

Closing the Achievement Gap

A. By June 2012, targeted subgroups will meet/exceed AYP achievement status requirements based on Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (OAKS) reading assessment scores.

Each listed subgroup at the elementary level will increase the percentage of students meeting/exceeding/safe harbor targets from the designated annual AYP Academic Growth benchmarks based on OAKS reading scores.

% of Students Meeting OAKS Reading Performance Standard

Group	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
All	87.65%	88.89%	90%	91%
Hispanic	71.32%	74.19%	76.77%	79.09%
LEP	72.36%	75.12%	77.61%	79.85%
Economically D.	76.13%	78.52%	80.67%	82.6%
Students w/Disab.	55.34%	59.81%	63.83%	67.45%

*Growth targets employ AYP "Safe Harbor" calculations, which incorporate a 10% reduction in the number of students not meeting the performance standard each year.

Each listed subgroup at the middle school level will increase the percentage of students meeting/exceeding/safe harbor targets from the designated annual AYP Academic Growth benchmarks based on OAKS reading scores.

% of Students Meeting OAKS Reading Performance Standard

Group	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
All	82.85%	84.57%	86.11%	87.5%
Hispanic	54.25%	58.83%	62.95%	66.66%
LEP	42.99%	48.69%	53.82%	58.44%
Economically D.	64.44%	68%	71.2%	74.08%
Students w/Disab.	49.24%	54.32%	58.89%	63%

*Growth targets employ AYP "Safe Harbor" calculations, which incorporate a 10% reduction in the number of students not meeting the performance standard each year.

Each listed subgroup at the high school level will increase the percentage of students meeting/exceeding/safe harbor targets from the designated annual AYP Academic Growth benchmarks based on OAKS reading scores.

% of Students Meeting OAKS Reading Performance Standard

Group	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
All	75.10%	77.59%	79.83%	81.85%
Hispanic	28.57%	35.71%	42.14%	47.93%
LEP	8.33%	17.5%	25.75%	33.18%
Economically D.	49.53%	54.58%	59.12%	63.21%
Students w/Disab.	30.43%	37.39%	43.65%	49.29%

*Growth targets employ AYP "Safe Harbor" calculations, which incorporate a 10% reduction in the number of students not meeting the performance standard each year.

2009-2011 CIP Action Plan

“Closing the Achievement Gap”

Instructions: Based on your Self-Evaluation outline develop an Action Plan for each district Improvement Goal. Your Action Plan should be evidenced-based. Complete a separate table for each Improvement Goal identified by the district.

