

**Report on Oregon's Progress in Implementing
CIM and CAM Achievement Standards
And Related Measures
To Transform the K-12 School System**

Governor's Task Force on School Improvement

October 16, 1996

CONTENTS

1. Why This Assessment	1
2. The Magnitude of the Challenge and a Framework for the Effort Required	3
3. Findings	5
4. Recommendations	13

1. WHY THIS ASSESSMENT?

High Achievement Standards Are As Crucial As Ever

High achievement standards are the central pillar of Oregon's effort to transform its K-12 public schools. The urgency for such standards has, if anything, intensified since the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century¹ was forged in HB 3565 and then refined in HB 2991. In just the past two years, Oregon's successful economy has created thousands of openings in well paying, skilled positions for which there is a shortage of qualified Oregonians. As a result, employers have begun importing the workers they need.

The new talent is Oregon's gain, but the skill deficiencies of those left behind is everyone's loss. The shortage of skilled workers is impairing Oregon's economic competitiveness by restricting productive capacity and increasing the costs of remedial training. Among individuals, lack of skills translates into limited career prospects, low income, and unemployment. These, in turn, impair family and community stability. None of these outcomes is acceptable.

The Timing Is Right To Examine Progress In Implementing Standards

Oregon's school improvement effort is now in its fifth year, and since the state's future depends so much on the outcome, it makes sense to see how that effort is going. Civic and business leaders want to know. So will legislators in the session just ahead.

The Governor's Task Force on School Improvement is one of six panels created by Gov. John Kitzhaber in June to examine Oregon's progress in transforming its schools. The primary focus of the task force is Oregon's progress in implementing student achievement standards embodied in the Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) and the Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM). The task force is essentially the CAM Advisory Committee to the Oregon Department of Education given an expanded charge. This group represents a wide variety of Oregon leaders with a stake in achievement standards and related school improvements, so it is well qualified for the task at hand.

Governor's Charge to the Task Force

The Governor has charged the task force to examine the current strategy in Oregon for implementing both the CIM and CAM, with an eye to anything that could endanger achievement of these standards and related measures. The task force is to report its findings and recommendations to Gov. Kitzhaber and State School Supt. Paulus. To guide this work, the Governor reminded the task force to keep the following principles in mind:

- Implementation of the certificates of mastery cannot be compromised or delayed.
- The implementation strategy must make sense to parents and students, whose understanding and support is essential.

¹For convenience, this is subsequently referred to as the Oregon Education Act.

- The strategy must have the support of teachers and other local educators.
- Employers must be close advisors and allies in the effort and must value CIM/CAM standards in their hiring policies.
- Post-secondary education organizations must value CIM/CAM standards in their admissions process and there must be a seamless fit of the standards in the K-16 continuum.
- Schools must utilize the capacity of technology in CIM/CAM implementation.

2. THE MAGNITUDE OF THE CHALLENGE AND A FRAMEWORK FOR THE EFFORT REQUIRED

The Scale and Difficulty of the Undertaking

Oregon's new K-12 education standards and related improvements require not just incremental change but fundamental *transformation* of the existing school system. The challenge of accomplishing that transformation is enormous when one considers the scale of the system, the logistics of the changes required, and the psychological and organizational barriers to overcome.

The scale of the system is formidable. The state has 210 school districts with more than 561,000 students and approximately 27,000 teachers in over 1,200 buildings scattered across 98,000 square miles. The annual cost of running this system exceeds \$2.7 billion.

Just two examples illustrate the logistics of transforming the system. First, curriculum, classroom organization, teaching methods, learning process management, and school scheduling will have to be modified to help children achieve the new standards. Therefore, several thousand teacher candidates now in undergraduate programs, 27,000 teachers in Oregon schools, and the school administrators who support them will require extensive orientation and training. Second, employers must be involved statewide in school-to-work programs that are a part of the new curriculum. A preliminary scale analysis suggests that among Oregon's 145,000 high school students, 40,000 will require at least one job shadow and 30,000 one structured work experience. To meet this demand, 7,000 employers representing 280,000 jobs would have to provide one job shadow for every seven employees and one work experience for every 10 employees. Forming the employer-school partnerships required and coordinating both the school and employer end of these student experiences is a huge undertaking.

