Salem-Keizer Public Schools Student Investment Act (SIA) Instructional Expertise Convening Report/Results

1/31/20 RS2 Education Consultants

Charge:
The Salem-Keizer School District convened a team of approximately 35 staff who would focus on bringing "instructional expertise" to the creation of their Student Investment Account (SIA) application. Their purpose was to provide the foundation for a set of recommendations forwarded to the decision makers and drafters of the application. This report is intended to summarize the process they participated in and summarize their input into recommendations representative of that input.

Team:
The team was comprised of teachers from each level (elementary, middle, high school), classified representatives, principals from each level, licensed union president, and a selection of district office administrators. When asked to self-identify their affiliation with the district and demographic information, they indicated the following:

Affiliation - Ten Teachers, Five Special Education Teachers, Three TOSA/Coach, Two Classified Staff Members, Eight Administrators, and Three who provided no response.

Demographic Information – Twelve White, Seven Hispanic/Latinx/Mexican American, One African American, One Korean American, Three Bilingual, One Disabled, One LGBTQ+, and Three who provided no response.

The seven and a-half hour meeting was supported by Salem-Keizer Public Schools and held in the Salem-Keizer Board Room. Rob Saxton of RS2 Education Consultants acted as the meeting facilitator. Superintendent Christy Perry convened the meeting and handed off to Kraig Sproles, Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Schools. Both Superintendent Perry and Assistant Superintendent Sproles acted as process observers of the meeting.

Meeting participants sat in table groups of four or five members per table and began the meeting by introducing themselves to other participants. It was a lively and engaged group throughout the length of the meeting.

The initial phase of the process provided important context and information about the SSA Student Success Act/SIA prior to any decision making. Six separate and discreet SIA "component" steps were processed. In each step, information was delivered through a Power Point and discussion model, and then participants were asked to synthesize these components in writing to create their own meaning and intent. The component parts included:

1. Understanding of the Salem-Keizer Public Schools (SKPS) Equity Lens and utilizing it to make decisions for the SIA.
2. The requirements, intent or purpose of House Bill 3427 – the SSA/SIA
3. Synthesis of the main components or recommendations of the QEC (Quality Education Commission)

4. Understanding of the SKPS CIP Continual Improvement Plan (CIP), its contents, targets, evaluations, and needs assessment.
5. Synthesis of the Community Engagement Process conducted by the District. This included the method, participants, and input from the community.
6. Synthesis of SKPS Student outcomes and disaggregated data. Creation of the story these data tell about student learning and discrepant outcomes in the SKPS.
7. Understanding of the Oregon State Equity Lens and utilizing it to make decisions for the SKPS.

The second phase of the meeting focused on a process designed to drive participants to recommendations about which student populations the District should focus on with their SIA efforts.

Participants reviewed their own "SIA component" thinking, wrote, shared with a partner, and discussed at their table group. They then went through a forced choice process, each ranking and choosing four student sub-groups they would recommend for specific focus.

The third phase of the process focused on driving participants to recommendations about which Longitudinal Data Targets as required by the SIA, the district should concentrate on. In addition, participants chose to add two additional possible data targets for consideration. The first was a SKPS Middle School Math outcome, and the second was a measure for English Language Proficiency.

Participants wrote, shared with a partner, and discussed their thinking with their table group. They then went through a forced choice process, each ranking and choosing four Longitudinal Data Targets. The possible choices were:
1. Regular attender rates
2. 3rd grade reading
3. 9th grade on-track
4. On-time graduation rate
5. Five-year completer rate
6. SKPS Middle School Math Outcome
7. English Language Proficiency Outcome

The fourth phase of the process moved to the heart of the meeting purpose - recommendations on instructional improvement, program delivery, and systemic change delivered through the SIA.

