

Gresham-Barlow



School District

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Regular Board Meeting / Work Session

AGENDA

May 23, 2013

BOARD OF EDUCATION
May 23, 2013

Board Meeting / Work Session – 6 p.m.

**Partnership Room
Center for Advanced Learning (CAL)
1484 NW Civic Drive, Gresham, OR**

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

_____	Dale Clark, Chair	_____	Jim Schlachter, Superintendent
_____	Matt O’Connell, Vice-Chair	_____	Jerry Jones, Chief Financial Officer
_____	Carla Piluso, Director		
_____	Dan Christenson, Director		
_____	Kathy Ruthruff, Director		
_____	Kent Zook, Director		
_____	Kris Howatt, Director		

III. DISCUSSION TOPICS

1. Achievement Compact with the Oregon Education Investment Board (OEIB) for 2013-14.....Ketelsen / Drilling
2. Eliminating Disparities / Equity.....Schlachter
3. Pre-Capital Construction Planning / Project Management RFP.....Jones

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

May 24, 2013: Budget Reduction Day 5 of 5
Offices and Schools Closed

May 27, 2012: Memorial Day
Schools and Offices Closed

May 30, 2013: Board Work Session - 6 p.m.
Partnership Room
Center for Advanced Learning

June 3, 2013: ACE Academy Celebration – 7 p.m.
At ACE

June 3, 2013: Adult Living Program Commencement – 7 p.m.
Council Chambers
Public Safety and Schools Building
Board Representative: Matt O’Connell and Carla Piluso

Gresham-Barlow School District No. 10 Jt.
Agenda - Regular Board Meeting / Work Session
May 23, 2013
Page 2

June 6, 2013: Budget Hearing – 6:45 p.m.
Council Chambers
Public Safety and Schools Building

June 6, 2013: Regular Board Meeting - 7 p.m.
Council Chambers
Public Safety and Schools Building

V. ADJOURN (Estimated time for adjournment: No later than 8 p.m.)

JS:lc:5/21/13:5:01 PM

GRESHAM-BARLOW SCHOOL DISTRICT
1331 NW Eastman Parkway
Gresham, OR 97030-3825

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Jim Schlachter
Teresa Ketelsen
Tim Drilling

DATE: May 23, 2013

RE: No. 1 – Achievement Compact Advisory Committee Recommendations

EXPLANATION: The Achievement Compact Advisory Committee is responsible for recommending goals and targets for the achievement compact in a report to the board. The board is responsible for considering the recommendations and report when it enters into the achievement compact for the next fiscal year, and for filing the committee's report with the achievement compact it adopts and forwards to the Oregon Education Investment Board, by July 1, 2013.

The board discussed the committee's initial report in a work session January 24, 2013, and reviewed those recommendations during the February 7, 2013, board meeting. Since then, the committee has been able to gather previously unavailable data for student subgroups, set related achievement targets and develop rationale for the new targets. The committee's report to the board has been revised accordingly.

PRESENTERS: Teresa Ketelsen, Tim Drilling

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS:

1. 2012-13 Board Briefing, Data Team Initiatives
2. Achievement Compact Advisory Committee, May 23, 2013 Report to the Board
3. Achievement Compact Data Sheets

RECOMMENDATION: Review the recommendations and rationale for each indicator as submitted by the Achievement Compact Advisory Committee

REQUESTED ACTION: No formal action is required.

TD:lc



District Mission
EVERY STUDENT prepared for a lifetime of learning, career opportunities, and productive contributions to the community.