Perhaps more imposing are the psychological and organizational barriers to change. Whether as students, parents, teachers, or school administrators, people are invested in a host of assumptions and behaviors. When asked to change, they need to understand why change is important, how their lives will be made better, what the trade-offs are, and what they must do. Then they need assistance. Organizations are similarly invested in their existing configurations and procedures. Change requires new ways of thinking, planning, scheduling, working, communicating, and evaluating. Established ways of doing things do not give ground easily.

Even within the confines of a tightly controlled hierarchy, fundamental system wide change cannot be mandated and coerced. It must occur in the heart, and for this to happen, people must be brought along with a clear vision, a sensible strategy, and effective leadership. This is even more true when the system to be changed consists of 210 separate jurisdictions, each largely independent, each comprising a variety of stakeholders who exert influence on what happens.

The Framework for School Transformation

A number of conditions are required to transform any institutional system, and

especially one composed of separate organizations and stakeholders:

- **Clear vision.** There should be a comprehensive documented vision of improvement that is shared by advocates and widely understood and accepted by stakeholders. In particular, everyone needs to embrace the idea that standards will be higher and student achievement of these standards will be measured.
- **Implementation strategy.** This should consist of much more than standards, assessments, and a schedule for their development and application. It is a comprehensive plan that identifies important objectives, key leaders and players, organizational structures and coalitions, major initiatives and assignments, time lines, funding requirements, communication methods, and measures of results.
- **Oversight process.** Over the course of implementing school improvement there must be an organization and a set of procedures to continuously review the vision and to monitor its implementation in a way that allows for breaking down barriers and making mid-course corrections
- **Shared leadership.** The effort to transform the schools must involve shared leadership among all institutions and stakeholders² affected.
- **Adequate resources.** Staff and financial resources are required to support the day-in, day-out work of transforming the schools.

In the case of school standards and related improvements, there is an additional condition:

- **Perceived value of the product to consumers.** The quality and adequacy of the standards themselves must be apparent to parents, teachers, employers, and post-secondary educators.

These conditions form the framework for the task force findings and recommendations which follow.

²Stakeholders are defined here as classes of individuals with a stake in the outcome of school improvement, such as students, parents, teachers, employers, and taxpayers. Certain institutions such as school districts, the Oregon Department of Education, and the Oregon State System of Higher Education also have a stake in school improvement. These are sometimes described here as "institutional stakeholders."

3. FINDINGS

An Opportunity That Calls for a Larger Scale of Effort

The Oregon Education Act for the 21st Century is the most far-sighted legislation yet enacted to transform a statewide school system. Because what we hope to accomplish for our schools and communities is huge and unprecedented, the effort we exert must be increased in scope, intensity, and organization at both state and local levels.

What we have attempted and accomplished thus far has taught us a number of things. First, despite the gains we have made, the magnitude of what needs to be done exceeds all of our previous expectations. Second, the work that needs to be done and the leadership needed to do it cannot be provided by the Oregon Department of Education or the K-12 system alone. Transforming our K-12 schools, it is now clear, requires initiative and leadership from community colleges, from four-year colleges and universities, from teacher training programs, from employers, and from teachers, parents, and administrators in local school districts, as well as from state government. Third, system wide school improvement requires a shared vision and unprecedented cooperation that transcends individual organizations and institutions.

Background Findings

Positive Accomplishments. Since 1991, Oregon can point to the following accomplishments in school improvement by the Department of Education:

- Development in 1991 of a statewide assessment system to measure performance of students at grades 3, 5, 8, and 11; subsequent redevelopment of that system in 1996 to measure student progress toward CIM standards at grades 3, 5, and 8, and to measure student attainment of CIM standards at grade 10
- Work with the 1991 Legislature to develop the basic school improvement framework contained in HB 3565; work with the 1995 Legislature on the modifications that produced HB 2991
- Draft redefinition of the Common Curriculum Goals, which serve as a foundation for standards and assessments
- Draft development of all nine CIM academic content standards and two skill performance standards, which were adopted by the State Board of Education in September 1996
- Draft development of content and career-related learning standards for the CAM, scheduled to be adopted in December 1996
- Visits by Superintendent Paulus and her staff to school districts in communities throughout the state to explain and promote the standards and related measures contained in the Oregon Education Act

Two other notable accomplishments have occurred in this period. First, availability of federal school-to-work funding has given rise to numerous models of work-based learning partnerships between schools and employers around the state.

