

Goal: to align school level resources to the 2010-15 strategic plan using an Evidence Based Model of school effectiveness.

Outcomes

- Developed documentation identifying linkages between the THRIVES strategies contained in the District's strategic plan and the elements of the Evidence Based Model of school effectiveness.
- Created a computer-based simulation model to estimate the level of resources needed to implement each element of the Evidence-Based Model in each of Beaverton's schools.
- Developed resource recommendations intended to serve as a template for resource allocation for the five year implementation of the strategic plan.
- Identified changes needed to be more effective in producing student learning and close existing achievement gaps and incorporate all elements of the strategic plan.
- Identified efficiency issues: number of core and elective teachers, class sizes, school schedules, strategies for intervention or extra help for struggling students, use of individual and collaborative planning time in schools.

Mapping District's Vision into Program Resources

"Students are at the center of our vision. Their individual achievement is our collective responsibility."

1. We fundamentally believe that every single child has unique gifts and talents, and we are committed to help discover and develop them.
 - Individual education plan for each child and a set of education offerings that provide both core curriculum as well as options for a wide range of children's interests.
 2. Success belongs to each student and will not be predicted by race, ethnicity, family economics, mobility, gender, disability, or initial proficiencies.
 - Eliminating achievement gaps linked to poverty and ethnicity combined with efforts to ensure that differences in student performance will not be along socio-demographic lines.
 3. All children will have choices for their future success and will carry with them a lifelong love of learning that enhances their lives and supports generations that follow.
-

- Core curriculum for all students because the knowledge, skills and competencies for post high school life -- college and career readiness – in today’s knowledge-based economy are quite similar.
 - Each child will be successful in the individual plan and profile that is developed with them, because success at learning is a foundation for a “lifelong love of learning.”
4. High standards and high expectations drive our students, our staff, and our community.
- High standards will be set for acceptable performance of Beaverton’s students supported by the community, set by staff as the goal for *all* students, and pursued diligently by each individual child.
 - Since Beaverton’s students will continue to take state tests (as well as perhaps other measures of performance), this means the Beaverton goal for all students should be performance to the *exceeds* level on state academic achievement tests.
5. Every staff member commits to professional growth, excellence, and success.
- All staff will engage in continuous and ongoing professional development, and will set a goal to develop knowledge, skills and expertise that meet the highest standards of their profession, and which are effective in having their students perform to high performance standards.
6. We are strongly connected to our families and the local and global communities.
- The District involves families in the deployment of the District’s programs and strategies. Families do their part in helping their students perform successfully in core academics and other interests, and standards for success are benchmarked to world-class levels.

Mapping District’s Mission into Program Resources

“ To engage students in rigorous and joyful learning experiences that meet their individual needs so they may thrive, contribute, compete and excel.”

- Standards for performance in all areas are high. Successful performance to high standards is the mission for *all* students and for their specific interests.
-

Mapping District Goal into Program Resources

“All students will show continuous progress toward personal learning goals ... and be prepared for postsecondary education or career success.”

- Competencies necessary for post-secondary education or job success in today’s knowledge economy are essentially the same. This goal is interpreted as meaning all students experience success in learning a core set of academics plus additional learning objectives.

Focus on Student Learning

ALL students will be exposed to a rigorous core curriculum and also exposed to elective classes and activities such as world language, art, music, career/technical education, sports, and others. The common element for all classes or activities will be excellence, i.e., learning to mastery in a core content area and personal interest area. The District’s culture will continue to be one of excellence and mastery, regardless of the specific content or topical focus.

Resources for THRIVES Strategies

Specific recommendations for all school-level resources needed to deploy THRIVES strategies included elements of the Evidenced-Based Model:

1. Core and specialist/elective teachers
 2. Instructional Coaches
 3. Strategies for struggling students including:
 - Teacher tutors
 - English language development for ELL students
 - Extended day academic programming
 - Summer school academic programming
 - Services for students with disabilities
 4. Pupil support staff including guidance counselors, nurses, family outreach, etc.
 5. Librarians
 6. Administrative staff including:
 - Principals & Assistant Principals
 - Secretaries & supervisory aides
 7. Dollar per pupil resources for:
 - Gifted and talented programming
 - Instructional materials and formative (pre-assessment) assessments
 - Computer and related technologies
 - Student activities
 - Professional development for trainers, whether outside experts or central office staff
-

