



*Oregon*  
*Consolidated State Performance Report*  
*Comprehensive School Reform Program*  
  
**2003-2004**

**Oregon Consolidated State Performance Report:  
Comprehensive School Reform Program (CSR)  
2003-2004**

The Oregon CSR Consolidated State Performance Report was completed by the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) staff. The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) assisted the staff with analysis of implementation trends for Round 2 CSR schools in their final year of implementation and compiled and analyzed student achievement data for all Rounds. This report is submitted in fulfillment of the federal ESEA CSR program requirement.

If you have any questions or need clarification on this report, please contact either of these individuals:

Oregon CSR Coordinator: Janet Bubl  
Education Program Specialist

503 378-3600 Ext. 2710  
janet.bubl@state.or.us

Director of Support to  
Districts Team: Helen Maguire

503 378-3600 Ext. 4504  
helen.maguire@state.or.us

**Overview**

Fourteen schools in Oregon have completed their three-year implementation plans as a part of Oregon's Round 2 funding cycle. Seven schools are currently in Round 3 and eight schools are currently in Round 4. Oregon SEA staff worked closely with these schools as they evaluated progress made during their implementation. An Oregon CSR *Progress Report Presentations* (Appendix A) format was developed and includes the following criteria:

- Progress made on Oregon Statewide Assessments;
- Progress made on local assessments;
- Progress made on program implementation of the eleven CSR components.

This report includes an analysis of Rounds 2, 3 and 4. Round 1 schools had already completed their implementation by 2002-2003 and were included in the last state evaluation. Table 1 provides Round information by year. From 1999 to 2004, a total of 52 schools have received CSR funding in Oregon.

**Implementation of Years by Rounds**

Round	Number of Schools	Planning Year	Year 1 Implementation	Year 2 Implementation	Year 3 Implementation
Round 2	14	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004
Round 3	7	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
Round 4	8	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	

Table 1

### **Process Used to Determine School Selection for All Rounds**

Oregon has a Two-Step Process: *Pre-Qualification Application* (Step One) and *CSR Application Information* (Step Two) for determining school selection. This has been a consistent process since Oregon developed its CSR plan. For purposes of this report, the most current documents of the Two-Step Process were included (Appendix B and C). While Round 2 schools, specifically, may have had a slightly different form, it seemed more appropriate to include up-to-date CSR material.

- As part of the process, a school district is invited by ODE to apply on behalf of a school(s) which meet the CSR criteria. At the time of the grant funding, all CSR schools were identified as low-performing schools according to state criteria. Currently, only one of Round 2 schools remains in low-performing status. However, it should be noted that in 1998-99, when schools were first identified for CSR eligibility, the average RIT score on state assessments was the only factor used to determine low-performing status. The Oregon Report Card evaluation system, which applies to all schools in the state, was implemented in January 2000 to measure the performance of Oregon schools. As a result, the criteria for identifying low-performing schools has changed to incorporate a broader sense of performance indicators. The criteria for Rounds 3 and 4 was whether they received Low or Unacceptable on the Oregon Report Card or didn't make Adequate Yearly Progress.
- The district submits the *Pre-Qualification Application* (Appendix B ) which is scored by an ODE team. A determination is made if the district is ready on behalf of the school(s) for the CSR process to begin. Then an on-site school visit is made by Oregon Department of Education staff. This is a strength of the process as the school staff has time to ask questions when the ODE staff presents the CSR process. The ODE staff also has an opportunity to visit the school to meet the staff and administration. The staff must have a vote of at least 90% agreement to proceed with the application.
- The school has the remaining school year as a planning year. Title I schools were given a \$10,000 planning grant from separate funds (non CSR funds) to complete the application. Non-Title I schools were given financial assistance through their districts.
- Schools spend the planning year completing the Step Two: *CSR Application Information* (Appendix C). The process includes, for example, a comprehensive needs assessment, a prioritization of needs, an inquiry approach to selecting research-based program(s), and a detailed implementation action plan. The application is completed with support by ODE staff or other technical assistance (i.e., school reform consultants, retired educators, Northwest Educational Lab staff, district staff). The school is assured that the application will be reviewed and evaluated and if there are sections that do not meet the criteria, the school will be given additional assistance. The application process is meant to be a

positive experience since the school knows that the funding is assured once the criteria is met.

- Schools receive their grant funding and begin their implementation in the fall, following the planning year.

### **Technical Assistance Provided to Sites**

Technical assistance is provided to all CSR schools in a variety of ways:

- All participating schools had two workshops per year (2000-2001, 2001-2002): one in the fall for evaluation training and one in the spring for progress report training. In the fall of 2003-2004, the workshop was postponed until January of 2004. That workshop focused on evaluation analysis and planning for the spring Progress Report Presentation at the same time. These were regional workshops around the state in four different locations. Although these schools were aware of the evaluation component of the CSR program, in the fall this was an opportunity to become more familiar with the reporting form and the specific criteria for determining progress and continuation of funding. Each school team had time to analyze and reflect on data it had gathered to that point and to begin work on their reporting documentation. In the spring the work continued with emphasis on self-ranking on the CSR eleven components and the upcoming Progress Report Presentations. These workshops were also organized by Rounds so that schools could be given appropriate support at their level of implementation.
- The workshops were followed by on-going technical assistance by staff from the Oregon Department of Education Title I staff and the one remaining ODE Title I Distinguished Educator (see next section on Changes in the Oregon CSR Process) as time and personnel permitted. In some cases, especially in 2003-2004 when the ODE staff was reduced, Northwest Regional Education Laboratory evaluation staff, Education Service Districts' staff, local school district staff, school reform consultants, and others such as retired educators who have school reform background came to a school's assistance. The purpose of this follow-up assistance was to ensure that each school was able to reflect on the progress made during the first year, problem-solve barriers to successful implementation, refine goals as needed, and plan for the coming year.
- The NWREL CSR Unit assisted ODE staff in planning, evaluating and supporting CSR implementation. The unit also assisted with all ODE sponsored workshops mentioned above.
- An increase in district level support occurred because of the reduction in the ODE staff available for direct school support. ODE staff worked with district personnel to help them understand the CSR process and requirements. At each workshop, a district person was required to attend.