IMPROVEMENT GOAL							
By June 2012, each listed subgroup will increase the percentage of students (see attached Improvement Goal summary data) meeting/exceeding/safe harbor targets from the designated annual AYP Academic Growth benchmarks based on OAKS reading scores.							
NEEDS ANALYSIS							
Aggregated student performance data from OAKS indicates a subgroup “achievement gap.” in reading and writing. Teachers need ongoing professional development with implementing differentiated instructional strategies (SIOP, etc.) to more effectively scaffold students with diverse learning needs.							
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE FOR RESEARCH-BASED EDUCATION STRATEGY							
“Professional Learning Communities at Work/Best Practices for Enhancing Student Achievement” <i>DuFour and Eaker</i> “Pyramid Response to Intervention/RTI, Professional Learning Communities, and How to Respond When Kids Don’t Learn” <i>Buffum, Mattos, and Weber</i> “Classroom Instruction That Works” <i>Marzano, Pickering, and Pollock</i> “Fulfilling the Promise of the Differentiated Classroom” <i>Tomlinson</i> “Because Writing Matters/Improving Student Writing in Our Schools” <i>National Writing Project and Nagin</i> “Developing Literacy In Second-Language Learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth” <i>Mahwah</i> “Making Content Comprehensible for English Language Learners: The SIOP Model” <i>Echevarria</i> “Practical Guidelines for the Education of English Language Learners: Research-Based Recommendations for Instructional & Interventions” <i>RMC Research</i>							
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
<i>What evidence-based strategy will be implemented? How do you know the strategy will help achieve the goal?</i>	<i>What evidence and processes will be used to ensure that the strategy(ies) and staff development planned are being implemented in the classroom?</i>	<i>What data will be collected through your assessment system that measures desired changes in student learning?</i>	<i>What are the projected start and end date(s)?</i>	<i>Who will provide oversight for implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the strategy?</i>	<i>What are the anticipated costs?</i>	<i>What sources of funding will be used for the activity (more than one source may be listed)?</i>	<i>What did the Evidence of Impact data tell you about your district or school? Were the results what you intended? Are the results moving the district towards the goal?</i>
Implement standards-based instruction K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Teacher instructional planning, delivery and assessment reflect the use of standards * Teacher developed pacing guides that reflect implementation of power standards and reading/writing framework in planning instruction * Teacher teams create common formative and summative assessments based on the standards. 	Student subgroups meet annual AYP reading growth targets	Aug '09- June '10	Instructional Services Teaching and Learning Team Principals PLC Teams	K-5 Progress Report Development and Training (\$30,000)	Title I Title II Title III General Fund	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * K-5 standards-based progress report implemented * A clearly defined credit-for-proficiency model is implemented. * High schools adapt Pinnacle to track/record credit-for-proficiency progress * Teachers communicate with parents regarding student progress based on standards. 						
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
Continue Implementation of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to ensure focus on student learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Teachers develop, implement and analyze two to four common formative assessments * Regularly scheduled time for teacher teams at each school site to collaborate around student learning and improvement of instruction * District and building leadership teams established and functioning using the PLC model * Instructional decisions are based on data, including formative assessments * High schools investigate schedules to provide sufficient time for collaboration and intervention planning for struggling learners * PLC teams flexibly respond to the needs of students within subgroups 	<p>Annual PLC implementation survey indicates that all schools have functioning teams</p> <p>Student subgroups meet annual AYP reading growth targets</p>	Aug '09- June '11	<p>Instructional Services</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Team</p> <p>Principals</p> <p>PLC Teams</p>	<p>Professional development coordination of all "Closing the Achievement Gap" activities and strategies (\$35,000)</p> <p>PLC Implementation (\$40,000)</p>	Title II General Fund	
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
Enhance district-	* Building level PBIS	Student	Aug '09-	Instructional	PBIS Summit	Title I	

<p>wide implementation of PBIS/RTI at all levels to provide interventions for struggling learners.</p>	<p>meetings scheduled at least three times per year to review school-wide academic/behavior results with emphasis on subgroups not meeting AYP</p> <p>* RTI/PLC teams meet six to nine times per year to review academic/behavior results of students receiving strategic and intensive interventions</p> <p>* RTI implemented at all levels and records indicate that students are receiving interventions and making progress within the classroom (core) and outside the classroom (strategic and intensive) as needed.</p>	<p>subgroups meet annual AYP reading growth targets</p> <p>DIBELS (K-2) Summary of Effectiveness results show 80% of students at proficient level</p>	<p>June '11</p>	<p>Services</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Team</p> <p>PBIS Teams</p> <p>PLC Teams</p>	<p>and On-site Team Planning (\$25,000)</p>	<p>Title II General Fund</p>	
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
<p>Enhance implementation of best instructional practices for subgroups, with emphasis at secondary level</p>	<p>* Placement practices and classroom design are studied to open up more pathways for subgroups</p> <p>* Teachers are trained to implement differentiated instructional practices to address diverse learning needs</p> <p>* PLC Teams and Teaching & Learning Team research and identify best instructional practices for all students.</p> <p>* Adopt principal classroom walk-through observation models for SIOP, behavior, and reading; samples of observation feedback forms are shared and discussed at levels meetings.</p> <p>* All teachers of writing are using the 6+1 Writing Traits</p>	<p>Student subgroups meet annual AYP reading growth targets</p> <p>Principals report success in using observation protocols</p> <p>Evaluation results from trainings show that teachers understand how to use the Writing Framework</p> <p>Based on the Oregon Writing Assessment, students in all subgroups meet or exceed the projected district</p>	<p>Aug '09- June '12</p>	<p>Instructional Services</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Team</p> <p>PBIS Teams</p> <p>Literacy Coaches</p> <p>PLC Teams</p>	<p>TBD</p> <p>Administrator Training (\$5000)</p>	<p>Title I Title II Title III General Fund</p>	