Evidence Based Budgeting Highlights
Odden & Picus Final Report Summary

Page 4

THRIVES	Core Teachers	Elective Teachers	Inst. Coaches	Tutors	ELD Teachers	Extended Day	Summer School	Special Education
T1								
T2								
T3								
H1	X							
H2					X			
H3								
R1				X	X			
R2	X	X	X					
R3								
R4								
I1	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
I2	X	X	X	X	X			X
V1					X			
V2								
E1	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
E2	X	X						X
S1	X	X	X	X	X			X
S2	X	X	X	X	X			X

THRIVES	Pupil Support	Librarians	School Admin Staff:	Gifted and Talented	Inst. Materials	Computers and Related Technology	Student Activities	Trainers for Prof. Development
			Principal Secretary, Aides					
T1						X		X
T2						X		
T3						X		X
H1								X
H2								X
H3	X		X					X
R1	X							
R2								
R3								
R4								
I1		X		X	X		X	X
I2	X	X	X	X				X
V1	X							
V2	X							
E1						X		
E2			X					
S1	X		X			X		X
S2			X			X		X

Core and Elective Teachers, School Schedules and Time for Teacher Collaboration

Numbers of core and elective teachers, class sizes for core and elective classes, and school schedules are all linked together as the largest element of school-based resources. One point on which there is widespread agreement is that the best way to organize teacher work is in collaborative teacher teams, teams that use student data to design, hone and modify curriculum units and lesson plans, and who collectively engage in a cycle of continuous instructional improvement. In the teacher focus group, participants identified time for “collaborative teacher team work” as one of the most important goals for the strategic budgeting process. This desire was reinforced by all three principal groups – elementary principals, middle school principals and high school principals. Several models have been identified to accomplish teacher collaboration time, and principals have scheduled August work sessions to continue this work.

Goal: Identify ways to design school schedules so that teacher teams could have at least three 45 minute periods a week to meet on curriculum and instructional issues.

The decisions on core and elective teachers are the critical first step for engaging in the strategic budgeting process, as core and elective/specialist teachers consume the majority of all teaching positions.

Instructional Coaches

Schools need instructional coaches to organize teachers into collaborative work teams that function effectively. There should be a minimum of one instructional coach at each prototypical school – about 432 elementary students, 450 middle school students and 600 high school students (so, for example, a minimum of two coaches in a middle school with 900 students). The job of the coaches is to work with collaborative teacher work teams as well as with individual teachers, in every prototypical school. The initial zero-based budget provides for this level of instructional coaches.

Strategies for Struggling Students

Intervention begins with some accommodations within the regular classroom, which requires no additional resources. The next step is 1-1 or very small group tutoring, followed by English Language Development instruction in small classes for ELL students, extended day academic help, summer school academic help, and then special education. This approach often reduces the need for special education services as the sequence of interventions keeps many students on track academically and “reduces” the need for those special education services.

Teacher tutors One certificated teacher tutor for every 200 at risk students with a minimum tutoring position of one for every prototypical school building. Licensed teacher tutors should be used for struggling students.

ESL Staff The proposed model includes a ratio of 1 ESL teacher for 39 English Language Learners. *Additional* staff are provided to reduce class sizes for instruction in beginning levels of English language proficiency.

Extended Day Academic Help The Evidence-Based model provides for two hours of after school support for at-risk students. Instruction is provided on a one to fifteen student teacher ratio. Most often these students qualify for free or reduced lunch. Furthermore, the model assumes that 50% of at-risk students is a good estimate of the percentage of total students requiring additional support. The proposed Strategic model simulates this intervention strategy for just 25% of at-risk students at a reduced level due to budgetary reasons.

Summer School Academic Help The Evidence-Based model provides for a six hour academic focused summer school program for at-risk students. Most often these students qualify for free or reduced lunch. These students are also placed into classrooms with a one to fifteen student teacher ratio. The proposed Strategic School Model simulates this intervention strategy for 25% of at-risk students. The resources provided are at a reduced level due to limited resources in Beaverton's budget.

Students with Disabilities The proposed Strategic School Model provides a fixed 1 FTE teacher position and a .5 FTE instructional assistant position for every 150 regular students. This is expected to be adequate in order to offer a full range of services for all students with disabilities. This allocation excludes students with severe and profound disabilities. The proposed Strategic School Model simulates these positions on an equal basis across all schools, but the District could reallocate such positions to align the number of students with disabilities at each site.

