

Oregon District Continuous Improvement Plan Cover Sheet 2007 – 2009	
<u>District Information:</u>	
County: Coos	
District Name: Coos Bay Public Schools	
Address: 1255 Hemlock. PO Box 509 Coos Bay, OR 97420	
Telephone: 541-267-3104	
<u>CIP district contact:</u>	
Name: Duella Scott-Hull	
Telephone: 541-267-1319	
Email: duellas@coos-bay.k12.or.us	
Date of Submission:	
I certify that this Continuous Improvement Plan was developed in compliance with requirements of Oregon and Federal statutes and regulations. The District School Board has approved this plan for submission to ODE.	
Name of Superintendent:	Name of Board Chair:
Bob De La Vergne	Kathy Murray
Signature of Superintendent	Signature of Board Chair
Date:	Date:

B. Executive Summary

Over the past three years Coos Bay Public Schools has refined an improvement model based on the belief: Education for All, Whatever It Takes. Our resources are allocated, and our instructional practices are aligned to this belief.

The district has experienced achievements that demonstrate the success of this model: student achievement in math and reading has increased each year (until the 2007 school year when cut scores were re-aligned and spring assessment switched formats); in 2007 grades 7, 8 and 10 demonstrated gains in reading and scored above state average with the cut score revisions; Career and Technical Education students continue to show growth on all state targets and out-perform state CTE students in academic and technical skills; all schools continue to have Satisfactory, Strong or Exceptional ratings on State Report Cards; attendance rates at each school continue to improve or hold steady and most are above the state target; the number of 2 + 2 credits earned at SWOCC by MHS students during their senior year doubled for the class of 2007; the number of students entering post-secondary training from Marshfield continues to increase; the overall math and English Comp GPA for MHS graduates in the 4-year public college system continues to be higher or equal to state averages. CBPS continues to be an Instructional Technology leader with over 795 student computers—200 of which are laptops; 22 SmartBoards, 68 instructional media carts and various other technology to enhance student learning and classroom instruction.

The CBPS administrative team uses a continuous improvement model to identify student learning needs. The team facilitates data-driven discussions in their buildings to set instructional and achievement goals. While improvement is continuous, our flat and declining scores at middle and high school concern the team. Continued progress toward all students meeting achievement targets is needed. A gap analysis reveals an achievement gap for economically disadvantaged and special needs students. The low graduation rate at our alternative school is also an area of concern. Our programs successfully attract disenfranchised students and drop out recovery students, yet we are not successful in getting them to graduate.

Our focus is to implement the professional learning teams model with identification of power standards—essential learning skills, development of common formative assessments, and utilizing data-driven model to select instructional goals and needed professional development. We have focused resources on developing the leadership capacity among administrators and teacher leaders to carry out the goals and initiatives of the site and district continuous improvement plans.

CBPS will work with PSU consultants and a team from the Canby School District to guide our work in the student achievement goals. We will continue to focus on teachers integrating the instructional technology available to them to meet student learning goals. Our key strategy is to focus on building professional learning communities that are focused with laser-like precision on student learning. This CIP details our focus based on rigorous self-evaluation and examination of data available to us.

C. Description of the District

Coos Bay School District (CBSD) is located on the South Oregon Coast. There are seven schools in the district serving approximately 3,500 students. School configurations include three K-4 elementary schools, one 5-6 intermediate school, one 7-8 middle school, one 9-12 high school, and one 9-12 alternative high school. In addition, the district sponsors one charter school serving 50 students, some from the Coos Bay community and others from outside the community. Over 54% of the students in the district are bussed to school. The district adheres to an open enrollment policy allowing students and families to choose the elementary school that best fits their learning needs on a space available basis. The school board and administration has continued to make class size a priority, and even in times of budget cuts they have protected the classroom to the extent possible using a combination of grant and general funds. Average class sizes across the district are in the range of 20-29 students per teacher. An emphasis is placed on lower class sizes at the primary level (K-2) and grade 3.

More than half of the students in the district qualify for free or reduced meals based on their family income level. Over 19% of the students in the district are identified with a disability and receive services through special education. Last year 276 students were referred for services to the district's homeless liaison. Numerous volunteers donate their time to our schools with a large amount of this time being directed to support of students in the classrooms.

District wide we work toward **“Education For All, Whatever It Takes”**.

D. Self-Evaluation Summary

Prompt 1: Describe the district's progress since 2005 in attaining:

- each of the 10 Oregon Educational Performance Standards and
- each of the goals set in the 05-07 CIP.

1) All districts shall maintain standard schools (Division 22):

Each fall the District's Leadership Cabinet reviews the Division 22 standards for compliance. The team notes items of concern and procedures/policies that need to be addressed or updated. In the last two years the district's technology and comprehensive counseling plan have been updated. This year (07-08) the district will update its drug/alcohol/health instructional plans and procedures, review the wellness policy, review the comprehensive guidance and counseling plan and develop power standards for the K-12 media centers. The district is in compliance with division 22 standards and currently no areas of deficiency or concern have been noted.

2007 Graduation Requirements:

The District has implemented the 2007 graduation standards. The high school is using an advisory model where each student is assigned to an advisor for four years. The advisor is responsible for each student taking classes necessary to complete all graduation requirements. The Personal Education Plan is developed and implemented with students in the advisory class. The Marshfield Advisory Committee has developed a curriculum for advisors to use with students. The curriculum includes comprehensive counseling, education plan and profile, career related learning standards and experiences, and they are currently working on the extended application. The high school administration has given

several presentations/updates to the school board and to parents at conferences and transition meetings with Sunset Middle School parents. The middle school is working with their advisory teachers and the MHS Advisory Committee to develop a middle school education plan and profile aligned to the high school's. The high school and Southwestern Oregon Community College (SWOCC) have worked together over the last year to develop pathway documents that will become part of all educational plans to help students determine and prepare for the "next step" after high school. The MHS plan and forecaster is being revised to reflect the Pathway model for 2008-09 school year planning.

Destinations Academy, a grade 9-12 alternative school, is revising course offerings to meet the graduations requirements in a project-based learning environment. Students have a 4-year Personal Education Plan along with a transition to next steps facilitated by the school's teachers.

- 2) **All students will show continuous individual growth in all core academic subjects. All Districts will provide opportunities for students to demonstrate career related knowledge and skills and extended application.**

Academic Growth:

Until the 2006-07 assessment scores were released, CBSD showed a steady growth in English Language Arts and Math for grades 3-7 with scores near or above the state average. Grades 3, 4 and 5 showed marked declines for 2006-07. We are concerned that raising the cut scores and switching to paper and pencil testing accounted for much of this decline since our instructional program in reading and math and our instructional strategies did not change as dramatically as the test scores did. However, the decline has been noted by district and building staff and we are addressing it in the following ways:

- Grades K-4 are in the process of finalizing their language arts adoption. The emphasis with this adoption is on selecting a core program with strong reading and writing components connected tightly to state standards at each grade level.
- District-wide we are beginning to look toward the 2008-09 math adoption by analyzing our current adoption's strengths and weaknesses.
- The larger issue is a lack of common formative assessments across the district to better inform our instructional practices. Those assessments would have given us a clearer picture of how our students are performing given the state assessment anomalies for 2006-07.

Scores for grades 8 and 10 showed moderate increases the past few years. Their decline for 2006-07 was less than at grades 3-7. We believe this is due in part to the lowering of the cut scores and the spring paper and pencil testing. The 10th graders last took paper and pencil when they were in 3rd grade; 8th grade has never taken a paper and pencil state assessment. We are addressing the student performance as follows:

- Grades 5-12 adopted language arts materials with a common focus on reading strategies that strengthen students' performance in a variety of reading tasks. The goal is to develop independent readers who can self-identify which key strategies to use for the appropriate reading task.
- Grades 5-12 adopted a writing curriculum that emphasizes writing for all content areas with a strong focus on the state standards for writing.

- We recognize the weaknesses in the high school math curriculum and are currently meeting as a math team to address student performance, new graduation requirements and a math curriculum that accommodates both.
- Grades 5-8 are evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the current math curriculum in preparation for the 2008-09 math instructional materials adoption.
- We recognize the need to have common formative assessments for the district in order to better determine how well students are performing on district identified power standards.

During the 2006-07 school year, Millicoma Intermediate School—which houses the district’s entire 5th and 6th grade student population—piloted a data reporting program, *Mastery In Motion*. This program allows individual teachers, grade level teams and other student instructional teams to look at student data from OSATs, work samples and other building assessments like Oral Reading Fluency to inform instructional practice. Because of the success of the pilot, the entire district is using the program for 2007-08. As we develop our common formative assessments and have more longitudinal data, we anticipate teachers having stronger data-driven conversations. As we move to develop district power standards and the common assessments based on those standards, we plan to further develop data teams in each building and resurrect the district wide Assessment Cadre.

Table 1

Percent Meeting or Exceeding Standard						
Reading	State Avg 2006/07 New Cut Scores	2006/07	2005/06 With New Cut Scores	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04
Grade 3	83%	77%	87%	93%	89%	80%
Grade 4	80%	79%	84%	93%		
Grade 5	72%	67%	74%	88%	88%	77%
Grade 6	75%	71%	70%	81%		
Grade 7	77%	75%	72%	74%		
Grade 8	69%	69%	68%	68%	67%	58%
Grade 10	66%	62%	61%	47%	54%	48%
Math						
Grade 3	70%	59%	82%	91%	93%	73%
Grade 4	72%	70%	79%	91%		
Grade 5	68%	54%	71%	84%	82%	79%
Grade 6	71%	68%	71%	80%		
Grade 7	74%	67%	75%	75%		
Grade 8	70%	69%	70%	64%	65%	45%
Grade 10	55%	47%	49%	34%	42%	34%

Because of the shortened version of the paper and pencil spring assessment, no strand data was available for 2006-07. We will compare our fall OAKS strand data to the 2005-06 strand data to begin to make some comparisons. Again, this underscores the need to use the assessments available with our K-8 math curriculum to determine student strengths and weaknesses in math and identify common assessments for the reading strands. The 2005-06 strand data shows Examining Content in Information Text and Reading to Perform a Task as areas of concern district-wide. This and anecdotal data

from classroom teacher assessments, was a leading indicator for us as we selected grade 5-12 language arts instructional materials for the 2007-2013 adoption cycle and will inform our K-4 selection. Examining Content in Information Text and Reading to Perform a Task continue to be areas of concern at the high school level. The English department is addressing this by creating a new course and by focusing on instructional materials that strengthen this deficit in existing courses. The feeder schools are also focusing on these areas in their instruction and assessment for learning.

Because the strand data is based on relatively few questions, the need for common assessments district wide is once again under scored.

Table 2

2005-06 Reading Literature Strand/Trait District Data (% Meet/Exceeds)						
Grade	Demo Gen Understand	Dev an Interpret	Info Text	Lit Text	Read to Perform Task	Vocab
3	88.26	88.73	100		70.42	84.98
4	90.95	86.21	74.57		81.9	85.78
5	86.5	78.48	73.84	72.15	73	78.9
6	75.65	77.83	73.91	76.96	77.39	76.52
7	72.22	73.33	61.48	73.33	63.7	72.22
8	65.16	59.68	58.06	61.94	56.45	62.58
CIM	50.54	51.97	38.71	53.05	40.86	59.5

A look at math strand data for 2005-06 shows all 5 areas are of grave concern at the high school level. This is being addressed by examining new curriculum and courses to meet the need of the new graduation requirements and of increasing student performance in all areas of mathematics. We will continue to examine current K-8 curriculum for strengths and weaknesses as we gather more data. Because the strand data is based on relatively few questions, the need for common assessments district wide becomes a priority.

Table 3

2005-06 Mathematics Strand/Trait District Data (% Meet/Exceeds)					
Grade	Alg Rels	Cal & Est	Geometry	Measurement	Stat & Prob
3	84.98	79.81	83.57	81.69	76.53
4	82.33	86.64	87.93	82.33	88.36
5	68.35	81.57	79.75	81.43	66.24
6	73.71	66.81	75.86	78.02	76.29
7	75.74	67.28	70.96	68.75	72.06
8	60.97	60.65	60.32	56.13	66.13
CIM	38.57	37.86	36.97	38.21	36.36

Writing at all grade levels continues to be a district concern and focus. As we gain capacity to look at longitudinal work samples at all grade levels and state performance assessments at grades 4, 7 and 10, we will continue to make better-informed decisions regarding writing curriculum and instructional practices. The dip in scores from 2004-05 to 2005-06 resulted in common district professional development at grades K-5 and individual building focus on writing instruction. This resulted in a dramatic improvement in K-4 writing scores for 2006-07. While still slightly below the state average, the improvement shows a need to continue the focus on common professional development and examination of student writing.

The erratic scores at grades 7 and 10 resulted in new writing curriculum being selected at grades 6-8 and 7-12. Training in the new curriculum and supporting instructional strategies and examination of student writing samples will be a focus for the combined staff.

Table 4

Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Standard					
Writing	State Average 2006/07 New Cut Scores	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04
Grade 4	45%	41%	21%	59%	
Grade 5					51%
Grade 7	48%	31%	43%	69%	
Grade 8					69%
Grade 10	55%	57%	56%	73%	74%

High school science scores have consistently exceeded the state average (note state average in parentheses) and have increased each year. 8th grade scores have increased each year, but are slightly below the state average for 05-06. 5th grade scores continue to increase but are still below state average. Science teachers have begun the discussion and examination of curriculum and are considering an integrated science approach rather than the current model of dedicating each of grades 6-9 to a separate discipline. This discussion and exploration of other models will be the focus in 2008-09 in preparation for the 2009-10 adoption of new instructional materials based on revised science standards.

Table 5

Percentage Meeting or Exceeding Standard				
Science	State Average 2006/07	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05
Grade 5	No test	No test	73% (80%)	68% (76%)
Grade 8	No test	No test	76% (70%)	67% (67%)
Grade 10	No test	No test	67% (64%)	53% (63%)

Improvement Criteria:

The elementary schools continue to meet AYP targets for all subpopulations while both the middle and high school continue to struggle in students with disabilities not meeting either math or ELA AYP targets. The high school did improve its AYP rating for economically disadvantaged students in ELA, but not in math. The high school continues to struggle meeting AYP in math for all students except American Indian and white.

According to Achievement Gap Analysis, elementary students exceeded ELA by 37.33% and math by 29.93%. This represents an increase in ELA over 05-06 data and a decline in math. All subpopulations increased in ELA and decreased in math at the elementary level.

At the middle school, students exceeded ELA target by 27.81% and math by 27.1%, both representing an increase over 05-06 data. All subpopulations increased the percentage over target for ELA and all increased in math except students with disabilities. However, the gap lessened for students with disabilities in both areas. All subpopulations improved in both areas.

High school students exceeded the AYP target in ELA by 13.39% and fell below the math target by 0.21%. This near miss does represent an improvement over 05-06 data. All subpopulations increased in ELA and all but students with disabilities increased in math.

An analysis of the 2007 assessment results compared to the 2007-08 AYP targets of 60% pass in ELA and 59% pass in math indicate that all subpopulations at the elementary are on target to meet AYP; students with disabilities in both ELA and math may continue to fall below the AYP targets; and the high school may fall short of AYP in ELA with economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities and with all subpopulations in math. However, these projections do not take into account the interventions that will be in place as a result of the data analysis.

