Next Generation of Accountability

A Summary of the ESEA Flexibility Plan
Fall 2012
A Major Shift

- Under leadership of Governor & Superintendent of Public Instruction
- System unique to Oregon
- Consolidating state initiatives and federal requirements
- Seamless outcomes-focused PK – 20 system
- 40/40/20 Goal
- Tight on outcomes, loose on means
Current Issues Impacting Accountability

- National Considerations
  - Pending ESEA reauthorization
  - Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) Next Generation initiative
  - USED waivers of ESEA requirements

- Governor’s Initiative
  - Oregon Education Investment Board
  - LearnWorks
CCSSO’s Guidelines for Flexibility

- **Alignment of Performance Goals to College and Career Ready Standards**
- **Annual Determinations for each School and District**
- **Focus on Student Outcomes**
- **Continued Commitment to Disaggregation**
- **Deeper Diagnostic Reviews**
- **Building School and District Capacity**
- **Targeting Lowest Performing Schools**
- **Innovation, evaluation, and continuous improvement**
- **Reporting of timely, actionable, and accessible data**

*Oregon Department of Education*
LearnWorks

- 40-40-20 target
- Curricular continuum and proficiency based
  - Aligned and articulated targets
  - Authentic, classroom-based assessments
  - High-quality instruction
  - Standards-based reporting
  - Flexible time structures for students and teachers
- Focus on college and career readiness
- Funding for outcomes
Next Generation Plan Development

- Targeted planning through workgroups
- Draft plan posted for comment
- Submission to USED January 2012
- Peer review process March 2012
- USED feedback April 2012
- Resubmission May - June 2012
- Approval July 2012
- **Implementation begins 2012-13!**
Four Principles for ESEA Flexibility

- College and Career Ready Expectations
- Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support
- Effective Instruction and Leadership
- Reduce Duplication and Unnecessary Burden
College & Career Ready Standards

- Oregon is adopting the Common Core State Standards (CCSS)
- Adopted English/language arts & math
- Other subjects will follow
- Steering Committee & Stewardship Team

Four workgroups:
- Teaching & learning
- Instructional materials
- Professional development
- Communications
CCSS Alignment

- English Language Learner Proficiency Standards
- Accommodations for Students with Disabilities
- Head Start Child Development & Early Learning Framework
- Process for adopting instructional materials
- Partnership with higher education
- Increased rigor of statewide assessments
- Increased access to accelerated learning opportunities
CCSS Support

- Partnerships with educational & professional organizations
- Planned professional development
- Implementation Toolkit for Teachers
# Accountability and Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Compact</td>
<td>State and district policy makers</td>
<td>Guide budget and policy setting at state and local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Report Card</td>
<td>Families and the public</td>
<td>Communicate about district and school effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student level data</td>
<td>Students, families, school personnel, state and district policy makers</td>
<td>Inform and evaluate teaching learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Achievement Compacts

- Annual agreement between state & each district, ESD, community college, & OUS institution
- Created in partnership with Oregon Education Investment Board
- Using data from prior years
- Engage staff & community in the process
- Ambitious but attainable goals for following year
New Oregon Report Card

- Few changes for fall 2012
- Redesign for fall 2013
- Aligned with Achievement Compact
- Reflect student growth toward standard, still including performance of subgroups
- Incorporating measures of college & career readiness
Model, Focus, & Priority Schools

- **Model** – high achievement or graduation & high growth
- **Priority** – very low achievement or graduation, low growth, & low subgroup growth
- **Focus** – low achievement or graduation, low moderate growth, & below average subgroup growth
- **Title I Schools in need of improvement** – 15-20 schools demonstrating a need for supports
- **Other Schools** – approximately 80%, not in need of intervention
Identifying Model, Focus & Priority Schools

- Calculated from student ratings on reading, mathematics, & graduation rates

- Resulting ratings
  - Achievement rating
  - Growth rating
  - Subgroup growth rating
  - Graduation rating
  - Subgroup graduation rating

Elementary & Middle Schools

High Schools
## Weights for School Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elem</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgroup Growth</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgroup Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Approximate Counts of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Portion</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30 (17 SIG schools, 13 newly identified schools)</td>
<td>36 (Including 17 SIG Schools)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All counts are based on approximately 600 Title IA funded schools in Oregon.
Levels of Intervention

- Level 3: Intensive Direct Intervention
- Level 2: Directed Use of Resources
- Level 1: Coaching and Support
- Locally Guided Continuous Improvement
Priority Schools

Annual Rating of Schools

- Priority Schools
- Focus Schools
- Model Schools
- Other Title I Schools

Annual Self-Evaluation
Guided by Leadership Coaches

Deeper Diagnoses of 5 Key Areas
- Technical and Adaptive Leadership
- Educator Effectiveness
- Teaching and Learning
- District and School Structure and Culture
- Family and Community Involvement

Conducted by School Appraisal Teams

Comprehensive Achievement Plan
Developed collaboratively by District, School, Network Coordinator, and Leadership Coach

Continuous Improvement Network
Staffed by Regional Network Coordinators and School Support Teams

Leadership Coaching

Internal Continuous Improvement Process
Focus Schools

Annual Rating of Schools
- Priority Schools
- Focus Schools
- Model Schools
- Other Title I Schools

Annual Self-Evaluation
Guided by Leadership Coaches

Comprehensive Achievement Plan
Developed collaboratively by District, School, Network Coordinator, and Leadership Coach

Deeper Diagnoses of 5 Key Areas
- Technical and Adaptive Leadership
- Educator Effectiveness
- Teaching and Learning
- District and School Structure and Culture
- Family and Community Involvement

Conducted by School Appraisal Teams

Continuous Improvement Network
Staffed by Regional Network Coordinators and School Support Teams

Leadership Coaching

Internal Continuous Improvement Process
Key Areas of Effectiveness

- **Teaching and learning**
  - What content do teachers teach?