	<p>model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Students are flexibly grouped based on data indicating progress toward meeting growth targets * Menu of differentiated trainings developed by Instructional Services * Credit for Proficiency model implemented at high school level 	<p>growth targets</p> <p>Fall MAP results from grades 3-8 indicate that students in each quartile are meeting or exceeding growth targets</p>					
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
<p>Access, analyze and monitor achievement data in meeting growth targets for all students and use the data for program/instructional decision making and planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * District-wide assessment schedule in place and followed by all schools * All staff trained to effectively use common data analysis protocol to determine instructional needs of all students * Each school monitors progress of all students based on district assessment plan, and makes instructional decisions based on learning needs of the students. * Based on available data, district and school teams perform quarterly review of ECIP/SIP goals aimed at closing the subgroup achievement gap. * Transitions from level to level have been reviewed and revised to support academic success of all. * Intervention protocols and procedures in place * Systems and procedures in place to monitor graduation 	<p>Annual MAP results indicate that students in each quartile in grades 3-8 are meeting or exceeding growth targets</p> <p>DIBELS (K-5) Summary of Effectiveness results show 80% of students at proficient level</p> <p>Student subgroups meet annual AYP reading growth targets</p> <p>AYP graduation targets met for subgroups</p>	<p>Aug '09- June '11</p>	<p>Instructional Services</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Team</p> <p>PBIS Teams</p> <p>Literacy Coaches</p> <p>PLC Teams</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>Title II General Fund</p>	

	cohorts to evaluate and support students to meet graduation requirements						
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
Analyze district and school policy, resources and systems to address the needs of sub-groups.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Parents of sub-groups have enhanced understanding of school systems and how to access support for their children * Transitions from level to level have been reviewed and revised to support sub-group academic success. * Clearly articulated processes are in place to provide parents the information they need to understand school systems, how to access services and how to support their children’s learning at home. * District, department and school budgets reflect the goals defined in the ECIP. * A process is in place to conduct peer reviews of SIPS and resource alignment. * Schools analyze and refine procedures to support students in graduating with essential skills proficiencies 	Related goals from “Diversity and Inclusion Committee” plan are met	Aug '09- June '11	Instructional Services Teaching and Learning Team Principals Department Heads Diversity and Inclusion Committee	TBD	Title I Title II Title III General Fund	
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
Implement 2009-10 AYP 2141 Professional Development Plan	* Teaching and Learning Team monitors progress and develops annual plan	Student subgroups meet 2009-10 AYP reading growth targets	Sept.'09- June '10	Instructional Services Teaching and Learning Team	2009-10 Title II total allocation including positions (\$265,000)	Title II	

Literacy Growth for All

- A. By June 2012, the AYP "All Students" subgroup will meet/exceed AYP achievement status (incorporating safe harbor) requirements based on OAKS reading assessment scores.**

% of Students Meeting OAKS Reading Performance Standard

Level	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Elementary	87.65%	88.89%	90%	91%
Middle School	82.85%	84.57%	86.11%	87.5%
High School	75.10%	77.59%	79.83%	81.85%

*Growth targets employ AYP "Safe Harbor" calculations, which incorporate a 10% reduction in the number of students not meeting the performance standard each year.

- B. By October 2012, students in grades 3-8 will achieve at least a 70% growth target average for students in each quartile as measured by the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) Fall-to-Fall measure.**

% of Students Meeting MAP Reading Growth Target

Quartile	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
All	60.4%	64.36%	67.92%	71.13%
Low	68.7%	71.83%	74.65%	77.19%
Mid Low	69.0%	72.10%	74.89%	77.40%
Mid High	60.8%	64.72%	68.25%	71.43%
High	53.4%	58.06%	62.25%	66.03%

*Growth targets employ AYP "Safe Harbor" calculations, which incorporate a 10% reduction in the number of students not meeting the performance standard each year.

- C. By June 2012, at least 80% of K-2 students overall will meet the reading proficiency benchmarks as measured by end-of-year DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Early Basic Literacy Skills) assessments for each grade level.**

% of Students Meeting DIBELS Reading Benchmark

Grade Level	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Kindergarten (PSF)	57.1%	65%	73%	80%
1 st Grade (NWF)	63.9%	70%	75%	80%
2 nd Grade (ORF)	60.6%	67%	74%	80%

*Growth targets calculated to meet 80% level by 2012 as indicator that core reading program is being fully implemented, including universal interventions provided for students within regular classroom setting.