Table 6

AYP Academic Status				
English Lang. Art All Students	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04
Elementary	Met	Met	Met	Met
Middle School	Met	Met	Met	Met
High School	Met	Met	Not Met	Met
Math All Students				
Elementary	Met	Met	Met	Met
Middle School	Met	Met	Met	Met
High School	Met	Not Met	Not Met	Met

Table 7

Achievement Gap Analysis																
2006/07 Elementary AYP Data Compared to 2005/06																
Group	Academic Status				Adjusted Status				Difference from all Students				Difference from Target			
	ELA 06/07	ELA 05/06	Math 06/07	Math 05/06	ELA 06/07	ELA 05/06	Math 06/07	Math 05/06	ELA 06/07	ELA 05/06	Math 06/07	Math 05/06	ELA 50% Target 06/07	ELA 50% Target 05/06	Math 49% target 06/07	Math 49% target 05/06
All Students	Met	Met	Met	Met	87.33%	71.69%	78.93%	92.76%					37.33	21.39	29.93	43.76
Economically Disadvantaged	Met	Met	Met	Met	84.70%	67.95%	76.40%	90.44%	-2.63	-3.74	-2.53	-2.32	34.7	17.95	27.4	41.44
Students with Disabilities	Met	Met	Met	Met	68.56%	59.65%	63.41%	75.00%	-18.8	-12.04	-15.52	-17.76	18.56	9.65	14.41	26.00
Hispanic	Met	Met	Met	Met	89.05%	80.67%	75.61%	101.36%	1.72	8.98	-3.32	8.6	39.05	30.67	26.61	52.36
Am Indian	Met	Met	Met	Met	94.57%	75.03%	86.77%	101.85%	7.24	3.34	7.87	9.09	44.57	25.03	36.77	52.85
White	Met	Met	Met	Met	89.43%	73.23%	81.20%	93.88%	2.1	1.54	2.27	1.12	39.43	23.23	32.18	44.88
Multi-Racial	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
2006/07 Middle School AYP Data Compared to 2005/06																
Group	Academic Status				Adjusted Status				Difference from all Students				Difference from Target			
	ELA 06/07	ELA 05/06	Math 06/07	Math 05/06	ELA 06/07	ELA 05/06	Math 06/07	Math 05/06	ELA 06/07	ELA 05/06	Math 06/07	Math 05/06	ELA 50% Target 06/07	ELA 50% Target 05/06	Math 49% target 06/07	Math 49% target 05/06
All Students	Met	Met	Met	Met	77.81%	61.32%	76.10%	71.91%					27.81	11.32	27.1	22.91
Economically Disadvantaged	Met	Met	Met	Met	70.52%	52.84%	68.43%	61.08%	-7.29	-8.48	-7.67	-10.83	20.52	2.84	19.43	12.08
Students with Disabilities	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Met	46.43%	37.58%	42.30%	55.90%	-31.4	-23.74	-33.8	-16.01	-3.57	-12.42	-6.7	6.9
Hispanic	Met	Met	Met	*	75.92%	66.40%	69.28%	*	-1.89	5.08	-6.82	*	25.92	16.4	20.28	*
Am Indian	Met	Met	Met	Met	80.65%	60.05%	80.17%	71.66%	2.84	-1.27	4.07	-0.25	30.65	10.05	30.17	22.66
White	Met	Met	Met	Met	80.37%	65.62%	79.29%	77.23%	2.56	4.3	3.19	5.32	30.37	15.62	30.29	28.23
Multi-Racial	Met	*	Met	*	97.02%	*	91.31%	*	19.21	*	19.21	*	47.02	*	41.31	*
2006/07 High School AYP Data Compared to 2005/06																
Group	Academic Status				Adjusted Status				Difference from all Students				Difference from Target			
	ELA 06/07	ELA 05/06	Math 06/07	Math 05/06	ELA 06/07	ELA 05/06	Math 06/07	Math 05/06	ELA 06/07	ELA 05/06	Math 06/07	Math 05/06	ELA 50% Target 06/07	ELA 50% Target 05/06	Math 49% target 06/07	Math 49% target 05/06
All Students	Met	Met	Not Met	Not Met	63.39%	56.14%	48.79%	45.25%					13.39	6.14	-0.21	-3.75
Economically Disadvantaged	Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	56.43%	49.39%	40.99%	40.39%	-6.96	-6.75	-7.8	-4.86	6.43	-0.61	-8.01	-8.61
Students with Disabilities	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	39.01%	25.31%	28.89%	30.93%	-24.4	-30.83	-19.9	-14.32	-10.99	-24.69	-20.11	-18.07
Hispanic	*	Met	*	*	*	63.47%	*	*	*	7.33	*	*	*	13.47	*	*
Am Indian	Met	Met	Met	Not Met	75.51	56.46%	59.05	42.58%	12.12	0.32	10.26	-2.67	25.51	6.46	10.05	-6.42
White	Met	Met	Met	Not Met	63.95%	58.05%	49.81%	48.31%	0.56	1.91	1.02	3.06	13.95	8.05	0.81	-0.69
Multi-Racial	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

* Suppressed due to insufficient data

Career-related Knowledge and Growth:

All grade 7-12 students are assigned an advisor who works with them during their 7-8 and 9-12 years at Sunset Middle School and Marshfield High School. Grade 7-8 advisors help students with homework, developing study skills and planning their high school course work. The middle school staff is currently working with high school staff to develop a 7-8 Personal Education Plan that flows into the MHS PEP. The MHS advisors support and monitor students' progress in meeting career-related learning standards and experiences and extended applications. MHS continues to develop and implement its extended application criteria. Students keep a portfolio in advisory detailing their education plan and profile (PEP), CRLS, CRLE and extended applications. MHS has an advisory council made up of MHS administration, teachers and staff to continuously revise this student support program. MHS has piloted Credit Based on Proficiency and is

currently expanding the opportunities for MHS students and revising and developing assessments for CBOP in partnership with the Business Education Compact.

Destinations Academy students have a PEP that is developed upon entry to the program and monitored by staff. A community project that encompasses the CRLS provides a CRLE for Destinations students each year.

Documented growth for TAG and IEP

AYP preliminary 2006/07 data

The documented growth for students on IEP's shows progress in math at the high school level and reading at one elementary school. Otherwise, scores for students on IEPs continue to be a concern.

Table 8

School	IEP Math			IEP ELA		
	2005-06	2006-07	Chg in %	2005-06	2006-07	Chg in %
Blossom	81.82	45.65	-36.17	68.18	73.91	5.73
Bunker	54.17	51.35	-2.82	66.67	51.35	-15.32
Madison	60.00	25.00	-35.00	58.62	29.17	-29.45
Millicoma	33.64	24.27	-9.36	44.34	24.04	-20.30
Sunset	33.33	25.26	-8.07	30.69	36.08	5.39
MHS	17.07	19.44	2.37	15.00	30.56	-15.32
Res.Link	0	0	0	0	0	0
Destination	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 9

TAG ELA			
Grade level	2006/07 Met or Exceeded	2005/06 Met or Exceeded	% Change
3rd	90	100	-10%
4 th	100	100	Same
5 th	96.15	100	-3.85
6 th	95.65	100	-4.35
7 th	100	94.59	+5.41
8 th	91.43	93.94	-2.51
CIM	100	95.24	+4.76

Table 10

TAG Math			
Grade level	2005/06 Met or Exceeded	2006/07 Met or Exceeded	% Change
3rd	100	90	-10%
4 th	100	100	Same
5 th	100	96.15	-3.85
6 th	100	100	Same
7 th	94.44	100	+5.56
8 th	96.97	94.12	-2.85
CIM	87.5	100	+12.5

Table 11

TAG Writing			
Grade level	2005/06 Met or Exceeded	2006/07 Met or Exceeded	% Change
4 th	55.17	33.33	-21.84
7 th	69.44	68.42	-1.02
CIM	95.00	100	+5.00

90% or more students in the district identified as TAG continue to meet or exceed in the area of reading. Math scores for 2006/07 also show 90% or more students met or exceeded on statewide assessments. The district's 4th grade writing scores declined and all the elementary school are addressing this through professional development, targeted interventions and school wide instructional activities. The above chart shows growth for 10th graders over the past two years in math, reading and writing for students identified as TAG.

3) By 2013 – 14, all students will reach high standards in reading and mathematics.

AYP requirements for 2007 – 2009:

See Table 7

Elementary schools are on track for meeting AYP targets of 60% for ELA and 59% for math. Curriculum reviews, supplemental instructional materials aligned with research-based interventions, development of common assessments along with identifying power standards will assure continued progress in this area. The district is also committed to maintaining and/or reducing class sizes at the primary grade level.

At the middle school, all populations except students with disabilities in both ELA and math are on target to meet AYP targets. Special education at the middle school is implementing an inclusion model for 2007-08, continues to use Read 180 as a reading intervention, is implementing the general education writing program and double dosing math and language arts for students on IEPs. Continued study of interventions, development of common formative assessments and identification of power standards are all goals.

High school students are on target to meet 07-08 AYP targets in ELA with exception of economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities. Secondary mathematics must show the largest growth in all subpopulations to reach AYP targets. In preparation for the 2008-09 math adoption, K-12 teachers are evaluating current curriculum and instructional materials to identify gaps. Developing power standards and common formative assessments will be a part of this process along with revising the course offerings at the high school level to meet new graduation standards and demonstrated student needs. The high school special education staff is also studying models of delivery and will revise its current pull out model to give students the best chance of meeting academic targets to succeed in high school and beyond. To address academic deficiencies and attendance issues, Destinations Academy is revising curriculum to provide students a hands-on environment in which to learn academics.

All schools have a Report Card rating of Satisfactory or better:

The district has one exceptional, one strong and four satisfactory ratings with two schools not rated. Last year CBPS had one exceptional, three strong, two satisfactory and two not rated. The 06-07 Satisfactory schools were close to a Strong rating.

CBPS send parents and staff both a district and an individual school report card each December. In addition, all parents receive their student's OSAT results annually. Last year, Millicoma Intermediate piloted Mastery in Motion and shared student progress at fall conferences right after fall TESA assessments were completed. For 2006-07, all schools will have access to this data to share with parents and to make second trimester instructional placement decisions.

Table 12

School Report Card Data ~ School Ratings Overall				
School	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04
Blossom Gulch	Satisfactory	Exceptional	Strong	Satisfactory
Bunker Hill	Exceptional	Strong	Satisfactory	Not Rated
Madison	Satisfactory	Strong	Strong	Satisfactory
Millicoma	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Strong	Not Rated
Sunset Middle	Strong	Strong	Satisfactory	Not Rated
Marshfield High	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Destinations Academy	Not Rated	Not Rated	Unacceptable	Low
Resource Link Charter	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated

Participation rate equal to or greater than 95%:

The district participation rate is greater than 95% for elementary, middle and high school. All subgroups in each of the buildings, except the charter school and the alternative program, also had participations greater than 95%. The charter school and the alternative school did not have 95%, but did show improvement over the 2005-06 school year.

Table 13

OSA Participation Rate				
Eng/LA	2006/07	2005/06	2004/05	2003/04
Elementary	100%	99%	99%	99%
Middle School	100%	98%	97%	98%
High School	98%	94%	95%	96%
Math				
Elementary	100%	100%	97%	99%
Middle School	99%	99%	96%	98%
High School	97%	97%	96%	96%

Table 14

School Participation Rate %		
Eng/LA	2006/07	2005/06
Blossom Gulch	100	100
Bunker Hill	100	99
Madison	100	99
Millicoma	99	99
Sunset Middle	100	98
Marshfield High	99	96
Destinations Academy	85	85
Resource Link Charter	84	74
Math		
Blossom Gulch	100	100
Bunker Hill	100	100
Madison	100	100
Millicoma	99	99
Sunset Middle	100	100
Marshfield High	99	99
Destinations Academy	87	85
Resource Link Charter	72	59

4) All English Language Learners will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum, meeting or exceeding Oregon academic performance standards in reading and mathematics.

In 2004/05 a pilot program was implemented to review data from the Woodcock Munioz and the ELPA. The intent was to have an equal amount of students take each test, however the criteria established by the ODE did not allow this to occur. The data presented in the above chart shows only students who took the Munioz for both years. The sample size is small and does not accurately reflect the whole population. Using adjusted December 2006 data: 66% of ELL students rose one level of language proficiency higher than the previous year. And 40% of all LEP students attained English language proficiency each year. At the end of 2005-06 school year, 24 students were exited from receiving services.

Table 15

06/07 AYP for ELL	49% meet or exceed	50% meet or exceed
School	Math	ELA
Bunker Hill	50.00	66.67
Madison	63.64	72.73
Sunset	52.94	58.82
Resource Link	0 NA	0 NA
Millicoma	41.38	51.72
MHS	0 NA	0 NA

Table 16

2005/06 English Language Assessment Results				
English Proficiency progress by Cohort	# LEP students at this level in 2004-05	#LEP students who increased proficiency in 2005-06	District % of LEP students making progress in 2005-06	State % LEP students making progress in 2005-06
Level 1	6	5	83 %	60 %
Level 2	4	2	50 %	49 %
Level 3	8	3	38 %	59 %
Level 4	4	0	38 %	59 %

5) Beginning in the fall of 2007, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers in core content areas. Districts will also have a plan to maintain the goal of 100% of core content classes being taught by highly qualified teachers.

The Human Resources Specialist for the CBPS meets annually with non-highly qualified staff to review their progress in becoming highly qualified. Each teacher that is not deemed highly qualified by federal standards has a plan on file with the district HR Specialist. The district supports staff becoming or retaining Highly Qualified status by allocating \$66,327 from general funds to pay college tuition and \$8,200 from IIA funds to pay for Praxis, ORELA and other exams required to become Highly Qualified. The district subscribes to ED Zap and attends the Educator Job Fair in Portland each spring to attract Highly Qualified applicants for all positions. If this national recruitment does not garner a Highly Qualified candidate, we work closely with ODE staff as we proceed with hiring. The district has 94% of elementary teachers Highly Qualified; those who are not were hired out of college and need to pass either the Praxis or the ORELA. The district has had a more difficult time finding highly qualified middle and high school teachers in special education, math, science, and social studies given the new requirements for these subjects.

The district sets aside general fund and grant dollars for professional development to retain Highly Qualified teachers in addition to offering wage/benefit packages in line with other schools our size off the I-5 corridor. Each staff member is provided a computer and has access to a large stable of instructional technology tools to assist them with building and classroom needs. All staff are encouraged to become leaders through involvement in various building and district committees and provided numerous opportunities to increase instructional skills and effective practice through professional development.

In addition, for the past six years the district has allocated Title IIA funds, (and Title VIB when the district qualifies for such funds), and general fund dollars to support a new teacher mentor program. Each teacher who is new to the district is assigned a mentor from the experienced teaching ranks. In addition to district-sponsored mentoring activities, many buildings also sponsor activities to ensure the success of newly-hired teachers.

Data in Table 17 reflects the following: **Elementary**—94% of all elementary staff are Highly Qualified with one school having 100% of its staff Highly Qualified. The 5 non-highly-qualified elementary staff represent: 1 special education, 1 kindergarten, 1 ELL, 1

reading at grades 5-6 and 1 alternative education teacher. **Sunset Middle**—The 15 sections taught by non-highly qualified represent: 5 sections of social studies, 7 sections of various special education classes representing 1 teacher; 3 sections of various alternative education classes representing 1 teacher. **Marshfield High**—The 32 sections taught by non-highly qualified represent: 12 sections of science, 12 sections of special education in various subjects representing 3 teachers, 8 sections of various alternative education courses representing 4 teachers, all of whom need to take various Praxis tests. **Destinations Academy (Alternative)**—2 sections of social studies and one special ed math representing 3 teachers; **Resource Link Charter**—science, language arts, social studies and special education representing 3 teachers. All deficiencies are being addressed by taking additional course work, tests or placement in a different position or school depending on the individual HQ plan of the teacher. These figures represent a significant improvement over the 2006 data and reflect the work our HR Specialist has done 1) with teachers in developing and monitoring Highly Qualified plans, and 2) with principals during the hiring process.

The majority of district students are taught by Highly Qualified teachers. Minority and economically disadvantaged students are not taught at a higher rate by non-highly qualified staff than all students are.

Table 17

Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers 2007-08			
	Section/Staff	HQ Sections/Staff	% Taught by HQ Teachers
Elementary			
Blossom Gulch	23 Staff	23 HQ Staff	100%
Bunker Hill	17 Staff	16 HQ Staff	94%
Madison	17 Staff	15 HQ Staff	88%
Millicoma	29 Staff	27 HQ Staff	93%
Middle & High School			
Sunset	122 Sections	107 HQ Sections	88%
Marshfield	233 Sections	201 HQ Sections	86%
Destinations Academy (Alt.)	12 Sections	9 HQ Sections	75%
Resource Link	12 Sections	7 HQ Sections	58%

- 6) **All students will be taught in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning.**

The 2005-2006 Report Card rating for student behavior at all schools are **satisfactory**.

Table 18

Student Behavior		
School	2006/07	2005/06
Blossom Gulch	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Bunker Hill	Strong	Satisfactory
Madison	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Millicoma	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Sunset Middle	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Marshfield High	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Destinations Academy	Unacceptable	Unacceptable
Resource Link Charter	Unacceptable	Unacceptable

- The district did not meet ODE performance targets at the 8th grade level in the areas of smoking, alcohol, marijuana or physical fights.
- The district is below state averages in the areas of marijuana, guns and threat/weapons.
- Unwanted sexual comments and harassment based on race are also below state averages.

