



JOHN KITZHABER
Governor of Oregon
OEIB Chair

JULIA BRIM-
EDWARDS

YVONNE CURTIS

MATTHEW DONEGAN

SAMUEL HENRY

NICHOLE JUNE
MAHER

MARK MULVIHILL

DAVID RIVES

RON SAXTON

MARY SPILDE
Chair-Designee

KAY TORAN

JOHANNA
VAANDERING

DICK WITHNELL

Chief Education Officer
NANCY GOLDEN

OREGON EDUCATION INVESTMENT BOARD

Best Practices and Student Transition Subcommittee

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS: Yvonne Curtis (Chair), Mark Mulvihill, David Rives,
Lynne Saxton, Kay Toran, and Kim Williams
Wednesday, February 5, 2014
10:00 AM – 12:30 PM
506 SW Mill Street, Room 710
Meyer Memorial Board Room
Portland 97201

Phone In Information: 888-204-5984
Participant Code: 946952

*Members of the public wanting to give public testimony must sign in.
There will only be one speaker from each group.
Each individual speaker or group spokesperson will have 3 minutes.*

AGENDA

- 1.0 Welcome and Roll Call
- 2.0 Approval of the Agenda
- 3.0 Approval of the Minutes from January 14, 2014
- 4.0 Proposed performance indicators for education preparation programs --Scott Fletcher, Dean, Lewis and Clark Graduate School of Education and President of the Oregon Association of College for Teacher Education
- 5.0 Importance of Early Literacy (focus on age 3 to grade 3)--
Serena Stoudamire Wesley, OEIB Early Transitions, Equity and
Community Director
- 6.0 Discussion on Subcommittee's role, progress, and next steps
around recommendations to forward to OEIB—Tight/Loose
 - 6.1 Discussion of guiding questions to frame
recommendations to OEIB and key areas of focus
 - 6.2 Review best practices, policy and rule
recommendations received by subcommittee
 - 6.3 Review of Scope of Action and timeline for
recommendations

- 7.0 Subcommittee member follow up and potential recommendations from previous meeting
 - 7.1 LEP Student Outcome Data from ODE
 - 7.2 Dual Language Standards
 - 7.3 ELL Expectations for General Education Candidates
- 8.0 Draft items for Cooperating Teachers Survey: Best Practices and Incentives--Hilda Rosselli, OEIB College and Career Readiness Director
- 9.0 Public Testimony
- 10.0 Review of Tasks and Details on Next Meeting
Tuesday, March 11, 2014 10:30 – 12:30
506 SW Mill Street, Room 710 Meyer Memorial Board Room,
Portland 97201
- 11.0 Adjournment

****Times are approximate***

All meetings of the Oregon Education Investment Board are open to the public and will conform to Oregon public meetings laws. The upcoming meeting schedule and materials from past meetings are posted [online](#). A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for accommodations for people with disabilities should be made to Seth Allen at 503-378-8213 or by email at Seth.Allen@das.state.or.us. Requests for accommodation should be made at least 48 hours in advance.

OREGON EDUCATION INVESTMENT BOARD
Best Practices and Student Transitions Subcommittee

Tuesday, January 14, 2014
10:30 AM – 12:30 PM

Meeting Notes

1.0 Welcome & Roll Call

Members in attendance: Yvonne Curtis, David Rives, Mark Mulvihill, Kim Williams, Lynne Saxton

2.0 Review and approval of the agenda

Item 4.4 was added to the agenda. The agenda was approved with a minor edit.

3.0 Approval of the December 10th meeting notes

Kim Williams made a motion to approve the notes. David Rives seconded the motion and the notes were approved as presented.

4.0 Follow up on documents from previous meetings

4.1 Brian Reeder shared updated data from a study of the 2005 cohort of LEP students. Mark Mulvihill and David Rives will review the data further and bring back key findings and potential recommendations to the February meeting. Of note: Why are students in LEP Level 1 for five years?

4.2-4.3 Keith Menk sent a brief update from TSPC on Dual Language Standards and LEP standards for general education candidates. David and Yvonne will review the documents and bring back key findings and potential recommendations to the February meeting.

4.4 A proposal for a study on Cooperating Teachers (CT) was shared and approved. Suggestions were made concerning how to learn more about the motivations, needs and experiences of teachers who serve as CTs or who decline the opportunity, Hilda Rosselli to bring back list of draft items at next meeting. She was also asked to work with Scott Fletcher from Oregon Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (OACTE) to provide an update on common Educator Preparation Program performance indicators being discussed by TSPC and educator preparation programs.