- **Educator effectiveness**
  - How do educators behave to get the best results?

- **Family and community involvement**
  - How does the school/district engage parents and the community?

- **District and school structure and culture**
  - Do district and school policies and practices support student achievement?

- **Technical and adaptive leadership**
  - Does the school’s leadership team effectively lead for improvement and how to adjust to the school context?
Priority Schools Timeline

- Title IA set asides as school year begins
- Self-evaluation early fall 2012
- Deeper diagnostics fall 2012
- Plan development & approval winter/spring 2013
- Comprehensive, system-wide interventions beginning 2013-14
- Address all of the five key areas of effectiveness
- School Improvement Grant (SIG) schools continue with approved plan
SIG Schools as Priority Schools

- Continue priority status through 2014-15
- No supplemental Title IA school improvement funding following SIG expiration
- Most likely continued reporting requirements as priority school
- Continuation in the Network as an option
Focus Schools Timeline

- Title IA set asides as school year begins
- Self-evaluation early fall 2012
- Plan development & approval fall 2012
- Interventions targeting achievement gaps beginning midyear 2012-13
- Deeper diagnostics as resources allow
- Revision of plan and interventions for 2013-14 based on deeper diagnostics
ESEA Required Set Asides

- 10% district improvement professional development set aside ends following 2011-12 school year
- Supplemental Education Services and school choice are no longer required
- 20% district-level school improvement set aside (formerly SES/Choice) waived for 2012-13
- 20% district-level school improvement set aside may be required in 2013-14 and 2014-15
- 10% school-level professional development set aside remains for identified schools
Funds to Support Improvement

- School and district set asides
- Funds to Priority and Focus schools
  - $5000 initial planning grant
  - Funds based on identification
  - Funds based on enrollment
- Funds to Model Schools
  - $2500 initial planning grant
  - Services purchased by specific priority or focus schools
  - Services purchased by state for professional development or other services
Continuous Improvement Network

- Leadership Coaches
- Regional Network Coordinators
- School Appraisal Teams
- School Support Teams
- Education partners and organizations
Leadership Coaches

- Mentor leadership’s professional growth
- Provide direction in completing self-evaluation
- Facilitate creation and implementation of CAP
- Participate in school support team
- Network to strengthen implementation strategies
- Assist in selecting external resources
Regional Network Coordinators

- Support priority and focus schools in self-evaluation
- Facilitate selection of school support team members
- Coordinate deeper diagnoses
- Assist in selection of interventions
- Assist in oversight & monitoring of CAP implementation
- Support participation in the Network
School Appraisal Teams

- Review results of self-evaluation & school data
- Apply appropriate diagnostic tools and conduct deeper diagnoses
- Create a report of results and prescribed interventions
- Assist in continued diagnoses as needed
School Support Teams

- Assist in the development of CAPs
- Support roles needed to ensure implementation of CAPs
- Assist in oversight and monitoring of district
- Assist in oversight & monitoring of CAP implementation
- Support participation in the Network
Education Partners

- Expansion of current statewide efforts
  - RTI
  - OSBA Lighthouse Project
  - STEM
  - Accreditation
  - PBIS
  - DATA Project
  - ESD School Improvement
  - Other programs

- Many partnering organizations:
  - K-12 districts & schools
  - Higher education
  - Early learning service providers
  - Education Service Districts
  - Business community
  - Other education & community organizations
Educator Effectiveness

Overview of the Oregon Framework for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems
Educator Effectiveness System

- STANDARDS
- RECRUITMENT
- PREPARATION
- LICENSURE
- INDUCTION & MENTORING
- ONGOING PROFESSIONAL LEARNING
- DEVELOPMENTAL CONTINUUMS
- STUDENT OUTCOMES
- POLICY AND SYSTEMS CHANGE
- EQUITY
- EVALUATION

From CCSSO State Consortium on Educator Effectiveness
Effective Teachers and Leaders Matter

Within the school environment, teachers and administrators have the greatest impact on student learning; ensuring educator effectiveness is key to addressing the achievement gap for all students.
Oregon Framework

- The state framework will guide local development or alignment of district evaluation & support systems to:
  - Ensure local systems are rigorous and designed to support professional growth and accountability;
  - Improve instruction in the classroom and leadership within the school and district; and
  - Improve student learning and growth of each and every student.

- ODE will provide models and tools that meet state criteria; districts may adopt or develop their own that meet or exceed state criteria.