Table 19

05-06 Sunset Middle School 8 th Grade Healthy Teen Survey								
Targets	Offense	Sunset	State	Diff.	Harassment	Sunset	State	Diff.
8%	Smoker	13.7%	8.7%	+ 5%				
15%	Alcohol	32.1%	31.9	+ .2%	Race	3.5%	8.8%	- 5.3%
8%	Marijuana	9.5%	9.9%	-.4%	Unwanted sexual comments	8.3%	9.1%	-.8%
	Threat/weapon	4.3%	6.4%	-2.1%	Clothes	16.1%	15.2%	+ .9%
12%	Physical fight	23.3%	15.9%	+7.4%	Friend	9.6%	9.2%	+ .4%
3%	Gun	4.3%	5.9%	-1.6%	Other	19.1%	18.5%	+ .6%

Table 20

05-06 Marshfield High School Healthy Teen Survey								
*Targets	Offense	MHS %	State %	Diff. %	Harassment	MHS %	State %	Diff. %
15%	Smoker	18.6	15.4	+3.2				
35%	Alcohol	32.2	43.9	-10.8	Race	4.8	7.0	-2.2
15%	Marijuana	16.6	18.7	-2.1	Unwanted sexual comments	3.4	9.2	-5.8
	Threat/weapon	0.7	1.6	-0.9	clothes	11.0	11.7	-0.7
5%	Physical fight	8.9	7.3	+1.6	Friend	8.9	6.4	+2.5
5%	Gun	0.0	0.5	-0.5	Other	10.3	12.8	-1.7

* Targets established by ODE

Activities to support safe and drug free school include:

- District wide Positive Behavior Support Program
- First and Second Steps Curriculum in the elementary schools
- Red Ribbon Week
- Yellow Ribbon Awareness program
- School Health Advisory council

- School Safety Officer
- Stop Smoking program “ This Way Out”
- Comprehensive Counseling Program

Positive Behavior Support is strongly implemented in all Coos Bay schools. Some of the elementary schools have implemented Second Steps curriculum and the intermediate and middle school administrators are currently reviewing the implementation of the program at their grade levels. All behavior referrals are entered into the SWIS program and principals and building teams review the data and make decisions for the behavioral interventions at the school. The data is entered by a designated person for each building, from referrals written by staff. The referrals include pertinent information such as time of day, place and type of behavior. This data is retrieved from SWIS in the form of reports. The reports can be used to develop functional behavior assessments on a school wide scale. The teams will discuss the referrals at each building to develop programs, intervention and other necessary activities to address the concerns.

In addition, schools have implemented various strategies for addressing attendance rates in the district. MHS currently has a telephone call system in place showing a 1.3% increase in attendance from 2006 to 2007. Bunker Hill and Madison utilize support staff to call families when their child does not arrive at school each day resulting in .5 and .4 per cent attendance increases respectively. Blossom Gulch reports its progress toward reducing tardies weekly in the parent newsletter. Once per trimester the principal at Millicoma personally greets parents who are dropping their children off on time with coffee and donuts.

All students in grades 9 – 12 have an Education Plan and Profile and are supported by an adult advocate and guidance and counseling:

All students in grades 9-12 have a Personal Education Plan and Profile and are guided through the process by an assigned advisor who is with the student all four years. MHS has 3 guidance counselors who assist students and advisors with course planning. Sunset Middle School is in the process of developing a PEP that complements the one students will encounter in grade 9. SMS advisors will work with students and parents to understand the significance of this document. SMS students also have access to full time counseling and guidance staff.

All students participate in Career-Related Learning Experiences during grades 9-12:

All Marshfield High School students participate in at least one career related learning experience each year. These experiences include community based experiences through Credit Based on Proficiency, Work Experience, Job Shadows, various career days and student run businesses at MHS.

- 7) **All students will attend school and graduate from high school with a Post-high school plan.**

Increasing graduation rates greater than or equal to 68.1%:

Marshfield High School’s graduation rate fell from 78.1% in 04-05 to 75.1% in 05-06. The school increased its Hispanic graduation rate from 58.8% to 73.3% while American

Indian rate fell from 85% to 75%. Programs in place to increase the Hispanic rate continue to strengthen the rate for this group. The District has partnered with the Coquille and the Confederated Tribes to put after school tutoring programs in place to address the American Indian graduation rate. While students with disability graduation rates increased from 51.4% to 57.1%, this is an area of concern for the District since Modified Diplomas count as a drop out for this population. MHS is reviewing and revamping its high school special education delivery model to support students taking the general curriculum in an attempt to reduce the number of Modified Diploma students. Credit recovery options using Odysseyware are available to high school special education students.

Destination, the alternative program high school, and Resource Link, an on-line Charter School; continue to struggle with graduation rates for all populations of students. Destinations revised the way students earn credits and continue to review its curriculum and attendance policies in order to address this deficit.

Table 21

Graduation Rate				
2005-06	Marshfield	Destinations	Resource Link	State Target
All Students	75.10%	29.00%	13.60%	68.10%
Economically Disadvantaged	74.20%	40.00%	20.00%	
Limited English Proficient	0.00%		no data	
Students with Disability	57.10%	17.60%	33.30%	
Asian/Pacific Islander	100.00%		0.00%	
Black (not of Hispanic origin)	33.30%	0.00%	100.00%	
Hispanic origin	73.30%	0.00%	no data	
American Indian/Alaska native	75.00%	50.00%	33.30%	
White (not of Hispanic origin)	75.80%	32.50%	0.00%	
Multi-Racial/Multi-Ethnic	0.00%	20.00%	no data	
2004-05	Marshfield	Destinations	Resource Link	State Target
All Students	78.10%	40.20%	0.00%	68.10%
Economically Disadvantaged	98.30%	50.00%	no data	
Limited English Proficient	0.00%	0.00%	no data	
Students with Disability	51.40%	33.30%	no data	
Asian/Pacific Islander	100.00%	no data	no data	
Black (not of Hispanic origin)	0.00%	no data	no data	
Hispanic origin	58.80%	0.00%	no data	
American Indian/Alaska native	85.00%	50.00%	0.00%	
White (not of Hispanic origin)	83.70%	39.00%	0.00%	
Multi-Racial/Multi-Ethnic	no data	no data	no data	

Attendance rate greater than or equal to 92%:

All elementary, intermediate and middle schools had attendance rates above the 92% target. Marshfield's was slightly lower than the target while Destinations was well below the target and Resource Link Charter School was well above the target. Marshfield and Resource Link improved their attendance rate over the 2005-06 school year as did nearly every school except Destinations. The Destinations staff has aggressively addressed the attendance issue at the school and has made changes to curriculum and staffing to address the problem as well as decreasing the number of students attending the program to allow for individual interventions with each student.

Table 22

Attendance Rate (%)		
School	2006/07	2005/06
Blossom Gulch	93.5	93.9
Bunker Hill	94.3	93.8
Madison	93.4	93
Millicoma	93.8	93.9
Sunset Middle	93.3	92.6
Marshfield High	90.9	89.6
Destinations Academy	63.4	65.7
Resource Link Charter	95.6	93.8

Increased partnerships and articulation between secondary and post secondary institutions:

Marshfield High School was part of a College Careers Transition Initiative (CCTI) grant with Southwestern Community College for 3 of the grants' 5 year cycle from 2004-2007. The goals of the grant were 1) to articulate IT and manufacturing courses with SWOCC, 2) begin exploring other career pathway areas to articulate between the high school and college and 3) reduce the number of student entering college who needed remediation prior to entering the college curriculum. The benefits of this partnership were many: 1) MHS sophomores take the college placement test in the spring with results reported to students, parents and counselors to plan courses for grades 11 and 12; 2) increased articulation agreements between SWOCC and MHS; 3) developing a career pathways model for the MHS course forecaster; 4) increased communication between high school and college instructors regarding curriculum and placement tests.

As a result of the articulation agreements and exploring possibilities for further 2 + 2 agreements, MHS has taken a serious look at its hiring practices and aggressively recruits teachers who have a Masters degree in their subject so more courses can be offered on the MHS campus for college credit. These strategies, coupled with a more proactive relationship with SWOCC as a result of the CCTI grant, is reflected in the following statistics: MHS Class of 2007 earned 621.5 credits at SWOCC while still in high school compared to 351 for the Class of 2006 and 87.5 for the Class of 2005.

Increased percentage of students pursuing post-secondary studies:

Attendance rates at the local community college have increased in each of the last 3 years: 130 graduates enrolled at SWOCC in the fall of 2007 compared to 117 for the class of 2006 and 92 for the class of 2005. According to Gear Up statistics for Marshfield, in 2005 53% of graduates enrolled in post-secondary education while 58% of the class of 2006 did so. The largest percentage both years (71% and 91%) enrolled in community college programs while 29% in 2005 and 9% in 2006 enrolled in 4-year institutions.

According to Oregon University System Entering Freshman Profile, the number of MHS graduates entering 4-year state institutions has increased each year and the persistence rate for those students equals or is higher than the state for each of those years.

Increased percentage of students entering post secondary without need for remediation:

An increased focus on taking the community college placement test as a sophomore so students have an idea of their college placement skill level has resulted in an increased number of seniors taking the placement test. While the number of students taking the test as seniors has increased by nearly 40% since 2005, the number of students whose tests indicate remediation might be needed has increased by 4% in math, 14% in writing and 26% in reading. MHS English department (and grades 5-8) selected research-based instructional materials in writing and reading designed to decrease this need. MHS is currently designing new course work to address this deficiency. The math department is currently looking at instructional practices and reading the research on instructional strategies, course design and materials in preparation for the 2009 adoption.

Marshfield participated in a College Career Transitions Initiative grant with SWOCC whose main goal was to reduce the number of student needed remediation for college courses. As a result of the CCTI grant, high school and college faculty met to discuss curriculum in math and writing. MHS math department added a math lab for remediation as a result and is continuing to look at curriculum and instructional materials to ensure that students are ready to take the general curriculum at college. The English departments also met and continue to discuss the disconnect between the college's placement test for writing and what it actually measures—grammar. The college faculty believes that a high school student whose state writing performance scores are 4 on all strands will have no difficulty earning at least a C+ in Wr121. While this would be an excellent Action Research project, no movement has been made to accept these scores in lieu of the college placement scores.

According to OUS Entering Freshman Profile, Marshfield graduates from 2003 and 2004 had higher SAT scores than the state but were slightly lower in 2005. The high school and overall college GPA for MHS students was higher than state average for graduates in 2003-05 who enrolled in the 4-year public university system. The overall math and English Comp GPA for MHS graduates was higher or equal to state averages.

Increased percentage of students completing post secondary degree or certification:

We have no solid data at this time. MHS will explore commercial software programs that survey and keep track of graduates.

Decreased Dropout rates focus: School Report Card student behavior ratings of Satisfactory or better.

The MHS, Destinations and Resource Link dropout rates all have increased the past three years and are above the state average. This is an area of concern and one that all three schools will focus on to determine reasons and develop strategies to decrease the rate. MHS has a state report card rating for student behavior of Satisfactory. Destinations and Resource Link are rated Unacceptable in this area.

MHS implemented an Interdisciplinary Team Model to keep track of 9th grade attendance and grades. A mandatory study skills class is in place for 2007-08 for all 9th graders. The IDT review grades and attendance every 6 weeks and meets with parents and students who are deficient to develop a success plan. Destinations Academy staff is

analyzing attendance data monthly and having meetings with students and appropriate adults to address the attendance issue.

Table 23

Dropout Rate				
	Marshfield	Destinations	Resource Link	State
2005/06	5.90%	53.60%	23.40%	4.10%
2004/05	5.50%	43.00%	13.60%	4.20%
2003/04	4.00%	19.40%	16.70%	4.60%
2002/03	4.60%	13.40%	NA	4.40%
2001/02	4.30%	7.30%	NA	4.90%

8) All students will have access to and develop proficiency in utilizing technology to improve their academic achievement.

Improved student academic achievement in English/language arts, mathematics, science, social sciences, the arts and second languages (world languages) through the use of technology:

The district has made a steady investment in instructional technology using both general fund and grant dollars. CBPS has 1,328 networked computers, 795 of which are student desktops and laptops. All schools are wireless which allows maximum use of lap tops, Smart Boards and instructional media carts in classrooms.

Students in grades 5-12 who are reading below grade level receive instruction using Scholastic Read 180. Odysseyware is used at Destinations and Resource Link for credit recovery and instruction for courses not offered in the alternative setting and for all high school special education students. In the spring of 2008, elementary students will be piloting an on-line writing curriculum, Step Up to Writing. Currently one elementary school is piloting an on-line writing program I Can Write Online. Each school uses a variety of tutorial and software supplemental to the curriculum. Having 15 - 30 lap tops available in each elementary, 36 at the intermediate school, 15 at the middle school, and 90 at the high school makes it possible to use technology to differentiate instruction and engage students. Having this technology available also makes it possible for students to use technology as a tool in their classes. They research, write, produce a variety of products, take virtual field trips, and enhance their course of study using technology.

The district has an assistive technology team lead by a special education teacher who serves as an assistive technology specialist one day a week and sits on the state assistive technology team. Funding for training and acquisition of assistive technology has increased each year using district and IDEA funds. Each school at grades 5-12 has one or more portable technology carts that allow students access to scanning of text for voice out put, reader pens and voice recognition technology.

Demonstrate significant increase of student access to technology for the purpose of supporting academic achievement:

In 2002, the District received a competitive IID grant and used this money to begin an acquisition of instructional technology and develop the training needed to implement its

usage. Each year since then, the District has continued to purchase instructional technology and software with general fund and grant dollars. Booster Clubs at each school have also invested in their respective buildings' instructional technology. Prior to 2002 date all that was available to students were computers and a few AlphaSmarts in special education.

Since 2002, the District has purchased 22 Smart Boards each equipped with a teaching station featuring a computer, an Elmo document projector, a data projector, and DVD/VHS player; 40 digital cameras; 40 hand-held GPS units; 8 digital microscopes to be used with the SmartBoard or instructional media cart; 68 instructional media carts outfitted with wireless keyboard and mouse, AverVision document projectors, data projector, DVD/VHS player; 247 AlphaSmarts; 14 laptop carts with 15 per cart; 127 computers for labs; a variety of Vernier science probes for the middle and high schools; and various software and licenses for web based programs or for loading on our network. This robust stable of instructional technology continues to grow allowing teachers and students to access the world outside the classroom, explore supplements to curriculum and develop 21st century skills.

Assist every student – regardless of race, ethnicity, income, geographical location, or disability – in becoming technologically literate by the end of eighth grade:

The District's technology curriculum is based on the ISTE standards. The technology K-8 curriculum culminates in a trimester of technology at both 7th and 8th grades to provide students with a solid background to enter the IT programs at MHS if they choose. The MHS program is articulated through 2 + 2 agreements with SWOCC. The District continues to focus training and resources on the K-6 instructional technology program. It is an area of focus since teachers at this level have varying degrees of comfort using technology as a seamless part of their instructional practice as indicated by the results of the professional needs survey. Instructional technology resources and training are distributed equally to schools. Schools with higher poverty are targeted with additional training on how to use the technology to target identified academic needs of students. This issue was discussed at length with the Title I elementary principals at the June, 2007 meeting and each has plans in place to address teacher training. The discussion was based on the results of the professional development and professional practice needs assessment administered to all staff in January of 2007.

Integrate technology into curriculum and instruction through high quality professional development based on relevant research and Oregon's Instructional Technology Common Curriculum Goals:

The CBPS offers high quality research-based professional development in technology each year. Since 2002, the District has development and maintained a local Instructional Technology Cadre. The District invests IID, V and general fund dollars in the professional development of this trainer cadre. Their goal is to further their own knowledge so they can train and build capacity among staff to integrate instructional technology into their teaching. The Tech Cadre trainers meet monthly to discuss research-based practices, review staff and student surveys, develop training based on their research, and the surveys and make provisions for their own training. This group also facilitates a group of Student Tech Cadets in the schools to further develop a group

of student trainers who can assist staff in trouble shooting equipment and to assist teachers with student technology use.

Each month special education teachers receive professional development in assistive technology as part of the monthly staff meeting. The assistive technology team has created a stakeholders group with representative from SWOCC, the school board, staff and various community partners.

Teachers, administrators and instructional assistants complete a self-assessment and professional development survey annually. This provides the basis for the Tech Cadre's own professional development and subsequent training of staff.