School Board

Carla Piluso
Dale Clark
Dan Christenson
Kathy Ruthruff
Kent Zook
Kris Howatt
Matt O'Connell

Superintendent

Jim Schlachter

Presenter:

Teresa Ketelsen
Deputy Superintendent

Tim Drilling
Director, Assessment & Accountability

2012-13 BOARD BRIEFING

A Collaboration of the Superintendent's Cabinet

Data Team Initiative

Achievement Compact Advisory Committee

Board Work Session Date: May 23, 2013

1. **Issue:** The Achievement Compact Advisory Committee is responsible for recommending goals and targets for the achievement compact in a report to the board. The board is responsible for considering the recommendations and report when it enters into the achievement compact for the next fiscal year, and for filing the committee's report with the achievement compact it adopts and forwards to the Oregon Education Investment Board, by July 1, 2013.
2. **Overview/Background Information:** The Board discussed the committee's initial report in a work session January 24, 2013, and reviewed those recommendations during the February 7, 2013 board meeting. Since then, the committee has been able to gather previously unavailable data for student subgroups, set related achievement targets and develop rationale for the new targets. The committee's report to the board has been revised accordingly.
3. **Recommendations:** District administration recommends the board consider the committee's recommendations and request any additional information required to set final targets and adopt the achievement compact during the board meeting, June 6, 2013.
4. **Budget Implications:** The development and adoption of the achievement compact occurs in conjunction with the development and adoption of the district budget, and allows the board to consider allocation of resources to accomplish the achievement compact.
5. **Statement of Impact:** The goals and targets in the achievement compact are a focus on student achievement leading to high school graduation or completion, and college readiness.
6. **Potential Policy Implications:** None.

Td: 5/16/13

Attachments:

- A Achievement Compact Advisory Committee Report
- B Achievement Compact Data Sheets

Achievement Compact Advisory Committee May 23, 2013 Report to Board

Background

The Achievement Compact Advisory Committee (ACAC) was assembled to develop 2013-14 Achievement Compact recommendations to the school board. On October 4, the board approved the membership of the Advisory Committee, which includes licensed, classified, and administrative staff, as follows:

Tim Collins, AGSA
Renni Ferguson, OSEA
Cyrus Harshfield, GBEA
Michelle Mercer, GBEA
Jennifer Paulsen, AGSA

Jim Schlachter, District
Bruce Schmidt, AGSA
Megan Sternberg, OSEA
Molly Stewart, OSEA
Maranda Turner, GBEA

Facilitators: Tim Drilling & Teresa Ketelsen, District Office

The committee is responsible for recommending goals and targets for the Achievement Compact in a report to the board, presented on February 7, 2013. The goals and targets are a focus on student achievement leading to high school graduation or completion, and college readiness, all pointing toward the state's 40/40/20 Goal in 2025.

The board is responsible for considering the recommendations and report when it enters into the Achievement Compact for the next fiscal year, and for filing the committee's report with the Achievement Compact it adopts and forwards to the Oregon Education Investment Board. The committee has met six times this school year to examine historical achievement data, set targets, and develop a rationale for each target.

Process for Setting Achievement Compact Targets

The district used two methods to set targets for Achievement Compact indicators – one method to calculate targets for College and Career Readiness Outcomes, and a second method for calculating targets for **Progression Outcomes**. The committee utilized methodology developed in the spring of 2012 by a number of school districts, including Portland, Beaverton, and Eugene, to assist other districts with the target setting process.

The College and Career Readiness Outcomes are Four-Year Graduation Rate, Five-Year Completion Rate, **Earning 9+ Credits** and Post-Secondary Enrollment.

The calculation used here includes a growth calculator component to establish the district's "**trajectory line**," which represents the annual growth needed for the district to achieve the College and Career Readiness Outcomes by 2021.

The trajectory line represents the annual growth rate necessary to reach 100% success on the five-year completion rate for 9th graders entering high school in 2016-17, and therefore completing high school five years later, in 2021. The year 2021 was chosen to leave 4 years for college enrollment prior to the state's 2025 goal. The trajectory line is the starting point in target setting for the All Student group and the Disadvantaged Student group, and depicts annual growth in the following increments:

- All Student group – 2.8% increase each year in students meeting the outcome
- Disadvantaged Student group – 4.0% increase each year in students meeting the outcome. It should be noted that the growth rates for the seven individual Disadvantaged Student subgroups, and for the Asian and TAG subgroups, will all differ, based on the past performance of the group.