- D. By June 2012, the overall percentage of students meeting/exceeding the Oregon Writing Assessment at grades 4,7, and 10 will increase incrementally per year according to the following benchmarks:**

% of Students Meeting Writing Oregon Writing Performance Standard

Grade 4	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
All	48.53%	53.68%	58.31%	62.48%
Hispanic	18.18%	26.36%	33.73%	40.35%
LEP	28.26%	35.43%	41.89%	47.70%
Economically D.	29.56%	36.60%	42.94%	48.65%
Students w/Disab.	10.26%	19.23%	27.31%	34.58%

Grade 7	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
All	60.40%	64.36%	67.92%	71.13%
Hispanic	29.82%	36.84%	43.16%	48.84%
LEP	24.39%	31.95%	38.76%	44.88%
Economically D.	36.20%	42.58%	48.32%	53.49%
Students w/Disab.	20.69%	28.62%	35.76%	42.18%

Grade 10	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
All	73.31%	75.98%	78.38%	80.54%
Hispanic	53.66%	58.29%	62.46%	66.22%
LEP	46.67%	52.00%	56.80%	61.12%
Economically D.	57.89%	62.11%	65.89%	69.31%
Students w/Disab.	19.15%	27.23%	34.51%	41.06%

*Growth targets employ AYP "Safe Harbor" calculations, which incorporate a 10% reduction in the number of students not meeting the performance standard each year.

2009-2011 CIP Action Plan

“Literacy Growth for All”

Instructions: Based on your Self-Evaluation outline develop an Action Plan for each district Improvement Goal. Your Action Plan should be evidenced-based. Complete a separate table for each Improvement Goal identified by the district.