Documented professional development to support teachers in integrating technology into instructional program:

Conferences Attended:

- October 2006 & 2007: Technology Educators of Oregon - Tom Hull attended and debriefed w/ CTE team
- February 2007: ITSC in Portland - Sharon Muffett, Peggy Thornton, Fred Hunt (members of Tech Cadre)
- April 2007: OACTE in Salishan – CTE Team: Michelle Inskeep, Catherine Hampton, Fred Hunt, Tom Hull, Steve Walker, Jesse Ainsworth, Gary Haliski, Travis Howard, Duella Scott-Hull
- May 2007: Enhanced and Advanced SmartBoard teaching techniques—Sharon Muffett
- June 2007 - Microsoft Excel Basics & Microsoft Excel Beyond Basics in Eugene – Sharon Muffett, Peggy Thornton, & Peggy Ahlgrim (Tech Cadre members) & Shelley Fuller
- October 2007 - NSBA T & L Conference - Duella Scott-Hull, Chad Putman, Peggy Thornton, Sharon Muffett, Jason Goodson, Fred Hunt (members of Tech Cadre)

Trainings Provided:

- Sept. 2006: MIM training for Millicoma staff pilot and district level staff by Douglas ESD staff
- 2006-07 School Year: Smart Board, Instructional Media Cart, United Streaming, Alpha Smart, Laptop cart use, GPS, digital camera and various software trainings throughout the schools
- 2006-07 School Year: Classroom lesson design and demonstration use for the technology mentioned in previous entry
- 2005-07 School Year: Web Page Design, Inspiration for Reading and Writing, Outlook basics and advanced, Excel for the classroom, Web Quest, web site exploration and use in lesson design
- Sept. 2007: Excel class taught to secretaries by Peggy Ahlgrim & Shelley Fuller
- Sept. 2007: Instructional Media cart & United Streaming training taught by Sharon Muffett at Millicoma & MHS
- Sept. 2007: Lap top cart use taught by Sharon Muffett at Millicoma & MHS
- Oct. 2007: Mastery in Motion training for secretaries, department heads or team leaders from each building and all administrators by Michael Reeves, MIM developer.
- Oct. 2007: Mastery in Motion training by Sharon Muffett at Millicoma & MHS

Sept. & Oct. 2007: United Streaming, Alpha Smart, digital camera, GPS Laptop. Smart Board, various software at Blossom by various Tech Cadre members and Blossom staff
Oct. 2007: Continued MIM training at all schools by Millicoma pilot group

Trainings Planned:

The Tech Cadre will meet in November to debrief the T + L Conference and plan professional development for the 2008 school year. Several members attended a workshop *50 Ways to Use United Streaming* and plan to offer a series of enhancement trainings for both the new and experienced United Streaming User. Three members have focused on Smart Board use training at recent conferences and plan to design lessons and deliver training for Smart Board users. Cadre members are also experienced Inspiration users and plan a series of workshops to address vocabulary and writing instruction using Inspiration. The staff survey indicated a need for training on the use of Excel and Word to teach various curriculums. Since our student and staff technology standards are based on those endorsed by ISTE and NETS, we plan to attend the national conference in June in San Antonio. We last attended this in 2003 and it was the catalyst for our instructional technology implementation and subsequent revisions, and the impetus needed to launch the District's Instructional Tech Cadre of trainers.

61% of staff reported the use of instructional technology has positively impacted their teaching while 33% stated that it has had a "somewhat positive" impact on their teaching. Only 6% reported no impact on teaching. In addition, 55% reported their use of instructional technology has positively impacted student learning while 37% reported that it had a "somewhat positive" impact on student learning. Only 8% reported no impact. Fifty-six of those responding provided anecdotal comments regarding these two items.

The 2007 needs assessment indicates that 52% of respondents desire training on use of Smart Boards; 44% on use of Instructional Media Carts; 51% on use of laptop carts; 42% on GPS handhelds; 41% on use of document projectors (AverVision or Elmo). Training desired on other technology in our classrooms was rated less than 40%; however, that represents nearly 50 people. The needs assessment indicated that 42% desire training on Excel; 44% on Publisher; 41% on Access; 47% on web page design; 37% United Streaming, and 36% on finding and using Internet sites. Other software and internet applications received ratings of less than 35%, but that represents nearly 40 people. In addition, we have new staff who have yet to be surveyed.

The survey was taken on Survey Monkey so the disaggregation of the data was provided by grade level bands (i.e. K-2 etc.), content areas for grade 7-12, areas of specialization (i.e. nurse, counselor etc.) Building principals, building planning teams and the Tech Cadre trainers all studied the data to inform planning for 2007-08. A follow-up survey will be done in January, 2008.

9) Career and Technical Education (CTE) students will meet or exceed levels of performance on the Perkins core indicators.

The percentage of CTE students meeting academic attainment in reading, writing, mathematics: Even though the percentage has decreased steadily the past three years, CTE students at Marshfield have exceeded the plan target each of the past three years for reading. MHS CTE students have exceeded the plan target the past three years for

writing and the percentage of students exceeding the standards has increased steadily. They have also exceeded the plan target for math and have held steady the past two years after a decrease from 2005 to 2006. MHS data continues to exceed or equal regional and state percentages in most reporting categories.

The percentage of CTE students meeting technical skill attainment: CTE students have exceeded the target each of the past three years while dropping for 2006-07 and barely meeting the target.

The percentage of CTE students graduating from high school: CTE student graduation rate was below the plan in 2005, above the target in 2006 and slightly below for 2007. This does not reflect the trend for the general population. CTE students graduate at a higher rate than the entire student population at Marshfield.

The percentage of CTE graduates continuing with post-secondary education or entering employment: Marshfield students have held steady in this category at nearly 92% and exceed the state plan targets.

The percentage of CTE students completing a program of study that is nontraditional for their gender: Marshfield students exceeded the target until 2006-07 when the percentage in this category dropped 5.5%. The 87.23% rate is still above the rate for the region but below the state level.

This data will be analyzed in more detail for the annual Perkins report and will be on file at ODE and in the CBPS curriculum office after November 30, 2007.

Table 24

PTE Concentrator Performance Measures Coos Bay SD 9 - All Concentrators	Plan Actual	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Meet or exceeded the 10 grade reading proficiency standards	Plan	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
	Actual	75.34%	67.59%	66.51%
Meet or exceeded the 10 grade writing proficiency standards	Plan	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%
	Actual	54.90%	59.62%	64.76%
Meet or exceeded the 10th grade math proficiency standards	Plan	49.00%	49.00%	49.00%
	Actual	63.51%	59.46%	59.52%
Met the technical skills core indicator for your district/region/alliance	Plan	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
	Actual	98.97%	100%	95.52%
Student attainment of high school diploma or recognized equivalent	Plan	92.60%	91.56%	91.56%
	Actual	90.43%	95.29%	90.55%
Placement in postsecondary education, advanced training or employment, one year after completion Based on previous year's senior class	Plan	85%	89.96%	91.34%
	Actual	No data	91.28%	91.94%
Participation of secondary students in programs which are non-traditional for their gender	Plan	50.00%	55.19%	55.90%
	Actual	71.67%	56.07%	49.09%
Attainment of a high school diploma or recognized equivalent for students participating in programs that are nontraditional for their gender	Plan	91.30%	88.34%	88.47%
	Actual	94.35%	93.48%	87.23%

2006-07 Student Enrollment		PTE Students	All Students	Percent
0.50 or more credits				
All Students		807	1193	67.60%
Special Programs - Disadvantage & Disabled		477	807	59.10%
Non-Traditional		268	807	33.20%
Tech-Prep		480	807	59.40%
2006-07 Students meeting technical skills standards				PTE % Met Standard
All Students				96%
Special Programs - Disadvantage & Disabled				94%
Non-Traditional				96%
Tech-Prep				95%
2006-07 PTE Graduation Rates				PTE % Met Standard
All Students				91%
Special Programs - Disadvantage & Disabled				79%
Non-Traditional				87%
Tech-Prep				92%

- 10) *All districts will demonstrate progress towards closing the achievement gap between high-and low- performing children, especially the achievement gaps between minority and non-minority students, and between disadvantaged children and their more advantaged peers, so that student performance cannot be predicted by ethnicity, gender, family income, disabling condition or other socio-economic classification.*

See Table 7

Coos Bay Public Schools has identified an achievement gap between all students and the economically disadvantaged. This gap is larger at the middle and high school level than at the elementary level. The gap in ELA at the elementary level is 2.63% compared to 7.29% at the middle and 6.96% at high school. This gap has decreased in each of the past three years. The discrepancy in math for this sub population at the elementary level is 2.53% and 7.67% at the middle and 7.8% at high school. This represents a very slight increase at the elementary, a decrease at the middle and a substantial increase at the high school. An achievement gap also exists between students with disabilities and all students. At the elementary and middle levels the gap increased in ELA significantly while decreasing significantly at the high school. The gap in math decreased for students with disabilities at the elementary while increasing for both middle and high school. It is interesting to note that the past two years the graduation rate for economically disadvantaged equaled or exceed that of all students. [See Table 21]

Multiple programs and strategies have been employed to address these achievement gaps; and building-level planning committees and district teams continue to research and implement strategies to decrease these noted gaps. Math curriculum and instructional strategies are being researched for K-12 in preparation for the 2009 instructional materials adoption. The instructional materials adopted for grades 5-12 language arts, and in place for the 2008 school year, were selected because of their strong research-

based instructional strategies and curriculum. K-4 is piloting three programs this year with materials to be in place for the 2009 school year. Read 180 is in place for grades 5-12 to address identified deficiencies in Title I and special education students at grades 5-8; and freshman and sophomore students identified as being no more than two years below grade level reading at MHS; and any student significantly below grade level at Destinations Academy. The Rewards program based on the work of Anita Archer is used in grades 5-12 to supplement curriculum in reading for special education students. Read Well is used to identify and address deficiencies K-4. The middle school has implemented homework help, study skills and math facts program in advisory each day as well as a noon study hall. The high school is in its second year of an advisory program and added a study help program one hour per week this year to. MHS is developing new math and language arts courses designed to address the gaps in achievement, and Destinations is revising curriculum to an interdisciplinary and project-based approach to teaching and learning.

Prompt 2: Describe the district’s strategies and programs that enabled your district to make progress against the 10 Oregon Education Performance Standards as explained in response to Prompt 1. (Please use the Standards for District Success to guide the discussion here.)

Standard 1 Curriculum:

- **1.1/ 1.2 / 1.6** The District reviews its K – 12 curriculums for two content areas each year to be sure they are aligned with state common curriculum goals and content standards. The focus is on the content areas up for current instructional materials adoption and the upcoming adoption. Additionally, beginning in 07 – 08 all core content curriculums will be reviewed to be sure that all “essential” curriculum is taught and assessed. Power Standards and Common Formative Assessments are the focus of this work. All CTE programs’ curriculum is reviewed annually with Advisory Committees.
- **1.3/1.4/1.5** The District facilitates K-12 vertical and horizontal curriculum discussions and 9-14 discussions. The process will be strengthened by identifying Power Standards and developing and implementing Common Formative Assessments based on these standards. This will address curricular gaps and data needed to make instructional decisions.
- **1.7** The District offers multiple options for learning outside the traditional structure of schools. Grades 4-12 have an option to an on line district-sponsored Charter School. An alternative learning high school is also available. Marshfield offers a work-based learning environment at CE2, has multiple 2+2 and College Now courses articulated with SWOCC as well as Advanced Placement and credit recovery options in night school.
- **1.8** Transition activities are carefully planned for pre-K to Kindergarten, 4th to 5th grade, 6th to 7th grade, 8th to 9th grade, and 12th to post secondary options. Elementary staff meets with Head Start and all preschools to ensure smooth transition into Kindergarten. Parent outreach includes Kindergarten Round-Up, parent meetings for each of the transition years at 5th, 7th and 9th grades, and a Senior Parent Night. Also, students visit the school to which they are transitioning in the spring and students in the grade to which they will be transitioning come to the feeder schools for small group discussions/question-answer sessions about the transition. Additional visits and collaboration is made for special needs students transitioning between buildings at each level. A field day for all 4th graders transitioning to 5th grade at

Millicoma is led by current 5th grade students. Freshmen have an orientation day on campus in the fall organized by upperclassmen and faculty advisors.

- **1.9** All students participate in a variety of career related learning experiences each year. The School to Work Specialist works with students who seek additional CRLE opportunities through internships, job shadows, volunteer activities or formal work experience.
- **1.10** Students have access to pathway framework documents to plan their 4 and 6 year educational plan. These are listed in the MHS forecaster. CTE programs have national or state skills sets as their foundation when programs come due for approval.

Standard 2 Instruction

- **2.1/2.2** The district has provided professional development in content area reading strategies for the middle school and high school staff to teach key instructional strategies that are effective with all students. K-8 staffs have been trained on effective writing across the curriculum strategies. K-8 staffs have implemented a standards-based mathematics curriculum. High school focus will be on finding research-based instructional materials and strategies to address the poor math performance at the high school level. These literacy strategies will be a continued focus.
- The district has provided training opportunities for GLAD and SIOP and differentiated instruction. This is a continual area of focus.
- **2.4** The district has offered several professional development opportunities in the effective integration of technology into instruction. A large number of staff uses Smartboards, Instructional Media carts, digital cameras, GPS units, Vernier science probes, lap tops, and/or Alpha Smarts as part of their instructional program. This is a continued area of focus particularly at the elementary.
- **2.5** The district adopts new instructional materials according to the state schedule each year. All special programs are included in the curriculum alignment and adoption cycles. Only materials or programs with a strong research base are considered.
- **2.6** The elementary use a variety of assessments that accompany their reading and math instructional materials. This is an area of focus K-12 as we work on common formative assessments and implement new IDEA requirements.
- **2.7** All buildings have a counselor and/or access to mental health services. The Intermediate School (5/6) is currently working on implementing a Mental Health program with the assistance of ODE through a Healthy Kids Learn Better Grant. Grades 7-12 have an advisory program that supplements the guidance department's work on educational plans. Aspire is active at the 9-12 level. The district has a K-12 Guidance and Counseling Plan.
- **2.8** Staff continually updates content and pedagogy through courses and trainings. The district has a tuition reimbursement fund and professional development to address identified needs in this area.
- **2.9** Cultural Competency is a constant focus in our schools. TSPC requires competence at licensure and the district continues to offer training on locally-relevant issues. We have a continued focus on the work of Ruby Payne and Donna Beagle around the culture of poverty and on the growing Latino community through our ELL program.

- **2.10** The district sponsors a mentor program with all new certified staff and administrators being assigned a mentor. Building administrators serve as mentors for newly hired classified staff.
- **2.11** All district staff work on various building or district committees where data is used to inform program and instructional goals and decisions. Some of the more robust teams are PBS, Title I, CTE/Perkins, student support teams, IEP teams and district and building grade level and content area curriculum teams. With ready access to student data on the teacher desk top with the use of Mastery in Motion, we will revive the district Assessment Cadre.
- **2.12/2.13** The district uses the data gathered from student performance and from staff professional needs surveys to help determine professional development activities. All professional development focuses on effective instructional strategies to improve academic achievement through all aspects of the educational setting.
- The district has an evaluation plan focused on staff proficiency. It is currently under revision by a district team.

Standard 3 District and School Culture and Norm

The Coos Bay Schools are committed to providing all students learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

- **3.1/3.3** The District’s mission is “Education for All Whatever It Takes.” All programs, policies and decisions support this mission. Positive Behavior Support programs are implemented district wide. Millicoma Intermediate and Sunset Middle Schools have quarterly assemblies to address student expectations.
- **3.2** The transitions are detailed in Compliance Section 5 of this CIP. Transitions for students Pre-K through post secondary are in place and reviewed.
- **3.4/3.7** All schools have successful and effective behavior systems in place. Counselors are in all schools and a School Resource Officer at the middle school/high school. Each school is a PBS school with an active team. The Title One supervisor reviews current Safe and Drug Free plans with all school district administration and requests input to update or revise plan yearly.
- **3.5** Each school has a guidance program and the district has a K-12 Guidance and Counseling Plan. Grade 7-12 staff has implemented an advisory program.
- **3.6/3.7** All program decisions are based on data and solutions are research-based. A variety of building level and district committees review data, develop plans and strategies and implement research-based solutions that inform the work outlined in this CIP.
- **3.8/3.9** All professional development is based on a building and/or district plan that was developed in a collaborative data-based setting. Professional development takes place in a collaborative setting with staff attending as a team and returning to share with appropriate grade, building, content or district teams. All focus is on student learning and/or an environment that fosters student achievement.
- **3.10** The high school and middle school have implemented a successful advisory program, which assigns each student to a staff member for four years. As a result, most students develop a significant relationship with at least one adult in the school environment.

Standard 4 Family and School Engagement

- **4.1** Each Coos Bay school has an established site council and parents are represented on these councils. The site councils review parent surveys each year to develop and revise parent involvement plans. Site council meeting minutes are posted on each school's web page. The District's parent involvement coordinator is available to assist schools with plans and providing resources to include in the plans. The Superintendent's Advisory Council is made up of parents from each building and meets every other month.
- **4.2** Each school posts upcoming school events for families on their individual school websites. Web sites can be accessed through the Coos Bay Public Schools web page: www.coos-bay.k12.or.us.
- **4.3/4.5/ 4.6** Activities include parenting classes using Second Step curriculum, help with homework nights, Open Houses or Fall Orientations, weekly parent newsletters, parent conferences, science night, community garden located at Madison Elementary. Child care and transportation are offered to families in need for all activities. Translation services are also provided. The District office is located centrally for all school buildings to access. The parent lending library, the Homeless Liaison and Parent Involvement Coordinator are located at this site. These positions support all students and families in the district.
- **4.4/4.5** The Coos Bay administrators meet monthly as a group in addition to monthly as sub groups (elementary and secondary). Principals share the information at staff meetings and site council meetings as the team develops the plan. The district has on-going contact/consultation with the University of Oregon and Southwestern Oregon Community College. At the building level, principals meet and consult with the Department of Human Services, Coos County Health Department, Oregon State Extension Office, Head Start Advisory Council and the Hispanic Outreach program in an effort to coordinate with these agencies to help support parent involvement. District level administrators and support staff participate in the following organizations: Coastline, Mental Health, Community Connections and the Homeless Council. Information and opportunities gained through consultation and collaboration is disseminated at administration meetings and board meetings.
- **4.4/4.1** The schools send out yearly surveys to parents requesting input on parent involvement and school activities. The data is reviewed at site council meetings with and the results being used to create a parent involvement plan. The plan is sent to all parents and made available upon request.
- **4.4/4.5** Each Career and Technical Education program has an active community & business advisory committee. The members of this committee not only advise on program and curriculum design, but also are program advocates donating time and resources to make these programs successful.