- Requires local collaborative process with teachers, administrators, and bargaining representatives.
Oregon Evaluation Framework
Alignment of State and Federal Requirements

The Oregon Framework incorporates SB290 and federal requirements

Guides implementation of aligned state & federal requirements
# Implementation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2012</td>
<td>ESEA Waiver approved; State Board endorsed Oregon Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Pilot framework and student growth measures in 50 districts&lt;br&gt; All districts develop or align local evaluation &amp; support systems; regional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>ODE resubmit amended evaluation guidelines for USED approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By July 1, 2013</td>
<td>All districts submit assurances and implementation plan to ODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>All districts pilot implementation of local systems; regional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>All districts implement local systems; regional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By July 1, 2015</td>
<td>Regional Peer Review Process &amp; Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16 &amp; beyond</td>
<td>Continuous improvement of systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Pilot 2012-2013

- Test and refine Oregon Framework for educator evaluation
- Pilot in SB252 Oregon District Collaboration Grant districts:
  - Vernonia
  - Sisters
  - South Lane
  - Ashland
  - Pendleton
  - Lebanon
  - Redmond
  - Sherwood
  - Lincoln County
  - McMinnville
  - Oregon City
  - Springfield
Oregon Commitments

- No public reporting of individual teacher data
- Not supporting the use of standardized data as the sole measure of student learning
- Not supporting student growth as the sole component on which to base evaluation
- Agreement that for an educator evaluation system to drive improvement of student outcomes, the data and information it provides must be used to improve instructional practices
Implementation of educator evaluation is a continuous improvement process

- Monitor what is working and not working over time
- Take into consideration emerging research and best practices
- Adjust state framework and policies as needed
Continuous Improvement Network

Annual Rating of Schools

- Priority Schools
- Focus Schools
- Model Schools
- Other Title I Schools

Annual Self-Evaluation
Guided by Leadership Coaches

Deeper Diagnoses of 5 Key Areas
- Technical and Adaptive Leadership
- Educator Effectiveness
- Teaching and Learning
- District and School Structure and Culture
- Family and Community Involvement

Conducted by School Appraisal Teams

Comprehensive Achievement Plan
Developed collaboratively by District, School, Network Coordinator, and Leadership Coach

Continuous Improvement Network
Staffed by Regional Network Coordinators and School Support Teams

Leadership Coaching

Internal Continuous Improvement Process
## Oregon Framework Required Elements

Elements to be included in all **teacher** and **administrator** evaluation and support systems in Oregon school districts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards of Professional Practice</strong></td>
<td><strong>Differentiated Performance Levels:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Multiple Measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluation and Professional Growth Cycle</strong></td>
<td><strong>Aligned Professional Learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standards of Professional Practice

Teachers

Model Core Teaching Standards (INTASC)

- Four Domains:
  1. The Learner and Learning
  2. Content
  3. Instructional Practice
  4. Professional Responsibility

Administrators

Educational Leadership/ Administrator Standards (ISLLC)

- Six Domains:
  1. Visionary Leadership
  2. Instructional Improvement
  3. Effective Management
  4. Inclusive Practice
  5. Ethical Leadership
  6. Socio-Political Context
Differentiated Performance Levels

- Performance evaluated on the Standards of Professional Practice on 4 levels:
  - Level 1 – Does not meet standards
  - Level 2 – Making progress toward standards
  - Level 3 – Meets standards
  - Level 4 – Exceeds standards

- ODE will provide approved research-based rubrics
Multiple Measures

Evaluation includes multiple measures from all three categories of evidence:

(A) Professional Practice

(B) Professional Responsibilities

(C) Student Learning and Growth

Measures performance on *Standards of Professional Practice* and student learning.
Multiple Measures: Student Learning & Growth

- Collaborative Student Learning and Growth Goal Setting Process:
  - Teachers and administrators collaborate with their supervisors/evaluators to establish at least two student learning and growth goals
  - Discuss rigor and rationale of each goal, research-based strategies, quality of evidence and standards addressed
  - Meet and discuss progress mid-year and at end of year
  - Reflect on results and determine implications for professional growth plans and summative evaluation*
## Multiple Measures: Student Learning & Growth

All teachers and administrators in collaboration with supervisor/evaluator, establish at least two student learning goals and measures from following three categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Types of Measures</th>
<th>Examples, but not limited to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>State or national standardized assessments</td>
<td>OAKS, SMARTER, ELPA, Extended Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Common national, international, regional, district-developed measures</td>
<td>ACT, PLAN, EXPLORE, AP, IB, DIBELS, C-PAS, other national measures; or common assessments approved by the district or state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teachers: Classroom-based or school-wide measures</td>
<td>Student performances, portfolios, products, projects, work samples, tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators: Other school-wide or district-wide measures</td>
<td>Graduation rate, attendance rate, drop-out rate, discipline data, PSAT, AP/IB tests, dual enrollment, college remediation rates, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation and Professional Growth Cycle

Critical steps in the cycle
Collaborative process, ongoing feedback, focus on improving effectiveness
Aligned Professional Learning

- Evaluation aligned with high quality professional development opportunities
  - Informs decisions for professional growth plans
  - Relevant to educator’s goals and needs

Resource:

*Learning Forward: Standards for Professional Learning*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Suggested Action Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ District design teams work collaboratively to design or align local</td>
<td>▶ Review Oregon Framework (SB290/waiver) requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation &amp; support systems</td>
<td>▶ Establish a process &amp; timeline for collaborative planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Self-evaluate to determine if current system meets the five required elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Determine multiple measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Identify capacity needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Develop implementation plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do I have to do? When?

