Hanna's suggested edits 12-8-11

Poverty in the intro: The OEIB must address the reality that approximately 21 % of Oregonians live in poverty if we are to reach our goal of 40-40-20. To position Oregon as a leader in education we must ensure that **all** of our students walk into our school ready to learn. One of the most influential leaders in education, Linda Darling-Hammond has listed "The high level of poverty and the low levels of social supports for low-income children's health and welfare, including their early learning opportunities" as the first bullet on her list of five factors that create the major building blocks of unequal and inadequate education outcomes in the United States. Research also shows that the number one predictor of student success is parent income (if you would like the research citations let me know). A comprehensive plan to address this issue will be paramount to our success.

General comments:

- I understand learner may be a broader term, but I believe "student" is the word that will help us sell our message. (*See Issue #10*)
- The use of the term "Islands of excellence". We need to examine our language and the assumptions it conveys. Through multiple, repeated references and explanations, this report says that good work is being done in a spotty way – in "islands of excellence" – silently implying that these "islands" exist in a "sea of mediocrity". This is not proven or demonstrated anywhere in the report, because it is not true. It would be fine to identify "experiments in teaching and learning" or "standout efforts" or "innovations", but to imply that these few examples are the only place that high-quality education is happening is an insult to our public educators statewide. (*Discuss.*)
- The terms "Student Assistance Commission" and "Student Access Commission" are used interchangeably at least four places in the document, we should be consistent with the language and define it. (*New agency name takes effect 1/1/12. Will reflect new name of Oregon Student Access Commission.*)
- Chapter 2 is full of language that is concerning:
    - performance compacts instead of achievement compacts (*SB 242 uses the term performance compacts for the compacts between the Higher Ed Board and the universities, p. 30. This is our only reference to performance compacts*)
    - Participating learner- I cannot imagine a parent wanting their child to be referred to as a participating learner (*Participating learner will be changed to student*)
    - The state being a "broker", how about an advisor

P. 2 chapter 1: "Public testimony has been a featured part of the OEIB meetings,…."

Structured, meaningful public involvement is essential ***prior to*** OEIB implementing legislation forward. Most Oregonians have no idea what we're actually proposing or what it may mean to their children. We should not overstate the degree to which the OEIB has been able to truly **listen** to the public and those most directly impacted, about what it wants and believes. This text makes it sound as though we have had significant public engagement in these ideas and adjusted our design accordingly. This statement needs to be revised. (*Discuss.*)

P. 5-6 chapter 1: The text and charts concluding that "our current generation of young adults…are less educated than their parents' generation".

They may have fewer formal degrees, but later information reflects that we don't collect data to verify all the certificates and other job-related training Oregonians ***are*** getting through innovations serving the business sector's demand for skilled workers, generally at our community colleges. Also, it ought to be said here that this "failure" (if it is one) is also tied to the effects of immigration, job-loss-related poverty, and the unaffordability of higher ed tuition. Otherwise, the reader is left with the unfair/untrue implication that our institutions of education are simply failing and insufficient. (*P. 7 description and charts on page 8 reference that we are talking of educational as measured by degrees and certificates. Degrees and certificates are the measures for 40/40/20. We call out affordability as an issue, pp. 15-16.*)

P. 6 chapter 1: "It is true that, by most measures, student achievement has been stagnant."

Actually, our education system has, in many ways, improved student results even with a long span of funding reductions over the past two decades. We are succeeding with our students in spite of insufficient funding! Not only is the charge of

"stagnance" inaccurate and unsupported (no citation), it undermines the text that follows, which celebrates educator innovations and hard work.

(Discuss.)

P. 6 chapter 1: And in Senate Bill 253, the Legislature raised the bar for educational attainment in Oregon. The goal: By 2025, every Oregon student, 100 percent, must earn a high school diploma –one that represents a high level of knowledge and skills. And 80 percent must continue

I do not believe we should use the word must (must is not in SB 253). We are setting our students and educators up for failure to say must and 100%. This paragraph should be struck, because there is already a more careful description of the bill elsewhere in the document.

(See Issue #20.)

Beginning on P. 7/ chapter 1: and throughout document: Reference to "our citizens" in our schools.

It would be great to refer to "Oregonians" or "students" or "parents" as appropriate, but in the context most frequently used in this draft, "citizen" is used when "person" is meant, and not all of our students and families are "citizens" – not of Oregon OR of the US in some cases. This is a sensitivity point for some.

Will change citizens to residents, Oregonians or students etc. as appropriate.

