OREGON EDUCATION INVESTMENT BOARD

December 1, 2011
OUS Board Room, 1800 SW 6th Ave., Suite 515
Portland State University Academic and Student Recreation Center,
Portland 97207

OEIB Members Present
Gov. John Kitzhaber, Chair; Nancy Golden, Chair Designee; Richard Alexander, Yvonne Curtis, Julia Brim Edwards; Samuel Henry; Nicole Maher; Mark Mulvihill; David Rives; Ron Saxton; Mary Spilde; Kay Toran; Johanna Vaandering

Advisors Present
George Pernsteiner, Chancellor, OUS; Susan Castillo, Supt of Public Instruction; Camille Preus, Commissioner of Community Colleges; Josette Green, Director, Oregon Student Assistance Commission

Members/Advisors Excused
Matt Donegan

Staff/Other Participants

Tim Nesbitt	Mgr, Education Investment Proj.	Sarah Ames	Communications, Ed Inv. Project
Ben Cannon	Office of the Governor		
Margie Lowe	Policy Advisor, Ed Invest Proj.	Todd Jones	Policy Advisor, Ed Invest Project
Seth Allen	Executive Support		

Welcome and Introductions
Governor John Kitzhaber opened meeting and welcomed guests. The Governor stated that recent issues should not allow us to be distracted from our mission. The people in this room are instrumental to making sure we reach our full potential.

He introduced Executive Support staff, Seth Allen. Announced he would be leaving at 2pm. Nancy Golden will take over at 2pm. There are some important discussions on management and governance issues, including approval of outline of report to legislature and approval of legislative concepts. We'll be taking testimony later in the meeting today. Meeting being webcast and materials posted.

Adoption of Minutes for Meeting of Nov. 21, 2011

MOTION: DIRECTOR RICHARD ALEXANDER MOVES TO ADOPT MINUTES; DIRECTOR MARK MULVIHILL SECONDS THE MOTION.

Discussion:

- Pg. 3 – Director Johanna Vaandering voiced concerns about the funding language (the use of the term "incentive funding") and the need to reflect her statement that this issue needs more discussion.

VOTE: MINUTES ADOPTED WITH CLARIFICATION NOTED

Discussion of Governance Issues:
The Governor presented a letter to the Board with three recommendations related to:

A. Management/Administration: Chief Education Officer
B. Governance/Management: Functions, Responsibilities, State Boards and Commissions
C. Governance/Coordination: OUS and Institutional Boards

A. - Recommendation: Give the Chief Education Officer the authority and resources needed to organize the state's integrated education system from pre-K to college and career (P-20).

1. The Chief Education Officer shall have direction and control over the following positions for the purpose of designing and organizing the state's P-20 education system:

a) Commissioner of Community Colleges and Workforce Development;
b) Chancellor of the Oregon University System;
c) Executive Director of the Oregon Student Assistance Commission;
d) Early Childhood System Director*;
e) Executive Director of the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (upon appointment per SB 242); and,
f) Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction* (upon appointment per SB 552).

*Governor has appointing authority under current law.

2. The Chief Education Officer shall direct the positions listed in Section 1 (a)-(f) herein and work with the Superintendent of Public Instruction and her designees to design and organize the state's P-20educationsystem(see B- Governance/Management).

3. The Governor shall resolve any conflicts that may arise with existing boards and commissions which hold the appointing authority over the positions listed in Section 1 (a), (b), (c) and (e) herein.

Any changes regarding this recommendation:

- Board needs time to process all the information.
- Dec. 5, 2011 is the legislative deadline for concept, but legislative counsel can make changes.

MOTION: DIRECTOR RON SAXTON MOVES TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION A; DIRECTOR KAY TORAN SECONDS THE MOTION.

Discussion:

- Language discrepancy: “Direction and control” vs. “shall direct and have direct report responsibilities”
- **NOTE:** The workgroup has the flexibility to work out language inconsistency.

VOTE: MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

B. **-** Recommendation: Develop legislation for the 2013 session to complete the organization of the state's P-20 education system, consolidate boards and commissions and streamline management, and free up resources to support teaching and learning.

MOTION: DIRECTOR RICHARD ALEXANDER MOTIONS TO APPROVE THE STRUCTURE FOR THE WORKGROUP; DIRECTOR SAXTON SECONDS THE MOTION.

Discussion:

- Need for clarity between the work of the work group versus the Board.
- Tim Nesbitt clarification: The workgroup, as laid out in Section B, is not intended to be a subject of legislation.
- Need for more time to read documents

Item B continued to the Dec. 7 meeting.

C. - Proposal: During the interim, the Board develops recommendations for the Legislature to consider, concerning an independent governing board for one or more of our universities. The Chief Education Officer will work with OEIB, State Board of Education, and those institutions that are interested in moving in that direction, to develop recommendations about terms and conditions, authorities and side boards for independent governing boards in the OUS system.

Item C continued to the Dec. 7 meeting.

Early Learning Council

Pam Curtis, Chair, Early Learning Council distributed, and read thru Recommended Early Learning Components for 2012 Legislation. These do not reflect all that the Council will address in its report, just items that could impact potential legislation. The Council's work continues.