5.0 Rural District Collaboration Project: Lessons Learned from the CLASS Project

Julie Smith provided insights learned in the CLASS Project focused on rural districts. She noted that student achievement levels of many of our rural schools are comparable or better than many of our more urban areas but that postsecondary transition rates are lower. She recommended that the purpose of K-12 schooling must be linked to community development. Barriers noted included limited personnel needed to fully

support school improvement, curriculum development, technology initiatives, data use, and support systems for students. Mark Mulvihill noted that initiatives have to be prioritized using a lens of local control and with clear purpose on what this means for “our kids.” Kim Williams added observations regarding “frontier” districts whose needs are unique as well. Chair Curtis noted that the OEIB team needs to continue working with ODE on ways to effectively reach rural communities around realistic efforts to support 40-40-20. She asked Julie to work with Chalkboard staff to provide additional ideas to the Subcommittee at the April meeting.

6.0 Discussion on Grades 11-14 : Best Practices and Policies

○

6.1 Update on Eastern Promise Replication

Whitney Grubbs provided an overview of the principles guiding the replication of Eastern Promise. An RFP will be issued shortly from ODE to fund 2-3 grants that will implement similar efforts attuned to local communities with attention to first generation students and opportunity gaps. The four pillars are:

- Commitment to a cross-sector collaboration
- Commitment to building a college-going culture
- Commitment to multiple models serving student’s college going needs including CTE
- Commitment to developing cross-sector professional learning

Questions raised: Are two to three projects enough? How are we learning from those who are doing this work but are not funded by OEIB? How can we make sure that the Equity Lens is fully applied to this work? How does this work dovetail with the Regional Achievement Collaboratives (RAC)? What about communities where not all of the partners are willing to collaborate on these efforts? Will there be shared learning events that leverage what we are learning from the Early Learning Hubs, RACs, Coordinated Care Organizations and Workforce efforts.

Whitney will update the Subcommittee in March or April on progress of the RACs.

6.2 Update from the Accelerated Learning Committee

Hilda Rosselli provided a brief update on the work of the Accelerated Learning Committee that grew out of SB 222 and she provided a set of issues impacting student transitions with potential recommendations. It was recommended that issues related to CTE also be highlighted and the document be shared with the Accelerated Learning Committee at their next meeting as they focus on policies and potential legislation. Nancy Golden noted that the HECC is also focusing on the middle 40 and seeking ways to scale up efforts that create more equity for CTE. It was noted that a key approach will also have to involve reexamining existing resources that need to be aligned differently.

6.3 Draft College and Career Readiness Statewide Definition

Cathy Hurowitz and Hilda Rosselli presented a document explaining the need and uses for a statewide definition of College and Career Readiness. It was noted that the

definition was crafted to reflect current K-20 students as well as those seeking to re-enter schooling, or prepare for the job market. Mark Mulvihill made a motion to forward the draft definition to the full OEIB at the February meeting. Kim Williams seconded the motion. The motion was approved. A recommendation was made to add additional background on steps involved in the formation of the definition.

7.0 Digital Conversion

Chair Curtis reported that COSA is facilitating a group examining needs related to digital conversion and that a strategic plan would be brought back to the Subcommittee in May.

8.0 Public Testimony

No public testimony was provided at the meeting.

9.0 Review of Tasks and Next Meeting

- Next meeting will be held Wednesday, February 5, 2014 10:00 AM – 12:30 PM at 506 SW Mill Street, Room 710 Meyer Memorial Board Room, Portland 97201
- Agenda will start with discussion of the questions that should be shaping recommendations from the Subcommittee that will be forward to the full OEIB.
- Recommendations will be heard from:
 - Subcommittee teams examining follow up information from ODE on ELL student outcomes
 - Subcommittee teams examining follow up information from TSPC on dual language program standards and ELL expectations for general educators
 - Draft survey items examining Cooperating Teacher needs and experiences
 - Other items on the Subcommittee's Scope of Action

Meeting was adjourned at 12:35 PM.