P. 8 chapter 1: Achieving this goal will challenge the will and capacity of our education systems

I don't believe this language is necessary. *(Discuss.)*

P 10 chapter 1: A recent study isolating the factors that make a difference in school effectiveness suggests that it boils down to five fundamentals: frequent teacher feedback, data-guided instruction, frequent tutoring and counseling, increased instructional time, and high expectations.[i] And decades of research widely confirm that early

I do not understand why this study was chosen as it is a limited study that does not mirror our funding level or other elements of our current reality in our public schools. We have our own collection of best practices that is reviewed every two years by the Quality Education Commission. I would suggest we reference and site the QEM. I would also suggest we refer to Linda Darling-Hammonds list of five factors that create the major building blocks of unequal and inadequate education outcomes in the United States as information that would be helpful in this report. (The Flat World and Education pg. 30)

We eliminated the reference to the study from the 12-9 draft.

P 11 chapter 1: Nationally and in Oregon, a little more than one quarter of associate's degree-seeking students earn a degree within three years. While statistics are debated at this level, few argue with the fact that far too many students are enrolled with no clear educational goal in mind.

I would like to see the research on this. The research I have seen and the conversations I have had with individuals on this issue lead me to believe a great number of our community college students are not degree-seeking, they have other goals like professional development, vocational skills and job training. If it is our goal we need to address that issue. Failure to build the broader mission of our community colleges into the achievement expectations will result in punitive treatment of community colleges and will not serve students per their desires and demands.

Will add clarifying language as suggested.

P. 12 chapter 1: "More than one in five (21 percent) of Oregonians under six years old live in poverty. Among African-American children, 40 percent live in poverty."

Should we use the most recent data? According to an ***Oregonian*** report dated Nov. 24, 2011, more than **50%** of African-American children live in poverty, which is up from **30% just one decade ago!**

P. 17 in 12-9 draft includes updated data.

P. 14 chapter 1 : "But we must move forward with the resources we have and identify how much progress can be accomplished with improvement and how much will require new resources."

Tone is very important in this document, and we need a more careful characterization of the challenges in public education today – one that does not infer poor quality instruction or management . Given the low morale in our public schools today, how do we magically achieve "improvements" at the lowest funding level in decades, when all the best practices and research-based, effective interventions are resource intensive?

(Discuss.)

P. 1 chapter 2: "We must find ways to improve the teaching" (first paragraph).

See above comment, tone is important. Imagine what we could have done to improve education over the last decade if we would not have been handcuffed by NCLB and the testing craze. I would suggest we say "we must find ways to better meet the needs of our students and families to spark the learning of all ……."

Can add language.

Pg. 1 chapter 2

But we must also be careful not to pursue hastily-conceived initiatives that distract us from charting the best path forward.

I believe we need to ensure that our districts and educators understand and are prepared to implement compacts. The Board needs to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of not only the district, but the state/OEIB. The state/OEIB must ensure that the outcomes we set are attainable with the funds we disperse. The QEM allows us to estimate the % of achievement we can expect with any certain level of funding. We cannot expect 100% achievement when we fund at 65%. By addressing this we avoid setting up false expectations and we will be allowed to implement the tight/loose system the Governor would like.

See below.

Pg. 1 chapter 2 For these reasons, we begin with a focus on state level resources–the $7.1 billion that flows to education in the current budget--as we consider the state's capacities to invest in, direct, coordinate and support the missions of literally hundreds of educational entities from pre-K programs to school districts and colleges.

"Direct" needs to be taken out, I do not believe we are directing. (*Discuss. "Direct" seems appropriate*.)

Pg 2 chapter 2 From the perspective of the participating learner,

REALLY, who would call a student a participating learner????

Agreed.

Pg. 4 chapter 2: How that money is invested becomes one of the chief strategies to drive better outcomes for students — and to achieve Oregon's 40/40/20 goals.

Suggested language "Improve education in Oregon"

Discuss.

P. 6 chapter 2: "Each of these is a conscious and deliberate investment by thoughtful school boards….All school districts receive about the same dollars per student, but some have distinctly better results – instate assessments, graduation rates and post-secondary success."

This section should be revised to either be specific about which districts have like dollars, like community cultures, and like student demographics, or the point should be omitted. Simply making a dollar-per-student comparison is neither sound nor fair.

Discuss.

Pg 10 chapter 2: Additional investments will be intended to provide ~~incentives for innovation~~, the adoption of evidence-based best practices and higher performance. Investments might take the form of strategic grants to focus on particular learning stages or learner groups. ~~The board might also propose shifting to performance grants, perhaps offering funding based on rates of students earning certificates or degrees, or the number of students who achieve English proficiency and exit from ESL programs.~~ These are ideas to be fully discussed and vetted in 2012, as the Governor's 2013-15 budget proposal is developed and then presented for the Legislature's consideration.

These are flawed, unproven practices that continue to be brought forward. I believe having this in the document sets us up for undue criticism at a time when we do not need it. Having the last sentence with modification to say that we will be exploring research and having conversations about other methods would serve us much better.

Discuss.