- Direct school support did continue by ODE staff when appropriate or specifically needed. CSR principals and school facilitators did receive monthly updates by the CSR Coordinator. Support generally included phone conversations, e-mails, materials sent, and, in some cases, site visits.
- CSR has served as a model for an intensive, in-depth school improvement planning process. Oregon is electing to use this same model to strengthen the Title I Schoolwide Program planning process throughout the state and to provide a vehicle for change in schools that are in School Improvement status. All CSR schools, schools engaged in Title I Schoolwide Program planning, and schools in School Improvement status work with a school support team from various places (i.e., ODE staff, Education Services Districts, their own district personnel support, school reform consultants, retired educators) . This consistent process is proving to be effective and will be strengthened and continued by the various ODE teams working together.
- Schools in all Rounds had technical assistance from Locally Developed Programs or Externally Developed Programs. The Locally Developed Programs included outside professional development training which was researched by the CSR Team during planning. While many stayed with a Model Provider, others sought specific technical assistance for their respective school. (For the purposes of this report either designation of Externally Developed Program or Model Provider will be used).
- Up until 2003-2004, model providers and ODE and/or district staff was generally used by CSR schools. But with the reduction of Distinguished Educators and an awareness that the model providers were not giving schools the in-depth technical assistance on the entire CSR eleven components and school reform, a requirement that each school contract with a Technical Assistance External Provider (also referred to as just an External Provider) for 2004-2005 was established. The document schools had to complete, *2004-2005 Requirement for External Support and Technical Assistance for CSR Schools and Districts* is included (Appendix D). Several CSR schools had been contracting with an independent, specific Technical Assistance External Provider during 2003-2004. She was not associated with a model provider but had extensive school reform experience. It became apparent to the ODE CSR Coordinator that an independent External Provider would be important for all CSR schools. The particular External Provider has become this year's trainer/support for all the new External Providers this year. She contacts all the providers through e-mail and/or the phone, sends information about CSR and technical assistance, and will host a workshop in January 2005 for all the external providers.
- This group of Technical Assistance External Providers throughout the state are from various backgrounds: school reform consultants, retired educators, retired superintendents, and Education Service District support, for instance. By

December 2004, 10 external providers were working with 15 Round 3 and 4 schools; two providers were working with more than one school.

In summary, the strength of the Oregon CSR process is its belief that comprehensive reform is complex and unique to each school and district. For this reason, a “one-size fits all” approach would not capture the effort and progress each school was accomplishing. Although the criteria are the same for each CSR school, Oregon’s approach provides an individualized assessment of each school’s progress. This approach considers the context in which the school is operating when determining whether progress has been made. By individualizing the process, Oregon expects each school to be different, although each is expected to show progress. As a result, the technical assistance offered is tailored to meet the different needs of each school. It is because of the individual focus on each school that changes in the technical assistance was made for 2004-2005.

### **Changes in the Oregon CSR Program**

Certain change have occurred at the Department of Education:

- The ODE Distinguished Educator program, which had eight support staff working with schools throughout the state, was reduced to one Distinguished Educator in 2002-2003. Currently, her responsibilities also include Title IA Schoolwide Planning and Targeted Assistance support, School Improvement Grants and various other Title IA responsibilities.
- Another major changed occurred in the CSR progress report process. Originally, progress reports were written each spring and submitted to ODE. These were reviewed and a written report was sent to the school in the fall. Beginning in 2002-2003 and 2003-2004, schools began giving Progress Report Presentations. This will be fully explain in the following section: Process and Criteria Used to Determine Sites Made Progress.
- Another change for Oregon, was the retirement of Chris Rhines who established and coordinated the Oregon CSR (originally the CSRD) since its beginning. Janet Publ, ODE Education Program Specialist, was named the CSR Coordinator in October 2004.

### **Oregon School Information**

The following section describes CSR schools in various ways: enrollment, poverty, student characteristics, state designations, grant funding, etc.

- Table 2 provides information about Oregon school enrollment and the average school size. CSR schools are generally small, with a few exceptions. While a

small school may be helpful in staff communication, often resources, in general, are limited.

### CSR Enrollment 2003-2004

Round	Under 300 Enrollment	300-600 Enrollment	600-900 Enrollment	900 or more Enrollment	Average Enrollment	Enrollment Range
2	6	4	3	1	429	186 to 1108
3	3	4	0	0	328	127 to 467
4	3	3	2	0	350	72 to 777

Table 2

- Table 3 provides information about the breakdown of schools in the CSR program. Perhaps the most interesting is the number of alternative schools. One alternative schools is from an urban setting and includes both middle and high school students. The other alternative school is in a rural setting and only serves high school students. Both are in Round 4, which is also interesting in comparing the success they are having. Obviously, their work has only begun as they are in their second year of implementation. It so happens that both schools' External Provider has been the same person for two years. She has encouraged their networking of information and a site visit by the schools.
- It is also apparent, as mentioned earlier, CSR schools changed from predominately Externally Developed (model) Programs to Locally Developed Programs. Many schools in the various Rounds retained their Externally Developed Programs (Table 3). Out of 23 school programs in Oregon, 20 are using Externally Developed Programs and 9 are using Locally Developed Programs. The Locally Developed Programs have occurred mostly in Round 4. This was probably due to the clarification in the CSR legislation that schools did not have to choose an Externally Developed Program.

### CSR Schools and Developed Programs Through 2003-2004

Round	Number of Elementary Schools	Number of Middle Schools	Number of High Schools	Number of Alternative Schools (also included in the previous columns)	Number of Externally Developed Programs	Number of Locally Developed Programs
2	3	7	4	0	12	2
3	3	3	1	0	6	1
4	3	2	3	2*	2	6

Table 3

\*One alternative school is only a high school and one alternative school is middle and high school combined.

- Table 4 provides the number of urban and rural schools. Oregon has three major urban centers (Portland, Salem and Eugene) which all happen to be in the Willamette Valley. A number of schools are in rural and even remote areas. Southern Oregon and Central Oregon are some distance from the Willamette Valley, some separated by the Cascade Mountain Range. This has been a problem for workshops, site visits, and finding and using Technical Assistance External Providers or Model Providers. The distance has meant that, at times, ODE staff will travel to the sites for smaller workshops (combining several rural districts) rather than having the schools travel to Salem, the location of the Oregon Department of Education. Occasionally, ODE will host a workshop in the Portland area which includes a number of other cities in the Portland Metro/Multnomah County region. When noting the number of visits by Model Providers or other outside consultants (presented as a document in schools' CSR Progress Reports), it is apparent that the rural and even more remote sites are at a disadvantage.
- Table 4 also shows the range of poverty in the schools and the number of Title I schools. In reviewing demographics for the various Rounds, it is apparent that poverty numbers are significant in Oregon. Currently, Oregon is ranked second in the nation for hunger; last year Oregon was ranked first. Oregon has the highest unemployment in the nation. In 2002, Oregon was ranked 29 out of 50 states because 18% of Youth and Children Under Age 18 were living in poverty. Most schools, as noted, are Title I schools. Being a Title I school has been an advantage to CSR schools in that they have had experience with managing funds, working on professional development, having a sense (though often without an in-depth needs assessment) of schoolwide planning and creating an implementation action plan. CSR planning increased their use of a comprehensive needs assessment and a more in-depth action plan.