Second, the Oregon State System of Higher Education has taken the initiative to develop its own proficiency standards that apply to Oregon high school graduates who seek admission to the state system.³

Challenges. Despite the accomplishments noted above, a great number of educators, business leaders, and others share the belief that much more needs to be done. In group exercises, task force members expressed remarkably similar views on a number of critical issues:

- **Shared vision.** Why school transformation is needed and what it entails is not well understood by most laymen and many educators. Even though CIM standards have been adopted and CAM standards are under development, too few parents and teachers understand their implications.
- **Implementation plan.** Oregon needs a plan to accomplish school transformation that is widely understood and that tackles the challenge at a much larger scale and level of comprehensiveness.
- **Stakeholder involvement.** Those with a stake in school improvement need to be involved and invested in school transformation much more broadly.
- **Resources.** In order to accomplish an undertaking of this magnitude, Oregon needs to fund the effort adequately.

The Importance of Maintaining Momentum. The real risk presented by these hurdles may be that school improvement is losing its educator audience. In a survey of educators from a broad sampling of schools between 1992 and 1995, Paul Goldman and David Conley found an erosion in support for and optimism about school improvement.⁴ Support for fundamental change in the schools dropped from 56 percent in 1992 to 36 percent in 1995. Over the same period, skepticism about school transformation grew from 52 to 64 percent. Compared to three years earlier, respondents said they were less optimistic that the Oregon Education Act would lead to improved learning. Fewer respondents were in agreement with the ideas in the Act.

Some of this erosion can be traced to the Legislature's 1995 amendment of its 1991 school law.⁵ Some educators believe teachers in particular became wary of school restructuring with the 1995 amendment and have subsequently adopted a "wait and see" posture. Although the change in the law created new uncertainties, it is just as

³The Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS) covers six content areas, such as math and social sciences, and nine "process proficiency" categories, ranging from skills in writing to teamwork. Community colleges are developing a similar system called Proficiencies Required for Entry into Programs (PREP). The initial focus of PREP is to set proficiency standards for students who complete the first two years of their undergraduate work at a community college before moving on to a four-year school. There is a strong likelihood that PREP will also apply to the admission of students seeking a two-year associate of arts degree.

⁴*Oregon Educator Reactions to Restructuring Legislation: Survey Results 1992-1995*, Paul Goldman and David T. Conley, Department of Educational Leadership, Technology & Administration, University of Oregon, Eugene.

⁵Survey samples were taken in the fall of each of these years, so data in 1995 was gathered after passage of HB 2991. Although revision of the school act may have contributed to the decline in educator support in 1995, support was on the wane when measured in 1993 and 1994.

plausible that early support and optimism declined because few effective measures were put in place to keep education professionals informed and involved on a large scale. Skepticism about school transformation is a problem, but there is a greater danger that too few stakeholders have an interest in it, appreciate its benefits to Oregon children, and understand its requirements and implications.

Specific Findings

Finding 1: Statement and Acceptance of a Clear Vision. Even though the Oregon Education Act has been explained in a number of forums and documents over the past five years, Oregon still needs to produce a clear, comprehensive vision statement that is widely understood and accepted by key stakeholders at the local level. Surveys the past few years suggest that the general public, including parents and students, has very limited understanding of Oregon's plan to transform its schools. Yet, widespread support for the basic principles behind it continues.

Most Oregonians believe higher skills will be required in the economy of the future, and a solid majority support change in their own neighborhood schools. Greater accountability is identified as one of the most desirable changes mentioned. In a Nelson Group survey, roughly two-thirds of parents, students and the general public supported the CIM and CAM when they were described.⁶

The Legislature's 1995 amendment of the 1991 legislation contributed inadvertently to this confusion. Meanwhile, public awareness of school improvement has been clouded by other education issues, most notably, budget shortfalls and layoffs in many districts. Some events have changed the vision of school improvement. For example, just after HB 3565 was passed, many educators interpreted its CAM provision as a new form of vocational education in a two-track system. Soon thereafter, the Oregon Board of Education explicitly asserted that the CAM would apply to all students, not just those not planning to attend college. Recently the Oregon State System of Higher Education has developed PASS, a set of performance standards to govern student admission to Oregon's public four-year post-secondary schools. The emergence of the PASS system has raised concerns about another set of standards to understand and deal with at a time when people are still coming to terms with CIM and CAM and their requirements. Recently representatives from the Department of Education and the State System have begun working to reconcile the two sets of standards and assessments, and the PASS program is beginning to develop materials to inform parents, teachers, and others about the admission standards system.