Participants were asked to read and notate a Research Guide of best practices for delivering program to students through the four allowable uses of the SIA funds – Reducing Class Size, Well Rounded Education, Instructional Time, Health and Safety. This group did not focus on the Health and Safety component as another input group had that charge. The basis of the research guide was the work of educational researcher John Hattie. Participants were given context for Hattie's work and his use of "effect size" for education practices. Each participant then selected one or two high level strategies and wrote about the implementation opportunities, challenges, and resourcing of the strategy.

Finally, participants discussed their strategies with a partner and then with their table group. A recorder memorialized the most common thinking of each table member and the collective of the group. The strategies with the most support were presented first and then listed in descending order. A presenter then delivered their recommendations to the entire committee. The recommendations were committed to writing and provided to the facilitator for synthesis.

Raw Results

Focal Student Populations:
These results are organized from highest to lowest as identified by the process, regarding the students who should receive the focus of SIA effort from the District. A vote of one equates to four (4) points, a vote of 2 to three (3) points, a vote of 3 to two (2) points, and a vote of 4 to one (1) point.

Demographic	Vote of 1	Vote of 2	Vote of 3	Vote of 4	Total Score
Economically Disadvantaged	15	5	6	5	92
English Learners	6	13	5	4	77
Students with Disabilities	5	4	4	7	47
Underserved Races/Ethnicities	0	5	7	7	36
Hispanic/Latino	4	2	2	1	27
Black/African American	0	2	3	1	13
English Learners Anytime in High School	2	0	3	2	12
Homeless Students	0	0	4	0	8
Male	0	1	0	1	4
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0	0	1	1
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	1	1
Combined Disadvantaged	0	0	0	1	1
Female	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	0	0	0	0	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0
Multi-Racial	0	0	0	0	0
White	0	0	0	0	0
Former English Learners	0	0	0	0	0
Never English Learners	0	0	0	0	0
Talented and Gifted	0	0	0	0	0
Migrant	0	0	0	0	0
CTE Participants	0	0	0	0	0
CTE Concentrators	0	0	0	0	0
All Students	0	0	0	0	0

Longitudinal Data Targets:
These results are organized from highest to lowest as identified by the process, regarding the choice for which Longitudinal Data Targets the District should focus on. Again, a vote of one equates to four (4) points, a vote of 2 to three (3) points, a vote of 3 to two (2) points, and a vote of 1 to one (1) point.

Targets	Vote of 1	Vote of 2	Vote of 3	Vote of 4	Total Score
3rd Grade Reading	11	6	4	0	70
English Language Proficiency	4	4	13	8	58
9th Grade On-Track	3	10	3	4	55
Regular Attender Rate	4	4	3	4	54
SKPS Middle School Math	2	5	6	6	41
On-Time Graduation Rate	2	1	3	7	24
Five-Year Completer Rate	0	3	0	2	8

Strategies:
These recommendations are the result of the research protocol and are listed in their entirety as stated by each participant, the table group, and reported out to the committee. The top comment on each list was the most universally agreed on strategy in each group. The second strategy listed the second most agreed to, and so on.

Group 1
- Training, support and coaching for All staff in –
    - Culturally responsive teaching
    - Explicit instructional strategies
    - Trauma informed practices
    - Equity
    - Interventions and enrichment
- Additional Specialized FTE to –
    - Reduce class size K-1
    - Reduce group size for -
        - Struggling readers
        - Students with disabilities
        - Emerging bilinguals
- Invest in practices aimed at recruitment, hiring and retaining racially diverse staff

Group 2
- Target additional specialized staffing to reduce group size for –
    - Interventions
    - Struggling readers
    - Students with disabilities
    - Emerging bilinguals
- Invest in Pre-K to 3rd grade reading that elevate RTI (Response to Intervention) practices
- Train and coach Direct Instruction

- Expand enrichment opportunities that are culturally relevant
- Innovative research informed expansion of high interest opportunities to all schools –
    - Elementary specials
    - Middle school electives
    - High school access to all
- Increasing ELD language time for students not on track (RTI model)