Standard 5 Leadership

- **5.1/5.2 / 5.5 / 5.6** Each building's principal and/or assistant together with its staff (certified and classified) annually develop/update a School Improvement Plan as well as Title I plan and PBS plans based on assessment data, needs surveys, and public input. District level administrators facilitate planning discussions that equitably allocate resources to achieve common goals.
- **5.3/5.7** Principals manage discretionary and other building budgets to ensure implementation of all building level goals. Safety committees meet monthly along with other instructional and behavioral teams. District level administrators manage and monitor resources to ensure achievement of common district goals.

- **5.4** All district administrators focus on understanding and meeting the needs of all populations in the district.
- **5.8** General fund professional development dollars and grant dollars are allocated equitably to achieve common district goals. Careful planning merges various funding streams and resources to ensure equitable support for common goals.

Standard 6 Integrated Systems and Structures

- **6.1 / 6.4** Each year District and building level teams review data and set academic and student behavioral goals as part of a continuous improvement process.
- **6.2** All professional development and instructional practices are based on current research as well as student achievement and/or behavioral data.
- **6.3** Grade level and content area teams meet within a building and across the district both vertically and horizontally to examine student work and plan instructional interventions.
- **6.5** Building level teams meet monthly to examine progress toward goals and district teams meet quarterly. Please see Section H for a detailed account of this process.
- **6.6** A system is in place to share data from OSAT, work samples and building level assessments to make informed instructional decisions. Mastery in Motion allows for immediate disaggregation of achievement data for just-in-time instructional planning. We recognize the need to develop and use common assessments across the district.
- **6.10** See Compliance Section 3 for detailed discussion of funds and resource allocations.

Prompt 3: Discuss the root causes that contributed to the district not attaining one or more of the 2005-07 CIP goals described in Prompt 1 and identification of new priority concerns as identified in Prompt 1. (Use the appropriate Standards of District Success to guide the discussion to identify ‘root causes’ here.)

- One area that needs work is identifying student negative behaviors and developing PBS and other programs and strategies to address the behaviors. We need a continued focus on training new staff in PBS and in agreeing upon a uniform data collection system to track student behaviors. Currently two different systems are used and there is not consistency among buildings as to what data is entered into which system—eSIS or SWIS.
- While progress was made, we need a continued focus on high school improvement regarding graduation data, developing systems of support for students academically and for all aspects of health and well being. Progress has been made by revising the high school schedule, instituting an advisory program, focusing school wide support on mental health and wellness issues and revising curriculum to meet graduation requirements through the lens of rigor, relevance and relationships. While Destinations Academy hired a half-time counselor and is revising curriculum and closely monitoring attendance, continued work needs to be done in these area. This is a large undertaking and is a continuous, yet incremental, process. Slow systems changes, new staff and multiple changes of leadership are factors that have impacted the progress on this goal.
- Progress is being made on articulating curriculum K-14. All instructional materials are aligned to state standards as they are adopted. We are still in process of identifying gaps in curriculum alignment. We continue to focus on identifying power standards with a

focus toward common assessments. Progress continues to be made toward full integration of technology into all teachers' instructional practice. Both goals are a capacity issue. Staff and building principals change and need to be trained. Mapping and aligning curriculum to standards is a continual process. Time is the resource in shortest commodity. Leadership is looking at one aspect of the PLC work—to identify what we can stop doing in order to do what matters most.

- Marshfield and Destinations staff continue to work with community college staff and counselors continue to work with four year institutions, community college, trade and technical and other post secondary options to make the 9-14 transition seamless. 2008-09 will be the first year a course forecaster with a pathways model is used at MHS. Work still needs to be done on credit recovery options. Slow systems changes, new staff and multiple changes of leadership are factors that have impacted the progress on this goal.
- Progress is made, but all schools still do not meet AYP. Gap analysis data shows students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students to make progress at slower rates than all students. Graduation rates for students with disabilities continue to be a challenge. Secondary math scores indicate a need for curricular and instructional revisions. K-12 reading and writing are a continued focus although progress is noted in each area. The challenges have been a math alignment issue. K-8 have been using a standards-based curriculum the past four years while the high school continues to offer traditional courses and use textbooks focused on a non-integrated approach. Training staff to focus on reading and writing across the content area is both a capacity and a staff turnover issue.
- While we are closing the gap, we still have non-highly qualified staff and, in some instances, continue to hire non-highly qualified staff. Finding highly qualified special education, math, science and reading instructors continues to be a challenge in our area.
- We have not made distance learning a main-stream option. The focus has been on working on career pathways, personal education plans, graduation requirements and other high school reform issues. It is again a capacity issue. As other programs fall into place, this goal will move forward. We have expanded our College Now and 2 + 2 options rather than add additional AP courses because our student data shows students prefer to enroll in courses with guaranteed credit if they pass the class rather than in courses that require an expensive summative test with no guarantee of credit. Our data indicates that only 30% of those in AP courses take the test and fewer yet receive credit at colleges.
- We continue to struggle to get staff trained in GLAD and SIOP. We have the trainer and funds available; it is getting the buy in from staff to take the training that is an issue. We need to do a better job of educating the staff about the importance of the training.

Prompt 4: Describe any areas where the district needs to collect additional data and perform further analyses to make more informed decisions.

The district has identified the need for common formative assessments based on identified power standards as one area to target for data collection. We are currently using Mastery in Motion district wide, after a year's pilot at Millicoma Intermediate, to enable teachers and administrators to have their students' achievement data readily available. This tool makes data-driven decisions at the classroom, building and district level more immediate and meaningful. However, we need to have common data points and common assessments to determine students' progress in addition to state assessment data, work samples and randomly gathered classroom assessments to facilitate immediate classroom instructional changes to accommodate the needs of all students.

Stronger data collection at Marshfield and Destinations to track graduates and determine 2 +2 and other college credits earned in high school are needed to better inform program decisions at that level.

The Coos Bay School District did not participate in the Healthy Teen Survey for the 2006/07 school year; therefore we did not have data to determine our districts current percentage rate (ODE Safe and Drug Free Targets) or the opportunity to compare those percentages to the previous year. Contact was made with the coordinator of Healthy Teen and we will participate in the survey this year and again in 2008/09.

It has recently been acknowledged that there has been inconsistency in the collection and recording of our behavioral data. Currently we have both eSIS and SWIS to record behavior referrals (both majors and minors.) Recent conversations revealed that some buildings were using both systems, while others were using one or the other, but not both. We are currently working to rectify this situation.

E. Compliance

1. Professional Development

(a & b) How stakeholders (District personnel, teachers, principals, paraprofessionals and parents) participate in the needs assessments of Title I-A, Title I-C, Title II-A, Title I-D and Title V-A (if any) professional development activities. The focus areas of the needs assessment and the subsequent professional development activities?

The staff participated in a needs assessment in January 2007 which will be repeated each year. The survey was done online via Survey Monkey and focused on specific subject (math, language arts, science, etc.) needs by grade spans, technology integration, and instructional strategies. A detailed analysis of the survey is available at the CBPS curriculum office. Since the survey was conducted on-line, the data is readily disaggregated by grade-level bands, content areas, specialties, years of experience etc. 133 of 187 licensed staff responded to the survey. The majority of staff desired professional development in writing process, reading, math, instructional strategies including differentiating instruction, and technology integration. The staff and board also identified a concern/need to reduce class size in the district. Additionally, a review of assessment data by district and building teams noted a need to improve reading K – 12, writing 4 – 12, and math 5/6 – 12.

Each building submitted a professional development plan based on their data review and survey results. Title I buildings conducted additional surveys to determine professional development goals.

(c) How stakeholders reviewed, selected, and planned activities based on the review on scientifically based research and why the activities will improve student achievement.

A district level team of administrators, building level teams of teachers, administrators and parents reviewed the professional development and OSAT test data to determine what professional activities to pursue as buildings as well as district-wide. The teams chose to pursue a professional development plan that focused on data driven decisions, power standards, common assessments, and instructional strategies focused on differentiation and on all aspects of literacy. While the goals are common, each building develops its own internal plan to meet the common goals. In addition, the district plan focuses on vertical participation in common professional development. The district will partner with SCESD in a regional effort using their School Improvement Funds (SIF) focused on accountability and leadership, data driven decisions, power standards, and instructional strategies based on the work of Doug Reeves. This will be a two year effort with eight members of the district being trained as part of a regional team and then training our own staff. The SCESD is also working with regional CTE teams to develop programs of study and integrate academics into CTE curricular content.

The professional development activities were selected after reviewing assessment data and the professional needs survey data. The literature is clear that the combination of data driven decisions, using power standards, and effective instructional strategies will increase academic performance. The professional development plan is sustained during the school year and across multiple years by having staff attend professional development as teams, observe each other implementing what was learned, reading and sharing additional research and pursuing more training as the data indicates a need. Teams regularly read ASCD, IRA, NSCD and other websites and publications to match research based training and strategies to instructional needs. The plan uses district Title IA, Title IIA, IID, V, III consortium, IDEA, district general funds and the SCESD SIF funds to accomplish the long-term goals.

For detailed lists of 05-07 professional development activities see Section E. #8 under Compliance and Section H.

- (c) **How professional development activities are meeting the needs of teachers; coordinated with professional development activities under other federal, state, or local programs; classroom focused; sustained; and, aligned with academic content standards.**

The District plan reflects the common elements in each of the building's professional development plans. Title I plans and/or School Improvement Plans reflect the professional development needs of staff. All are based on student achievement data and staff professional needs surveys. The plans are revised and updated throughout the year to reflect current data which provides a focused plan with long-term goals and flexibility. All grant and district professional development funds are merged in appropriate ways to maximize the use of resources. This is detailed in Section E Compliance #3 and is referenced in multiple places in this CIP.

- (d) **Comprehensive professional development for Career and Technical Education (CTE) teachers that promotes the integration of coherent and rigorous**

academic content standards and CTE curricula. Include opportunities for academic and CTE teachers to jointly develop and implement curricula and teaching strategies. (as related to Perkins IV).

The CTE professional development is detailed in the Perkins IV one-year transition plan and in the budget narrative submitted and on file with ODE and available in the CBPS curriculum office. An overview follows:

- CTE teachers attend OACTE as a team in April and spend team time planning the upcoming year's Perkins needs. Other district funds are directed to professional development as needed.
- CTE team meets monthly beginning in August to learn instructional strategies in reading, writing and math and to develop lessons focused on the naturally occurring academic components in their programs.
- Teachers receive training to use Mastery in Motion to analyze student reading, writing and math data for each of their classes. The needs revealed here are the basis for the monthly instructional strategy and lesson design training.
- Annual review of CTE student data based on the Perkins core indicators.
- CTE teacher and math teacher participate in Math in CTE sponsored by ODE. They train the CTE team in the monthly meetings to develop math lessons.
- All new CTE teachers are assigned a 3-year mentor as per TSPC licensure requirements. This program is all professional development.
- CTE teachers visit other programs in the state on a rotating cycle so that each visits a program every other year.
- CTE teachers are included on the MHS team that attends the Superintendent's Summer Institute and in turn lead instructional strategy sessions for MHS and for CTE staff.
- Participation in various technical skills contests. This third party evaluation of student skills helps instructors revise curriculum.
- Participation in professional conferences related to program area to learn latest curricular and instructional practices.
- Building and district team's attendance at conferences and workshops focused on academics in CTE classroom and on reading and writing across the curriculum.

As with all other building and district plans, the CTE/Perkins professional development is on-going and revised based on student achievement data, the professional needs survey and advice from the advisory committees to each program.

2. Parent, Family and Community Involvement

(a) A description of the process used to involve parents in the development of the parental involvement policy (as related to NCLB, Title I-A, Section 1118).

Each Coos Bay Public school has an established site council and parents are represented on these councils. The site councils review parent surveys each year to develop and revise parent involvement plans. Site council meeting minutes are posted on school web page and also located in the offices. The parent involvement coordinator is available to

assist schools with plans and providing resources to include in the plans. Input is gathered from the Superintendent's Advisory Council at their bi-monthly meetings. This group has parent representatives from each building.

(b) A description of the parent and community involvement strategies for involving all student populations including neglected/delinquent, migrant, ELL, economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and students failing or at risk of failing to meet Oregon Standards (as related to Title IA, IC, ID, III).

The Coos Bay Public schools support parent and community involvement through a variety of activities at the school building level and at the district office. Activities include parenting classes using Second Steps curriculum, help with homework nights, Open Houses or Fall Orientations, weekly parent newsletters, parent conferences, family science and nights, community garden (located at Madison Elementary), with child care and transportation offered to families in need. ELL parents meet at a fall pot luck where they are informed of activities regarding the Title III plans and other services offered. Indian Education parents meet each trimester for a gathering and a parent meeting to provide input and review the Indian Education Plan. The district has a partnership with the Coquille and Confederated Tribes to provide an academic tutoring program.

The District office is located centrally for all school buildings to access. The parent lending library, the clothes closet, the Homeless Liaison and Parent Involvement Coordinator are all located at this site. These positions support all students and families in the district. Each school posts upcoming school events for families on the individual school websites. Web sites can be accessed through the Coos Bay Public Schools web page: www.coos-bay.k12.or.us.

(c) A description of the process used to consult with teachers, researchers, school administrators, parents, institutions of higher education and other education-related community groups in developing the parent involvement plan (as related to Title I, III, V-A).

The Coos Bay administrators meet monthly as a group in addition to monthly as sub groups (elementary and secondary). Principals share the information at staff meetings and site council meetings as the team develops the plan. The district has on-going contact/consultation with the University of Oregon and Southwestern Oregon Community College. At the building level, principals meet and consult with the Department of Human Services, Coos County Health Department, Oregon State Extension Office, Head Start Advisory Council, Oregon Youth Authority and the Hispanic Outreach program to coordinate with these agencies in order to support parent involvement. District level administrators and support staff participate in the following organizations: Coastline, Mental Health, Community Connections and the Homeless Council. Information and opportunities gained through consultation and collaboration is disseminated at administration meetings and board meetings. Site Councils, CTE Advisory Committees and the Superintendent's Advisory Council all contribute to and review the plan.

(d) A description of the provisions for systematic consultation with parents, teachers and administrators throughout the implementation and revision of the parent involvement plan (as related to Title I-A, I-C, V-A, IV-A).

Each year the parental involvement policy and plan are reviewed by building level staff and site councils. Parents are asked at the parent-teacher conferences, PTA meetings, and annual Title IA meeting for suggestions that would improve both the policy and plan. The buildings revise their plans based on the input from parents and staff. Plans and suggestions for revisions are also reviewed by the Superintendent's Advisory Committee, made up of parents from each of the 7 schools in the district. This group meets bi-monthly during the school year. The site council and building staff approve revised plans in the spring before implementing in the coming school year.

The schools send out yearly surveys to parents requesting input on parent involvement and school activities. The data is reviewed at site council meetings and the outcome of the meeting is used to create a parent involvement plan. The plan is sent to all parents and made available upon request. Surveys in many schools are being conducted on-line at open houses and conferences, and with a link to the school's web site. Parents who do not have access to internet or do not attend open houses or conferences are offered a hard copy of the survey to complete. Data is then entered by district staff. Disaggregation of data is immediate and meaningfully used.

(e) A description of how stakeholders (parents, students, teachers, representatives of business and industry, labor organizations, and representatives of special populations) are informed about the requirements and involved in the development, implementation and evaluation of CTE programs (as related to Perkins IV).

Each state approved CTE program at Marshfield has an advisory committee consisting of local business and/or industry representatives, a college and/or labor representative, a school board member, a parent, a MHS administrator and a CBPS district administrator. The committees meet twice a year to review program curriculum, state labor data, CTE student achievement data and to advise and revise programs and curriculum based on this data.

Each program is in the process of developing marketing and informational brochures for all stakeholders. Currently parents and community are kept informed about programs through local media and school district publications. Student advocates including special education case managers, MHS counselors, advisors and Aspire volunteers are informed about the CTE programs by CTE teachers and the MHS course forecaster. Some programs have awards and recognition events in the spring. Beginning in the spring of 2008, the CTE programs will have a joint Open House for community, parents, business and industry and other interested parties. Equity and equal access are insured for special populations by working closely with counselors and case managers.

See Perkins IV one year transition plan on file at ODE and at CBPS curriculum office for detailed information.

