offering professional development activities, including inter-school opportunities, and building the data collection and analysis systems.

Oregon Department of Education (ODE)
ODE has offered workshops on SIG implementation for district and school leaders. In addition school-based leadership coaches are provided to every SIG principal. The statewide system of supports and regional educational centers are well integrated into the school improvement efforts of ODE. State-wide meetings and coordination of school to school communication are supported

at the SEA level. The ODE staff expressed enthusiastic interest in being a part of planned peer-to-peer technical assistance initiative which would bring two SEAs together for mutual planning and idea exchange regarding SIG implementation and support at the SEA level.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE RECOMMENDATIONS

This section addresses areas where additional technical assistance may be needed to improve the quality of SIG program implementation.

Issue 1: While ODE has conducted visits and given feedback to schools about implementation concerns, ODE has not provided any formal monitoring findings to its SIG schools; school leadership teams are not certain whether ODE feedback constitutes recommendations or required changes.

Technical Assistance Strategies:
- ODE staff review their monitoring procedures and clarify expectations for districts and schools. Resources may include webinars offered on the online School Turnaround Learning Community (STLC) and example monitoring procedures and processes available from other SEAs (Responsibility: ODE & ED).

Issue 2: Districts and schools requested more opportunities to share with other SIG schools promising practices and lessons learned within the State and around the country.

Technical Assistance Strategies:
- Provide opportunities for SIG school and district leaders to share strategies within Oregon (Responsibility: ODE).
- Establish Oregon group on STLC to share practices and promote discussions around SIG implementation challenges (Responsibility: ODE).

Issue 3: District and school staff requested additional support around connecting family and community engagement to their school goals and priorities. Districts did not appear to have comprehensive family and community engagement plans.

Technical Assistance Strategies:
- Connect ODE with national experts on family and community engagement to discuss improvement strategies (Responsibility: ED).

Issue 4: ODE requested information on credit by proficiency programs and strategies to help students recover credit quickly and accelerate learning for those looking to move past standard courses.

Technical Assistance Strategies:
- Provide resources and identify practices relating to earning credit by proficiency and credit recovery (Responsibility: ED).

Issue 5: ODE requested technical assistance around planning and developing strategies for sustaining SIG reforms after the grant ends.

Technical Assistance Strategies:
- Include ODE in Department's Peer-to-Peer Technical Assistance Initiative and focus on sustainability during that process (Responsibility: ED).

MONITORING FINDINGS

Summary of Monitoring Indicators

Critical Element	Requirement	Status	Page(s)
1. **Application Process**	The SEA ensures that its application process was carried out consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Sections I and II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010)]	N/A	
2. **Implementation**	The SEA ensures that the SIG intervention models are being implemented consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Sections I and II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]	Findings	13-15
3. **Fiscal**	The SEA ensures LEAs and schools are using funds consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Section II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010)) ; §1114 of the ESEA; and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-87]	N/A	
4. **Technical Assistance**	The SEA ensures that technical assistance is provided to its LEAs consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Section II of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]	N/A	
5. **Monitoring**	The SEA ensures that monitoring of LEAs and schools is being conducted consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Section II of the final requirements for the School Improvement	N/A	

	Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]		
6. Data Collection	The SEA ensures that data are being collected consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program. [Sections II and III of the final requirements for the School Improvement Grants authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010))]	N/A	

Monitoring Area: School Improvement Grants Program

Critical Element 2: The SEA ensures that the SIG intervention models are being implemented consistent with the final requirements of the SIG program.

Finding 1: ODE did not ensure that Portland School District 1J and Salem-Keizer School District 24J established schedules and implemented strategies that significantly increased learning time for all students. POWER High School reported an additional 44,610 minutes of instructional time as a result of after-school tutoring, Saturday Academy tutoring, and summer instruction. However, it appears that these opportunities were not made available to all students and, even if they were, that they district did not have capacity to serve all students if they elected to enroll. McKay High School also did not significantly increase learning time, reporting that they had lengthened days by only 10-12 minutes. Examination of bell schedules of Salem-Keizer School District 24J' other SIG schools indicates that the schools, except for Hallman Elementary School, have not implemented increased learning time. Hallman Elementary appears to have increased the school day for students by approximately 50 minutes. Although POWER and MHS did not significantly increase the length of the school day, week, or year, both schools had increased time in-class as well as time available for professional development for teachers by decreasing transition times and restructuring the student day.