The committee applied the same annual growth rate calculated for the five-year completion rate to the four-year cohort graduation rate and post-secondary enrollment.

The Progression Outcomes are 3rd Grade Reading, 5th Grade Math, 6th Grade Attendance, 8th Grade Math, 9th Grade Credits Earned, and 9th Grade Attendance.

The method for calculating annual growth required for the district to reach its goals for these indicators differs from the approach used above, although the annual growth required still represents a trajectory line. For each of these indicators the committee set targets for an annual 10% decrease in students who are not proficient. For example:

- a. Identify the percentage of students (in 2010-11) who are not meeting the outcome measure (if 70% of students are meeting, then 30% are not meeting)
- b. Take 10% of students not meeting (10% of 30% is 3%)
- c. Apply that 10% to identify the target (70% + 3% is 73% as the target)

This growth model replicates the “Safe Harbor” calculation that was part of No Child Left Behind Act's adequate yearly progress determination.

Data Used in Setting Targets and Providing Rationale

The committee considered the following data in their work to set targets:

- Achievement Compact 2013-14 Projected Targets *
- District Trajectory Line
- District Trend Line (actual achievement data)
- Comparison District Actual and Trajectory
- Actual State Average
- Individual schools within the district – actual for 2010-11 and 2011-12, as well as targets projected for 2012-13 as part of their School Improvement Plans (SIP)

In setting a recommended target for each indicator, the committee reviewed available data, and tried to find a balance between aspirational and achievable targets. The committee attempted to identify primary factors affecting student achievement for each indicator, including programs, initiatives, and resources. **In all cases, the committee recommends to set targets on the trajectory line.**

**It should be noted the GBSD Achievement Compact 2012-13 (Projected) Targets were set prior to district use of the methodology developed by the three districts referenced above.*

ACHIEVEMENT COMPACT 2013-14
INDICATOR TARGETS & RATIONALE

Progression Outcomes:

Kindergarten Readiness Assessment Participation	All Students	96%
	Disadvantaged Students (Aggregated)	96%
	Disadvantaged Subgroups	
	Economically Disadvantaged	96%
	Limited English Proficient	96%
	Students with Disabilities	96%
	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	96%
	Hispanic Origin	96%
	American Indian/ Alaska Native	96%
	Pacific Islander	96%
	Non-Disadvantaged Subgroups	
Asian	96%	
Talented and Gifted	96%	

The kindergarten readiness assessment includes measures of early literacy, early math, social-emotional development, approaches to learning, and self-regulation. It will be administered within the first six weeks of kindergarten. For the 2013-14 school year, districts will include only participation rates for the kindergarten assessment.

3rd Grade Reading	All Students	68%
	Disadvantaged Students (Aggregated)	60%
	Disadvantaged Subgroups	
	Economically Disadvantaged	62%
	Limited English Proficient	47%
	Students with Disabilities	56%
	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	62%
	Hispanic Origin	57%
	American Indian/ Alaska Native	58%
	Pacific Islander	90%
	Non-Disadvantaged Subgroups	
Asian	76%	
Talented and Gifted	96%	

This indicator measures third grade students who are proficient in reading by meeting or exceeding on the statewide assessment. Literacy by Design is now in its third year as our adopted reading curriculum at all elementary schools. Over the three years, training has been provided with multiple opportunities for follow up to effectively imbed the whole group, small group, and assessment components into daily reading instruction. Third graders who are assessed in 2013-14 will have received this instruction since kindergarten. Response to Intervention (RTI) programs are also in place at all elementary schools, to provide additional support to students who are struggling readers. These two programs will result in an increase in both the All Students and Disadvantaged Students outcomes.