The evolution of the Oregon Education Act and the debate that goes with it has been a useful process, but it has given rise to confusion and anxiety. To allay misunderstanding and apprehension, Oregon needs a single, clear, comprehensive, and widely disseminated vision statement that explains school transformation, its elements, and how they fit together. Such a vision statement should:

- **State the chief reasons** for school transformation, particularly why standards and related changes are needed to prepare our children for a more skill-intensive economy. This statement must be compelling for all stakeholders but especially for parents and children.

⁶ The Nelson Report, May 17, 1995. This research, contracted by the Department of Education, surveyed opinions on performance standards from hundreds of administrators, teachers, citizens, parents, employers, and students between November 1994 and April 1995.

- **State goals** to be achieved. For example, Oregon has already declared that it wants to field the best educated work force in America and then a work force equal to any in the world. A statement of goals should also link education improvement to family and community cohesion and to Oregon's quality of life.
- **State the changes required** and why they are important. Oregon has four that are crucial: 1) high standards that all students are expected to meet, 2) performance-based assessment, 3) applied learning through school-to-work offerings by schools and employers, and 4) local flexibility in designing and operating programs to meet the new student performance standards.
- **Define key tools and programs.** We need to clearly define CIM, CAM, PASS, PREP, and school to work, as well as their relationship to one another in sufficient detail so their nature and purpose make sense to parents, students, school administrators, and teachers.
- **Lay out the implementation strategy.** This should describe the challenges to implementation as well as the steps that must be taken and the responsibilities of various institutions and stakeholders in taking those steps.

Finding 2: Implementation Strategy. The existing effort to implement standards and related school improvements must be strengthened in three important ways.

First, school transformation cannot be accomplished or even led by the Oregon Department of Education alone. Implementation requires leadership and participation from a much wider range of institutional stakeholders.

Second, Oregon's present implementation effort does not adequately address the logistical and organizational requirements of transforming Oregon's K-12 school system nor has it approached the level of mobilization needed to transform that system. As noted earlier, the task force believes that implementation must go beyond developing standards and assessments and a schedule for their application. It must go beyond advocating and defending school improvement in town meetings and media forums. It must be a carefully planned effort that spells out a coherent vision, identifies important objectives, engages key leaders organizes institutions and coalitions, launches major initiatives and assignments, employs sophisticated project management techniques, secures funding requirements, communicates clearly to its audiences, and monitors progress — all on a consistent, comprehensive, statewide scale. Any single strand of school transformation, such as teacher retraining or employer involvement in school to work, requires a strategy of this scale. But none is in place, either for individual strands or for school transformation as a whole. Business members of the task force have noted that it would be inconceivable for a large company to undertake a transformation equivalent to Oregon school reform without such an implementation strategy and the necessary resources in place. One school superintendent likened the current effort to fielding a track team in which the competitors must meet very high standards of performance— high jumps, long throws,

fast times —without the benefit of skilled coaches, equipment, training, and a game plan.

In its review of Oregon's content and performance standards, a national panel report authored by Edward D. Roeber⁷ noted the importance of an implementation strategy that goes well beyond developing standards and assessments:

It should be widely recognized that neither standards nor assessments by themselves, no matter how thoughtful or rigorous, will bring about the changes and improvements sought in teaching and learning in Oregon's classrooms. While these are certainly necessary conditions for standards-based reform to occur, they are not sufficient alone for improvement to successfully take place. For the standards and assessment to lead to appropriate, long-term change (and to help all children and youth to learn the standards), an implementation plan needs to be drawn up that addresses the information needs of a number of audiences, as well as the specific training needs of teachers, counselors, administrators, local boards of education, and others responsible for helping students achieve the rigorous standards.

In defense of the Department of Education, it should be noted that the conditions for employing a comprehensive implementation strategy have not been favorable. In enacting the Oregon Education Act the Legislature set the requirements of school transformation but made little provision for the comprehensive effort and the resources needed to achieve it. Moreover, the Department's traditional role has been to require and monitor school district compliance with state educational standards. Even though the Department is taking steps to move away from a compliance mode of operation (particularly, telling school districts *how* they must meet statutory requirements), it serves what is essentially a statutory compliance system. By December, for example, the Oregon Administrative Rules, Division 22, are expected to incorporate student performance requirements and the certificates of mastery into Oregon district requirements.