By July 1, 2013

✓ All districts submit implementation plan and assurances for local system aligned to 5 required elements, including:
  ▸ State adopted teaching standards and leadership standards (or crosswalk if using other standards)
  ▸ State approved scoring rubrics; 4 performance levels
  ▸ District selected multiple measures
  ▸ Professional growth cycle
  ▸ Aligned professional learning opportunities
  ▸ Training for all staff and evaluators

2013-2014

✓ All districts pilot implementation of local evaluation & support system
Educator Effectiveness Website

http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=3478
Getting in Touch

- College and Career Ready Standards—Cheryl Kleckner
  - cheryl.kleckner@state.or.us  503-947-5794

- School Ratings—Jon Wiens
  - jon.wiens@state.or.us  503-947-5764

- Educator Effectiveness—Theresa Richards
  - theresa.richards@state.or.us
  - 503-947-5736 or 503-587-8840
Getting in Touch

- The Network—Denny Nkemontoh
  - dennynkemontoh@stateor.us  503-947-5880

- Priority Schools—Jesse Parsons
  - jesse.parsons@state.or.us  503-947-5602

- Focus Schools—Shanda Brown
  - shanda.brown@state.or.us  503-947-5809

- Model Schools—Jan McCoy
  - jan.mccoy@state.or.us  503-947-5704
Getting in Touch

- ODE Next Generation Site
  - [http://www.ode.state.or.us/go/nextgen](http://www.ode.state.or.us/go/nextgen)

- Tryna Luton
  - tryna.luton@state.or.us
  - 503-947-5922 or 503-508-1268

- Jan McCoy
  - jan.mccoy@state.or.us
  - 503-947-5704
With the reauthorization of ESEA pending, Secretary Arne Duncan and USED created the opportunity for states to apply for several waivers that are intended to give relief to states and districts from some of the requirements and one size fits all restrictions of No Child Left Behind.

This presentation will take you through the high points of Oregon’s ESEA Flexibility request and implementation.
In October 2011, we embarked on the journey of planning for and drafting the waivers, but with the greater vision for Oregon at the forefront of the process.

The Governor’s Office and the Oregon Department of Education worked in partnership, along with many stakeholders from across the state, to draft a system unique to our state that combines the latest vision for education coming out of the Governor’s Office, Oregon’s current education programs, and federal requirements.

The goal is to create a seamless system that is outcomes based and spans prekindergarten through grade 20. This endeavor includes what we refer to as “40/40/20 Goal”

The 40/40/20 goal:
- 100% earn high school diploma
- 80% pursue instruction beyond high school
- Of this 80% - half (or 40%) work toward professional certification, associates degree, or similar training
- and half (40%) go on to a bachelors and beyond.

To accomplish this the principle of “tight-loose” comes into play. Very clear or tight on what the outcomes need to be, at the same time, allowing educators to determine the best way to achieve them.
Several issues came together over the last 12 months providing impetus for change in rating and intervening in schools. Each of these are described in greater detail on the following slides.

These included issues at both the federal and state levels.

(You may want to add updated information here about other initiatives that have been developed...)
The Council of Chief State School Officers, in the absence of reauthorization of ESEA (NCLB under President G. Bush), developed guidelines to support conversations with USED regarding potential flexibility through waivers.

These guidelines prompted President Obama to announce an opportunity to seek state-level waivers from ESEA (September 23, 2011). Each bubble on this slide represents one of the original CCSSO guideline. These are clearly reflected in all subsequent work on the flexibility waivers.

(I would not worry about this info if it were me....pretty remote from what we now know as the ESEA Flexibility stuff)
LearnWorks was commissioned by Governor Kitzhaber to review Oregon’s system of supports and funding to schools. They met during October, 2011 and crafted guidelines for improvement efforts in Oregon.

LearnWorks called for a statewide goal of 100% of students graduating high school, 40% pursuing training beyond high school (associates or specialized career training), and 40% working to a bachelor’s degree or beyond.

The group called for a continuous curriculum supporting student learning pre-K through grade 20 with each level preparing students for next steps in college and career readiness.

The focus of educational effort, as described by LearnWorks, should be on college and career readiness – Know, Think, Act, Go

LearnWorks suggested that funding should be tied to success on planned outcomes.
The process has included and will continue to include involvement from many educators across the state and many different groups.

We put together some large workgroups that worked over the course of a couple months and some smaller, more focused groups to answer targeted questions and create an outline of the different parts to the plan.

A first draft was posted mid-December for public comment and we have incorporated much of what we heard from the public – adding and revising content. Oregon submitted to USED on January 23, 2012.

USED used a peer review process to review. After a back and forth negotiation and process with USED, Oregon received approval in July 2012 and immediately began putting systems in place and furthering the work that was already started.
The ESEA Flexibility waivers focus on four major principles. The first three are explained in more detail within the request and in this presentation.

#4 - Efforts to reduce duplication and unnecessary burden are woven throughout the waiver application and extend the paperwork reduction initiative already underway at ODE.
Let’s move into the details of the drafted request.

The waivers call for implementation of college and career ready standards, giving students access to curriculum that is aligned to those standards.