**Rural, Urban, Title I Schools and Poverty Figures  
2003-2004**

Round	Number of Urban Schools	Number of Rural Schools	Number of Title I Schools	Range of Poverty in Schools
2	7	7	10	37.5% to 82%
3	2	5	7	56% to 74%
4	4	4	7	54% to 88%

Table 4

- Table 5 provides various data points about Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners (ELL). In urban schools in Oregon, the number with multiple languages spoken in the home other than English is significant. Some urban schools have as many as 17 to 23 languages spoken in the homes. During CSR

Progress Reports, schools self-reported that communication with parents, whose native language was not English, was very difficult. This was a constant challenge and theme for schools. The numbers of ELL students is also a factor in Oregon schools. For instance, one elementary school reported its enrollment of ELL students is 73% (it also happens to be the elementary school with the highest poverty at 88%). The ELL figures show that Oregon’s population is in need of ELL support at the school level. The overall average percentages for all CSR schools are above the state ELL Oregon student average in 2004 of 9.4%. The range is important as well. Individual schools have some very large numbers of ELL populations, up to 85%. Students with Disabilities are within a normal range of figures one would expect in schools and compare to the state student average in 2004 of 12.9%.

**Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners  
in CSR Schools  
2003-2004**

Round	Average % of Students with Disabilities	Range of Students with Disabilities	Average % of English Language Learners	Range of English Language Learners
2	7%	0% to 16%	13.8%	0% to 45.9%
3	6.4%	1% to 10%	10.7%	0% to 19.3%
4	7.5%	3% to 14%	19.5%	0% to 85%

Table 5

- Table 6 provides Oregon Report Card and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status. It is hopeful to see that 100% of Round 3 schools are rated “Satisfactory or Strong” and 86% of them have met AYP. [Schools are analyzed by four categories on the Oregon Report Card: Student Performance, academic achievement; Student Behavior, attendance/dropout; Improvement; and Student Characteristics, participation in statewide assessments. Schools are rated Exceptional, Strong, Satisfactory, Low or Unacceptable. A school’s “meeting” AYP is determined by students, including subgroups, needing to meet rigorous state academic standards by 2013-2014, thus needing to meet annual performance targets.] As might be expected, because Round 4 schools were finishing the implementation on only their first year at the time of the AYP data was represented, they have some work to do. One would have hoped that Round 2 schools would have done as well in AYP as Round 3 schools, but that doesn’t appear to be the case.

**Oregon Report Card Rating and AYP Designation  
for CSR Schools  
2003-2004**

Round	Percentage of Schools with a Rating of Satisfactory or Strong on the Oregon Report Card	Percentage of Schools that Met Adequate Yearly Progress
2	78%	42%
3	100%	86%
4	63%	50%

Table 6

- Since one of the factors in student success is attendance, Table 7 provides attendance data compared to state data. All CSR elementary schools had an attendance level below the state. CSR middle schools also fell below the state average. The most significant difference is in the high schools which fell well below the state average. There are two alternative schools which likely affected the average for the high schools; however, one alternative school's attendance average is 90%, but the other's is 82.9%. While this may account for a poor average, the issue of high school attendance is still a concern for schools.

**CSR Attendance Averages Compared to State Averages  
2003-2004**

Round	CSR Elementary Average Attendance	State Elementary Average Attendance	CSR Middle School Average Attendance	State Middle School Average Attendance	CSR High School Average Attendance	State High School Average Attendance
2	93.5%	94.2%	92.8%	94.2%	88.3%	91.4%
3	93.9%	94.2%	93.6%	94.2%	87.6%	91.4%
4	93.6%	94.2%	92.3%	94.2%	86.4%	91.4%

Table 7

- Without exception, each Round has had a minimum of two changes in principals during the CSR grant implementation. One school had a change each year, beginning at the end of the planning year and each year thereafter. What was most apparent by the change in school administration was the lack of knowledge and the time it took, especially in the fall, to involve the principal in the CSR grant process. If a school had a strong CSR team and/or planning team, then the school tended to stay more on track. If a school had a change in the team or if the team, itself, was not directly involved (in cases where the principal held most of the information), the school and the new principal were at a serious disadvantage. These events also occurred at the same time that the

Distinguished Educator program was significantly reduced so there was not ODE staff available to go to each school in September to help the principal get engaged in the process.

- Even at the district level there have been administrative changes, both in Title I coordinators and district superintendents. This has meant that schools who were given permission to proceed with the CSR application, including flexibility promised by the district, often found the district unaware of earlier agreements. Educating those in the district office was time consuming. Often ODE staff found it necessary to meet with the new coordinators and superintendents in order to explain what the District had “agreed to” when it originally applied on behalf of the school(s).
- Table 8 gives the average CSR grant amount per school, including the district administration amount. At first, funds were distributed equally per school. Subsequently, schools were awarded various amounts depending on the school size/per child allocation. A base amount was determined for the year and the Round, then additional funds were awarded. The reason the amount was increased from \$76,650 was that it did not seem to be adequate to fund school reform and a fixed amount per school was also an issue because of school size.
- It is noted that there was a significant increase in grant amounts in the past two years. With three CSR schools withdrawing, the funds were reallocated to the other schools. In all three cases, the decision to withdraw was the school’s (by a staff vote) and not a state’s decision. It appeared that two main reasons for the withdrawals were because the lack of complete teacher buy-in and a change in the principal. For two schools, even though there was buy-in during the initial application and implementation process, the buy-in changed over time. The third school went through the planning year and with a new out-of-state principal who was not in favor or interested in the CSR program, that school did not even start its implementation.

### CSR Grant Amounts

Round	Average Grant Amount Year 1 Implementation	Average Grant Amount Year 2 Implementation	Average Grant Amount Year 3 Implementation	Funding Range During Implementation Years
2	\$76,650 All schools received the same amount that year	\$87,868	\$95,576	Low of \$73,000 to high of \$114,260
3	\$83,515	\$91,791	\$168,098 (This year, 2004-2005)	Low of \$77,250 to high of \$173,449
4	\$93,923	\$169,898 (This year, 2004-2005)		Low of \$83,600 to high of \$188,893

Table 8

- Table 9 presents the increase in grant funds over the three years. It is clear that early grants were smaller than later years. The change, as previously mentioned, occurred because schools needed more funding for reform. The size of schools also become a relevant issue in funding. As a note, in reviewing Round 2 schools, the grant funding can be broken down into school levels and averages: the elementary school average over three years was \$84,030; the middle school average over three years was \$86,352; and the high school average over three years was \$89,841.

**Range of Grant Funding from  
2002-2003 to 2004-2005**

<b>Year of Grant Funding</b>	<b>\$70,000 to \$90,000</b>	<b>\$91,000 to \$130,000</b>	<b>\$131,000 to \$190,000</b>	<b>Total Number of Schools in Implementation</b>
2002-2003	24	5	0	29
2003-2004	12	9	8	29
2004-2005	5	9	7	21

Table 9

- Supplemental funding (not reflected in Table 8) has been offered to CSR schools for the past two years for summer work. Schools could apply for a maximum of \$16,000. Schools applied for the money by stating a plan based on need, determining a summer “schedule,” and developing a budget. Some schools used the money for a student summer school and others used the money for staff development. All but one school, from all Rounds, applied and received supplemental funding.