Group 3
- Targeted instruction before and after school for –
    - Struggling learners
    - Emerging bilinguals
- Train and coach Direct Instruction and Explicit Instruction strategies in ELA and Math
- Couple class size reduction with ongoing job imbedded PD and coaching on –
    - K-2 early intervention
    - Direct and Explicit instruction
    - Specialized staffing
    - PD needs to be modeled, continual, meaningful – coaching
- Tear apart and start over with systems that support the research

Group 4
- MTSS (Multi-Tiered Systems of Support) implemented for system sustainability
- Tier 1: Culturally responsive/sustaining guaranteed and viable core instruction and behavior systems
    - Balanced asset system
    - Core materials
    - Right-sized job embedded coaching and specialists
    - Trauma informed and restorative behavior systems
- Tier 2 and 3: Right sized number of specialists to provide intervention and support in addition to Tier 1
    - Sustainable focus and resourcing to establish continuum of support
- Resourcing needs
    - Balanced asset system
        - Diagnostic in K-12 math and ELA
        - Collaborative time for CFA's
        - Development of district assessments
    - Core Materials
        - Curriculum adoptions
        - Time, training, and implementation, coaching and mentoring
        - Training on culturally relevant responsive and sustaining practices, including district wide structures to push practices forward
    - Right-sized job-embedded coaching specialists
        - Instructional mentors
        - Behavioral specialists and trainers/mentors
        - Reading and math specialists
        - Counselors
        - Graduation mentors

- Culture/Climate specialists

Group 5
- Community Schools
  - Robust afterschool programs
  - Libraries open to community longer evening hours
  - Intramural sports
  - Adult education/programs
  - Pre-K education
  - Culture Center
  - Open late
  - Tutoring
  - Community Partnerships
- Summer School – no cost
  - Rigorous
  - Support to be on grade level
  - Community partnerships
  - Day camps
- Staff Summer PD Academy
  - Culturally responsive practices
  - Week-long PD
  - On-going check-ins
  - Mentoring
- Full MTSS Implementation
  - Provide staff supports for tier 2 and 3

Group 6
- CTE – expand enrichment opportunities that are culturally motivating and relevant
- Preschool – implement/expand preschool programs with highly trained teaching staff
- Diverse staff – Invest in practices aimed at recruiting, hiring, and retaining a racially diverse teaching staff
- Class size p- Couple class size and a reduction strategy with on-going job-embedded professional development and instructional coaching
- Increase instruction time – Add targeted instructional time after school and evidence-based interventions within the school day

Group 7
Strengthening MTSS at the school level
Increasing FTE to implement high leverage practices daily
- Implement evidence-based interventions before, during, and after school
- Add specialized staffing for struggling learners –
  - Struggling readers
  - Students with disabilities
  - Emerging bilinguals
  - Other identified focal groups
    - Ensure fidelity

- Enrichment
- Culturally relevant
- Connecting learning to prior knowledge
- Cooperative learning techniques

In an effort to bring additional clarity to these strategies, the written record provided by participant was individually read and compiled. It was important to look for consistency in regard to the recommended strategies by individuals as well as each table group.

The items below capture the entirety of the strategies suggested by individuals, with the frequency of each suggestion recorded to the left of the item. In an effort to honor what was specifically indicated, the record creates small differentiations in similar themes. More detail on the themes is provided later in the report.