A third —and major — concern about the existing implementation effort is that it has no strategy in place to mitigate the jolt that is expected to occur in two years as the CIM standards go into effect with 10th grade assessments. Only 30 to 45 percent of students assessed in 1998 are expected to meet the CIM academic content standards prescribed for English and math. This is understandable, since the systems for getting large numbers of students to the CIM level of proficiency are not yet in place. Today's eighth graders, who will take the proficiency assessment two years from now, are in an especially disadvantaged position.

Issues that need attention at the school level include these:

- Moving as quickly as possible to provide intensive support in English and math proficiencies for today's eighth graders to get as many as possible ready for the assessments.
- Helping students and their parents understand that today's eighth graders (and the students just behind them) are in the first wave of a change in standards that not all will meet initially. In this process, students and parents must be reassured 1) that there is no stigma involved in not initially meeting the

⁷ *Review of the Oregon Content and Performance Standards*, Report of the National Standards Review Team, Edward D. Roeber, Council of Chief State School Officers, July, 1996.

standards, 2) that plenty of support will be provided to help students meet the standards in subsequent assessments, and 3) that a student will receive a diploma no matter what the outcome of the assessment process.

- Getting the resources in place in schools to give intensive support to students who do not meet the CIM standards on the first or second assessment.

If these issues are not met head on as soon as possible, public support for higher standards could collapse with the first assessments in 1998.

Roeber also called attention to this problem:

...state and local school districts need to think through what will happen when students fail to initially achieve the high standards set by the assessment. A major assumption of the Oregon standards-based system is that it will help all children and youth achieve at much higher levels. Yet, it is unrealistic to expect all students will do so initially. Therefore, if the standards-based system is to have a positive impact on student learning, constructive action will need to be taken with students who do not initially meet the standards, as well as to review and improve the instructional programs so that more students meet the standards in the future. Such planning should not wait until the assessments are implemented, but instead, should be a part of the pre-planning process leading up to implementation of the assessment system based on the standards.

The alternative. The task force believes Oregon's existing implementation approach must be made broader and more comprehensive. In this approach, everyone involved would work from a commonly held vision. Various institutional stakeholders would have key assignments and they would work together and communicate daily in a collaborative organization. Major players in this approach would include the Oregon Department of Education, the Oregon State System of Higher Education, the community colleges local school districts, and employers⁸.

Local leadership and initiative would be critical in this scheme. With incentives and other forms of support, schools would go about their work differently than they do now. Today curriculum and materials are, for the most part, centrally prescribed and handed down. In the new model, the learning process, curriculum, and school improvement plans would be designed at the site level to help students achieve standards. Using continuous improvement principles, teachers and their site partners would constantly assess and improve their effectiveness in raising children to proficiency levels.

There would be at least two critical strands in this effort. One would be communicating to various audiences the nature of student performance standards and the implications of these standards. The second would be to give existing teachers, aspiring teacher

⁸ Employers in particular can exert leverage on behalf of standards. Wacker Siltronic is sending an unmistakable message to job seekers and students by asking on its employment application forms if the applicant holds a CIM or CAM. The State of Oregon, one of Oregon's largest single employers, might raise standards consciousness in a similar fashion.

candidates now in college, and the administrators who support them the training in curriculum, teaching techniques, and learning management that will enable children to meet the performance standards ahead. Staff development is such an enormous undertaking and so central to everything else that school transformation will succeed only to the degree that staff development succeeds.

Finding 3: Oversight Process. It will take more than the Department of Education to create and sustain the perspective and the reach needed to oversee and guide school transformation. A good deal of what is required to transform Oregon schools lies outside the Department's organizational structure and statutory responsibility. As noted earlier, because school transformation is such a large, long-term effort, there must be an organization and a set of procedures to continuously review the vision and to monitor its implementation in a way that allows for breaking down barriers and making mid-course corrections.

Finding 4: Shared Leadership. Leadership is emerging to transform the schools, but it isn't sufficiently shared. Portions of the business community are working with the Department of Education and individual school districts. Some school districts have moved down the road on their own initiative. As mentioned earlier, the state's higher education system is developing its own performance-based admission standards. Too few institutional stakeholders, however, are working closely enough with others. More potential players must become active in the game. The few who are in the lead must do a better job of sharing information, integrating their labors, and working toward the same ends. As mentioned earlier, Department and state higher education officials are beginning to discuss the integration of CIM, CAM, PASS, and PREP standards. More such collaboration needs to occur among institutional stakeholders.