**Process and Criteria Used to Determine Sites Made Progress**

- Beginning in May/June 2003, and continuing May/June 2004, school teams were required to give an oral *CSR Progress Report Presentations* (Appendix A). School teams prepared an hour report, followed by 30 to 40 minutes of questions by the State Review Team (SRT). The size of the school team varied from usually 4 but occasionally up to 8 to 10 staff. Schools teams were required to bring the principal and a district person to the Oregon Department of Education in Salem, where the reports were given. Some schools included External Providers (which will be required in the next progress report process in June 2005). Generally, schools gave a powerpoint presentation with each staff member giving part of the presentation. Previously, schools wrote and submitted a progress

report. Each team was asked to compare the process and value of the written report versus the oral presentation. Every school, without question, said the oral presentation was just as time consuming but a much more inclusive process. Staff on the team met repeatedly to discuss, plan and prepare the report. Rather than just a few (or even one person) writing the report it was a true group effort and a considerable amount of school reflection occurred. Often it was noted that schools presented their report to the entire staff for input before the school's presentation to ODE. Some used parts of the report to present to school boards and parent groups and/or site councils. This appeared to give buy-in to all stakeholders at the site, schools reported. Schools had specific information and documents to be presented and included in hard copy. The *CSR Progress Report Presentations* (Appendix A) was the school's guidance.

- The SRT consisted of Oregon Department of Education staff, the ODE Title I Distinguished Educator, Northwest Regional Education Laboratory evaluation staff, Education Service Districts' staff, local school district staff, and others with school reform background. Principals from Round 2 CSR schools were also asked to be on the SRT. The teams were varied in size, depending on the schedule, but generally there were at least 4 to 5 team members at each presentation. Two people, the CSR State Coordinator and one other person very knowledgeable in the CSR process and school reform, listened to all 29 reports. The SRT used the same *CSR Progress Report* form as it listened to the presentations and made notes for a final written report. Comments from individual SRT members' forms were consolidated into one report and final determination of progress was made. Each school and district received a School and District Progress Report with a summary of its presentation with findings by the SRT which included positive comments, feedback, clarifying questions, strengths and areas of concern, and other comments to consider as the school either continued in implementation or if it is was in its last year, sustainability considerations. A sample from one school's final State Review Team's comments, the *School and District Progress Report Review Team Comments*, is included (Appendix E).
- Each school, in all rounds, was required to determine if at least some progress was made toward student achievement goals, either through Oregon Statewide Assessments or local assessment (see School Progress in Implementation below). Schools were also required to self-evaluate the progress made toward successful implementation of the eleven components using the *Continuum for Assessing the Comprehensive of School Reform Plans* (Appendix F) and to submit an action plan and budget for the following year, besides a number of other documents. Schools were required to report progress on either state assessment or local assessment data. An analysis of these data determined whether a greater percentage of students met or exceeded state standards in reading and math, and whether gains were made on local assessment data.

- In the fall of 2004, as Rounds 3 and 4 schools began their next school year, the External Provider for each school was asked, specifically, to review with the school team (who gave the presentation) and/or CSR Team the State Review Team's written report on the school's Progress Report Presentation. This gave the schools an opportunity to review the report and to begin addressing concerns or questions the SRT had. It also gave focus to the CSR plan at the beginning of the year. In the fall of 2003, this was not as easily handled as not all schools had an External Provider who could review with them. Since the requirement has changed (all schools contracting with an External Provider), this fall it happened. In June Round 2 schools were asked specific questions about how they proposed to sustain their plan at the end of their funding. Since Round 2 schools did not have external provider support any more, the local school district was expected to work with the school in reviewing the SRT report in the fall of 2004.

### **Student Performance Data: State Assessments**

- The Oregon State Assessments (OSAT) are given yearly in Reading and Math at grades 3, 5, 8, 10. Both are multiple choice content assessments. In addition, but not included in the CSR report, are two other assessments: Math Problem Solving and Writing. These are sent to the state and scored by teachers throughout the state with an appropriate scoring guide. In the past, students have used paper and pencil, but currently many students use the Technology Enhanced State Assessment and take the multiple choice tests on a computer.
- Table 10 provides the number of schools that showed Oregon State Assessment gains of students meeting or exceeding standards from 2001-2004 (Round 2) or those schools not showing gains. State test scores for Round 2 schools were examined over the four years (initial planning year and three implementation years) to identify the percentage change. [The Round 3 schools show data from 2002-2004 and Round 4 shows data from 2002-2004 in following Tables.]
- District data are not compared because schools are often the only school in the district in their grade level.

**Round 2 Schools Compared to State Data**  
**(Planning Year 2000-2001, Implementation Years 2001-2002 to 2003-2004)**

Subject/Grade	Total number of Round 2 schools testing in this grade	Number of Round 2 schools showing gains 2001-2004	Percent of Round 2 schools showing gains 2001-2004	Round 2 schools that did better than the statewide change from 2001-2004	Percent of Round 2 schools that did better than the statewide change
<b>Reading</b>					
Grade 3	2	0	0%	1	50%
Grade 5	6	3	50%	4	75%
Grade 8	7	2	29%	2	29%
Grade 10	4	3	75%	3	75%
All Grades	19	8	42%	10	53%
<b>Math</b>					
Grade 3	2	2	100%	2	100%
Grade 5	6	5	83%	5	83%
Grade 8	7	4	57%	3	57%
Grade 10	4	0	0%	0	25%
All Grades	19	11	59%	10	53%

Table 10

The data in Table 10 show that the 14 Round 2 schools were slightly more likely to show gains than not over the grant period. Three key points can be drawn from the data in the above table:

- From 2001 to 2004, 8 of the 19 tested grades in the CSR schools showed gains in reading and 11 showed no gains. In math, 11 of the 19 tested grades in CSR schools showed gains. (Note: There are 14 schools in Round 2, but because some schools have more than one tested grade, there are 19 tested grade data points for each subject each year.)
- Comparing the CSR schools to the state in reading, 53% of Round 2 schools (10 of 19) did better than the state. Statewide, the percentage of students meeting state reading standards in the four tested grades actually dropped slightly from 2001 to 2004. Two of the Round 2 schools stayed the same or showed a decline but still did better than the statewide change.
- Comparing the CSR schools to the state in math, 53% of Round 2 schools did better than the state. The percentage of students meeting state math standards in three tested grades (3, 5, and 8) increased statewide from 2001 to 2004 and in grade 10 the statewide percentage dropped slightly.

**Round 3 Schools Compared to State Data**  
 (Planning Year 2001-2002, Implementation Years 2002-2003 to 2003-2004)

Subject/Grade	Total number of Round 3 schools testing in this grade	Number of Round 3 schools showing gains 2002-2004	Percent of Round 3 schools showing gains 2002-2004	Round 3 schools that did better than the statewide change from 2002-2004	Percent of Round 3 schools that did better than the statewide change
<b>Reading</b>					
Grade 3	3	0	0%	1	33%
Grade 5	3	1	33%	2	66%
Grade 8	3	0	0%	2	66%
Grade 10	1	1	100%	1	100%
All Grades	10	2	20%	6	60%
<b>Math</b>					
Grade 3	3	0	0%	0	0%
Grade 5	3	2	66%	2	66%
Grade 8	3	2	66%	2	66%
Grade 10	1	1	100%	1	100%
All Grades	10	5	50%	5	50%

Table 11

The same mixed results hold so far in Round 3 schools where six of the 10 tested grades have done better than the statewide change in reading and five have done better than the statewide change in math (Table 11).