Oregon already had this process underway. The State Board of Education has adopted the Common Core State Standards for English/language arts and mathematics and the plan is moving forward on adoption of other subjects.

A Steering Committee leads the implementation and assessment work, guiding efforts at the policy level and serving as the main point of contact for the work.

A larger Stewardship Team works on the details in four focus areas:
  - teaching and learning
  - instructional materials
  - professional development
  - communication

The group has been and will continue to work on crosswalk analyses, identifying similarities and differences between the standards and aiding in the development of resources and tools for districts.
Other alignments in this work include:

- aligning instructional materials

- alignment with early childhood education – the recommendation from the OEIB is that Oregon adopt the already federally required Head Start Child Development & Early Learning Framework

- alignment with institutions of higher education – both for the transition of students into college and for educator preparation

- work is going on with the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium to align the statewide assessment and increase the rigor of the assessment

- several partnerships and collaboratives are underway to further accelerated learning opportunities for students
  - dual credit
  - Expanded Options
  - Advanced Placement
  - International Baccalaureate
  - Career and Technical Education
  - Accelerated College Credit Programs Grants
  - Test Fee Program
For outreach and implementation, Oregon has many different educational organizations working together to provide professional development across the state, create an Implementation Toolkit for Teachers, and provide other resources statewide.
The Achievement Compact is a new document intended to formalize an agreement between the Oregon Education Investment Board and individual school districts (ESDs, OUS institutions, and other education agencies also create compacts). These compacts allow state and district policymakers to collaborate on goals for the district.

The state report card remains an important part of the reporting model. Over the 2012-13 school year, it will be refined to better meet the needs of its target audience, families and the public served by individual schools and districts. This tool communicates the effectiveness of particular schools/districts.

All of these are fed by student data from state sources. These data are of use to all audiences and at the individual level or aggregated, present important perspectives on student achievement and program effectiveness.
Achievement Compacts are partnership agreements between the state (through the Oregon Education Investment Board) and each district, ESD, community college and OUS institution.

These will create a more focused picture of performance over time, and set forth ambitious but attainable goals for the following year by engaging stakeholders in the process.

School and district report cards look at past performance, using data from prior years, on a building-by-building basis. Achievement compacts are forward-looking, requiring districts to set clear goals and budget accordingly.
The waivers call for states to create a plan for a differentiated system of accountability. Oregon will move away from AYP ratings to a model that includes growth and differentiated measures for districts and schools.

The current Report Card will be in use through 2012-13 – with a few changes for fall 2012:

- No AYP
- High school ratings based on an annual measureable objective (AMO) for graduation rate 2 percent higher than 2011-12
- Model, priority and focus school designations will be included
- Achievement index award same points whether students meet or exceed

In the mean time, we will be redesigning the Report Card to align with the Achievement Compact implementation so that it reflects student growth toward measures of college and career readiness. This will still include a focus on performance of underachieving subgroups.

The goal is for first implementation fall 2013.
Under this new system, Oregon will no longer create the typical list of schools and districts in improvement that was based on AYP ratings.

Instead, there will be:

- model schools – these are the reward schools, those with the highest performing/graduation rates and high growth
- focus schools – those with low achievement or graduation, low moderate growth, and below average subgroup growth
- priority schools – these are the schools with very low achievement or graduation, low growth, & low subgroup growth

The federal requirements call for identification of Title I schools and, in some cases, Title I eligible schools in these ratings. Oregon’s goal is to include all schools.

This leaves all other schools (approximately 80%) out of these categories and, along with the model schools, most likely not in need of interventions.
In identifying these schools, the calculation will include reading and math OAKS scores and graduation rates.

The resulting ratings are based on:
- achievement
- growth
- subgroup growth
- graduation
- and subgroup graduation
This slide shows the weights for the overall ratings of schools. As you can see growth becomes less of a factor at the high school level than at the elementary and middle levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Elem</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgroup Growth</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgroup Graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oregon districts funded 598 - 600 schools with Title I funds. The figures above are based on those data.

The percentages shown are required by the federal application request.
Supports and interventions will be provided in a multi-level system. The bottom tier of the triangle signifies districts and schools that are meeting the goals of their achievement compacts and not in need of intervention. The next three tiers constitute classifications of priority and focus schools with increased intervention and support depending on the level.

**Level 1: Coaching and Support**
- Schools and districts at this level will select and use outside resources, such as mentors/coaches from peers at schools and districts with similar characteristics and/or other educational partner organizations. There will be few restrictions on use of funds or on program improvement choices.

**Level 2: Directed Use of Resources**
- Close review of the CAP and its relevance to diagnosed key concerns in the school along with prescriptive choices of programs and expenditures will be done.
- Schools at level 2 will be monitored on their use of funds and the alignment of funds with program improvement efforts as described in the CAP.
- Network participants will help to evaluate fidelity of program implementation and the impact of those programs on student achievement.

**Level 3: Intensive direct intervention**
- Schools at level 3 will have far less latitude in their implementation of programs and will be directed toward particular programs as the CAP is created and implemented.
- Expenditures will be clearly delineated in the CAP and will be closely monitored.
- This will impact persistently under achieving schools.

**Placement in levels**
All priority schools (including SIG schools) will be at level 3. Focus schools may be at any level as determined by a rubric within the waiver and based on conditions within individual schools.