3. Coordination of Planning & Services

a) **Description of how strategies for implementing all state and federal programs will be coordinated for local efficiencies and efforts to make better use of resources:**

The District level leadership in charge of all federal programs, district instructional programs and support services, coordinate planning with stakeholder groups to see that resources are used efficiently and effectively to meet identified goals. During the continuous planning cycle this team is a resource to building level teams to identify common goals and professional development and/or instructional materials needs and to plan how to use available resources to gain maximum benefit for student achievement. [See section H for a detailed account of the process.]. There were some concerns that this combined-resources approach was not an effective method to use available resources in an equitable manner. Various stakeholder groups have been educated regarding demonstrated effectiveness of using funds collectively to achieve a common goal.

- **IDEA funds** are used to supplement curriculum, materials and on going assessments and professional development opportunities. This year Title One, evaluation teams, Student Study Teams and special education staff will be working together to address the need for progress monitoring and the new learning disability eligibility requirements. Professional development activities included in service training on Easy CBM with special education staff to assist the general educators with progress monitoring. **General fund dollars** were used to align and purchase curriculum articulated with the general education curriculum for grades 5-12 language arts and K-8 math. In 2007-08 we will do the same for K-4 and continue to align and articulate math. A combination of **Title I, IDEA, IIA and General Funds** provide the professional development.
- **Title IA funds** are used with building discretionary funds to implement supplemental programs and services to students at risk in reading, writing and math at all four of our elementary schools. **IIA funds** are used for the professional development for commonly identified K-12 goals for the middle and high schools which do not receive Title I funding, and Title I district dollars are used for K-5 professional development for the commonly identified K-12 goals along with **IIA funds**. **District General funds** supplement common professional development in these areas.
- **Title III funds** are used to support professional development for our ELL staff and building staff. **General Funds** purchased curriculum and **Title IA** pays for translations services for parents at school activities.
- **Title ID funds** are combined with general funds to provide a fulltime educational assistant to the Belloni School. The additional staff ensures staff and student safety and provides additional one to one instruction for our at risk students. **IIA and General Funds** provide professional development for staff in commonly identified goals with the district.
- **Title IIA and SIF funds** are used for K-3 class size reduction aimed at improving student achievement and decreasing problem behaviors.
- **Title IIA funds** are used in combination with **General Funds** and **Title VIB**—when the District is eligible—to provide a new teacher mentoring program aimed at retaining HQ teachers.
- **Title IIA funds** are used in conjunction with **Title I, Title V and General Funds** to provide research-based professional development for staff and

administrators on common district goals. When appropriate, **IDEA and Title III funds** are also used for professional development.

- **IIA funds** are used to support teachers attaining Highly Qualified status by paying for appropriate tests. **General Funds** pay college tuition for needed Highly Qualified courses. **Various Title and General Fund** dollars support professional development appropriate to a teacher's Highly Qualified plan.
- **IIA funds and General Funds** support attracting HQ teachers through recruitment efforts.
- **IID funds** in combination with **General Funds** and, where appropriate, **IA, IDEA and Perkins** support purchase of identified instructional technology and the professional development needed to effectively utilize the technology.
- **Title IV funds** support our building and general funds in providing surveillance equipment to assist two buildings with safety concerns.
- **Title V funds** are used for innovative education initiatives that support the District's commonly identified goals. **IIA funds** are frequently "passed through" to **Title V** to support piloting instructional interventions like Read 180, instructional technology initiatives like Student Tech Cadets and the Tech Trainer Cadre, data use and assessment training using Mastery in Motion. Each of these initiatives is partnered with appropriate **General Fund or Title IA or IDEA funds**.
- **Title X funds** are used to employ a Homeless Liaison. This position supports all students who meet the homeless definition at all of our buildings. The schools offer a variety of resources for children and families using both their building budgets and general funds. Title X funds have been used to buy a washing machine and dryer for each building; however, the building pays for soap, the utility bill and upkeep on the equipment.

b) **How will the LEA ensure migratory students receive assistance from all state and federal programs for which they are eligible (I-A, IC, X).**

The district does not have any migratory students identified at this time. Currently due to such low numbers of ELL students, the district is a member of the Lane ESD consortium.

c) **How schools will coordinate with social, health, and other public agencies and if appropriate, business to improve student achievement of all eligible students (I-D, IC, X)**

Currently a district representative participates on the Substitute Care Review Committee to provide input for at risk youth in need of an out of home placement. The homeless Liaison attends the county Homeless Council meetings and three district staff are participating in a county grant application process to address the issues around homeless and runaway youth in our county. All of these groups have representation of drug/alcohol program staff and juvenile correctional directors and staff. In addition, our district recently received grant funding to hire a mental health counselor to address the needs of students in our Responsible Behavior Development classrooms. Millicoma Intermediate recently received a HKLB grant to develop a mental health program for grades 5-6.

District staff participates in care teams with Mental Health to coordinate activities and services for students involved with the agency. Education staff at the Belloni Ranch

meets weekly with Ranch staff to plan and review student progress and coordinate transitions back to the home school district.

d) CTE program strategies for special populations including provisions for equal access, nondiscrimination and services to enable the special populations to meet or exceed levels of performance on the Perkins core indicators:

All CTE instructors are trained in instructional strategies to help **all** students engage in the learning process. Reading, writing, math and differentiation of instructional practices and curriculum are a focus of the training. Special populations is not a limited definition of only special education students. ELL, economically disadvantaged, gender, and ethnic minorities are included in the focus of instructional and inclusionary practices. All CTE teachers participate in data review and data-based decisions about curriculum and instruction for their programs. The five-year local Perkins IV plan will address these issues in detail once the recommendations of the state task force are reviewed and folded into the state Perkins IV plan.

Special populations exceeded all state targets for the past two years in all areas and in previous years have exceeded most targets. It is interesting to note that the high school diploma rate for special populations and non-traditional special populations is higher than the general population of CTE students. This is also true of technical skills attainment, non-traditional enrollment and post-secondary placement rates. It is clearly evident that these students have equal access to programs and to curriculum services that ensure their success.

4. School & District Culture

(a) A description of the LEA's performance indicators and levels for drug and violence prevention activities, including reductions in prevalence of risk factors and increase in prevalence of protective factors and levels of performance of reach performance indicator:

The Coos Bay School District currently offers a number of programs and activities to support a positive and safe school culture. Activities include: Positive Behavior System (district wide), Healthy kids Learn Better (elementary schools), First Steps and Second Steps curriculum. The district supports the Harassment Free Zone partnership with Coos County Human Rights and Eugene Schools. We also have a district-wide School Health Advisory Council and representative member at the LADPC meetings. A school Safety Resource Officer (MHS) and a School Safety Educator (Sunset), along with a Crisis Management Plan: (all buildings), and Comprehensive Counseling Program, each providing needed resources to support our students' safety. Health Education Programs provided for K-12, with supplemental activities and programs such as: Red Ribbon Week, Yellow Ribbon Assembly, Stop smoking program "This Way Out", No Name Calling Assembly, and at Sunset and Millicoma, grade level "expectation assemblies" two to three times a year.

(b) A description of how LEA will assess and publicly report progress on drug and violence prevention activities:

The district televises all the board meetings on channel 14, a public informational channel. In addition the newspaper is invited to public meetings and school activities. The Coos Bay School District releases the Healthy Teen Survey information to the local paper; however, the results printed in last year's local newspaper were incorrect.

(c) A description of how results of evaluation will be used to improve the drug and violence prevention program:

The district administration will review the current Safe and Drug Free plan to consider input to revise yearly as appropriate. Building administrators will review SWIS data reports quarterly with building staff responsible for implementation of activities. Building administrators will review SWIS data with Title Programs Coordinator to develop new goals for the district Safe and Drug Free plan. The district will continue to meet with community partners to discuss innovative, research-based programs and activities for drug and violence prevention. The PBS team will use SWIS data to develop interventions for students at the top of the pyramid.

(d) A description of the process the LEA used to annually review and update the school safety plan; crisis management plan; and alcohol, tobacco and other drug prevention plan:

The school district will participate in the Oregon healthy Teen Survey and review the results at administration meetings, staff meetings and site council meetings. The district will continue to research and implement exemplary programs to address the needs identified by our data, staff input and surveys.

5. Transitions *As evidenced by:*

(a) A description of the characteristics (learning difficulties, substance abuse, etc) of students returning to the district from programs for neglected or delinquent facilities/programs as they transition into the regular, or district operated alternative, school programs (as related to Title I-D)

The current procedures for students leaving the juvenile correction center include sending student's current transcripts and/or IEP to the home district and staff assistance with the development of a schedule for classes. A meeting to determine a safety plan is scheduled 3 weeks in advance of transition and the counselor from the Belloni Ranch follows the student for 90 days after leaving the facility. The teacher encourages visits and meetings with counselors to plan course work, schedule classes, etc. For students transitioning as an adult, the use of CIS website to help students identify skills and professions is utilized. Discussions with students about Job Corp, colleges, and trade schools are conducted. Coos Bay School District hires an educational assistant (EA) for support in the program. The EA acts as a liaison between Belloni and the transition school district.

(b) A description of activities for students transitioning from programs for neglected or delinquent facilities into the regular district program of district alternative programs including support services such as family counseling, student counseling, support for remaining drug/alcohol free, health services, etc. (as related to Title I-D)

A green book is required to track behavior, attendance and academic progress. Students have daily morning meetings with the educational assistant prior to leaving for MHS; reduced to 2-3 times a week if student shows success. Periodic surprise visits conducted by educational assistant and regular contact with between Belloni staff and public school happens via email and phone calls. Belloni Boys and girls Ranch follows students for 90 days after they leave the facility.

(c) A description of activities to transition pre school children into kindergarten programs (as related to Title I-A).

Two of the three elementary principals hold a position on the Head Start Advisory Board. The group focus is on collaboration and planning for Head Start and Early childhood Special Education students to transition into the district. Each year transition meetings are scheduled with receiving school staff (kindergarten teacher, district rep and service providers.) Children from Early Childhood Special Education services are re-evaluated to determine school age eligibility. The district holds a meeting in the spring to develop an Individual Education Plan (IEP for those students who continue to meet special education eligibility requirements. Kindergarten Round Up is held in the spring; however, Head Start classes visit elementary schools throughout the year. School district administrators and kindergarten teachers meet yearly with Head Start and ECSE teachers to discuss programs and get acquainted. The event is called the “Teachers Gathering.”

(d) A description of opportunities for secondary education students to participate in dual or concurrent enrollment programs or other ways to acquire postsecondary education credits (as related to Perkins).

The district has an articulation agreement with SWOCC that allows students to earn credits in a 2+2 program, dual concurrent enrollment programs, and an Expanded Options opportunity. These credits run the range from Welding, WR121, journalism, human biology, early childhood education and IT classes. Marshfield is currently working on agreements to articulate business, history and additional science courses with the community college and construction technology to either an apprenticeship program or one of two community colleges out of the area. In addition, MHS offers a variety of AP courses.

(e) A description of activities to assist migratory students to transition into post secondary education/training or employment (as related to Title I-C)

No students identified. Coos Bay Public Schools belongs to the Lane County ESD Title III consortium at this time. All students receive support from counselors, SWOCC staff, high school advisors and an ASPIRE volunteer program.

(f) A description of activities to assist transition into postsecondary education/training or employment.

All students meet regularly with their assigned advisor. School counselors meet with all students to formalize the next steps and refer students to appropriate resources. Special Education Case Managers meet with special education students, teachers and parents to develop appropriate transition plans. Southwestern Oregon Community College meets with all juniors and seniors to talk about post-secondary education and training available.

All sophomores take the SWOCC placement test to help plan their junior/senior years to be prepared to enter their choice of post-secondary education/training program. During the school year many colleges, trade schools, military recruiters, and others come to the high school to meet with students to explain their programs. The high school has an ASPIRE coordinator who oversees a large number of volunteers who meet with juniors and seniors to encourage/help them apply for scholarships and postsecondary programs.

Transition for students receiving a modified diploma include a referral to the Youth Transition Specialist (YTS) the third term of their junior year. Transition goals are included in the IEP and resources and services are identified in a team meeting with the student present. Referrals to Voc Rehab occur for students so barriers can be identified and removed in the work site placement. Assistance is provided to students for application to Social Security Insurance services during their freshman year of school. Collaboration with local school districts, families, and advocates led to the development of a web based resource for students and teachers. The site www.coosccr.info lists resources and links to support youth transitions for success in employment and other transitional needs. Students receiving a regular diploma complete an exit survey. The survey assists staff in identifying the students' desires after completing high school. Students also have transition goals on their IEP. The transition goals guide the staff in identifying services and supports; therefore strategies are individualized and based on needs identified by the students.

The MHS forecaster is being revised for the 2008-09 school year to reflect a Career Pathways model to assist parents and students as they begin planning for high school courses that lead to post-secondary training opportunities.

6. Private Schools

A documented Consultation Process

Multiple planning meetings are scheduled with the private school that is located in the Coos Bay district. We review the federal programs with them and work together to review the needs assessment, discuss the parameters of each Title grant program, and inform the school of its right to participate, review the complaint process and answer their questions regarding their proposed expenditures. Meeting notes are taken and a plan is developed with signatures to verify participation and agreements. For Title I services, a needs assessment includes the use of ODE income eligibility guidelines. Student's eligibility is determined with the tuition assistance application. The targeted assistance is based on a student need using curriculum based assessments and/or standardized achievement testing. An annual verification of private school consultation form is completed by the team. Evidence of evaluation for effectiveness includes grade reports and curriculum based assessments. Discussion took place at the last meeting (spring 2007) to consider using Dibels or ORF. Further discussion and implementation of an evaluation system will take place in the 2007-08 school year with the Coos Bay Title I coordinator, the district's Director of School Improvement and Christ Lutheran's director. We have an open and collaborative relationship with our private school partner. We communicate regularly by email and copies of these emails are placed along with meeting notes in our Private Schools binder.

7. Program Design

- a) **A description of career and technical education programs of study designed to meet or exceed Perkins levels of performance that includes coherent and rigorous content, aligned with challenging academic standards, and relevant career and technical content in a coordinated, non-duplicative progression of courses that align secondary education with post-secondary education to adequately prepare students to succeed education (as related to Perkins.)**

For the one-year transition plan, Marshfield is working on developing a program of study in Manufacturing Technology. South Coast ESD received a grant to assist with this work. Other local high schools and SWOCC will work to develop articulated programs.

In addition, MHS is revising curriculum in the manufacturing program and providing monthly training for all CTE instructors in relevant, research-based instructional strategies in reading and math that focus on CTE content. The manufacturing teacher and one math teacher are participating in the Math in CTE project sponsored by ODE. This content is being embedded into the manufacturing curriculum. We plan to enhance the monthly training sessions by supporting CTE teachers' participation with English and math instructors at workshops and conferences to ensure sustainability of the project as CTE teachers implement the instructional strategies and revised curriculum.

All of this is detailed in the one-year Perkins transition plan on file with ODE and in the CBPS curriculum office.

- b) **A description of career and technical education program design that is aligned or articulated with a postsecondary career and technical education program (as related to Perkins.)**

Currently Marshfield is working with SWOCC and South Coast ESD to align and articulate its state approved Manufacturing Technology program with the college program. The CBPS Perkins coordinator is participating on the state program design Task Force for Perkins IV and is attending all CTE Network monthly meetings to remain current and give feedback as the state Perkins IV plan is developed. *See the one-year Perkins IV transition plan on file with ODE and in the CBPS curriculum office.*

- c) **Description of any high quality student academic assessment and other indicators that are in addition to state assessment described in the state plan that will be used to:**

The district is in the process of identifying power standards and developing district wide common formative assessments. The administrators are obtaining and sharing information through team meetings and a monthly book club with the book selection focused on these two topics. Canby School district administrators will train the Coos Bay administrative team in the process Canby used to identify Power Standards and the process they are currently using to attach common formative assessments to those power standards.

Parents are provided information at parent conferences using Mastery in Motion reports. The State report cards are sent home in December and information is also disseminated through weekly newsletters and each building's web site.

Each elementary site uses a variety of tools to identify students at risk of reading failure including Running Records, Read Well, and work samples. An in-service presentation was held for special education staff to view Easy CBM as a tool for progress monitoring. A workshop was presented recently and follow up with staff will be occurring during department meetings. Title One School Wide Plans are reviewed by each school's Title One Team. The draft plans with identified goals are submitted to the district office for review. An ODE Title One Review Checklist is used by a district review team to ensure the plan meets compliance requirements.

F. Setting Goals—CBPS SMART goals are listed below and the action plans develop the goals in section G.

1. Coos Bay Public Schools will reduce the incidents of negative and unsafe behaviors, to meet state targets in physical fighting and smoking, by increasing staff trainings to recognize and implement effective strategies for classroom systems and individual interventions and expand supplemental curriculum to address violence and smoking prevention in our district.
2. CBPS will increase student achievement for all students to meet the 2008 and 2009 AYP targets and to close the achievement gap in reading, math and writing. State assessment scores and common formative assessments will be used to document improved learning.
3. CBPS will increase the use of Instructional Technology by classroom teachers by 25% each year 2008-10 as measured by professional needs assessment results.