5th Grade Math	All Students	60%
	Disadvantaged Students (Aggregated)	51%
	Disadvantaged Subgroups	
	Economically Disadvantaged	51%
	Limited English Proficient	44%
	Students with Disabilities	34%
	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	33%
	Hispanic Origin	48%
	American Indian/ Alaska Native	30%
	Pacific Islander	80%
	Non-Disadvantaged Subgroups	
	Asian	63%
Talented and Gifted	96%	

This indicator measures 5th graders who are proficient in math by meeting or exceeding on the statewide assessment. Math is a focus at most of the elementary schools. Common Core State Standards (CCSS) are being implemented into instructional practices this year, which will produce achievement gains. Four elementary schools have selected to participate in additional sheltered instruction focusing on mathematics.

6th Grade Attendance	All Students	89%
	Disadvantaged Students (Aggregated)	89%
	Disadvantaged Subgroups	
	Economically Disadvantaged	89%
	Limited English Proficient	93%
	Students with Disabilities	88%
	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	91%
	Hispanic Origin	95%
	American Indian/ Alaska Native	85%
	Pacific Islander	96%
	Non-Disadvantaged Subgroups	
	Asian	96%
Talented and Gifted	96%	

The 6th grade attendance indicator measures the percentage of students who attend 90% of the time or more. Since each school is closely monitoring student attendance, attendance interventions can now be put into place if a student begins to show signs of chronic absenteeism. Some of these interventions are parent contact, interviewing the student to determine reason for absences, assisting the student in goal setting towards positive attendance behavior, or acknowledgement for a student's efforts in turning around poor attendance patterns.

8th Grade Math	All Students	68%
	Disadvantaged Students (Aggregated)	57%
	Disadvantaged Subgroups	
	Economically Disadvantaged	58%
	Limited English Proficient	35%
	Students with Disabilities	37%
	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	45%
	Hispanic Origin	52%
	American Indian/ Alaska Native	54%
	Pacific Islander	33%
	Non-Disadvantaged Subgroups	
	Asian	66%
	Talented and Gifted	96%

This indicator represents the percentage of students who are proficient in 8th grade math by meeting or exceeding on the statewide assessment. The 2013-14 school year will be the second year for middle school students experiencing the Common Core State Standards in math. So, as students enter 8th grade with a strong foundation in more rigorous mathematics, they will be more successful. Also, 80% of the middle schools currently have a double-dose math class for 6th and 7th graders who are struggling to master the math standards. By the end of the 2013-14 school year these struggling math students will have had two years to access these extra support classes. This will result in an increase for both the All Students and Disadvantaged Students groups.

9th Grade Credits Earned	All Students	79%
	Disadvantaged Students (Aggregated)	71%
	Disadvantaged Subgroups	
	Economically Disadvantaged	70%
	Limited English Proficient	55%
	Students with Disabilities	64%
	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	66%
	Hispanic Origin	65%
	American Indian/ Alaska Native	64%
	Pacific Islander	80%
	Non-Disadvantaged Subgroups	
	Asian	91%
	Talented and Gifted	96%

The 9th credits earned indicator measures the percentage of 9th graders who have earned 6 or more credits by the beginning of 10th grade. Challenges for 9th grade students to earn 6 credits are increasing. Not only will the implementation of the Common Core State Standards increase academic rigor, the annual roll out of new Essential Skill requirements increases the accountability for students and schools. At the same time, the new 7-period schedule provides fewer opportunities for students to retake classes they fail to pass. Supports such as the Step Up program for students at Gresham HS and

the AVID program at Gresham HS and Barlow HS will help, but the committee believes that additional resources will be needed in order to raise and sustain performance.