**Round 4 Schools Compared to State Data**  
 (Planning Year 2002-2003, Implementation Year 2003-2004)

Subject/Grade	Total number of Round 4 schools testing in this grade	Number of Round 4 schools showing gains 2003-2004	Percent of Round 4 schools showing gains 2003-2004	Round 4 schools that did better than the statewide change from 2003-2004	Percent of Round 4 schools that did better than the statewide change
<b>Reading</b>					
Grade 3	3	2	66%	2	66%
Grade 5	4	2	50%	2	50%
Grade 8	4	2	50%	2	50%
Grade 10	3	1	33%	2	66%
All Grades	14	7	50%	8	57%
<b>Math</b>					
Grade 3	3	2	66%	1	33%
Grade 5	4	1	25%	1	25%
Grade 8	4	2	50%	2	50%
Grade 10	3	0	0%	1	33%
All Grades	14	5	36%	5	36%

Table 12

Reading results so far in Round 4 are again mixed: 8 of the 14 tested grades in the CSR schools have done better than the statewide change. In math, though, only 5 of the 14 tested grades in the CSR schools have done better than the statewide average change with just two years of data (Table 12).

**Student Performance Data: Number of Students Tested and Percentage of Students Meeting Standards**

The tables in the previous section focused on whether or not CSR schools showed improvement or declines. The two following tables focus on whether students in CSR schools improved or not as a group. In general, the data in these two tables also do not show a consistent pattern of improvement for students in the tested grades in the CSR Round 2 schools. In both reading and math, for two of the four tested grades, students in CSR Round 2 schools did better than the statewide average change and in two they did worse (based on comparison of the two rightmost columns in Tables 13 and 14).

**Number of Students Tested and Meeting Standards Over Time**

**Reading**

Grade	Number of Sites in Round 2	Number Tested Spring 2001	Number Tested Spring 2004	% of Students Meeting Standards Spring 2001	% of Students Meeting Standards Spring 2004	Round 2 Change 2001 to 2004	State Change 2001 to 2004
3	2	115	101	73%	66%	-7%	-2%
5	6	348	304	65%	70%	5%	-1%
8	7	861	934	51%	47%	-4%	-3%
10	4	446	422	37%	46%	10%	-2%

Table 13

**Math**

Grade	Number of Sites in Round 2	Number Tested Spring 2001	Number Tested Spring 2004	% of Students Meeting Standards Spring 2001	% of Students Meeting Standards Spring 2004	Round 2 Change 2001 to 2004	State Change 2001 to 2004
3	2	132	102	48%	71%	22%	7%
5	6	361	311	64%	78%	14%	3%
8	7	878	941	41%	44%	3%	4%
10	4	457	430	30%	22%	-8%	1%

Table 14

While Grades 3 and 5 showed large gains in math, it's important to note that there was a substantial drop in the number of students tested in both grades which indicates there probably was a change in the schools' service boundary and/or student demographics. Either factor makes it hard to correlate the gains to CSR.

### **Student Performance Data: Local Interim Assessments**

- Each school was required to develop a Language Arts and Math plan to assess students with local interim measures at least twice a year (fall and spring). A wide variety of interim assessments were used (i.e., pre/post tests in math, Individual Reading Inventory, STAR Reading, STAR Math, math problem solving work samples, and many others). The average number of assessments given per school included assessments at each grade level. The schools reported these results by showing the increase or decrease in student achievement, determining a school goal for the spring test, and identifying whether or not the school met its goal. The schools presented this information during their Progress Report Presentations. (See sample Interim Assessment Chart in *Progress Report Presentations*, page 25 of Appendix A.)
- Tables 15 and 16 show very few schools meeting their goals in Language Arts and Math. This appears to be inconsistent with the high percentage of schools which reported students increasing their interim assessment from the fall to spring. One issue that impacts schools is the pressure they feel from districts and/or NCLB requirements that students are progressing. The column on The Number of Schools Where All Student Improved on the Interim Assessment, Tables 15 and 16, is a good example. Schools were consistently showing that students were making progress, but because they set such high goals, they could not rate themselves as meeting their goals (see column The Number of Schools that Met at least 75% of Their Self-Determined Goals). Another issue may be that schools had difficulty determining an appropriate goal to set. When a school, for example, showed a 48% increase in student data, but didn't reach its goal, it appeared that the school had such low fall scores that the school set the spring goal very high. While they didn't meet their goals, students in very high numbers were increasing their scores on the spring's interim assessment, whatever assessment it was.
- A concern about interim assessments appears in the self-reporting part of this consolidated report. Schools had a difficult time finding assessments that worked effectively for them, especially in math. They also found the interim assessments often didn't align with the Oregon State Assessment Benchmarks. Staffs often felt they were not trained to give the tests nor did they have time to administer the test. Issues that are very apparent, especially in newly funded CSR schools, are administering the assessment, compiling and analyzing the

data and using the data to inform instruction and schoolwide goals. It wasn't uncommon for Round 4 schools to be creating the interim assessment documentation in the spring just before the next set of tests were to be given.

- Since interim assessment data was to drive instruction, this apparently didn't happen as frequently as was hoped, due to the complexity of giving assessments and compiling information.
- Future concerns could include: how to help schools determine good assessments; how to train staff effectively (especially new staff); how to review data and set reasonable goals; how to drive instruction based on data gathered.

### Local Interim Assessment Results 2003-2004

#### Language Arts

Round	Number of Schools Reporting	Average Number of Language Arts Interim Assessments Given per School	The Number of Schools Where <u>all</u> Students Improved on the Language Arts Interim Assessments	Number of Schools that met at least 75% of Their Self-Determined Goals
2	12	8	6	1
3	7	8	4	1
4	7	6	6	2

Table 15

#### Math

Round	Number of Schools Reporting	Average Number of Math Interim Assessments Given per School	The Number of schools Where <u>all</u> Students Improved on the Math Interim Assessments	Number of Schools that met at least 75% of their Self-Determined Goals
2	12	6	4	2
3	7	9	5	1
4	7	8	3	1

Table 16

#### **Round 2: School Progress in Implementation of the Eleven Components**

- Prior to the May/June 2004 Progress Report presentation, the team, site council, and staff used the *Oregon CSR Progress Report Presentation* form and the *Continuum for Assessing the Comprehensiveness of School Reform Plans* (Appendix F), from the US Department of Education with minor changes made for clarification, to assess their own progress. Schools self-reported progress

made toward implementation of each the 11 components; however, only 6 of the 11 components were part of the *Continuum for Assessing the Comprehensiveness of School Reform Plans* and were, thus, self-ranked. For instance, External Assistance, Support to School were not specifically listed in the Continuum but schools did report on them. It became apparent, in analyzing data for this report, that in order to reflect on implementation completely in the future that schools will need to rank themselves on all eleven components. Redesigning the *Continuum for Assessing the Comprehensiveness of School Reform Plans* will make this possible.