Discussion:

- Opinion was voiced that this is the foundation of what the Board is doing, that this is the part that they have to get right.
- Trying to coordinate the hubs where children are: hospitals and schools. Opportunity to do some very effective integration with health transformation.
- Long term goal is that ALL children,(not just those at-risk), connect to the hubs. Prioritizing the high risk children by: children of color; children who live at the poverty level; children whose families already access state services.
- Long term goal is that parent education falls under Community Engagement. Long ways away from that. Family and community are pivotal to a child's ability to learn, but there is no home for parent education/engagement in Oregon.
- Screening: K-12 teachers would be a part of designing the program.
- Concern that the hubs are organized geographically. The most at risk and ethnic communities don't always organize themselves by geography and can be lost. The hubs are organized geographically, but in the details one can see that they do call out the possibility that certain groups may want to be a hub. Not designating what that might be. Give communities the opportunity to come out and say that they can do these themselves.
- Trying to infuse the notion that certain ethnic populations are underserved into some of the requirements.
- Deep trust issues and time issues that keep certain ethnic populations from accessing services like Head Start, etc. Other states have started programs that are focused on these issues.
- Culturally sensitive and appropriate heads of hubs.
- Need for public input.
- This is a high level summary. What is not included is some very extensive public outreach over the course of the last year.
- Note the importance of sequencing over several years.
- Identified five developmental domains as an organizing framework. In the process of identifying measurements of each of those domains across the age spectrum. Will be starting to figure out what that translates into as far as deliverables for services and deliverables for ELC.

- Public hotspots/ Input: A lot of excitement about this; has needed to happen for 20 – 30 years; trepidation in that this means something different to everybody; change is scary.
- Going through this with Healthcare as well. Consuming 17% of GDP. The providers are terrified, because they don't know what the future looks like, but they know the current system isn't working. Not just about politics. It's about economics. Intersection of policy and politics.

MOTION: DIRECTOR SAXTON MOTIONS TO APPROVE THE LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT; DIRECTOR TORAN SECONDS THE MOTION.

Discussion:

- There were many parents that had input for the ELC report.

(The Governor excused himself at this point. Nancy Golden assumes duties of the Chair.)

- Kindergarten Readiness work.
- Need for more public revenue, not just private funds.
- 1997 Childcare Commission was discussing a few points that have been brought back up 15 years later.
- There will be time for further discussion.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

Report: Chief Education Officer Job Description and Selection Process

Two deliverables:

- Interview, evaluate and make a recommendation to the Governor regarding the recruitment firm**.** Made a recommendation to the Gov, based on specific criteria.
- Create a position description.

Also:

- Online survey regarding position description. Invites public comments.
- Two places that needed clarity: The relationship would be between the CEdO and the state's senior education officials; clear set of deliverables and success criteria developed.

Discussion:

- Separate sign in sheet for public comment.
- Concern over finding candidates based on criteria that has yet to be fully developed.
- Recruitment firms said that it wouldn't be a problem. The description ambiguity would screen out people who weren't interested in a position that included ambiguity within the position.
- Very clear that the position requires visionary leadership.

Public Testimony:

- Kris Alman

Invited Testimony: Education Service Districts

Rob Saxon Superintendant, Tigard -Tualatin School District
Randy Shields, Superintendant, Tillamook School District
Dennis Dempsey, Superintendant, High Desert Education Service District
James Sager, Superintendant, NW ESD

Rob Saxton:

- Robust, regional delivery system is an important component to reach 40-40-20 goal.

Public Testimony (Cont'd)

- Richard Sanders, Executive Director, Oregon Education Association

Discussion:

- Paul Rebille holds a position similar to the proposed CEdO position, in Massachusetts.

Invited Testimony: Education Service Districts (Cont'd)

James Sager: Always had regional delivery systems in Oregon. ESDs provide equity of opportunity for students and efficiencies in services. System has evolved. Dominated by local control across the sectors. Schools are being controlled by local school districts that the ESDs serve. Organic interdependency. Connections have been made to share good ideas. Believe strongly in seamless K-20 system. Need to remove the "stoplights" in the system. To move forward and achieve common goal, have to do a better job of aligning grid. Need new rules of the road, including compacts for student achievement and operational efficiencies. Could include:

- reduced administrative expenses,
- increased instructional expenditures,
- aligning calendars,
- implementing virtual learning options for grades 6 – 20,
- joint responsibility for student achievement,
- better prep for preschool age children.

Need regional delivery system. Current model supports keeping inefficient systems alive just to keep the money flowing. New model drives efficiency, improves quality, and expands opportunity for students.
Traffic circle document.