Institution profile (draft 10-9-13)

OEIB subcommittee presentation 2-5-14

Introduction

Programs are drilling down into the data presented here in great detail for the purposes of program improvement. These efforts are well documented in a variety of sources, including: TSPC Annual Reports, Program Approval Reports, Title II reporting, and accreditation. The purpose of the institutional profile is to provide an overview of data that will be useful and informative to a wide variety of stakeholders.

Purposes of this project

- (1) Program improvement
- (2) Effective communication with the public
- (3) Accreditation and accountability
- (4) Collective growth as a profession

Institutional profile

- (1) Institutional information
 - Website link
 - Institutional description/mission
 - Programs/licenses/endorsements
 - National accreditation
- (2) Program characteristics (initial licensure)
 - Level(s)
 - Admissions process
 - Number of completers
 - Candidate demographics
 - Faculty demographics
 - Hours of clinic practice
 - School partnerships
 - Innovative practices
- (3) Performance data (initial licensure)
 - Test pass rates for completers
 - Common candidate assessment
 - Hiring data
 - Alumni survey
 - Employer survey

DRAFT: OEIB Equity & Partnerships Subcommittee

Out-of-School Youth: Investment & Policy Recommendation Framework

Introduction

Oregon's 40-40-20 goal, adopted into law in 2011, has become shorthand for the efforts of the Legislature, Governor, Oregon Education Investment Board (OEIB), and other state education boards, commissions, and agencies to significantly improve the education achievement levels and prosperity of Oregonians by 2025. The 40-40-20 goal intends to provide a clear target – a “North Star” aligned with Oregonians’ economic, civic, and social aspirations – against which to generally gauge the state’s educational progress. The OEIB and Governor are united in the belief that in order for the 40-40-20 goal to be meaningful, it must be accompanied by the clear understanding that increased levels of attainment of diplomas, degrees and certificates must be achieved equitably -- across populations and across regions of the state.

Fundamentally, 40-40-20 says that *every Oregonian* is capable of earning at least a high school diploma or the equivalent thereof, and must have the opportunity to enter into the workforce in a meaningful way. Oregon’s youth who are not represented in the “traditional” pipeline – either because they have dropped out, are incarcerated, or are being served in an alternative setting – must be considered as part of the “each and every” to whom our goal applies. In the years leading up to 2025, we cannot afford to ignore our youth who have dropped out, who or are at risk for dropping or being pushed out, but rather must seize the opportunity these youth represent for improving our outcomes in both the short and long term.

Purpose and Scope

The areas addressed in these recommendations fall, in many cases, within the charges of other agencies, boards and workgroups. The intention of the OEIB Equity & Partnerships Subcommittee is not to complicate or replicate these charges, but rather to provide high-level direction and alignment between those efforts. In addition, the OEIB’s responsibilities for creating a seamless “Birth to College and Career” system and managing student transitions for the purpose of ensuring outcomes are achieved provide OEIB with the responsibility for looking at those students who don’t fit neatly into one category or another. For this reason, the OEIB Equity & Partnerships Subcommittee opted to create this set of Policy & Investment Recommendations, aimed at ensuring the population of youth who have dropped out, or are at risk of dropping out, do not inadvertently fall through the cracks that heretofore may have existed between education agencies.

Core Beliefs Framing Recommendations

We believe that the students who have previously been described as “at risk,” “underperforming,” “under-represented,” or minority actually represent Oregon’s best opportunity to improve overall educational outcomes. We have many counties in rural and urban communities that already have populations of color that make up the majority. Our ability to meet the needs of this increasingly diverse population is a critical strategy for us to successfully reach our 40/40/20 goals.

We believe that intentional and proven practices must be implemented to return out of school youth to the appropriate educational setting. We recognize that this will require us to challenge and change our current educational setting to be more culturally responsive, safe, and responsive to the significant number of elementary, middle, and high school students who are currently out of school. We must make our schools safe for every learner.

We believe that communities, parents, teachers, and community-based organizations have unique and important solutions to improving outcomes for our students and educational systems. Our work will only be successful if we are able to truly partner with the community, engage with respect, authentically listen -- and have the courage to share decision-making, control, and resources.

We believe every learner should have access to information about a broad array of career/job opportunities and apprenticeships that will show them multiple paths to employment yielding family-wage incomes, without diminishing the responsibility to ensure that each learner is prepared with the requisite skills to make choices for their future.

We believe that resource allocation demonstrates our priorities and our values and that we demonstrate our priorities and our commitment to rural communities, communities of color, English language learners, and out of school youth in the ways we allocate resources and make educational investments.