The following initiatives are not necessarily reflected in a separate goal in the action plan, but are an integral part of achieving the goals. Title grant funds and district general fund dollars will continue to be used to support the following critical components of CBPS continuous improvement:

- **Highly Qualified Staff:** A continued focus on hiring and retaining highly qualified staff using IIA and general funds will result in the following: *100% of new hires will be highly qualified; *100% of elementary staff will be highly qualified; *reduce the sections of courses taught by non-highly qualified at 7-12 by 50% by the 2009 school year. [mentor program, job fairs, recruitment tools and advertising, funds for HQ tests, tuition reimbursement]
- **Instructional Leadership:** Strong, visionary instructional leadership is necessary for any major change initiatives to be implemented and successful. 100% of principals, assistant principals and central office licensed administrators will lead teams to develop power standards by the 2009 school year. 100% of administrators will attend content area conferences and/or site visits with staff. 100% will attend a conference focused on District CIP goals. The District will support sustained professional development for administrators and identified teacher leaders in leadership for learning. [attendance at academic-focused training with teaching staff; training to lead and implement power standards and common assessments; training for continued facilitation and implementation of Professional Learning Community Model; training to lead literacy and math change at the building and district level]

- **Class Size Reduction:** Provide an environment conducive to teaching academic and behavior skills to primary grade students by keeping class size grades K-2/3 at or below 2007-08 levels.[using IIA and SIF funds]
- **Pre-K – 14 Transitions:** Continue to develop seamless transitions for CBPS students between schools and from high school to post-secondary by increasing activities designed tot: *Strengthen the academic and social transition between vertical grades and *strengthen the transition activities for student and parents at Pre-K to K; grade 4 – 5/6; grade 6 to 7/8; grade 8 to high school environment and high school to post-secondary; *develop additional 2 + 2 and College Now programs with SWOCC and other community colleges; *strengthen CRLE and extended applications to focus on post-high school transition opportunities] using Perkins, IA, IIA, V and general funds.

G. Action Plan

See the action plans for each of the above goals following Section H

H. Summary of the Planning Process

(a) List of those contributing to the CIP and their roles:

The writing of the plan and collecting all of the data and plans from various building and district teams and committees has been facilitated by the district administrative team (Bob De La Vergne, Superintendent; Duella Scot-Hull, Director of School Improvement; Julie Entz, Title I coordinator; Lisa DeSalvio, Director of Special Programs); administrative assistant Peggy Ahlgrim and data specialist Mary Burke. However, nearly 150 people including staff, parents, school board members, administrators and staff from SWOCC have worked on key components of the CIP plan.

Blossom Gulch Site Council

Cande Pressnall, Karla Delgado, Tim Connick, Terri Kinnard, Nicole Ault, Vicki Whitty, Cindy Bodkin, Joy Suppes - parent, Jennifer Haliski, Marty Giles - parent.

Bunker Hill Site Council

Dale Inskeep, Kara Davidson, Dayna Inskeep, Doyle Hallmark, Debbie Chesselet, Jerry Kirkeby, Sherrill VanVleet, and Beth Clarkson - parent.

Madison Site Council

Beth Bennison, Teri Jones, Lillian Erb, Deanna Chase, Stephanie Muma, and Arlene Roblan. No parent rep at this time.

Millicoma Site Council

Amelia Edd, Fred Eschler, Karen Ashcraft, Dianna Spillman, Judy Driscoll, Bryan Trendell, Helen Farr, Laurie Armstrong - parent, Cindi Miller - parent, and Sharon Rossback.

Sunset Site Council

Jamie Fereday, Lori Croff, Tom Mitchell, Chad Putman, Kathleen Zappelli, Jason Goodson, Billie Chestnut, Elaine Smith, and parents Karen Matson, Katie Paulson, Michele Cumberland, and Julie Entz.

MHS Site Council

Travis Howard, Bruce Bryant, Russ Namitz, Mark Lorincz, Gary Haliski, Luke Parrish, Tony Preston, Brenda Landrum, Phil Boyd, Cricket Soules - parent, Leslie Silver and Caitlin O'Donnell, students

Resource Link Site Council

Don Blom – school board member, Suzie Yeiter- community member, Heather Clausen – community member, Cheryl Frame - parent, Lesli Gieselman, Richard Hinkel, Stephen Hood, Dana Childs, Linda Vickrey

Blossom Gulch PBS Team

Jodi O'Mara, Cheryl Carr, Jennifer Haliski, Karla Delgado, Nancy Girt, Teresa Thurman, and Vicki Whitty

Bunker Hill PBS Team

Dale Inskeep, Kara Davidson, Dayna Inskeep, Doyle Hallmark, Debbie Chesselet, Jerry Kirkeby, Sherrill VanVleet, and Beth Clarkson - parent.

Madison PBS Team

Hank Lepley, Tammy Smallwood, Corrie Bogardus, Tina Grile, Vicki Milby, Arlene Roblan

Millicoma PBS Team

Jodi O'Mara, Cheryl Coplen, Claudia Benn, Helen Farr, Karen Ashcraft, Kim Banta, Laura Post, Rebecca Peters, Susan Paterson

Blossom Gulch Title 1 Review Team

Nicole Ault, Tim Connick, Tine Weekley, Candace Pressnall, Carli Ainsworth, Cindy Bodkin, Jennifer Haliski, Laura Means and parents Jennifer Groth, Marty Giles, and Joy Suppes

Bunker Hill Title 1 Review Team

Dale Inskeep, Kara Davidson, Dayna Inskeep, Doyle Hallmark, Debbie Chesselet, Jerry Kirkeby, Sherrill VanVleet, and Beth Clarkson - parent.

Madison Title 1 Review Team

April Hoy, Ann Marineau, Jack Banta, Vicki Milby, and parents Tammy Smallwood and Denise Pennington

Millicoma Title 1 Review Team

Bryan Trendell, Jodi O'Mara, Karen Isley, Amelia Edd

Superintendent Advisory—all parents

Michelle Londo, Linda Devereux, Jennifer Groth, Lynne Whitley, Christa-Lee Meddendorff, Kelly Thompson-Poore, Jill Jacobson, Tina Gutterman, Renee Blom, Laura Neilson, Kelley Rowe, Debi Springsteen, Dee Edwards, Denise Bowers, Joy Suppes, and Cricket Soules and Renee Brown, District Parent Involvement Coordinator.

Tech Cadre Team

Peggy Thornton, Sharon Muffett, Jason Goodson, Fred Hunt, Duella Scott-Hull

CTE Team

Duella Scott-Hull, Bruce Bryant, Tom Hull, Michelle Inskeep, Fred Hunt, Catherine Hampton, Steve Walker, Jesse Ainsworth, and Gary Haliski.

District Staff

Duella Scott-Hull, Kellea Kohn, Mary Burke, Peggy Ahlgrim, Jon Mishra, Renee Brown, Lisa DeSalvio, Rochelle Weiss, Gael Berhow, Bob De La Vergne, Donna Thomas, Trevor Edd,

Administrative Team

Jennifer Haliski, Dale Inskeep, Arlene Roblan, Jodi O'Mara, Bryan Trendell, Jon Mishra, Chad Putman, Travis Howard, Bruce Bryant, Greg Mulkey, Gael Berhow, Duella Scott-Hull, Lisa DeSalvio, Julie Entz, Linda Vickrey, Bob De La Vergne

Board of Directors of Coos Bay Public Schools

Kathy Murray, Chairman, Don Blom, Donna Opitz, Wally Hazen, David Ford, Andy Post, and Randy Miles

(b) A description of the planning process including an overview and chronology of significant events:

The CBPS operates on a continuous planning process cycle with the various teams constantly reviewing, revising and setting next steps toward meeting building-level and district common goals. The Board sets annual goals based on the CIP goals and participates in the planning process as well. This CIP represents our current thinking and plans based on extensive review of a myriad of data. It will be continually assessed and revised during the duration of this CIP.

Annual Review, Revision and Planning Process:

- In May-June PBS, Site and Title I teams from buildings review data to revise and set goals. This planning is moved forward at the August administrative team planning session and then taken back again to the building-level teams.
- In the spring Site teams begin reviewing progress on the SIP goals and planning/revising for the upcoming year. Input is gathered from each building's various committees and district-level committees.
- In April CTE team meets to determine the upcoming year's goals and priorities. Perkins, district general funds and other grant funds are assigned.
- Beginning in August, CTE team at Marshfield meets with the Director of School Improvement every month to review Perkins requirements and data and to plan professional development based on instructor needs, student data indicators and the April goal and priority setting.
- Beginning in August, the Tech Cadre meets monthly to evaluate instructional technology use, needs and training needs based on survey data they gather from buildings and anecdotal data from teachers.
- Each August the administrative team reviews preliminary AYP and report card data along with building SIP, Title I and PBS plans to finalize or modify goals for the coming year.

This planning is taken back to the building teams for discussion and revision and continually discussed at monthly administrative team meetings.

- The Superintendent's Advisory Council receives bi-monthly updates on the District's various plans, goals and Title grant plans. They give ideas and input each meeting based on feedback from their constituents.
- September - June, the Director of School Improvement and the Director of Special Programs give the Board of Directors monthly updates regarding progress toward meeting CIP goals through analysis of the various plans, professional development, assessment and reporting data.
- Late Fall each year building administrators present a detailed report on their building's data, goals and actions plans to the administrative team and the school board. This represents a culmination of all of the various building and district team planning and formalizes the planning, goal-setting, implementation and revision process.
- The process continues throughout the year as the buildings and the district monthly review data to make adjustments to goals and plans.

Specific 05-07 events that supported the planning & goal-setting (and implementation) process:

- July 2006 new first and second grade teachers attend BER Conference
- August 2006 & 2007 new K-2 hires attend Bridges math training
- August 2006 Read 180 training
- August 2006 team of grade 5-6 teachers attend Writing Towards Benchmarks
- August 2006 District in service speaker Robin Rose on setting the educational climate
- August 2006 and August 2007: teams of teachers and administrators from Millicoma Intermediate, Sunset Middle and Marshfield High Schools along with district Director of School Improvement attend Superintendent's Summer Institute in Portland.
- August 2006-2008 school year: Literacy plans written, revised and implemented at each of the 3 buildings. Teams meet at building level and as a district team throughout the year to plan and revise implementation.
- February, March and September 2006 literacy team members attend trainer or trainers for SOS Reading Strategies
- September 2006: All K-4 teachers, para-professionals and administrators trained by Judith Gould in the 4-square method of writing and instructional strategies to increase literacy.
- January 2007: K-2 team attends Statewide Literacy Outreach workshop @ SCESD
- January 2007: K-12 team of teachers and administrators attend Barry Lane writing and revision workshop.
- September 2006-2008 school year: Judith Gould and Barry Lane strategies continue to be implemented and monitored. Grade level and cross grade level teams within buildings and across district continue to meet regarding student writing achievement & instructional practices.
- October 2006 library staff attends OEMA to focus on supporting literacy with non-fiction and sessions on using EBSCO and OSLIS in the classroom to support literacy.
- October 2006 administrative team attends Charlotte Danielson workshop on evaluation.
- November 2006: Team of grade 6-12 language arts teachers, middle school principal and School Improvement Coordinator attend NCTE conference in Nashville. Focus: student writing, informational text reading, student literacy, leadership for student achievement.

- September 2006-2008 school year: Teams of teachers observe classrooms within the CBPS to focus on literacy strategies, writing and mathematics alignment, and various classroom elements related to mentor teacher program.
- Ongoing: teams of teachers visit sites outside of Coos Bay to observe how math and language arts instruction is delivered, how CTE programs are structured and how high school reform and graduation requirements are implemented. Discussions and planning for curricular and materials changes follow these visits. Schools in Mollala, Hillsboro, Newburg, Eugene and Roseburg have been visited.
- Ongoing: Each August building administrators assign new teachers a veteran mentor. The year-long mentoring includes weekly meetings between mentor-mentee, observation and coaching, classroom observations of other in-district staff and of other programs outside district, trimester meetings of mentors and of mentees separately.
- Ongoing: Harry Wong classroom management series for new hires and their mentors.
- September 2006-08 school year: CTE teachers work on integrating reading and math standards into curriculum. Observe each other's classrooms as part of the implementation process. Team works on ideas for Perkins IV budget and one-year transition plan. School Improvement Director finalizes and submits both.
- January 2007 – 2008 school year: NCTE attendees meet bi-monthly to debrief and revise implementation plan and sharing with other 6-12 language arts team.
- September, November, January, March & May: Superintendent's Advisory Council meets to discuss school and district improvement plans and funding to support the goals and plans and related issues.
- September 2006 – April 2007: K-12 language arts committee meets in K-4, 5-12 and K-12 team to study standards, best instructional practices and review instructional materials.
- March 2007: On site Title programs Monitoring Visit. The year leading up to this visit was rich with data review and documentation of processes, plans and procedures that contributed to our continuous improvement process.
- April 2007 CTE team attends OACTE and begins planning for one-year Perkins Transition Plan.
- June 2007: Every Day Math refresher training for grades 3-6 and special ed.
- June 2007 admin team attends COSA at Seaside.
- July 2007 – May 2008: CTE teacher and math teacher participate in ODE-sponsored Math in CTE classroom. They will train MHS CTE teachers during the school year.
- July 2007: 5-12 language arts materials ordered.
- September 2007-spring 2008: implementation and training using new 5-12 language arts materials. K-4 team pilots programs for purchase July 2008.
- Fall 2005 – 2009 school year: District admin. team begins study and implementation of Professional Learning Community model for school improvement. Bi-Monthly after school meetings to discuss professional literature and work through protocols to enhance understanding and help with implementation at building level. Attendance at COSA and other conferences where Doug Reeves, Rick and Rebecca DuFour and Robin Reed facilitated workshops.
- Summer and Spring 2005, 06, 07 and 08: One day off-site administrative retreat to review data, discuss professional reading, set goals and continue work on Professional Learning Community model.
- January 2007 admin. team attends COSA winter conference and focused on PLC, math and reading.
- January 2007: Tech Cadre attends ITSC regional conference in Portland followed by monthly planning and training sessions.

- February 2006 & 2007 central office team attends OACOA to continue work with Rick DuFour, Doug Reeves and Robin Reed.
- February and March 2007: attendance at national elementary and secondary principal's conferences since both were West Coast events. Focus of each team: common formative assessments, power standards, literacy strategies and student achievement in the Professional Learning Community.
- February 2007: K-6 team attends Oregon Reading Association conference and meet as building and district teams to share and implement strategies learned.
- February 2007 Read 180 follow up training
- March 2007: 9 members of admin. team attend National ASCD conference in Anaheim. Focus: common assessments power standards, literacy strategies, writing, student achievement; leadership in the Professional Learning Community model.
- March and April 2007: Administrative workshop and Saturday retreat to share key learnings from national conferences and discuss how to implement learning in 2007-08 building-level School Improvement, Title I and CIP plans. Study and discuss implications of Professional Needs and Technology survey administered to all staff in late January.
- September 2007 – 2009 school year: Admin. team reads and discusses the Ainsworth books: *Common Formative Assessments* and *Power Standards*; reviews Hillsboro and Canby Schools process and product for these areas.
- October 2007: Teach Cadre team attends T + L conference in Nashville. Monthly planning and training sessions to follow in 2007-08.
- November 2007: Canby trains admin. team to lead the process to identify power standards and common assessments.
- November 2007: Admin. team attends COSA-sponsored Professional Learning Community Conference with Rick and Rebecca DuFour.

(c) A description of the process the district used to identify evidence-based strategies:

The administrative team works together to study recent research on teaching and learning. We attend state and national conferences and share key learning points with each other and with staff after each professional learning experience. We do not attend anything unless we attend as a team, and we follow these same practices when sending staff to conferences and workshops. The administrative team each leads building-level staff in discussions focused on research-based solutions to address identified needs. Teachers have professional book clubs and discussion clubs where they examine and discuss the latest research on teaching and learning. The district has a culture of matching research based professional development and curricular materials to student achievement needs and maintains a professional library stocked with current research on best practices in teaching and learning, leadership for success, technology integration, and classroom management. The library is located in the CBPS curriculum office and is available to all district staff.

As an administrative team the past three years we have read and discussed multiple books and articles on leadership for student learning including books by Rick Dufour, Douglas Reeves, and Linda Lambert on leadership and Professional Learning Communities. The most recent edition of *Best Practices* by Daniel, Zelman and Hyde was the focus of a year-long book and research study. Ruby Payne's *A Framework for Understanding*

Poverty was the lens through which we reviewed PBS data, achievement data and various surveys as we updated various plans and developed our Homeless, ELL and Comprehensive Guidance and Counseling Plans. These, along with various books from ASCD, Corwin Press, Heinemann, IRA, and NSDC and other organizations, are reviewed and further researched to develop and expand our knowledge of current research and best practices. Administrators in turn lead their staffs in research-based discussions often using these same books as whole-staff or small-group book studies. Site Councils, the School Board and Superintendent's Advisory Council are all kept informed about the on-going effort to keep abreast of current thinking regarding student achievement. This strategy builds capacity for all involved to understand the issues and focus on research-based solutions.