IMPROVEMENT GOAL							
<p>A. By June 2012, the AYP “All Students” subgroup will meet/exceed AYP achievement status (see attached Improvement Goal summary data) requirements based on OAKS reading assessment scores.</p> <p>B. By October 2012, students in grades 3-8 will achieve at least a 70% growth target average for students <u>in each quartile</u> as measured by the MAP Fall-to-Fall measure.</p> <p>C. By June 2012, at least 80% of K-2 students overall will meet the reading proficiency benchmarks as measured by end-of-year DIBELS assessments for each grade level.</p> <p>D. By June 2012, at least 70% of students at grades 4, 7, and 10 overall will meet/exceed the Oregon Writing Assessment.</p>							
NEEDS ANALYSIS							
<p>Although current performance data on OAKS indicates that 509J students overall will likely meet/exceed the 2012 AYP targets, continued focus on literacy will help ensure that all students become proficient readers and writers. Teacher survey results also suggest a continuing need for professional development on how to provide students reading and writing interventions within the core program.</p>							
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE FOR RESEARCH-BASED EDUCATION STRATEGY							
<p>“Professional Learning Communities at Work/Best Practices for Enhancing Student Achievement” <i>DuFour and Eaker</i></p> <p>“Pyramid Response to Intervention/RTI, Professional Learning Communities, and How to Respond When Kids Don’t Learn” <i>Buffum, Mattos, and Weber</i></p> <p>“Classroom Instruction That Works” <i>Marzano, Pickering, and Pollock</i></p> <p>“Fulfilling the Promise of the Differentiated Classroom” <i>Tomlinson</i></p> <p>“Because Writing Matters/Improving Student Writing in Our Schools” <i>National Writing Project and Nagin</i></p>							
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
<p><i>What evidence-based strategy will be implemented?</i></p> <p><i>How do you know the strategy will help achieve the goal?</i></p>	<p><i>What evidence and processes will be used to ensure that the strategy(ies) and staff development planned are being implemented in the classroom?</i></p>	<p><i>What data will be collected through your assessment system that measures desired changes in student learning? (universal screening, progress monitoring and outcome measures)</i></p>	<p><i>What are the projected start and end date(s)?</i></p>	<p><i>Who will provide oversight for implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the strategy?</i></p>	<p><i>What are the anticipated costs?</i></p>	<p><i>What sources of funding will be used for the activity (more than one source may be listed)?</i></p>	<p><i>What did the Evidence of Impact data tell you about your district or school? Were the results what you intended? Are the results moving the district towards the goal?</i></p>
<p>Implement standards-based instruction K-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Teachers trained in instructional planning, delivery and assessment in a standards-based system * Teacher developed pacing guides that reflect implementation of power standards * Teacher teams create common formative and summative assessments based on the standards. 	<p>Students in all subgroups meet annual AYP reading growth targets</p>	<p>Aug '09-June '11</p>	<p>Instructional Services</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Team</p> <p>Principals</p> <p>PLC Teams</p>	<p>K-5 Progress Report Development and Training (\$30,000)</p>	<p>Title I Title II Title III General Fund</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * K-5 standards-based report card implemented * A clearly defined credit-for-proficiency model is implemented * Teachers communicate with parents regarding student progress based on standards * Teachers accessing writing framework in planning instruction; agenda/schedules of reading/writing framework training provided at each school; pacing guides developed * Schools analyze and refine procedures to support students in graduating with essential skills proficiencies 						
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
Continue Implementation of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to ensure focus on student learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Teachers develop, implement and analyze two to four common formative assessments * Regularly scheduled time for teacher teams at each school site to collaborate around student learning and improvement of instruction * Teaching and Learning Team provides support and research for PLCs to use collective inquiry to identify best practices specific to student needs * Instructional decisions are based on data, including formative assessments * High schools investigate schedules to provide sufficient time for collaboration and intervention planning 	Annual PLC implementation survey indicates that all schools have functioning teams	Aug '09-June '11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Instructional Services Teaching and Learning Team Principals PLC Teams 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional development coordination of all "Closing the Achievement Gap" activities and strategies (\$35,000) PLC Implementation (\$40,000) 	Title II General Fund	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Teaching and Learning Team investigates the applicability of the coaching model for improving effective instructional practices and developing tools for the PLC process * PLC teams flexibly respond to the needs of all students 						