Pg. 11-12 chapter 2: And as we pursue innovative assessments, there is one additional tool we need: surveys of next-level teachers, professors and employers. Only they can validate whether our students are truly prepared as they move through the educational continuum and on to the world of work.

I believe what we need are intentional conversations and plans between various level teachers, professors and employers. A survey is a great place to blast those whose shoes you have never worn, a conversation about what is needed to ensure a student can succeed at the next level will improve communication and student achievement.

Discuss.

Pg. 12 chapter 2: Project ALDER envisions the creation of a prekindergarten through postsecondary education (PreK-20) data system and research function that will compile longitudinal student data (without student identities attached) from every level of education.

I need some clarification, does this implies that teacher identities will be attached? *Yes, per ODE's federal grant.*

Pg. 13 chapter 2: Successful redesign and implementation will require work in three key areas: making the use of time a flexible variable rather than a controlling element; improving professional development; and developing and using formative assessment tools.

I would like to see the following added at the end of this sentence. "including teacher created formative assessments".

Addressed and included on p. 38.

Pg 2-12, chapter 2: Outcomes, achievement, assessments, demonstrated proficiency, better results, aggregate data, completion targets, reasonable expectations, accountability, and return on investment

This section is replete with these terms – all, in one way or another, tied to testing and test scores as a way to determine whether our educators are doing a great job with their students, and as a way to "recalibrate", day by day, if not. We need to plainly state that this ***is*** the overemphasis on testing that was (rightly) decried elsewhere in the report. Because there are no definitions of terms in the report, one is left to see "test scores and diplomas" everywhere the word "outcomes" or its many synonyms are written. If that is NOT what is meant, scant evidence of other meaningful measures that would comport to "longitudinal data systems" are offered to clarify otherwise.

Discuss.

Pg. 5 chapter 2: "Today, Oregon's education funding is centered on inputs and enrollments: how many students are served plays [a] much larger role in an institution's fiscal position than how well students are served….Essentially, budget architects and policymakers ask: What does it cost to keep everything the same?" ***and*** P. 7, section 3: "The board will define outcomes and guide the budget development process…to establish a sustainable baseline of funding…find[ing] ways to incentivize the identification and adoption of best practices…."

The current funding formula distributes the resources we have and only considers such "inputs" because they are good approximaters of how much it will cost to educate students. It is not a value judgment to overlook "how well" we serve our students, as explicitly stated. Budget architects who craft current-service-level budgets do so not to embrace current spending, but to communicate how cost drivers have changed from biennium to biennium and to set a baseline. As for achieving optimum quality, it is the role of the Quality Education Commission to establish research-based best practices and to estimate the costs of delivering that "how well" system to Oregon's students. That number is compared against the baseline number. We should be more accurate about the budgeting practices, even as we seek to change them.

A second point with respect to this topic (prompted by the P. 7 paragraph) is that the report– and the redesign vision – is ***virtually*** silent on the citizen-passed mandate of Ballot Measure 1 (2000 – Article VIII, Section 8 of the Constitution), which requires our schools to be funded adequately. The redesign vision is similarly reluctant to acknowledge that the best educational practices and the costs to fully invest in them has been calculated biennium after biennium for more than a decade by the QEC. We believe that this significant, highly-regarded work must be a fundamental part of how we approach the K-12 portion of our funding plan going forward. We cannot ignore the constitution's instruction to do so.

Should incorporate a reference to QEC.

Pg 1 chapter 3: "Develop budget models that provide sustainable baselines of funding for all educational entities and investment models that encourage innovation and reward success."

Perhaps we need a definition of terms. "Sustainable" and "baseline funding" we cannot consider this a "base" budget. As we discussed our districts and communities would call the current budget a **"crisis budget"**. I continue to be alarmed that we are talking about rewarding success when there is no research in education that shows incentivizing or rewarding is what makes a difference in student achievement. I suggest we have a training or Board discussion on the research and what has been proven to work and what is part of a reform movement that has had no success in improving student achievement.

Discuss.

Pg 2 chapter 3: To make progress, the state will develop and invest in core infrastructure: standard assessments to measure kindergarten readiness and first-grade reading, professional development for the early childhood workforce, <u>and a longitudinal, learner-level database that tracks the learner experience and outcomes starting from birth.</u>

The highlighted will be an issue for many Oregonians that needs to be addressed early on as it may be seen as big brother watching over their children (Chalkboard focus group data).

Pg 7 chapter 3: In the latter category, it will be important to find ways to incentivize the identification and adoption of best practices and to direct investments to initiatives with the highest returns.

Suggested language: "Identify and fund the"

"Incentivize and fund…" will work.

Pg 8 chapter 3: Western Governors University paragraph

I do not understand why this is one of the few examples we would use and do not believe we should.

WGU presented to Senate Ed and House Higher Ed committees; Governor was one of the founders; illustrates the benefit of proficiency based-learning.