(16)   Professional Development/coaching – On going, job-embedded for delivery to students of –

      (5)   High impact, research/evidence-based instructional strategies
      (4)   Culturally relevant/sustaining practices – core instruction
      (4)   Direct instruction
      (3)   Trauma informed care
      (2)   MTSS
      (2)   Explicit instructional strategies for skill development
      (1)   Inclusive practices
      (1)   PBIS
      (1)   Core instruction
      (1)   Coaches
      (1)   Needed administrators
      (1)   Meta cognitive strategies
      (1)   Mentors
      (1)   Summarization skills
      (1)   Equity
      (1)   Mental health
      (1)   Relevant practices
      (1)   Summer professional development academy
      (1)   Late arrival/early release time for PD
      (1)   Self-regulation
      (1)   Struggling learners
      (1)   Emerging bilinguals
      (1)   Pre-k-2

(9)   MTSS, implement daily, intensive, data-informed evidence-based interventions for struggling learners through MTSS

(7)   Add specialized staff to reduce caseloads to support

      (5)   Struggling readers
      (4)   Emerging bilinguals
      (2)   Students with disabilities

(1)	Music/Art programs
(1)	Intervention group size
(6)	Targeted instructional time before and after school for struggling learners and emerging bilinguals
(3)	RTI intervention practices - RTI for Pre-k to 3rd grade reading programs
(3)	CTE expanded to target CTE for underserved student populations at the middle and high
(3)	Class size reduction targeted at K-1 specifically and in higher poverty schools
(3)	Class size reduction
(2)	Enrichment opportunities that are culturally relevant
(2)	Pre-school expanded in English and Spanish
(2)	Recruit, hire, retain, diverse staff
(2)	Increased instructional time before and after school
(1)	Increase FTE
(1)	Robust after school programs that are free, and are partners with outside agencies
(1)	Create a community center with schools
(1)	Increase instructional time
(1)	Pre-school focus on self-regulation and family involvement
(1)	Well-rounded learning experiences – Increase participation in these programs

Synthesis/Recommendations:

In order for a synthesis of this process to be as helpful as possible, a specific and focused set of recommendation should be provided. Both collected results data and meeting context need consideration for best accuracy. The following synthesis is intended to consider the entirety of the input session in the formation of recommendations.

Focal Student Populations –
Even a quick glance at the review of the feedback from participants makes it obvious there are a several focal student populations the group believe deserve specific improvement efforts. The highest vote tally went to the Economically Disadvantaged student group, and a review of district data provide rationale for this choice. The English Learners student group received the second highest tally, and Students with Disabilities the third highest.

Unfortunately, the list of Focal Student Populations we used for the process broke subgroup data out into 24 different categories. With such a granular list, some responses may actually represent the same, or nearly the same, demographic. Specifically, the English Learners, Hispanic/Latino, and English Learners Any Time in High School categories. While these are not the same, they have a significant overlap and represent a nuanced response we should recognize. Combined, these three categories received a total of 116 points, which would constitute the highest level of support. Even without adding their totals together, they all were in the top seven vote getters in a list of 24 categories. A review of district outcome data confirm each of these groups as a worthy recipient of additional district effort. This is particularly true for the group of English Learners Any Time in High School. These students experience the lowest on-time graduation rate of any sub-group in the district. Focused efforts in the middle level English Learner program, supports

in core subject instruction, and specific attention for these students at the high school level could greatly improve their graduation rate.

Group participants indicated during the process that the breadth of Focal Student categories caused them to make some other calculated choices. The Underserved Races/Ethnicities designation received 36 points from committee members. Several participants specifically communicated they chose this group for its broad representation instead of the more specific sub-group designation. However, when these points are combined with those received by the more specific subgroups - Hispanic/Latino, Black/African American, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander categories, the point total is 78.

Merging the numerical result, participant discussion, and district outcome data confirm a rationale, need, and desire to target efforts on several of these focal student groups. Specifically, Economically Disadvantaged, English Learners, Underserved Races/Ethnicities (Hispanic/Latino, Black/African American, American Indian/Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander), English Learners Any Time in High School.

It is important to recognize that Students with Disabilities received the third highest level of support for focus. A review of student outcome data confirms this population experiences significant disparities as compared to all students. However, some rationale for achievement disparities can be made for Students with Disabilities. Many Students with Disabilities face learning challenges that actually make skill attainment and performance on assessments more difficult. Further investigation reveals that in Salem-Keizer, Students with Disabilities experience year-over-year academic growth commensurate with other student sub-populations. The only place this is not true is in grades 3-5 English Language Arts (ELA). These data indicate the likely need for additional focus on ELA for this sub-group at the elementary level. The significant level of support from the committee for strategies including MTSS, third grade reading efforts, and RTI would all provide methodology that should improve outcomes for this (Students with Disabilities) focal population.