Policy and Investment Recommendations

Focus Area One: Increase support for Oregonians seeking the General Educational Development (GED) credential

Findings:

Policy and/or Investment Recommendations:

Focus Area Two: Improving Alignment with Other Systems (Oregon Youth Authority, Department of Health and Human Services, etc.)

Findings:

Policy and/or Investment Recommendations:

Focus Area Three: Preventing Dropouts by Improving Systems and Services for Students in the Traditional System

Findings:

Policy and/or Investment Recommendations:

Focus Area Four: Supporting Positive and Successful Options for Students

Findings:

Policy and/or Investment Recommendations:

OEIB Best Practices and Student Transitions Subcommittee

DRAFT RECOMMENDATION FOR OEIB

A key function of the OEIB Best Practices and Student Transitions Subcommittee is to recommend actionable steps for OEIB to take related to policy and/or strategic investments that improve outcomes and transitions for students in Oregon that help improve progress towards 40-40-20.

What challenge, issue or barrier does this recommendation address?

What benefit will this recommendation have for Oregon students?

How does this recommendation align with the Equity Lens and improve outcomes for Oregon's students of color?

What relevant best practices inform this recommendation?

What unique opportunities does this recommendation leverage or maximize?

List and code each recommendation: (P-policy, SI-Strategic Investment)

**Voices from the Field:
Understanding Oregon's Cooperating Teachers Motivations and Recommendations**

NOTE: Representatives from the following stakeholder groups will be reviewing and providing feedback on sample draft questions for an online survey to be launched later this spring:

- Best Practices and Student Transitions Subcommittee,
- Chalkboard Distinguished Educators Council,
- Teacher Standards and Practices Commission,
- Oregon Education Association, and
- Oregon Association of Teacher Educators.

POTENTIAL DRAFT ITEMS

1. Comprehensive demographic and general information (pull down menu for each)

- Gender
- Race/Ethnicity
- Level of classroom teaching assignment
- Discipline area of classroom teaching assignment
- Years of teaching experience
- Level of last degree earned
- Number of student teachers you have supervised in the last five years
 - From an Oregon public university
 - From an Oregon private university
- Number of student teachers you have declined to supervise
- Last time you supervised a student teacher

2. Check the one reason or motivation for accepting a student teacher that best describes your situation:

- Professional obligation
- Desire to give back to the profession
- Gain new and innovative ideas that enhance my students' learning
- Sense of rejuvenation
- Opportunity for self-reflection
- Gain additional support in the classroom
- Desire to become a better teacher
- Help alleviate isolation associated with teaching
- Boost my enthusiasm about teaching and the profession
- Expectation from your school administrator
- Access to university tuition vouchers
- Other reasons or motivations not listed here
- Likelihood that you would want to serve as a cooperating teacher in the future

3. If you have declined the opportunity to take a student teacher in the last five years, check the one reason or motivation that best describes your situation:

- Interruption of your classroom routine for students
- Too many additional responsibilities
- Inadequate compensation
- Lack of support from the university
- Uncertainty about candidate competency
- Concern for losing time and progress with your students
- Previous negative experience as a cooperating teacher

4. Rate your level of satisfaction as a cooperating teacher with each of the following: (Scale: 0 = Very unsatisfying to 7 = Very satisfying)

- Process for being selected as a cooperating teacher
- Process for assigning a student teacher to your classroom
- Preparation and training for your role as a cooperating teacher
- University support provided prior to your service as a cooperating teacher
- University support provided to you during your service as a cooperating teacher
- Support provided by the school or school district
- Level of required responsibilities
- Clarity of the fieldwork materials and evaluations required
- Level of time that it took to serve as a cooperating teacher
- Additional value and support provided by the assigned university supervisor
- Compensation and incentives provided by the university or district
- Overall experience

5. How likely are you to take another student teacher if offered?

(Scale: 0 = Very unlikely to 7 = Very likely)

Explanation: _____

6. How many continuous weeks of full time student teaching are needed to provide cooperating teachers with adequate opportunities to evaluate student teacher performance and likely success as a teacher? Explain _____

7. Check any of the following that best describe the role you played as a cooperating teacher:

- Modeling of effective teaching practices
- Participation in co-teaching
- Providing guided practice in the use of specific teaching skills
- Assistance in planning and developing instructional materials
- Providing opportunities for observation and critique of your teaching by the student teacher