**Supplemental Education Services and Choice:**
Student transfer is a possible intervention in districts where possible – not required. Supplemental Education Services can also remain an intervention strategy – not required. The state will no longer go through an approval process of providers and publish an approved list of providers.
This diagram summarizes the intervention cycle for priority schools and illustrates the order of events. Schools will be identified annually. Only schools identified for the 2012-13 school year, based on achievement data through 2011-12, will be involved in interventions during the first three years. Schools identified following the 2012-13 school year will not be engaged by ODE and the statewide system of support until the identification of schools in 2015-16 at the earliest.

Following identification, priority schools will conduct their first annual self-evaluation using an online tool specified by ODE. This self-evaluation, completed by September 30, 2012, is the basis for initial assessment of the school and will be used to target the deeper diagnoses for the school.

Following self-evaluation, SCHOOL APPRAISAL TEAMS will conduct deeper diagnoses of the school to determine areas of relative strength and weakness and to target interventions to school needs. A report from these deeper diagnoses will include prescribed interventions for the school.

Note that to the right of the diagram it shows schools functioning without need of intervention.

Exiting levels of intervention is provided for when adequate progress is made by priority and focus schools but only after 3 years of intervention.
This diagram summarizes the cycle just described except for the changes in the timeline for Focus Schools. In the next few slides, we will focus on the details of some of the parts to this cycle.
In the annual self-evaluation process and the deeper diagnostic process, schools and districts will be honing in on five key areas of effectiveness.

**Teaching & learning**
- strengthen instructional program
- ensure research-based, rigorous standards
- use data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement

**Staff effectiveness**
- ensure teachers are effective
- use data to assist in this effort
- redesign day, week, year for additional student learning and teacher collaboration

**Family & community involvement**

**District & school structure & culture**
- establish an environment of safety, discipline, and that addresses non-academic needs

**Technical & adaptive leadership**
- strong leadership focused on student achievement
- use of data to inform decision making
Priority Schools Timeline

- Title IA set aside as school year begins
- Self-evaluation early fall 2012
- Deeper diagnostics fall 2012
- Plan development & approval winter/spring 2013
- Comprehensive, system-wide interventions beginning 2013-14
- Address all of the five key areas of effectiveness
- School Improvement Grant (SIG) schools continue with approved plan

Priority schools must set aside 10% of the school’s Title IA allocation from the district for professional development related to the area and issues causing identification. This should be described in the school’s section of the budget narrative submitted by the district.
All SIG (School Improvement Grant) schools are priority schools as of August 2012.

While SIG schools are priority schools, they represent a special case.
Focus schools must set aside 10% of the school’s Title IA allocation from the district for professional development related to the area and issues causing identification. This should be described in the school’s section of the budget narrative submitted by the district.
Districts will no longer be identified for improvement status. District PD set aside for use across all buildings is no longer available.

SES/Choice are no more in Oregon. No identification of SES providers; no requirement of services for students.

Students who have chosen to leave a school in improvement status may remain at their new school until completing the school’s highest grade but transportation is no longer the district’s responsibility.

Districts need not set aside funds for school improvement for the 2012-13 school year. Each district with 1 or more priority/focus school may be called upon to provide improvement funding for these schools for 2013-14 and 2014-15 as outlined in the schools’ improvement plans.

Schools must set aside 10% of their Title I allocation to target PD specifically improvement areas identified in the school’s plan.
Funds to Support Improvement

- School and district set asides
- Funds to Priority and Focus schools
  - $5000 initial planning grant
  - Funds based on identification
  - Funds based on enrollment
- Funds to Model Schools
  - $2500 initial planning grant
  - Services purchased by specific priority or focus schools
  - Services purchased by state for professional development or other services
School Appraisal Teams and School Support Teams will engage districts in the deeper diagnostic process, assist with creation of CAPs, and assist with planned interventions.

There are many successful programs and practices going on in districts across the state. The Network will exist to assist those districts and schools in need of assistance to get matched up with schools and districts strong in the areas where there is need to serve as mentors. This will include a regional aspect in some cases for practical and logistical purposes.

Educators and educational groups, organizations, and institutions will be called upon and be involved in peer to peer coaching to drive improvement, professional development, and the replication of successful programs, systems, and practices.

Existing efforts will be utilized:
- Oregon School and District Improvement Network (revisions and improvements will provide for the new plan)
- STEM
- RTI
- EBISS
- OSBA Lighthouse Project
- DATA Project
- and others
Leadership Coaches

- Mentor leadership’s professional growth
- Provide direction in completing self-evaluation
- Facilitate creation and implementation of CAP
- Participate in school support team
- Network to strengthen implementation strategies
- Assist in selecting external resources

Leadership (administrative) not instructional coaches.