9th Grade Attendance	All Students		89%
	Disadvantaged Students (Aggregated)		85%
	Disadvantaged Subgroups		
		Economically Disadvantaged	81%
		Limited English Proficient	78%
		Students with Disabilities	39%
		Black (not of Hispanic origin)	82%
		Hispanic Origin	81%
		American Indian/ Alaska Native	91%
		Pacific Islander	67%
	Non-Disadvantaged Subgroups		
		Asian	94%
	Talented and Gifted	96%	

This second 9th grade indicator measures the percentage of students who attend 90% or more of the time. Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) helps students to improve their attendance through a check-in/ check-out system, and acknowledges students who have shown improved attendance over time. The high school attendance initiative will be in its second year and will result in improved attendance rates. Under this initiative, letters are sent home when a student has been absent more than four days in a thirty-day window. With this focus on attendance, students who may have chronic absences are identified early and interventions put in place.

College and Career-Readiness Outcomes:

4-Year Graduation Rate	All Students		75%
	Disadvantaged Students (Aggregated)		64%
	Disadvantaged Subgroups		
		Economically Disadvantaged	66%
		Limited English Proficient	40%
		Students with Disabilities	41%
		Black (not of Hispanic origin)	61%
		Hispanic Origin	61%
		American Indian/ Alaska Native	62%
		Pacific Islander	75%
	Non-Disadvantaged Subgroups		
		Asian	55%
	Talented and Gifted	86%	

Graduation requirements are rising. Supports the district has put in place to help students to meet these requirements include multiple opportunities to complete the Essential Skill work samples, the attendance initiative, and the option of Rosemary Anderson HS-East. There is also a renewed focus on disproportionate exclusionary

practices, which can help to increase student retention. However, the committee believes additional resources are necessary to sustain improved outcomes.

5-Year Completion Rate	All Students		85%
	Disadvantaged Students (Aggregated)		79%
	Disadvantaged Subgroups		
		Economically Disadvantaged	80%
		Limited English Proficient	68%
		Students with Disabilities	70%
		Black (not of Hispanic origin)	58%
		Hispanic Origin	76%
		American Indian/ Alaska Native	71%
		Pacific Islander	96%
	Non-Disadvantaged Subgroups		
		Asian	82%
		Talented and Gifted	96%

This group includes students earning a modified or extended diploma, or a GED. Improving four and five-year graduation rates will drive up the completion rate, as will new opportunities for students to enroll in GED programs offered by the Gresham-Barlow Web Academy, Alpha HS, Mt. Hood CC, and soon at Rosemary Anderson HS-East.

Earning 9+ College Credits	All Students		%
	Disadvantaged Students (Aggregated)		%
	Disadvantaged Subgroups		
		Economically Disadvantaged	%
		Limited English Proficient	%
		Students with Disabilities	%
		Black (not of Hispanic origin)	%
		Hispanic Origin	%
		American Indian/ Alaska Native	%
		Pacific Islander	%
	Non-Disadvantaged Subgroups		
		Asian	%
		Talented and Gifted	%

This indicator measures the percentage of students who have received, or earned the right to receive, 9 or more college credits while enrolled in high school or earlier. Credits can be earned through any means approved by local school board policy, including AP exam, IB course completion, dual-credit course completion, community college or university enrollment.

Post-Secondary Enrollment	All Students	70%
	Disadvantaged Students (Aggregated)	60%
	Disadvantaged Subgroups	
	Economically Disadvantaged	61%
	Limited English Proficient	52%
	Students with Disabilities	48%
	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	76%
	Hispanic Origin	47%
	American Indian/ Alaska Native	69%
	Pacific Islander	
	Non-Disadvantaged Subgroups	
Asian		
Talented and Gifted	88%	

This indicator measures the number of students enrolled in a post-secondary institution within 16 months of high school completion. This group includes students enrolled in four-year colleges, community colleges, and technical certificate programs. The AVID program helps to propel more students toward college, while the AP and IB programs also enable students to earn college credits. Students enrolled in College Now and other early-college credit opportunities can earn lower-division college credits while in high school, often at no cost. The committee also recognizes the positive impact of the ASPIRE program. Access to Student Assistance Programs in Reach of Everyone is a mentoring program that matches adult mentors with middle and high school students to develop their educational goals beyond high school.