(d) A description of how the district makes the Plan available to the public:

The plan is shared with the above groups many of which have parent representation on them. Copies are given to the Superintendent's Advisory Committee, consisting of parents from each school and whose responsibility it is to keep parent groups informed. The Parent Involvement Coordinator for the district has a copy and shares the goals with parents. Principals put a notice in their weekly bulletin to parents offering a copy of the completed CIP. The CIP is adopted and discussed in a public board meeting with media and public present.

I. Budget Narrative/Spending Workbook

See online submission.

Action Plan

Instructions: Based on your Self-Evaluation outline 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>[Identify and briefly describe the Improvement Goal necessary to resolve the Priority Concerns identified in the district Self-Evaluation.] CBPS will increase student achievement for all students to meet the 2008 and 2009 AYP targets and to close the achievement gap in reading, math and writing. State assessment scores and common formative assessments will be used to document improved learning.</p>									
STATE PERFORMANCE STANDARD(S)									
1	2 - yes	3 - yes	4	5	6-yes	7	8	9-yes	10-yes
STANDARDS FOR DISTRICT SUCCESS									
<p>[Identify the Standard/Indicator to be addressed by this Improvement Goal. Refer to Oregon's <i>Standards and Indicators of District Success</i> framework.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Aligned with Oregon's Common Curriculum goals, content standards...and OARs 1.2 Common academic core for all students 1.3 Effective process for monitoring, evaluating, and reviewing curriculum 1.4 Educational programs and options are coordinated 1.5 Discussions among schools about curriculum standards 1.6 Vertical and horizontal alignment of curriculum with focus on key transition points 2.1 Instructional strategies aligned with goals 2.2 Varied instructional strategies that are evidenced based 2.3 Strategies aligned and monitored to address learning styles 2.5 Instructional materials are current, compliant, aligned, and sufficient to serve all students 2.6 Multiple reliable assessments provide feedback on learning and identify achievement gaps 2.8 Teachers demonstrate content knowledge and mastery of diverse pedagogical methods 2.11 Teachers are competent in data use and analysis 2.12 Intentional professional development strategy 2.13 Professional development data-driven, ongoing, job-embedded, and research-based 3.1 High academic expectations for all students evident in beliefs, practices, and policies 3.2 Commitment to ensuring successful student transitions (within K-12 and beyond) 3.3 Strong commitment to equity and diversity 3.6 Culture of evidence-based practice 3.7 Inclusive and collaborative decision-making 3.8 Culture of continuous professional learning 3.9 Culture of collective professional accountability 5.5 Leadership decisions are data-driven 5.6 Leaders disaggregate data to monitor the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on diverse student populations 5.7 Leaders provide resources, monitor progress, and remove barriers 5.8 Leadership provides sufficient professional development resources and support 6.2 Improvement planning is data-driven and research-based 									

6.3 Vertical and horizontal planning for improvement
6.4 Clear goals and aligned action steps

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE FOR RESEARCH-BASED EDUCATION STRATEGY

[What evidence supports the Strategies/Activities you are implementing to achieve your Improvement Goal. Please provide a brief summary of any relevant evidence from the research literature or past district experience.]

The collective research of Doug Reeves, Roland Barth, Rick and Rebecca DuFour, and Larry Ainsworth is clear that to improve student achievement, the focus of all district and school meetings and resources must be focused on student learning outcomes. These outcomes drive instructional practices. This is a fundamental shift from the focus on teaching. The research further demonstrates that teachers working in collaborative teams to *identify targets of essential skills (power standards); *develop and administer common formative assessments; *assess progress toward learning these essential skills; *develop interventions based on the assessment results; *learn new instructional strategies to meet students needs.

Strategy/Activity <i>What evidence-based strategy/activity will be implemented?</i>	Evidence of Implementation <i>What evidence do you have that what you planned to do is being done (monitoring)?</i>	Evidence of Impact <i>What evidence do you have that the change you wanted has occurred (evaluation)?</i>	Person Responsible <i>Who will provide oversight for implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the strategy?</i>	Start Date <i>What is the projected start date?</i>	End Date <i>What is the projected end date?</i>	Estimated Costs <i>What are the anticipated costs?</i>	Fund Source <i>What sources of funding will be used for the activity (more than one source may be listed)?</i>
All students K-8 and 10 (and 11-12 graders who want CIM & CTE students who have not achieved passing RIT) will take the OAKS state <u>reading</u> and <u>math</u> test in the Fall and in the Spring (special targeted groups may take a third assessment). Growth will be measured by the test scores	Each building will provide the district with a calendar of planned testing times.	State assessment scores from fall to spring increase	Duella Scott-Hull; Curriculum Director All building principals	October 2007 Sept. 2008	May 2008 May 2009	*Time *Transportation costs to district computer lab if accessed *Cost of Proctors	Building general fund/ discretionary budgets Title I budgets
All students will submit at least three <u>writing and math problem solving samples</u> during the year for scoring	Same	Work samples entered in MIM	Same	Same	Same	Compensation to scorers— \$4,000	District Curriculum Funds
Grade 4, 7 and 10 students (and those in 11 and 12 wanting a CIM & CTE students who have not received a passing score) will take state writing assessment	Same	State Performance Assessment Scores	Same	Feb. 2008 Feb. 2009	March 2008 March 2009	Processing time salary	District general fund
Implement adopted Language Arts instructional materials	*Lesson Plans monitored *Attend training	Student writing and reading scores improve	Same	Sept. 2007	June 2009	\$375,000 for materials \$5000 for stipends to attend training	District general fund District Curriculum Funds
Identify Power Standards *	Grade level PS developed for	PS identified and being used	Same	November 2007	August 2008	*Canby train admin team	IIA

	reading and math led by admin team					\$2000 *Stipends or subs for work time *Materials	IA, IIA & Dist. Curriculum funds IA & IIA
Develop Common Formative Assessments *	Teams give CFA for each PS to principals and curriculum director	CFA developed and being used to inform instruction	Same	November 2007	August 2008	*Stipends or subs for work time *Possible training needed	IIA & DCF IA and IIA
Identify Power Standards and Develop Common Formative Assessments for science and health *	Same as above	Same as above	Same	Sept. 2008	August 2009	Same as above	Same as above
Develop Pyramids of Intervention*	Each building develop interventions based on CFA data	Interventions implemented	Same	November 2007	Sept. 2008	*Training *Stipends or subs for work time	IA, IIA, IDEA IIA, DCF
Professional development targeted to professional learning teams to accomplish the above activities * PLT Workshop Series working w/ PSU consultants	Each building principal has a team of 7 attend the workshop series	Collaborative teaching teams focused on student learning meet regularly	Same	January 2008	June 2008	*Training fee for PSU \$12,000 *Stipends & subs for attending \$10,000	IIA/V, IDEA, IA IIA/V, IA, IDEA & DCF
Professional development targeted to address student needs as determined by student learning data	Training needs identified by building teams and district based on assessment scores	Training implemented & Shared with team	Same	January 2008	June 2010	Workshop, conference fees, travel to visit other schools, subs etc.	IIA, V, IA, IDEA, Perkins, DCF

IMPROVEMENT GOAL									
[Identify and briefly describe the Improvement Goal necessary to resolve the Priority Concerns identified in the district Self-Evaluation.]									
Increase the use by classroom teachers of Instructional Technology by 25% each year 2008-10 as measured by professional needs assessment results.									
STATE PERFORMANCE STANDARD(S)									
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8-yes	9	10
STANDARDS FOR DISTRICT SUCCESS									
[Identify the Standard/Indicator to be addressed by this Improvement Goal. Refer to Oregon's <i>Standards and Indicators of District Success</i> framework.]									
1.4 Educational programs and options are coordinated 2.1 Instructional strategies aligned with goals 2.2 Varied instructional strategies that are evidenced based 2.4 Teachers incorporate technology into classrooms 2.10 Effective professional mentoring and on-going support 2.11 Teachers are competent in data use and analysis 2.13 Professional development data-drive, ongoing, job-embedded and research-based 3.6 Culture of evidence-based practice 3.8 Culture of continuous professional learning 5.6 Leadership decisions are data-driven 5.7 Leaders provide resources, monitor progress and remove barriers 5.8 Leadership provides sufficient professional development and support									
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE FOR RESEARCH-BASED EDUCATION STRATEGY									
[What evidence supports the Strategies/Activities you are implementing to achieve your Improvement Goal. Please provide a brief summary of any relevant evidence from the research literature or past district experience.]									
CBPS technology goals, professional development, student, teacher and administrator technology skills sets are based on ISTE standards and their collaborative NETS project. National Staff Development Council recommendations on the teacher trainer model delivering "just in time" professional development based on demonstrated teacher needs is the driving force behind the Technology Trainer Cadre.									
Strategy/Activity <i>What evidence-based strategy/activity will be implemented?</i>	Evidence of Implementation <i>What evidence do you have that what you planned to do is being done (monitoring)?</i>	Evidence of Impact <i>What evidence do you have that the change you wanted has occurred (evaluation)?</i>	Person Responsible <i>Who will provide oversight for implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the strategy?</i>	Start Date <i>What is the projected start date?</i>	End Date <i>What is the projected end date?</i>	Estimated Costs <i>What are the anticipated costs?</i>	Fund Source <i>What sources of funding will be used for the activity (more than one source may be listed)?</i>		
Technology Trainer Cadre invites a teacher partner to attend Instructional Technology Strategies Conference in February 2008	Conference attended	Technology training developed & delivered to staff. New cadre members deliver	Duella Scott-Hull, Director of School Improvement	December 2007	June 2009	*Conference attendance \$4000 for 8 *Post conference planning sub or	V District Curriculum		

		training w/ veteran member.				stipend	Funds (DCF)
Technology Trainer Cadre attends ISTE in June 2008 to keep their training and instructional technology skills current. Invite one new cadre member and a building administrator to attend.	Attend conference as team and plan session attendance based on teacher training needs. Debrief every day and planning session upon return.	Technology training developed & delivered to staff. Increased use of technology to meet student learning needs.	Same	January 2008	June 2009	*Conference attendance \$13,000 *Stipends for post conference planning in August 2008	IID, V, DCF DCF
Develop technology training based on needs assessment survey and anecdotal conversations with teachers. (using key learnings from T + L, ISTE and ITSC conferences)	Trainings developed and delivered to district teachers.	Increased percentage of teachers using technology in classroom instruction	Duella Scott-Hull Tech Trainer Cadre Building principals	October 2007	June 2009	Stipends or subs for planning, developing and delivering training	District Curriculum Funds
Train Student Tech Cadets to assist teachers with the technology as teachers begin to use more technology to teach	Monthly Student Tech Cadet training sessions	Cadre of students available in each building to assist with technology	Duella Scott-Hull Tech Trainer Cadre	September 2007-	June 2009	Stipends or subs for planning and training student cadets	V and DCF
Develop and administer a student technology use and needs assessment	Survey developed	Survey administered, results compiled & disaggregated and curriculum planned based on results	Same	January 2008	June 2008	Stipends or subs for work time	DCF
Revise and administrator teacher Instructional Technology Needs Assessment	Survey revised and administered	Results compiled & disaggregated. Training developed based on results	Same	January 2008 & 09	June 2009	Stipends or subs for work time	DCF

IMPROVEMENT GOAL									
[Identify and briefly describe the Improvement Goal necessary to resolve the Priority Concerns identified in the district Self-Evaluation.] <i>All students will be taught in learning environments that are safe, drug-free, and conducive to learning.</i> The Coos Bay School District will reduce the incidents of negative and unsafe behaviors, to meet state targets in physical fighting and smoking, by increasing staff trainings to recognize and implement effective strategies for classroom systems and individual interventions and expand supplemental curriculum to address violence and smoking prevention in our district.									
STATE PERFORMANCE STANDARD(S)									
1	2	3-yes	4	5	6	7	8	9	10-yes
STANDARDS FOR DISTRICT SUCCESS									
[Identify the Standard/Indicator to be addressed by this Improvement Goal. Refer to Oregon's <i>Standards and Indicators of District Success</i> framework.] 3.1 High Academic expectations for all students evident in beliefs, practices and policies. 3.4 Learning environments are safe and drug free 3.6 Culture of evidenced based collaborative practice 3.7 inclusive and collaborative decision making 3.8 culture of continuous professional learning 6.2 Improvement planning is data driven and researched based									
SUPPORTING EVIDENCE FOR RESEARCH-BASED EDUCATION STRATEGY									
[What evidence supports the Strategies/Activities you are implementing to achieve your Improvement Goal. Please provide a brief summary of any relevant evidence from the research literature or past district experience.] Positive Behavior Intensive Supports PBS (2004 Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, University of Oregon.) SW-PBS is the integration of four elements a) Operationally defined and valued outcomes, b) Behavioral and biomedical science, c) Research-validated practices , and d) Systems change to both enhance the broad quality with which all students are living/learning and reduce problem behaviors. Second Steps Violence Prevention Program: An ODE exemplary program that is researched based to reduce school violence grades K-8 This Way Out-Freedom from Smoking Program- TEG is a practical, science-based program that will show you how to effectively deal with students who violate a school's tobacco policy. TAP provides tobacco-using youth with the options, resources, education, motivation, and support to stop using tobacco. Use attendance at this eight-session program as an alternative to suspension for teens who have been caught smoking. For grades 6-12. Oregon Healthy Teen Survey: An ODE recognized reliable measure for districts to determine their current percentages and compare to the ODE targets for Safe and Drug Free Schools									

Strategy/Activity <i>What evidence-based strategy/activity will be implemented?</i>	Evidence of Implementation <i>What evidence do you have that what you planned to do is being done (monitoring)?</i>	Evidence of Impact <i>What evidence do you have that the change you wanted has occurred (evaluation)?</i>	Person Responsible <i>Who will provide oversight for implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the strategy?</i>	Start Date <i>What is the projected start date?</i>	End Date <i>What is the projected end date?</i>	Estimated Costs <i>What are the anticipated costs?</i>	Fund Source <i>What sources of funding will be used for the activity (more than one source may be listed)?</i>
Expanding Second Steps Curriculum to all elementary school and our intermediate school and middle school in the District K-8 Purchasing Kits Training Staff	Review Lesson Plans periodically. Ask for feedback from PBS team as to how the program is supporting the school environment.	Review SWIS data at PBS building team meetings to determine if the programs having an impact of physical fighting	PBS team leaders, Title IV coordinator, Second Steps Trainers	March 2008	June 2010	\$2400.00	Title IV
Send two staff to the Second Step Trainer training in Seattle, Washington	The trainers will meet with the two new sites for implementation training to staff. The training schedule and events to support the implementation will be drafted and submitted to the Title IV coordinator and building principals.	Having our own district trainers will ensure staffs have easy access to the trainers to answer questions or assist with implementation as concerns come up.	Title IV coordinator, Building principals at Bunker Hill Millicoma and sunset	March 2008	June 2008	\$2000.00	Title IV
Identifying our data recording systems and consistently using the same system at all buildings (SWIS and ESIS)	The district administrators will review at the monthly team meetings the use	A consistent data system with accurate measures for student behaviors	Building PBS teams Building administrators who enter the data	January 2008	June 2008	SWIS \$1750.00 ESIS \$30,000.00	General Fund

	of data systems to ensure consistency at all buildings	to assist in directing building teams towards skills needed to be addressed with students and resources for staff.					
Provide ongoing PBS district and building level Training	Building professional development plans, PBS team meeting minutes, attendance at staff training, documentation of specific skills addressed and outcomes for	Reduction in referrals both minors and majors. Learning environments conducive for learning	PBS teams, building and district administration	Winter 2008	June 2009	\$4000.00 in district \$2000.00 out of district	Title IV
Participation in Healthy Teen Survey at Sunset, MHS and Destination Learning Center	The district will participate in the spring and the HTS will provide the data by August the following year to demonstrate participation	The data will assist us in identifying our ODE targets and our improvement in our previous percentages and our current rates. This data will assist the schools in identifying	Title IV Coordinator will make contact with HTS to ensure our participation. Building administrators will relay date of survey to the advisors	Spring 2008 and again Spring 2009	August 2008 And August 2009	Unknown	Title IV or building funds
Identify research based social skills curriculum at the high school level that can be implemented with groups of students identified as “ at risk “	The Dean of Students and the school counselors will review programs and	Student surveys SWIS data to review recidivism rates	MHS counselors and Dean of Students	Nov. 2008	June 2008	Time	NA

	determine an appropriate program.						
Ongoing smoking cessation classes at Marshfield for MHS students and Destinations Learning Center. Researching for implementation at Sunset Middle School	Review of attendance of classes	Reduction in number of students reporting usage on the Healthy Teen Survey	Dean of Students at MHS Assistant Principal at Sunset Principal at Destinations	January 2008 March 2008	On going June 2008	\$500.00	Title IV and General Fund