Already placed in schools and working with them

**The Leadership Coaches will:**

- provide technical assistance and support to priority and focus schools in completing a self-evaluation
- participate in scheduled trainings to learn more about their role and available resources
- work closely with school leadership teams to facilitate implementation of the CAP
- fully participate in the school support team for their assigned schools
- participate in networking opportunities to gather successful implementation strategies from other schools
- assist school leadership in identifying and enlisting external resources to support CAP implementation
- provide mentoring to leadership staff supporting their professional growth and development.
The Regional Network Coordinators will:

- participate in training needed to prepare for and continue their role
- provide professional development to priority and focus schools in completing a self-evaluation
- facilitate the selection of school support team members, specialists, mentors and/or consultants for priority and focus schools
- assist ODE, priority and focus schools, and school appraisal teams with deeper diagnoses coordination
- assist districts and school appraisal teams in selecting and describing appropriate interventions based on the level of intervention, self-evaluation, and deeper diagnoses
- support ODE in oversight and monitoring of district CAPs and evaluating the quality of implementation
- facilitate and support district participation in the Network.
School Appraisal Teams

- Review results of self-evaluation & school data
- Apply appropriate diagnostic tools and conduct deeper diagnoses
- Review and analyze the results of self-evaluations and available data describing school programs and outcomes
- Select from among approved diagnostic tools those appropriate for each school and conduct deeper diagnoses of areas indicated for improvement
- Create and submit a report of the results of the deeper diagnoses and prescribed interventions
- Assist in continued diagnoses as needed

School Appraisal Teams will:

• participate in training needed to prepare for their role
• review and analyze the results of self-evaluations and available data describing school programs and outcomes
• select from among approved diagnostic tools those appropriate for each school and conduct deeper diagnoses of areas indicated for improvement
• create and submit a report of the results of the deeper diagnoses and prescribed interventions
• assist ODE in continued diagnoses as needed.
The School Support Teams will:

• participate in training needed to prepare for their role
• assist districts in the development of CAPs
• support districts in a variety of roles to ensure swift and effective implementation of CAPs
• assist ODE in oversight and monitoring of district CAPs and evaluating the quality of implementation
• facilitate and support district participation in the continuous improvement network.
School Support will be made up of assistance from many different partners throughout the state and come from existing expertise!

Response to Intervention (RTI) Network, a multi-tiered approach to the early identification and support of students with learning and behavior needs

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS), a decision making framework that guides selection, integration, and implementation of the best evidence-based academic and behavioral practices for improving important academic and behavior outcomes for all students

Effective Behavioral and Instructional Support Systems (EBISS), an Oregon tailored combination of RTI with PBIS

The Direct Access to Achievement (DATA) Project, a series of trainings and materials provided on effective use of educational data

Oregon School Boards Association (OSBA) Lighthouse Project, professional development for school boards and leadership teams that focuses on student achievement

Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM), a statewide network focusing on
increasing investments in programs that encourage students to pursue careers in STEM and STEM education.
Educator Effectiveness

Overview of the Oregon Framework for Teacher and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems
Effective Teachers and Leaders Matter

Within the school environment, teachers and administrators have the greatest impact on student learning;

ensuring educator effectiveness is key to addressing the achievement gap for all students.
Oregon Framework

- The state framework will guide local development or alignment of district evaluation & support systems to:
  - Ensure local systems are rigorous and designed to support professional growth and accountability;
  - Improve instruction in the classroom and leadership within the school and district; and
  - Improve student learning and growth of each and every student.

- ODE will provide models and tools that meet state criteria; districts may adopt or develop their own that meet or exceed state criteria

- Requires local collaborative process with teachers, administrators, and bargaining representatives
Since the passage of SB290, Oregon Administrative Rules were adopted by the State Board of Education and Oregon received a waiver for NCLB. The waiver called for states to adopt state guidelines for local evaluation systems.

The Oregon Framework was endorsed by the State Board of Education in July 2012.

As illustrated in this graphic, the Oregon Framework builds from the foundation of SB290 and incorporates the federal waiver requirements. The framework guides districts as they design and implement their local evaluation systems.

(ESEA - Elementary & Secondary Education Act)
# Implementation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2012</td>
<td>ESEA Waiver approved; State Board endorsed Oregon Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Pilot framework and student growth measures in 50 districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All districts develop or align local evaluation &amp; support systems; regional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>ODE resubmit amended evaluation guidelines for USED approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By July 1, 2013</td>
<td>All districts submit assurances and implementation plan to ODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>All districts pilot implementation of local systems; regional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>All districts implement local systems; regional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By July 1, 2015</td>
<td>Regional Peer Review Process &amp; Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16 &amp; beyond</td>
<td>Continuous improvement of systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Pilot 2012-2013

- Test and refine Oregon Framework for educator evaluation
- Pilot in SB252 Oregon District Collaboration Grant districts:
  - Vernonia
  - Sisters
  - South Lane
  - Ashland
  - Pendleton
  - Lebanon
  - Redmond
  - Sherwood
  - Lincoln County
  - McMinnville
  - Oregon City
  - Springfield
Educator Evaluation & Support Systems

Oregon Commitments

» No public reporting of individual teacher data

» Not supporting the use of standardized data as the sole measure of student learning

» Not supporting student growth as the sole component on which to base evaluation

» Agreement that for an educator evaluation system to drive improvement of student outcomes, the data and information it provides must be used to improve instructional practices
Oregon Framework Implementation

- Implementation of educator evaluation is a continuous improvement process
  - Monitor what is working and not working over time
  - Take into consideration emerging research and best practices
  - Adjust state framework and policies as needed
Continuous Improvement Network