Pupil Support Staff The Evidence-Based model provides for pupil support staff (guidance counselors, social workers, nurses, family outreach and liaison, service learning, etc.) in the following ways: One position for every 250 secondary students, plus one additional position for every 100 at-risk students, with a minimum of one additional position for every 432 elementary students. Beaverton's formula and proposed Strategic School Model simulates on guidance counselor position for every elementary school, and one guidance counselor position for every 400 middle and high school students. In addition, the proposed Strategic School Model simulates additional pupil support staff at a rate of one position for every 200 at-risk students.

Librarians The proposed Strategic School Model simulated one librarian position for every middle and high school. Since elementary librarians often teach literacy units, they could be part of the elementary specialist and elective staff allocations. AT this rate, the model would include only 17 librarians for this particular staffing line. If each elementary school also receives a librarian in this staffing category, rather than as part of the specialist allocation, then 50 staffing positions are required.

Strategies for Struggling Students-continued

Administrative and Support Staff the proposed Strategic School Model provides:

- Principals – 1 principal at every school.
- Assistant principals – 1 for every high school of 600 and then prorates AP positions for larger schools by student size over 432 elementary students, 450 middle school students and 600 high school students.
- Secretaries – 1 for every 216 elementary pupils, for every 225 middle school pupils and for every 200 high school pupils.
- Supervisory aides for bus and lunch time supervision.

Dollar Per Pupil Resources

The Evidence-Based model includes dollar per pupil amounts:

- Instructional materials (\$145 for each elementary and middle school pupil and \$180 for each high school pupil)
- Formative assessments (\$25 per pupil at all levels)
- Computer technologies (\$250 per pupil at all levels)
- Student activities (\$200 per elementary and middle school pupil and \$250 per high school pupil)
- Gifted and Talented (\$25 per pupil at all levels)
- Professional development trainers (~\$100 per pupil including central office professional development staff).

This totals \$745 per pupil for elementary and middle school students and \$830 for high school students. This compares to about \$535 for elementary schools, and \$560 to 570 per pupil for middle and high schools allocated to these items in the current budget.

The report assumes the District will retain its current approach to funding instructional materials, and will use its current technology budget for computer technologies.

The District will need to decide whether it will budget the \$25 per pupil for Gifted and Talented programming, \$25 for formative assessments, and an appropriate amount for student activities.

Estimated 2009-10 Staffing Needs Based on Simulation

Service Program	Staffing	Cost (millions)
Instructional Coaches	79.7	\$6.15
Tutors with a Minimum of 1 per School	78.0	\$6.02
English Language Development	138.9	\$10.71
Extended Day Academic Help	55.9	\$4.31
Summer School Academic Help	37.3	\$2.88
Special Education Teachers	254.9	\$19.66
Librarians, Media Specialists, just secondary	17.0	\$1.31
Librarians, Media Specialists, elementary and secondary	50.0	\$4.34
Pupil Support Staff		
Guidance Counselors	83.3	\$6.43
Extra triggered by poverty	67.1	\$5.18
Total triggered by poverty:		
Tutors	78.0	\$6.02
Extended day	55.9	\$4.31
Summer school	37.3	\$2.88
Pupil support	67.0	\$5.17
Total*	238.2	\$18.38

* This includes \$4.72 million in ARRA funds

Note, however, that the proposed Strategic School Model simulated approximately half the original Evidence-Based resources for poverty (at-risk) students. The estimated total for poverty triggered resources in Table 1 is \$18.38 million, so it could be argued the total should be double that figure, or just over \$37 million.

Using these simulations as a starting point, there are five questions that need to be asked and answered:

Question to be Asked During Implementation

1. Does this simulation represent the model Beaverton wants to use to guide school resource allocation over the next five years? If not, then what alternative model is preferred?
 2. Is there agreement on the resources allocated based on poverty? If not, how should those program elements be altered?
 3. How will the cost estimate of this initial model – which is between \$13.2 and \$16.1 million more than the current budget – be funded?
 4. How will the poverty-triggered services be funded?
 5. Is there a way to double the poverty-triggered funds to reflect the amounts called for in the Evidence-Based model?
 6. Are there ways to “scrub” current Beaverton practices to “find” APU’s that could be used in more cost effective or efficient ways? For example, Odden & Picus have suggested some possible efficiencies in the provision of ESL services. There also may be more efficient ways to schedule high school classes
 7. If Beaverton shifted its strategies for providing extra help to struggling students to align with those in the Evidence-Based model, (within classroom accommodation, small group tutoring, extended day academic help, summer school academic help, and then special education) what amount of special education dollars could be allocated to these strategies?
-