Longitudinal Data Targets-
The results delivered on the Longitudinal Data Targets speak for themselves. Third Grade Reading received far-and-away the most support as an outcome target. English Language Proficiency came in second and would constitute a "local target" if chosen for focus by the district. The exact measurement and data used to indicate/determine proficiency is up to district decision makers. 9th grade on-track, and Regular Attenders were third and fourth respectively, and were closely grouped with the English Language Proficiency target.

SKPS Middle School Math had the next highest level of support. This would also be a "local target" and the exact measurement indicating success would need to be determined. The middle level does not currently have a target set by the state, making this a thoughtful choice. In addition, the district data indicating a lack of success for high school students who fail a middle school math class is compelling.

Strategies:

1. Professional Development (PD) that is ongoing, and job-embedded had the most support as a strategy by a significant margin, with sixteen participants calling it out as one of their top two strategies. Many participants continued on by specifically calling out specific learning they want from PD. There were several broad categories mentioned, like - Research/evidence based instructional strategies, or Relevant practices. Other suggestions were much more specific. The most often recommended included direct instruction, culturally relevant/sustainable practices, trauma-informed care, MTSS, and explicit instruction.

   During the process, participants regularly mentioned the need for coaches, mentors, administrators, and the time needed to provide PD. These were listed too, as were several suggested methods for providing the PD. A Summer PD academy, or late arrival/early release as examples.

   Professional Development fell into four main categories in the following ranking:
      a. Specific Strategies: Direct Instruction, MTSS, Explicit Instruction, PBIS, Meta Cognitive Strategies, Summarization.
      b. Culturally Sustaining Practices: Culturally Relevant Instruction, Inclusivity, and Equity.
      c. Mental/Behavioral Health: Mental Health, Trauma Informed Care, Self-Regulation
      d. Specific Personnel: Coaches, Mentors, Administrators

2. Second as an overall strategy was MTSS, with nine participants including this practice in their top two recommendations. They supported daily, intensive, data-informed, evidence based interventions for struggling learners. RTI, which is closely related to MTSS was also mentioned a number of times, and specifically for Pre-K to 3rd grade readers, a likely Longitudinal Target for the district.

3. Adding specialized staff and reducing caseloads in the support of specific learners (Struggling readers, Emerging bilinguals, Students with disabilities) had the third most support.

4. Targeted instructional time before and after school for struggling learners and emerging bilinguals received support from seven participants. This fits into the category identified in the SIA as increased Instructional Time.

5. The final two receiving three votes each were expanded CTE to target underserved student populations, and Class size reduction – specifically in higher poverty schools. Both of these recommendations target the strategy at focal student populations.

Requirements:
The Salem-Keizer Public Schools SIA application must meet a series of criteria in order to be approved by the state. They include:
- Meet SIA Law and Rule

- Consider the recommendations from the QEC (Quality Education Commission)
- Consider the District CIP (Continual Improvement Plan) and identified needs
- Take into account Input from the Community
- Consider Disaggregated Data
- Make Equity-based Decisions (Equity Lens)
- Utilize Evidence Based models

Each of the recommendations above (1-5) meet these requirements. Implementing five different recommendations can sometimes diminish the overall effect by making any single implementation too diffuse. In this case however, there is strong coherence in the full series of recommendations. When considered in full, the combination of recommendations could actually be formed into a comprehensive systemic package. It would include high quality Professional Development, specific Instructional Improvement strategies/methodologies, the staffing needed to carry out the targeted work, and have a focus on specific historically underserved student populations who currently suffer discrepant outcomes.