Optional Local Priorities

The district board can choose to add to the compact local priorities that include outcome measures the board believes will help to inform its goals for educational achievement within the district. If the board chooses to include local priorities, it must provide to OEIB a research-based rationale for the use of the local priorities and a description of what the board hopes to accomplish by the use of these priorities. The OEIB will act on the approval of these local priorities within 30 days of receipt of the district's Achievement Compact.

Examples of possible local priorities that the committee has discussed include:

- Algebra I
- Geometry
- Kindergarten attendance
- Essential Skill of Reading
- Essential Skill of Writing
- Parent involvement
- Family and community partnerships
- Staff professional development, with alignment by level across the district

The committee is not recommending that the board add any optional local priorities at this time. However, the committee will reconsider this matter in the future.

**Gresham-Barlow School District: 2013-14 Achievement Compact
May 23, 2013**

College and Career Ready: Are students completing high school ready for										
	9th graders	Dis-advantaged	9th graders of 2008-09	Dis-advantaged	9th graders of 2009-10	Dis-advantaged	9th graders of 2010-11	Dis-advantaged	9th graders of	Dis-advantaged
4-Year Cohort Graduation	71%	59%	70%	60%			75%	64%		
5-Year Completion	83%	75%					85%	79%		
Post-Secondary Enrollment	66%	56%					70%	60%		
Earning 9+ College Credits										

Disadvantaged is aggregate of disadvantaged student groups (details on pp. 2-4)

Gray shaded boxes are district-provided projections and goals

Progression: Are students making sufficient progress toward college and career										
	2010-11 All	Dis-advantaged	2011-12 All	Dis-advantaged	2012-13 All*	Dis-advantaged	2013-14 Goal All	Dis-advantaged	4-Year Goal (2016-17)**	Dis-advantaged
Kinder Readiness Participation							>95%	>95%		
3 rd Gr. Read. Proficiency	57%	49%	61%	50%			68%	60%		
5th Gr. Math Proficiency	51%	39%	51%	39%			60%	51%		
6th Gr. Not Chronic	87%	86%	85%	81%			89%	89%		
8th Gr. Math Proficiency	51%	39%	61%	48%			68%	57%		
9th Grade Credits Earned	77% [†]	64% [†]	74% [†]	64% [†]			79%	71%		
9th Gr. Not Chronic Absence	81%	74%	85%	80%			89%	85%		

*Estimate based on most recent available data **2017 goals are optional † SIP Reporter estimate

Equity: Are students succeeding across all buildings and					
	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14 Goal	4-Year Goal (2016-17)**
Priority & Focus Buildings*	1	3	3	3	

DISAGGREGATED DATA AND GOALS FOR EACH DISADVANTAGED STUDENT GROUP LISTED ON PP 2-4

*Prior to 2012-13, school in federal AYP "Need Improvement" status **4-year Goals are optional

Local Priorities: What other measures reflect key priorities in the district?										
	Year	Dis-advantaged	Year	Dis-advantaged	Year	Dis-advantaged	1-Year Goal	Dis-advantaged	4-Year Goal**	Dis-advantaged

**4-year Goal optional

Investment: What is the public investment in the district? (does not include capital investments)										
	2011-12	2012-13*	2013-14*	2013-14 QEM calculation of						
Formula Revenue					District Share					
Local Revenue not passed through formula					District Official					
Federal Revenue										
State Grants not passed through formula										

OEIB Chief Education Officer

NOTE: The gray fields for current and past data are optional, as are the tan fields for local priorities. Districts should fill in the blue fields with their targets, provided student counts are six or more.