- In the six components, schools identified indicators and ranked themselves in one of the three categories: Most Comprehensive (descriptions that best represent the spirit of the CSR Program); Somewhat Comprehensive (descriptions that should be strengthened to better address the requirements of the legislation); Not Comprehensive (descriptions that are inadequate to meet the requirements of the CSR program).
- A federal report review team of ODE staff, Northwest Regional Lab staff, and an External Provider to CSR schools met and reviewed all of the *School and District Progress Report Review Team Comments* from all Round 2 presentations. These were recorded, tabulated, and synthesized on the document entitled *Round 2: Analysis and Summary of School Progress on Implementation of CSR Plan from Progress Reports May/June 2004* (Appendix G). Included in the same document is a *Chart of Documentation and Progress Report Notes*. This identified where the information was found by the federal report review team. As noted on the chart, some information was directly taken from documentation required by the school and some was taken from the SRT written reports.

The following is the Round 2 summary of the complete analysis of the eleven components in the *Round 2: Analysis and Summary of School Progress on Implementation of CSR Plan from Progress Reports May/June 2004* (Appendix G):

### **Component #1: Research-Based Methods**

Out of 14 schools, half ranked themselves “Somewhat Comprehensive” and the other half ranked themselves “Most Comprehensive.” Schools found themselves implementing the program (either an Externally Developed Program or a Locally Developed Program) mainly because of on-site evaluation (by the developer) and support to staff. Some schools found that the lack of model developers’ evaluation guidelines and a lack of understanding of the local context were factors that hindered implementation. Locally Developed Program evaluation was often very helpful.

One of the problems occurred when a school dropped a Model Provider, then found it did not do enough research to develop its own program and strategies. This has been a consistent problem because doing research requires time, commitment, and analysis skills by staff who are already busy and oftentimes just want to “get on with the grant.”

It should be noted that in Round 2, 11 schools out of the 14 maintained their model provider for the life of the grant. One particular model provider was dropped by two schools: one in Round 2 and the other school in Round 4. It is interesting to note that the Round 2 school that dropped that particular provider in its last year of implementation also received a new principal and even a Title I Coordinator and Superintendent for the district changed as well. It wasn't until the spring, when the school was working on the Progress Report Presentation, that the principal began to understand the depth of the problem. He did contract with an External Provider who supported him and the team as they worked on their presentation. One footnote, is that even after the CSR funds ended, that same principal contracted in the fall of 2004 with the same External Provider to continue to help the school get "back on track" and try to maintain/sustain the program that he felt was finally getting into place. The complexity of using a model provider is apparent, especially when it is terminated by the school.

It should be noted that in Round 3 and 4, eight schools out of the 15 have maintained their Model Provider through 2003-2004 (Table 3). The one Round 4 school that dropped the model provider lost considerable time because the school year was just beginning and CSR was just starting to be implemented. The school had to rewrite its plan and determine its own Locally Developed Program.

### **Component #2: Comprehensive Design**

Eleven of the 14 schools ranked themselves "Most Comprehensive." Teams believed they integrated subjects, aligned state standards, used a variety of strategies and focused on subgroups. Schools also involved all the staff in the program, evaluation and design. Those three schools who ranked themselves "Somewhat Comprehensive" came to realize that the model, itself, is not the whole program. Continual staff and administration turnover also created a loss of buy-in and continuity. Those schools also believed that it was easier to be comprehensive in curriculum than comprehensive in other areas such as governance and parent and community involvement.

### **Component #3: Professional Development**

Again, eleven of the 14 schools ranked themselves "Most Comprehensive." This may be the strongest component for CSR schools. They seemed to use funds to have continual, on-site, sustained professional development. Coaches were used to help sustain the skilled learned during professional development. Schools who are truly engaged in professional development have a teacher mentoring program, have early release days, use assessment data to determine professional development, use funds to pay for extended hours (for teachers and paraprofessionals).

The three schools who ranked themselves "Somewhat Comprehensive" listed the following factors that hindered implementation: low quality professional development, lack of relevance, and paraprofessionals not included in training. With schools that dropped their Model Provider, comments about professional development surfaced: problems with contractual issues with providers; the lack of congruence between professional development provider; and the school's assessment of their professional development needs.

#### **Component #4: Measurable Goals and Benchmarks**

In this section, two areas of self-reporting were combined: Measurable Goals and Benchmarks and Curriculum Alignment.

Eleven schools ranked themselves “Most Comprehensive” in Measurable Goals and Benchmarks. Training provided about goal writing appeared to be effective. Goals are now linked directly to state standards and there is continual analysis of data to reset and revise goals. Of the three who ranked themselves “Somewhat Comprehensive,” they felt there was not enough involvement in reviewing and revising goals, especially with staff, parents, and the community.

Interim assessment issues included the need for staff training to administer the assessments, the lack of alignment between the assessments and state benchmarks, and time to administer the assessments were all factors that hindered the implementation of this component.

A more difficult area for schools, even after many years of a published Oregon State Standards and Benchmarks, is the curriculum alignment. Only six schools ranked themselves “Most Comprehensive” as they believed they devoted “meaningful time” to curriculum alignment. In the eight schools who ranked themselves “Somewhat Comprehensive,” the major problems included time to align curriculum and time to communicate with new teachers regarding curriculum alignment. There still appears to be lack of knowledge by staff about state standards. What may be most difficult to change is that some staff believe “goals are unattainable in certain subgroups.” This is a component that ODE will need to continue to help schools understand and work on in order to change this “mind set.”

#### **Component #5: Support of School Staff for Reform**

Even though schools did not rank themselves in this category, they were required to discuss and present evidence for this component. Factors that facilitated this component included a shared leadership and a committed staff to sustain the program. The Site Councils and CSR Teams worked as one leadership group, even if not together, they had “cross over” staff and, at the least, had CSR as an item on the Site Council agenda. The requirement that the school staff had to revote each year to continue with the CSR grant was also a factor in giving the staff a voice and giving the school a sense of commitment.

Factors that hindered this component included large staff turn over which diminished the support previously given to the plan and reduced the number of staff who had received previous professional development. “Turf issues” came to play in this component as well; certain teams took over a program so that the plan was not driven by all the staff. Technical Assistance External Providers could give considerable help to schools in this area. Oftentimes it is difficult for staff to ask themselves how they are working together. Giving feedback and advice by external providers, as an outside observer, would be valuable.

### **Component #6: Support Provided for Staff**

Schools did not rank themselves on this component, but were required to report. Guaranteed time for planning and implementation was critical for success of the plan. Having a district that is flexible and helps the school integrate programs was key. Early release time on a regular basis and on-site teacher support, such as teachers on special assignments, were mentioned as facilitating the implementation.

Areas of concern included the lack of: necessary materials, support staff (i.e., technology, librarian), time, district support, high level district administration knowledge of CSR, and a full-time principal (in a small school).