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
Enhance district-wide implementation of PBIS at all levels to provide interventions for struggling learners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Building level PLC meetings scheduled at least three times per year to review school-wide assessment/behavior results with emphasis on subgroups not meeting AYP * PLC teams meet six to nine times per year to review assessment results of students receiving strategic and intensive interventions * RTI records indicate that students are receiving interventions within the classroom (core) and outside the classroom (strategic and intensive) as needed. 	<p>Student subgroups meet 2009-10 AYP reading growth targets</p> <p>DIBELS (K-5) Summary of Effectiveness using adequate growth formula shows 80% of students at proficient level</p>	Aug '09-June '11	<p>Instructional Services</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Team</p> <p>PBIS Teams</p> <p>PLC Teams</p>	PBIS Summit and On-site Team Planning (\$15,000)	Title I Title II General Fund	
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
Enhance implementation of best instructional practices for all students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Placement practices and classroom design are studied to open up more pathways for subgroups * Teachers are trained to implement differentiated instructional practices to address diverse learning needs * Teaching and Learning Team researches and identifies best instructional practices for all students. 	<p>Students in all subgroups meet annual AYP reading growth targets</p> <p>Principals report success in using observation protocols</p> <p>Evaluation results from trainings show that teachers understand how to</p>	Aug '09-June '11	<p>Instructional Services</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Team</p> <p>PBIS Teams</p> <p>6+1 Traits Teacher Trainers</p> <p>Literacy Coaches</p> <p>TAG Liaisons</p>	<p>Literacy coach training and coordination (\$35,000)</p> <p>Stipends and training for TAG liaisons (\$13,000)</p> <p>Administrator Training (\$5,000)</p>	Title I Title II Title III General Fund	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Adopt principal classroom walk-through observation models for SIOP, behavior, and reading; samples of observation feedback forms are shared and discussed at levels meetings. * All elementary teachers of writing are using the 6+1 Writing Traits model * TAG liaisons trained to support implementation of differentiated instructional practices at each site. * TAG Parent Advisory Committee meets regularly * Students are flexibly grouped based on data indicating progress toward meeting growth targets * Credit for Proficiency model implemented at high school level 	<p>use the Writing Framework</p> <p>Based on the Oregon Writing Assessment, students in all subgroups meet or exceed the projected district growth targets</p> <p>Fall MAP results from grades 3-8 indicate that students in each quartile are meeting or exceeding growth targets</p>		PLC Teams			
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
Access, analyze and monitor achievement data for sub-groups and use for program/instructional decision making and planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * District-wide assessment schedule in place and followed by all schools * All staff trained to effectively use common data analysis protocol to determine instructional needs of all students, including TAG * Each school monitors progress of all students through Corvallis Assessment Reporting Application (CARA) and makes instructional decisions based on learning needs of the students. 	<p>Annual MAP results from grades 3-8 indicate that students in each quartile are meeting or exceeding growth targets</p> <p>DIBELS (K-5) Summary of Effectiveness results show 80% of students at proficient level</p> <p>Goals from “Diversity and Inclusion Committee” plan are met</p>	Aug '09-June '11	<p>Instructional Services</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Team</p> <p>PBIS Teams</p> <p>Literacy Coaches</p> <p>PLC Teams</p>		Title II General Fund	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Based on available data, district and school teams perform quarterly review of ECIP/SIP goals * Transitions from level to level have been reviewed and revised to support academic success of all. * Intervention protocols and procedures in place * Systems and procedures in place to monitor graduation cohorts to evaluate and support students to meet graduation requirements 	<p>Students in all subgroups meet annual AYP reading growth targets</p> <p>AYP graduation targets met</p>					
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
Implement 2009-10 AYP 2141 Professional Development Plan	* Teachers communicate with parents regarding student progress based on standards	Students in all subgroups meet 2009-10 AYP reading growth targets	Sept. '09- June '10	Instructional Services Teaching and Learning Team	2009-10 Title II total allocation including positions (\$265,000)	Title II	