Equity: Are students succeeding across all									
9th Graders of 2007-08									
	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	Hispanic origin	American Indian / Alaska Native	Pacific Islander	Asian (not included in)	TAG (not included in)
4-Year Graduation Rate	61%	35%	36%	56%	56%	57%		50%	85%
5-Year Completion Rate	77%	53%	70%	75%	69%	>95%		61%	91%
Earning 9+ College Credits									
Post-Secondary Enrollment									
2010-11 Results									
Kinder Readiness									
3rd Gr. Reading Proficiency	48%	27%	40%	48%	41%	43%	*	67%	>95%
5th Gr. Math Proficiency	39%	27%	21%	27%	35%	42%	*	35%	>95%
6th Grade Chronic Absence	85%	90%	83%	87%	93%	80%	57%	94%	>95%
8th Gr. Math Prof.	39%	27%	21%	27%	35%	42%	*	35%	>95%
9th Grade Credits Earned	62%	39%	49%	61%	59%	58%	67%	81%	96%
9th Gr. Not Chronic Absence	73%	60%	74%	71%	73%	73%	*	88%	>95%

9th Graders of 2008-09									
	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	Hispanic origin	American Indian / Alaska Native	Pacific Islander	Asian (not included in)	TAG (not included in)
4-Year Graduation Rate	63%	36%	33%	41%	56%	44%		72%	84%
5-Year Completion Rate									
Earning 9+ College Credits									
Post-Secondary Enrollment									
2011-12 Results									
Kinder Readiness									
3rd Gr. Reading Proficiency	49%	27%	33%	47%	36%	50%	*	67%	>95%
5th Gr. Math Proficiency	40%	31%	18%	17%	36%	14%	*	54%	>95%

6th Grade Chronic Absence	81%	87%	80%	69%	85%	85%	*	>95%	>95%
8th Gr. Math Prof.	28%	20%	22%	32%	41%	43%	*	58%	>95%
9th Grade Credits Earned	63%	45%	55%	58%	57%	56%	73%	89%	98%
9th Gr. Not Chronic Absence	77%	73%	74%	78%	77%	89%	*	92%	>95%

9th Graders of 2009-10									
	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	Hispanic origin	American Indian / Alaska	Pacific Islander	Asian (not included in)	TAG (not included in)
4-Year Graduation Rate									
5-Year Completion Rate									
Earning 9+ College Credits									
Post-Secondary Enrollment									
2012-13 Results									
Kinder Readiness									
3rd Gr. Reading Proficiency									
5th Gr. Math Proficiency									
6th Grade Chronic Absence									
8th Gr. Math Prof.									
9th Grade Credits Earned									
9th Grade Attendance									

9th Graders of 2010-11									
	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	Hispanic origin	American Indian / Alaska	Pacific Islander	Asian (not included in)	TAG (not included in)
4-Year Graduation Rate	66%	40%	41%	61%	61%	62%	75%	55%	86%
5-Year Completion Rate	80%	68%	70%	58%	76%	71%	96%	82%	>95%
Earning 9+ College Credits									
Post-Secondary Enrollment	61%	52%	48%	76%	47%	69%			88%

2013-14 Results									
	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	Hispanic origin	American Indian / Alaska Native	Pacific Islander	Asian (not included in aggregate)	TAG (not included in aggregate)
Kinder Readiness	>95%	>95%	>95%	>95%	>95%	>95%	>95%	>95%	>95%
3 rd Gr. Reading Proficiency	62%	47%	56%	62%	57%	58%	90%	76%	>95%
5 th Gr. Math Proficiency	51%	44%	34%	33%	48%	30%	80%	63%	>95%
6 th Grade Chronic Absence	89%	93%	88%	91%	95%	85%	96%	>95%	>95%
8th Gr. Math Prof.	58%	35%	37%	45%	52%	54%	33%	66%	>95%
9th Grade Credits Earned	70%	55%	64%	66%	65%	64%	80%	91%	96%
9th Grade Attendance	81%	78%	79%	82%	81%	91%	67%	94%	>95%