Annual Rating of Schools

- Priority Schools
- Focus Schools
- Model Schools
- Other Title 1 Schools

Annual Self-Evaluation
Guided by Leadership Coaches

Deeper Diagnoses of 5 Key Areas
- Instruction and Adaptive Leadership
- Educator Effectiveness
- Teaching and Learning
- District and School Structures and Culture
- Family and Community Involvement
Conducted by School Approval Teams

Comprehensive Achievement Plan
Developed collaboratively by District, School,
Network Coordinator, and Leadership Coach

Continuous Improvement Network
United by Regional Network Facilitator and School Leaders

Leadership Coaching
Oregon Framework Required Elements

Elements to be included in all teacher and administrator evaluation and support systems in Oregon school districts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standards of Professional Practice</td>
<td>Differentiated Performance Levels: 4 Levels</td>
<td>Multiple Measures</td>
<td>Evaluation and Professional Growth Cycle</td>
<td>Aligned Professional Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standards of Professional Practice

**Teachers**

**Model Core Teaching Standards (INTASC)**

Four Domains:
1. The Learner and Learning
2. Content
3. Instructional Practice
4. Professional Responsibility

**Administrators**

**Educational Leadership/Administrator Standards (ISLLC)**

Six Domains:
1. Visionary Leadership
2. Instructional Improvement
3. Effective Management
4. Inclusive Practice
5. Ethical Leadership
6. Socio-Political Context
Differentiated Performance Levels

- Performance evaluated on the **Standards of Professional Practice** on **4 levels**:  
  - Level 1 – Does not meet standards  
  - Level 2 – Making progress toward standards  
  - Level 3 – Meets standards  
  - Level 4 – Exceeds standards

- ODE will provide approved research-based rubrics
Multiple Measures

Evaluation includes multiple measures from all three categories of evidence

Measures performance on Standards of Professional Practice and student learning

(A) Professional Practice

(B) Professional Responsibilities

(C) Student Learning and Growth
Multiple Measures: Student Learning & Growth

- Collaborative Student Learning and Growth Goal Setting Process:
  - Teachers and administrators collaborate with their supervisors/evaluators to establish at least two student learning and growth goals.
  - Discuss rigor and rationale of each goal, research-based strategies, quality of evidence and standards addressed.
  - Meet and discuss progress mid-year and at end of year.
  - Reflect on results and determine implications for professional growth plans and summative evaluation.*
### Multiple Measures: Student Learning & Growth

All teachers and administrators in collaboration with supervisor/evaluator, establish at least two student learning goals and measures from following three categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Types of Measures</th>
<th>Examples, but not limited to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>State or national standardized assessments</td>
<td>OAKS, SMARTER, ELPA, Extended Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Common national, international, regional, district-developed measures</td>
<td>ACT, PLAN, EXPLORE, AP, IB, DIBELS, C-PAS, other national measures; or common assessments approved by the district or state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teachers: Classroom-based or school-wide measures</td>
<td>Student performances, portfolios, products, projects, work samples, tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators: Other school-wide or district-wide measures</td>
<td>Graduation rate, attendance rate, drop-out rate, discipline data, PSAT, AP/IB tests, dual enrollment, college remediation rates, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation and Professional Growth Cycle

- Self-Reflection
- Summative Evaluation
- Goal Setting
- Formative Assessment
- Observation & Collection of Evidence

Critical steps in the cycle

Collaborative process, ongoing feedback, focus on improving effectiveness
Aligned Professional Learning

- Evaluation aligned with high quality professional development opportunities
  - Informs decisions for professional growth plans
  - Relevant to educator’s goals and needs

Resource:

*Learning Forward: Standards for Professional Learning*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Suggested Action Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2012-2013</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ District design teams work collaboratively to design or align local evaluation &amp; support systems</td>
<td>✔ Review Oregon Framework (SB290/waiver) requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ District &amp; school administrators, teachers, union representative, school board</td>
<td>✔ Establish a process &amp; timeline for collaborative planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Self-evaluate to determine if current system meets the five required elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Determine multiple measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Identify capacity needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Develop implementation plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Oregon Department of Education
What do I have to do? When?

By July 1, 2013
- All districts submit implementation plan and assurances for local system aligned to 5 required elements, including:
  - State adopted teaching standards and leadership standards (or crosswalk if using other standards)
  - State approved scoring rubrics; 4 performance levels
  - District selected multiple measures
  - Professional growth cycle
  - Aligned professional learning opportunities
  - Training for all staff and evaluators

2013-2014
- All districts pilot implementation of local evaluation & support system
Educator Effectiveness Website

http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=3478
Getting in Touch

- College and Career Ready Standards—Cheryl Kleckner
  - cheryl.kleckner@state.or.us  503-947-5794
- School Ratings—Jon Wiens
  - jon.wiens@state.or.us  503-947-5764
- Educator Effectiveness—Theresa Richards
  - theresa.richards@state.or.us
  - 503-947-5736 or 503-587-8840
The full request, the PPT, and other information posted on our Next Gen site.

Feel free to contact Tryna Luton or Jan McCoy.

Can also write to: esearflexibility@oregonlearning.us
The full request, the PPT, and other information posted on our Next Gen site.

Feel free to contact Tryna Luton or Jan McCoy.

Can also write to: eseaflexibility@oregonlearning.us