Safe and Welcoming School Environment

- A. By June 2012, the district will achieve an overall score of 70% on implementation of Positive Behavior Supports (PBS) systems based on the “Benchmark of Quality” assessment. This assessment will provide data to support schools with consistently and accurately assessing behavior incidents, school climate, and using current behavior data. Baseline data will be established by June 2010.
- B. Based on results of the 2008 “Corvallis School District Diversity and Inclusion Survey” each of the assessed levels will show an increase in the percentage of students feeling safe and respected according to the following benchmarks:

% of Students from Survey Who Feel Safe and Respected at School

Levels	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Grades K-2	90.15%	91.14%	92.03%	92.83%
Grades 3-5	86.24%	87.62%	88.91%	90.02%
Grades 6-8	85.76%	87.18%	88.46%	89.61%
Grades 9-12	89.34%	90.41%	91.37%	92.23%

*Growth targets employ AYP “Safe Harbor” calculations, which incorporate a 10% reduction in the number of students not meeting the performance standard each year.

2009-2011 CIP Action Plan

“Safe and Welcoming Schools”

Instructions: Based on your Self-Evaluation outline develop an Action Plan for each district Improvement Goal. Your Action Plan should be evidenced-based. Complete a separate table for each Improvement Goal identified by the district.

IMPROVEMENT GOAL							
<p>A. By June 2012, the district will achieve an overall score of 70% on implementation of PBS systems based on the “Benchmark of Quality” assessment. This assessment will provide data to support schools with consistently and accurately assessing behavior incidents, school climate, and using current behavior data.</p> <p>B. Based on results of the Spring 2008 “Corvallis School District Diversity and Inclusion Survey” each of the assessed levels will show an increase in the percentage of students feeling safe and respected.</p>							
NEEDS ANALYSIS							
<p>The “Benchmark of Quality” assessment survey was developed specifically to address the implementation of PBS systems. Conducted annually, the data gathered from this assessment will provide school PBS teams with information to enhance behavior-related programs and practices. Additionally, the “Corvallis School District Diversity and Inclusion Survey” will provide school PBS teams with information on student perceptions regarding safety and the perceived prevalence bullying.</p>							
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE FOR RESEARCH-BASED EDUCATION STRATEGY							
<p>“Positive Behavioral Supports for Educators” <i>NASP Resources</i> “School Climate and Discipline: Going to Scale” <i>Sugai and Horner</i> “Antisocial Behavior in Public School: Strategies and Best Practices” <i>Walker, Colvin and Ramsey</i></p>							
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
<p><i>What evidence-based strategy will be implemented?</i> <i>How do you know the strategy will help achieve the goal?</i></p>	<p><i>What evidence and processes will be used to ensure that the strategy(ies) and staff development planned are being implemented in the classroom?</i></p>	<p><i>What data will be collected through your assessment system that measures desired changes in student learning? (universal screening, progress monitoring and outcome measures)</i></p>	<p><i>What are the projected start and end date(s)?</i></p>	<p><i>Who will provide oversight for implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the strategy?</i></p>	<p><i>What are the anticipated costs?</i></p>	<p><i>What sources of funding will be used for the activity (more than one source may be listed)?</i></p>	<p><i>What did the Evidence of Impact data tell you about your district or school? Were the results what you intended? Are the results moving the district towards the goal?</i></p>
<p>Implement standards- based instruction K-12</p>	<p>* K-12 Behavior Framework is developed</p> <p>* Pro-social curricula aligned with Framework</p>	<p>Results of annual Spring “Corvallis School District Diversity and Inclusion Survey” indicate that fewer than 10% of students feel unsafe or believe that bullying is occurring at their school</p>	<p>Sept. ‘09 -- June ‘12</p>	<p>Instructional Services</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>General Fund</p>	
<p>PBIS systems in place at all schools to access, analyze,</p>	<p>* School teams use the “Benchmark of Quality” assessment, behavior, and</p>	<p>Results of annual Spring “Benchmark of</p>	<p>Sept. ‘09 -- June ‘12</p>	<p>Instructional Services</p>	<p>PBIS/PBS coordination and training</p>	<p>Title II</p>	

<p>and monitor behavior and attendance and academic data for the purpose of program/instructional decision making and planning</p>	<p>attendance data in making programmatic decisions related to implementing PBS systems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * PBIS plan is aligned to a standards-based system * Behavior needs are identified and appropriate interventions are implemented * Data is used to establish and monitor interventions for students needing behavioral supports. * Instruction, behavior, and attendance data are integrated into PBIS activities 	<p>Quality” survey indicate this strategy has been implemented</p>			<p>of all strategies in “Safe and Welcoming Schools” plan (\$15,000)</p>		
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
<p>PBS “best practices” are implemented to make each school inviting and accessible for all students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * All schools are implementing pro-social curriculum to reduce bullying. * Technology curriculum addresses cyber-bullying. * Diversity and Inclusion Committee has created an action plan to address issues identified in district diversity assessment. * The district is implementing the Diversity Action Plan. * Advisor groups at high schools enhance student-adult relationships to ensure that students are connected with school * K-12 Counseling framework is developed and implemented. 	<p>Results of annual Spring “Corvallis School District Diversity and Inclusion Survey” indicate that fewer than 10% of students feel unsafe or believe that bullying is occurring at their school</p>	<p>Sept. ‘09 -- June ‘12</p>	<p>Instructional Services</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>Title II General Fund</p>	

Math Growth for All (transitional goal)

- A. By June 2012, the AYP "All Students" subgroup will meet/exceed AYP achievement status (incorporating safe harbor) requirements based on OAKS math assessment scores.

% of Students Meeting OAKS Math Performance Standard

Level	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Elementary	82.09%	83.88%	85.49%	86.94%
Middle School	81.51%	83.36%	85.02%	86.52%
High School	64.75%	68.28%	71.45%	74.31%

*Growth targets employ AYP "Safe Harbor" calculations, which incorporate a 10% reduction in the number of students not meeting the performance standard each year.

2009-2011 CIP Action Plan

“Math Growth for All” (transitional goal)

Instructions: Based on your Self-Evaluation outline develop an Action Plan for each district Improvement Goal. Your Action Plan should be evidenced-based. Complete a separate table for each Improvement Goal identified by the district.