### **Component #7: Parental and Community Involvement**

Certainly, this is the area where schools generally found themselves weakest. Eleven schools ranked themselves “Somewhat Comprehensive” because they did not have enough in place to bring parents into the overall plan. Schools were still doing the same “old” parent nights, often limiting them to social activities (although this is changing). They did not believe they have enough parents in the planning and decision making process. At the high school level, staff apathy to communicate with parents is apparent. Finally, schools did not have enough methods to communicate with non-English speaking parents.

Only three schools ranked themselves “Most Comprehensive.” Factors that made a difference included having community partnerships, training for staff on poverty issues, using a full-time parent volunteer coordinator, and being able to communicate with non-English speaking parents. Focusing on student achievement as a part of family involvement was a strength in these schools.

Obviously, this is a challenging component. A key seems to be that staff needs professional development on innovative ways of engaging parents and community members.

### **Component #8: Annual Evaluation**

Eight of the 13 schools reporting (one did not self-report) ranked themselves “Most Comprehensive.” By the very nature of the CSR Progress Reports being presented, the schools had to work together to prepare the report. The reports were often shared with staffs, parents, Site Councils, and even school boards. As schools prepared their reports, they noted that more time was spent to review Action Plans and data, staff committees gave input, and all stakeholders were engaged. Because a number of documents were required in the Progress Report, the teams had to seek out information and discuss with staff. In the past, as mentioned above, the written progress reports did not engage the entire staff and/or teams. Schools seemed genuinely proud of their CSR Progress Reports Presentations and, thus, ranked themselves high in this category.

The five schools who ranked themselves “Somewhat Comprehensive” generally did not have the interim assessment data (one of the report requirements) and documentation

in good order. Even though this was certainly not new for Round 2 schools, it continued to be a problem (most definitely at the high schools). Even though interim assessment data would normally fall under Component #4, because it was a requirement in the report, schools could not rank themselves higher in evaluation if part of the evaluation plan was not completed. Another issue included lack of structure to analyze progress on their own school.

It is noted that one school had significant media attention which helped to raise the community awareness, at the same time it frustrated the staff as the information and data was superficially reported in the press.

### **Component #9: External Assistance**

While schools did not rank themselves, this was an area of growth in Round 2 schools. By the end of three years of implementation, the schools were more “savvy” to whether they were getting the support they needed. If a Model Provider was consistent and making meaningful visits then the school felt supported. Even schools with a Model Provider (or at times when there wasn’t one), the schools contracted with other external providers who were more knowledgeable in school reform and who could step in and help the school in various ways (i.e., data analysis, parent/family involvement, staff commitment).

The schools felt hindered in this component when the schools felt the model provider was lacking understanding of the schools’ needs or there was a conflict in the contract or staff compatibility with the Model Provider.

### **Component #10: Resources**

While schools did not rank themselves, they were required to document how CSR funds were spent and how funds were coordinated with other resources. Factors that facilitated this component included a good integration of funds and other district support, restructured time and schedules to make the program work, lasting partnerships which brought in-kind funds to the school, district flexibility between programs, and efficient budgeting.

Schools who felt hindered in this component remarked that lack of planning on how to sustain the program after CSR funds are gone was a major concern. Sometime there is a conflict with a change in district personnel or a change in district priorities and goals; budgeting becomes an issue often in these cases.

### **Component #11: Strategies that Support Academic Achievement**

Schools did not rank themselves in this area. In the CSR Progress Report, schools were required to discuss non-instructional strategies that supported student achievement. Some schools were able to understand this component and had plans such as school climate, attendance, and behavior. Schools that felt they understood this component had staff receive training on non-instructional strategies, and they had done some research on the strategies.

Schools who did not understand or feel they had a good plan in this component, generally felt they had a lack of knowledge of research on non-instructional components. Some schools felt that the Model Providers did not address these areas which meant it was often up to the schools to “figure it out.” This meant time and resources which schools did not have and so this component was weaker.

Since this was a new CSR component to Round 2 schools, from the original nine CSR components, this may account for a lack of understanding. It will be interesting to note in later Rounds, those who started with all 11 components, if they have a better understanding of all the components.

Table 17 provides the summary of the self-reporting by Round 2 schools during the CSR Progress Report.

**Schools Self-Ranking on the *Continuum for Assessing the Comprehensiveness of School Reform Plans***  
**Round 2**

Eleven CSR Implementation Components	Not Comprehensive	Somewhat Comprehensive	Most Comprehensive
Research-Based Methods		7	7
Comprehensive Design		3	11
Professional Development		3	11
Measurable Goals and Benchmarks		3	11
Sub category: Curriculum Alignment		8	6
Support to School Staff *			
Support Provided for Staff*			
Parent and Community Involvement		11	3
Annual Evaluation		5	8
External Assistance *			
Resources *			
Strategies that Support Student Achievement*			

\*Schools did not self-rank in this component; 14 schools completed this document.

Table 17

### **Rounds 3 and 4: Schools Progress in Implementation of the Eleven Components**

Round 3 and 4 schools are in the midst of implementation and have similar strengths and areas of concerns. These are general summary statements, from the SRT reviews of the schools' Progress Report Presentations, but not at the level of specificity presented for Round 2 above.

#### **Strengths of Round 3 and 4 Schools**

- The CSR Team seems to be good at recognizing changes that are needed and making adjustments.
- Using assessments to inform instruction more effectively is clearly happening.
- The CSR Team has noted the importance of moving forward with a stable staff.
- Having literacy embedded throughout the building is a positive strategy.
- Strong teacher leadership is a definite strength. The CSR plan is teacher driven and site-based.
- The staff appears to have a common language which has a powerful impact on students.
- An awareness of the "culture of inquiry" supports student achievement.
- Strong attention is given not only to current achievement but to an understanding of the students' journey through school.
- There is a clear focus on academics, but also strong plans for attendance and student behavior. Attention to diverse populations is apparent.
- Schools realize the CSR process is a way to strengthen the whole school experience for children and staff; it isn't just a funding source for one area.
- Strong leadership at the school has identified barriers to student learning and has successfully allocated and planned for critical personnel additions.
- Schools recognize that all subgroups need support from all staff; professional development is helping staff with the skills they need to work with subgroups.
- Several schools have created a CSR Notebook for each staff member with specific CSR information (i.e., Action Plans, interim assessment schedules, and professional development calendar, and other pertinent information).
- There appears to be a "no excuse" attitude and a firm commitment to being comprehensive for total school improvement.
- Having the school act as a true learning community helps to create a strong vision.
- Professional Development has included a coaching model, feedback and on-site support. Reflection strategies for staff are also included.
- The district support is obvious with "data driven dialogues," protocols, observations, and "walk throughs."
- Alternative schools face different population challenges. They aren't making excuses but rather getting in there to figure out solutions.
- In professional development, training the entire staff at one school on "learning about math" and not just how to teach math strategies showed an integration of content and a deeper understanding.