- Engaging in discussions with the student teacher about practices and impact on student learning
- Offering critique and coaching to the student teacher
- Helping the student teacher develop goals for improvement
- Evaluating the student teacher's Teacher Work Sample
- Discussing the student teacher with the university supervisor and student teacher
- Completing required paperwork from the university
- Fixing problems created by the student teacher
- Taking on other responsibilities in the school because you were perceived to have more available time
- Other _____

8. Check any of the following that were used to prepare you for your role as a cooperating teacher:

- Materials received from the university
- Informational meeting held at the university or my school/district
- Participation in a training course or program
 - In person
 - Online
- Access to specific resources to support supervisory skills, observational techniques, and problem solving
- One-on-one meeting/conversation with a university supervisor
- Information shared by the student teacher
- Networking with other cooperating teachers
- Materials from a university website
- Support provided by school or district personnel
- Other _____

9. Which three do you think are most effective in preparing cooperating teachers?

- Materials received from the university
- Informational meeting held at the university or my school/district
- Participation in a training course or program
 - In person
 - Online
- Access to specific resources to support supervisory skills, observational techniques, and problem solving
- One-on-one meeting/conversation with a university supervisor
- Information shared by the student teacher
- Networking with other cooperating teachers
- Materials from a university website
- Support provided by school or district personnel
- Other _____

10. Describe the type of supports provided to you that were useful during your service as a cooperating teacher: _____

11. Check any of the following types of compensation you have received for serving as a cooperating teacher

- Financial compensation
 - Personal stipend (amount _____)
 - Funds to put towards the costs of professional development (approximate value _____)
 - Redeemable coupon or resources for your classroom (approximate value _____)
 - Other _____
- Professional recognition
 - Adjunct or clinical faculty appointment
 - Documentation towards teacher leader status
 - Access to bookstore discounts, use of campus libraries, computers, and recreational facilities
 - Letter or certificate of appreciation/recognition
 - Other _____
- Support for your professional learning
 - Tuition vouchers
 - Continuing education credits
 - University course credit (amount _____)
 - Opportunities to attend professional development events
 - Assistance with your own classroom instruction
 - Other _____
- Engagement with the teacher education program
 - Participation in an annual meeting to discuss ways to improve the clinical experience
 - More input on the curriculum used in teacher preparation programs
 - More input on the student teaching handbook and evaluation forms
 - More involvement in determining the final evaluation of the student teacher
- Engagement with the university
 - University privileges (library card, parking pass, events, etc.)
 - Guest lecture opportunities
 - Co-teaching student teacher seminars
 - Other _____

12. Which three do you believe are most effective as compensation for a cooperating teacher willing to supervise a student teacher?

- Financial compensation
 - Personal stipend (amount _____)
 - Funding to put towards the costs of professional development (approximate value _____)
 - Redeemable coupon or resources for your classroom (approximate value _____)
 - Other _____
- Professional recognition
 - Adjunct or clinical faculty appointment
 - Documentation towards teacher leader status
 - Access to bookstore discounts, use of campus libraries, computers, and recreational facilities
 - Letter or certificate of appreciation/recognition
 - Other _____
- Support for your professional learning
 - Tuition vouchers
 - Continuing education credits
 - University course credit
 - Opportunities to attend professional development events
 - _____
 - Other _____
- Engagement with the teacher education program
 - Participation in an annual meeting to discuss ways to improve the clinical experience
 - More input on the curriculum used in teacher preparation programs
 - More input on the student teaching handbook and evaluation forms
 - More involvement in determining the final evaluation of the student teacher
- Engagement with the university
 - University privileges (library card, parking pass, events, etc.)
 - Guest lecture opportunities
 - Co-teaching student teacher seminars
 - Other _____

13. If you have used university tuition vouchers received as a result of serving as a cooperating teacher, how easy were the voucher to access and use? _____ How effective were they in meeting your professional needs? _____

14. What changes would you recommend be made to strengthen and support the role that cooperating teachers provide during student teaching? _____

15. What other comments would you like to offer? _____

Definitions:

- Cooperating Teacher—classroom teachers charged with the direct mentorship of pre-service teachers during their student-teaching experience
- University Supervisor--
- Student Teaching—the last most intensive clinical experience a student teacher completes during which they are expected to demonstrate the highest level of engagement in the classroom on a daily basis
- Credit voucher--

DRAFT