IMPROVEMENT GOAL							
A. By June 2012, the AYP “All Students” subgroup will meet/exceed AYP achievement status (incorporating safe harbor) requirements based on OAKS math assessment scores.							
NEEDS ANALYSIS							
OAKS data shows that approximately 20% of students at the elementary and middle school levels are not on track to meet the state benchmark by the time they are scheduled to graduate. Approximately 35% of students at the high school level did not meet the OAKS benchmark. Additionally, the district is adopting new instructional materials for math at the elementary level, thus establishing a need for related professional development.							
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE FOR RESEARCH-BASED EDUCATION STRATEGY							
<p>“Principles and Standards for School Mathematics” <i>National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)</i></p> <p>“Curriculum Focal Points for Prekindergarten Through Grade 8 Mathematics” <i>NCTM</i></p> <p>“Great Ways to Differentiate Mathematics” <i>Small</i></p> <p>“Standards by Design” <i>Oregon Department of Education</i></p>							
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
<i>What evidence-based strategy will be implemented? How do you know the strategy will help achieve the goal?</i>	<i>What evidence and processes will be used to ensure that the strategy(ies) and staff development planned are being implemented in the classroom?</i>	<i>What data will be collected through your assessment system that measures desired changes in student learning? (universal screening, progress monitoring and outcome measures)</i>	<i>What are the projected start and end date(s)?</i>	<i>Who will provide oversight for implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the strategy?</i>	<i>What are the anticipated costs?</i>	<i>What sources of funding will be used for the activity (more than one source may be listed)?</i>	<i>What did the Evidence of Impact data tell you about your district or school? Were the results what you intended? Are the results moving the district towards the goal?</i>
Implement standards-based instruction K-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Teachers receive training on how to access and use the K-8 Math Framework, and receive training on standards-based instruction in relation to math * All elementary teachers are trained on how to use the new math materials within the context of standards-based instruction * Teacher PLC teams pace, plan and implement standards-based math instruction using newly adopted materials. * Teacher teams create common formative and summative assessments based 	Evidence of student progress will be monitored using OAKS assessment results	Sept. ‘09 -- June ‘12	Instructional Services Principals K-5 Grade Level Teams 6-12 Math Departments	TBD K-5 math adoption (\$250,000)	Title I Title II Title III General Fund	

	<p>on the math standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Schools analyze and refine procedures to support students in graduating with essential skills proficiencies * High school math department teams develop and implement credit for proficiency model in math * High School math framework is completed * Develop alternative pathways/courses to meet new math requirements at high school * Teachers communicate with parents regarding student progress based on standards * K-5 standards-based report card implemented 						
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
Research and implement best instructional practices for math	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Teaching and Learning Team researches and identifies best instructional practices for all students and subgroups * The K-5 math adopted materials are aligned with best practices in mathematics instruction * Secondary PLC teams of teachers collaborate to improve instructional practices * Teaching and Learning Team investigates applicability of coaching model to improving math instruction 	Evidence of student progress will be monitored using OAKS assessment results	Sept. '09 -- June '12	<p>Instructional Services</p> <p>K-5 Math Adoption Team</p> <p>6-12 Math Departments</p>	K-5 Math Adoption Training (\$30,000)	Title II	
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
Build capacity of teachers to provide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Develop a principal walk-through model for math that 	Evidence of student	Sept. '09 -- June '12	Instructional Services	TBD	Title II General	

strong K-12 core instruction that addresses the continuum of student learning needs	<p>provides evidence of implementation of best practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Professional development for teachers and administrators focuses on best practices in math instruction. * Use of research-based instructional practices to meet the needs of all learners enhanced through PLC collaboration. * Intervention systems and procedures in place to monitor graduation cohorts to evaluate and support students to meet graduation requirements * Interventions are provided within core math programs to address the needs of struggling learners. *.PLC teams use common formative assessments are used to guide instructional decisions * TAG students at all levels receive differentiated instruction to address advanced abilities in math 	progress will be monitored using OAKS assessment results		Principals		Fund	
STRATEGY	EVIDENCE OF IMPLEMENTATION	EVIDENCE OF IMPACT	TIMELINE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	ESTIMATED COSTS	FUND SOURCE	EVALUATION
Access, analyze and monitor math achievement data and use for program/instructional decision making and planning	* Pilot schools begin identifying and implementing progress monitoring tools for math	Evidence of student progress will be monitored using OAKS assessment results	Sept. '09 -- June '12	Principals School PBIS Teams	TBD	Title I General fund	