### **Areas of Concern of Round 3 and 4 Schools**

- Schools need to work on being able to articulate specific strategies so they will make a difference on academic achievement.
- Because training occurred during the summer, having new learnings “revisited” in the fall is important.
- Staffing and equipment have been given a great deal of funding. This can be a problem if the money is not providing enough professional opportunities for staff and support for parents. Schools need to be sure budgets reflect the needs of the staff.
- Knowing CSR is the school reform plan, not just the Model Provider, is important.
- The lack of on-going external support should be addressed. Schools need “outside eyes” to help with tackling the difficult or big issues.
- With new staff changes, it may mean a different school culture will develop. It is always a challenge to reach unity when welcoming and including new voices and new perspectives. Maintaining momentum, as staff changes, is also a factor.
- It appears that assessment is often seen by some as an event, instead of a strategy for school improvement. Future staff development might target staff “assessment literacy,” with an emphasis on local, unique, timely assessments that drive instructional strategies.
- Parent involvement needs to be looked at in deeper levels than just open house, math nights and brochures.
- Leadership is a key factor in success; a school needs to be careful that the leadership is shared by the staff and does not rest with just one person.
- Schools believed it was significant that they had a “common language” whether through a Model Provider or a Locally Developed Program. However, there were still issues with Model Providers, as stated above in Round 2 Component #1.
- Working with all staff, especially those with reservations about CSR, and trying to understand their concerns is critical for staff buy-in.
- Schools continue to work to discuss the “non-discussables”.
- Schools need to find ways to engage parents in understanding the CSR plan and to participate in the long-range decisions.
- Staff needs to understand the eleven CSR components. The school may have to work extra hard to be sure everyone is implementing and supporting the components.
- Schools need to review the *Continuum for Assessing the Comprehensiveness of School Reform Plans* and reflect on what their program truly looks like so they can address changes during the year to make it “Most Comprehensive.”
- The concern of “Three years isn’t enough” is duly noted!
- Interim assessments need to be clearly developed, teachers trained in administering them, and used so that instruction can change to meet the needs of the students.
- Paraprofessionals must get the training and support they need.

- Demographics of schools are changing; schools must be sure plans address the needs of the subgroups.

Tables 18 provides the summary of the self-reporting by Round 3 schools during the CSR Progress Report Presentations.

**Schools Self-Ranking on the *Continuum for Assessing the Comprehensiveness of School Reform Plans***  
**Round 3**

<b>Eleven CSR Implementation Components</b>	<b>Not Comprehensive</b>	<b>Somewhat Comprehensive</b>	<b>Most Comprehensive</b>
Research-Based Methods		1	6
Comprehensive Design		1	6
Professional Development			7
Measurable Goals and Benchmarks		1	7
Sub category: Curriculum Alignment		2	5
Support to School Staff *			
Support Provided for Staff*			
Parent and Community Involvement		4	3
Annual Evaluation		1	6
External Assistance *			
Resources *			
Strategies that Support Student Achievement*			

Schools did not self-rank in this component; 7 schools completed this document.

Table 18

Tables 19 provides the summary of the self-reporting by Round 4 schools during the CSR Progress Report Presentations.

**Schools Self-Ranking on the *Continuum for Assessing the Comprehensiveness of School Reform Plans***  
**Round 4**

Eleven CSR Implementation Components	Not Comprehensive	Somewhat Comprehensive	Most Comprehensive
Research-Based Methods		1	6
Comprehensive Design		2	5
Professional Development		1	6
Measurable Goals and Benchmarks		1	6
Sub category: Curriculum Alignment		4	3
Support to School Staff *			
Support Provided for Staff*			
Parent and Community Involvement		3	4
Annual Evaluation		2	5
External Assistance *			
Resources *			
Strategies that Support Student Achievement*			

Schools did not self-rank in this component; 7 out of 8 schools completed this document.  
Table 19

**Summary and Findings of SEA Evaluation**

- All CSR eleven components were implemented to varying degrees by all Round 2, 3 and 4 schools. The schools self-ranked and/or self-reported on the components. Schools are moving in the right direction.
- Schools reported that it was helpful to develop a strong implementation plan in the beginning and to have a clear process throughout. Regularly scheduled meetings, review of the action plan and data throughout the year is important.
- Schools reported that having an on-site/school CSR facilitator was instrumental in keeping the plan on track.

- As schools presented their progress reports, they identified barriers to successful implementation. However, some did not address these barriers or how they would solve them. These issues will provide areas to discuss with Technical Assistance External Providers (for Rounds 3 and 4) as they work with schools.
- All schools need intensive technical assistance in development of an assessment and evaluation plan. Selection of appropriate local interim assessment measures and general awareness of evaluation methods was a challenge for many schools. As indicated during the Progress Reports Presentations, some schools still did not have adequate structure to analyze progress. The plan for Technical Assistance External Provider support in 2004-2005 will help these schools (Round 3 and 4) and districts in order to improve this component.
- The factors that facilitated successful implementation would seem to verify Oregon's approach to a Two-Step process in selection of CSR schools. Factors such as staff buy-in and willingness to change, a strong principal, and support from the district were assessed in the pre-application phase of Oregon's Two-Step Application process. Schools indicated that these were among the most important factors in school reform efforts at this level.
- Parent involvement is definitely an area that staff needs professional development help and innovative approaches to the problems of engagement with families. Schools continue to struggle with this communication piece whether it is in language challenges, parents attending events, volunteer coordination, and a variety of other issues mentioned by schools.
- Schools need time to create a Locally Developed Program, to do a thorough needs assessment, to identify research-based models, and to develop an effective plan. Lack of time was the most common factor that hindered successful implementation.
- Having the *Continuum for Assessing the Comprehensiveness of School Reform Plans* components match the 11 CSR Components will be important, not only for school reflection, but for ranking on the 2004-2005 Progress Report Presentations.
- Some schools believe goals are unattainable for certain subgroups. This is a national issue because of all subgroups needing to meet benchmarks. Schools find this difficult and especially given only a three-year implementation cycle of CSR.
- Schools feel the time pressure of only three years of funding as a factor that looms in front of them continually. Sustainability is certainly a question asked of schools throughout the entire process. Research on the length of implementation is interesting to note. In the "Comprehensive School Reform and

Student Achievement, A Meta-Analysis” published in November 2002 by Geoffrey Borman of the University of Wisconsin-Madison (and others), it is stated: “...the number of years of model implementation has very important implications for understanding CSR effects on student achievement. The strong effects of CSR beginning after the fifth year of implementation may be explained in two ways: a potential cumulative impact of CSR or a self-selection artifact. Specifically, schools may be experiencing stronger effects as they continue implementing the models, or it may be that the schools experiencing particular success continue implementing the reforms while the schools not experiencing as much success drop them after the first few years...These studies, therefore, may underestimate the true potential of CSR for affecting change in schools and for improving student achievement. Stronger evidence is needed to understand the linkages between years of implementation and school improvement and, ultimately, its impacts on student outcomes.”

- CSR need to be connected to other state improvement efforts and processes. All state level school improvement staff members working with school reform need to be communicating. This would not only keep the SEA informed in working with schools, but would avoid overlapping and conflicting information being presented.