Citation: Section I.A.2 (d) (3) (A) of the final requirements stipulates, as part of the transformation model, that an LEA must "establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time." Section I.A.3 of the final requirements defines "increased learning time" as "using a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for: (a) instruction in core academic subjects including English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography; (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, including, for example, physical education, service learning, and experiential and work-based learning opportunities that are provided by partnering, as appropriate, with other organizations; and, (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects" (75 FR 66363 (October 28, 2010)).

Further action required: ODE must work with Portland School District 1J and Salem-Keizer School District 24J to ensure that all schools implementing the transformation model have significantly increased the total number of school hours.

Additionally, ODE must submit evidence to ED that it has reviewed each LEA that received FY 2009 and FY 2010 SIG funds to implement the transformation or turnaround model to determine if increased learning time is being implemented consistent with the SIG final requirements. For each school implementing the turnaround or transformation model, ODE must submit to ED documentation demonstrating the increase in learning time under the school intervention model and evidence that the time is being increased in accordance with the definition of "increased learning time" in the final requirements and Guidance on Fiscal Year 2010 School Improvement

Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (updated March 2, 2012). http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/legislation.html#guidance

Finding 2: ODE has not ensured that POWER High School has implemented a system that identifies and rewards staff.

Citation: Section I.A.2. (d)(1)(i)(C) of the SIG final requirements stipulates that an LEA must identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing [the transformation] model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so.

Further action required: ODE must work with POWER High School and Portland School District 1J to develop and implement a tool or rubric to identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates. The tool or rubric must be based in part on student performance and may include other indicators, such as classroom observations and attendance. ODE must submit this tool to ED and provide evidence that POWER has implemented it during the 2012-2013 school year.

Additionally, ODE must submit evidence to ED that it has reviewed each LEA that received FY 2009 and FY 2010 SIG funds to implement the transformation or turnaround model to determine if a system to reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff in SIG schools who have increased student achievement is being implemented consistent with the SIG final requirements. For each school implementing the turnaround or transformation model, ODE must submit to ED documentation demonstrating the implementation of such a reward system under the school intervention model and evidence that the system is designed in accordance with the definition of "student growth" in the final requirements and Guidance on Fiscal Year 2010 School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (updated March 2, 2012).

Finding 3: POWER High School has not implemented a teacher and principal evaluation system that takes into account as a significant factor data on student growth.

Citation: Section I.A.2 (d) (1) (B) (1) of the final requirements stipulates, as part of the transformation model, that an LEA must "Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that take into account data on student growth (as defined in [the] notice) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduation rates…" Section I.A.3 (b) (ii) of the final requirements defines student growth as "the change in achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time. For grades in which the state administers summative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics. A state may also include other measures that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms."

Further action required: ODE must work with POWER High School and Portland School District 1J to develop and implement a teacher and principal evaluation system that takes into

account data on student growth. For grades in which the State administers summative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, student growth data must be based on a student's score on the State's assessment under section 1111 (3) of the ESEA. The ODE must provide to the Department this evaluation tool and evidence that POWER has implemented it during the 2012-2013 school year.

Additionally, ODE must submit evidence to ED that it has reviewed each LEA that received FY 2009 and FY 2010 SIG funds to implement the transformation or turnaround model to determine if a teacher and principal evaluation system is being implemented consistent with the SIG final requirements. For each school implementing the turnaround or transformation model, ODE must submit to ED documentation demonstrating that the evaluation system is being implemented in accordance with the definition of student growth in the final requirements and Guidance on Fiscal Year 2010 School Improvement Grants under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (updated March 2, 2012).