Finding 5: Resources. Present funding and organizational resources are not adequate to support a more comprehensive implementation strategy. Under such a strategy, additional funding would be needed to underwrite staff support dedicated solely to school transformation. Funding would also be needed to stimulate and reward school district improvement initiatives. Even as tight as funding is at the present, districts need to be encouraged to commit some of their own funds to school transformation.

Finding 6: Mitigation of Other Barriers. School transformation will give rise to a number of conflicts that were never anticipated in existing institutional arrangements. More flexible staffing arrangements may be at odds with labor agreements in some districts. Training and skill requirements in new teaching methodologies may be at odds with existing certification practices. Putting students in the workplace under school-to-work programs may be at odds with certain federal and state laws and insurance coverages.

Leaders in school transformation must come to terms with such barriers. They must identify barriers as they occur and work with all parties concerned to eliminate or work around these obstacles. As a general rule, they should avoid confrontation and seek cooperative arrangements to resolve such matters.

Finding 7: Value of the Product. Although the task force is focused here primarily on *implementation* of the new performance standards, it believes that Oregon must treat

the standards themselves as a product continually subject to improvement. The standards are the key to school reform, so they must be well conceived and expressed and they must be highly relevant to the long-term needs of students and employers. Further, their quality and utility must be apparent to parents, teachers, and employers.

The task force believes that Oregon has made an excellent beginning with the CIM academic content standards recently adopted by the Board of Education. They mark a major advance for Oregon education. However, the state should not assume its work is finished with the CIM, and it obviously has more work to do on the CAM. In particular the task force believes that Oregon needs to put in place a process to improve the standards periodically, and it needs to do a better job of presenting and explaining the standards to students, parents, teachers, and the employer community. The standards should be as clear and understandable to non-educators as to educators.

Several specific steps need to be taken with regard to the standards:

- CIM and CAM should be benchmarked to internationally validated academic standards whenever possible.
- The process of developing and editing the standards should be broadened beyond educators and academicians to include employers and subject experts.
- Employers as a whole should be made familiar with the standards. By favoring the CIM and CAM as educational credentials, employers can exert a great deal of influence in motivating students to achieve the standards and in convincing parents and teachers that helping students achieve the standards is a critical priority.
- CIM, CAM, PREP, and PASS standards should be integrated as soon as possible into a set of standards that is clear to educators, students, parents, and business community members..

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

Overarching Recommendations

- Oregon is on the right track with school transformation. It must not abandon or shrink from this mission but instead step up its effort to implement higher standards and related school improvements. In particular, Oregon must move to a more comprehensive implementation strategy to transform its schools.
- By whatever structure and process it chooses, Oregon must assign much higher organizational and budget priority to school transformation.
- In its efforts, Oregon must put more support and more incentives at the disposal of local school districts where change actually takes place.

Specific Recommendations

- Within the next 30 days, create a single cross-functional organization to help implement the vision of school transformation and to monitor and assist implementation. This organization would be represented and guided by significant institutional stakeholders and would be supported by a full-time, integrated staff working as a team to do the detailed work of supporting the implementation of school improvement at the local level. Leadership of this staff and the overall effort should be entrusted to one person who "owns" the process.
- Within the next 60 days, develop and test for audience comprehension (particularly with parents and teachers) a single document that captures the vision of school transformation in Oregon, particularly standards, assessments, applied learning, and local flexibility in implementation.
- Within the next 90 days, develop a process to periodically improve the standards. Benchmark Oregon standards to internationally validated standards. Integrate 1) the content of various standards (CIM, CAM, PREP, PASS, school to work), 2) the processes for creating and applying various standards, and 3) standards and assessments. See that the standards are clear and comprehensible to non-educators, and see that they make sense to employers as well as recognized subject matter experts and practitioners beyond academic and education circles.
- Within the broader implementation strategy, in the next 90 days develop and begin to execute a strategy for creating networks, communication forums, and media campaigns to explain and win public acceptance of Oregon school transformation.
- Within the broader implementation strategy, give high priority to the development of current and prospective educators to help students meet Oregon's new performance standards. In particular, make available to existing teachers, aspiring teacher candidates now in college, and the administrators who support them appropriate training in curriculum, teaching techniques, and learning management.

- Organize the change effort around leading schools and give them incentive funding tied directly to progress in implementing standards and related improvements. Schools should be encouraged to find effective ways to meet standards, involve parents and community stakeholders, use performance data, and measure results. These high performing schools should be supported by the cross functional team in a variety of ways.
- Within the next 120 days, develop a plan to evaluate school transformation on an ongoing basis on two levels: process and effects.