9th Graders of 2011-12 (Optional 4-Year Goals)									
	Economically Disadvantaged	Limited English Proficient	Students with Disabilities	Black (not of Hispanic origin)	Hispanic origin	American Indian / Alaska Native	Pacific Islander	Asian (not included in aggregate)	TAG (not included in aggregate)
4-Year Graduation Rate									
5-Year Completion Rate									
Earning 9+ College Credits									
Post-Secondary Enrollment									
2014-15 Results									
Kinder Readiness									
3rd Gr. Reading Proficiency									
5th Gr. Math Proficiency									
6th Grade Chronic Absence									
8th Gr. Math Prof.									
9th Grade Credits Earned									
9th Grade Attendance									

NOTE: The gray and tan fields are optional. Districts should fill in the blue fields with their targets, provided that the student counts are six or more.

GRESHAM-BARLOW SCHOOL DISTRICT
1331 NW Eastman Parkway
Gresham, OR 97030-3825

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Jim Schlachter
DATE: May 23, 2013
RE: No. 2 – Eliminating Disparities / Equity

EXPLANATION: The Gresham-Barlow School District’s mission, “Every student prepared for a lifetime of learning, career opportunities, and productive contributions to the community,” calls out our intention to meet the needs of EVERY student. Data that indicates that not all students are successful suggests that there are achievement trends related to the economic status, race, ethnicity, and other identifiable sub-groups characteristics. Addressing achievement disparities is at the heart of our work as a district and is captured in our emerging conversations about equity.

In the Gresham-Barlow School District, equity has been a part of one of our strategic themes, “Learning Opportunities.” This has been advanced through our educational initiative, “Supportive Learning Environments.”

Over the past 12 months, a number of regional conversations regarding the equity in K-12 schools has emerged. The Oregon Education Investment Board has recently drafted an “equity lens” that is being considered as a guide to its work at the state level. Regionally, All Hands Raised (a Multnomah County partnership that involves K-12 public schools, higher education institutions, private non-profit organizations and business) has explicitly placed a focus on race, equity and rigor around continuous improvement in K-12 schools. Districts in the region have engaged in conversation around equity, equity policy.

PRESENTER: Jim Schlachter

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS: To be provided at the work session.

Board of Directors
Re: No. 2 – Eliminating Disparities / Equity
May 23, 2013
Page 2

RECOMMENDATION: The goals of this work session include:

1. Introduce the school board to documents, data and other information related to the issue of equity in K-12 schools.
2. Discuss the presented information and collect observations and questions.
3. Chart a path for continued board consideration of equity in the Gresham-Barlow School District.

REQUESTED ACTION: No action is required at this time.

JS:lc

GRESHAM-BARLOW SCHOOL DISTRICT
1331 NW Eastman Parkway
Gresham, OR 97030-3825

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Jim Schlachter
Jerry Jones

DATE: May 23, 2013

RE: No. 3 – Pre-Capital Construction Planning / Project Management – RFP

EXPLANATION: Work is in process to prepare for a potential capital improvements bond measure to be presented for voter approval in November 2013.

To assist staff in the planning, development and pre-implementation of a district-wide facilities improvement plan focusing on renovation, replacement, and upgrade to the facilities, it will be necessary to secure a contract for pre-construction support services through a request for proposal (RFP) process.

The work will be structured to maximize the district's resources and the economic impact of available funds. The purpose of this RFP is to inform potential respondents of the need for management consulting support services. Respondents will be requested to formally express interest and submit team and/or firm credentials and profiles relative to the sample RFP.

The project manager leads the team and helps negotiate the multiple relationships within any project—whether with the owner (the district), team members, firm principles or any variety of partners (such as the city, contractors or even civic committees), and functions as the hub of the project.

PRESENTER: Jerry Jones

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS: Sample Request for Proposal to be provided at the work session.

RECOMMENDATION: The administration will recommend that a project manager be selected to support the district in successfully completing a major capital construction project.

REQUESTED ACTION: No board action is required at this time.

JJ: mkh:lc