Dennis Dempsey: Need to do business differently. Not enough money. More money back into the classroom. Partnered with Chalkboard for a report on regional efficiencies. Report found that High Desert Education Service District could do business differently, saved $124K by having one HR Director over many agencies. The success of that inspired them to do something similar in their Technology, Special Education and Business Services. Project to save almost $500K this year. The key is that they are able to do things consistently across the region more efficiently and save money. Example: Sisters School District Superintendant was Special Ed Director, Curriculum Director, Title I, etc. They had to cut more money and he ended up adding elementary principal to his workload. By moving to the shared services model, this group of districts and ESDs now has someone who can provide Special Ed supervision, HR supervision, etc. Believes it will expand into other areas. Need robust regional service provider.

Randy Shields: Exciting time in education. When you are building systems that have to fit all the districts in the state, one of your problems is going to be the difference in size. Last five years Tillamook district student success has been four times the state average, and the reason is that they have been able to work together with a collaborative approach in the NW region ESD. Challenge of getting to 40- 40- 20 goal is going to be in rural communities. Going to need help. Need efficient and effective way to come together with other districts to share resources.

Discussion:

- We need to have an intentional inter-dependency network. Need to have a coordination of services.
- Incentivizing the school districts to spend money in the classroom isn't working. How do you get the districts to work together in all aspects, i.e., procurement, payroll, warehouse, etc? They are not working together as they should be.
- Some districts are doing it. Some are looking at options to do it. Virtual Technology Department created between four ESD's. Easier for local communities to get behind a statewide initiative.
- How aggressive in scaling up islands of excellence? You have islands of excellence, but not consistency.
- Samples for Compacts.

- What other states have been successful with this?
- Important to pilot test, not mandate from a state level.

Invited Testimony: Chalkboard Project – Results of Public Opinion Research
Sue Hildick, President of the Chalkboard Project

- Three focus groups over last three weeks. In Portland, Medford and Bend. Held by Adam Davis, Davis, Hibbitts & Midghall, inc.
- PowerPoint presentation by Adam Davis

Discussion:

- Were any people of color contacted to be a part of the focus groups? The sample of people was representative of the communities where focus groups took place.
- Reaching out to likely voters. Need to reach out to each and every child.
- Should standardized testing be used in measuring student achievement? Heard a lot of concern about testing. "Teaching to the test" was a term used a lot.
- Proficiency would be understood via assessments that might include some standardized testing, but also include other very different types of assessment, including ones that are classroom based, that rely on teacher judgment. Might include surveys of next level educators. Inserting placeholders for next generation assessment. State wide, standard, summative testing is not a full and complete descriptor of students progress towards proficiency.
- Heard words like "professional discretion", "teacher judgment" in focus groups. Was important. Heard a real concern about teachers regarding class size, pay. They only move as fast as their slowest student. They are dealing with issues way beyond their control. More societal problems. A lot of support for teachers.
- Community recognizing the importance of integration with social services.
- Biggest ah-ha moment: People are very passionate about having a better education system in Oregon, but do not have the capacity to pay anything more. Have to do more with what you already have. Related message: Have to do things differently.
- Role of parents is very important. Be prepared to talk in terms of parent responsibility and helping parents contribute.
- Significant number of people that feel that there is no role for the State to get involved in pre-K.

Action Items:

a. Outline of Report to Legislature, Summaries of Strategies

Discussion:

- C, last bullet point: Not all Oregonians who pursue education beyond high school may not be trying to achieve a degree. They may be just updating skills for their present job. May be too narrow.
- Develop more detail regarding a principle that speaks to the support of teachers. II. Summary of Strategies, 3rd bullet.
- C. Outcomes: What are we calling the learning stages?
- II. Summary of Strategies, 2nd bullet: Something to be said about the inputs that the state can be putting out in the community, so it's just not outcomes.
- III. Phase One, B, Framework: Speak to what the ESDs said today about networking -- that the state can set up to share best practices among like districts.
- Rather unique mission of community colleges needs to be noted. Both workforce development pieces as well as the AA degree.
- Outcomes: All Oregonians or Oregon children?
- Compacts: Be clear that we are responsible because we provide the funding.
- Feedback from districts regarding: number of days cut / class size / programs cut.
- Have 40-40-20 strategies at the beginning so that the other strategies are coming out of it.

- Longitudinal Data System: Most people will think that is information about students vs. a system that is not student based. Will be called out.
- Achievement Compacts: be clearer about dropdown regarding K-12 districts.
- Phase I, part B, Connections: Why are these beneficial collaborations not happening? Identify the barriers that remain.
- Be clear about the set amount of time available to return this report, and that it is an organic changing document.

b. Legislative Concepts for the 2012 Session

Discussion:

- Want to move forward with the *concept* today for Achievement Compacts and Governance Changes.
- The compacts are intended to be between the state and school districts for K12, as well as the state and the Oregon University System at the post secondary level, rather than with individual schools. For K12, school level data will continue to be available at the school level in the report cards (under redesign) that will be issued annually by the state. On a philosophical level, the Achievement Compact is meant to represent the relationship between the state and the schools. In the Oregon system, schools are governed locally. The state's primary intersection with schools is at the district level and with school boards. The state isn't involved very meaningfully at the school level. The CEdO and this Board couldn't be very meaningfully involved by sifting through the thousands of compacts that would be produced by every school. At the University System, the compact will be with the system, but with subcompacts from the OUS to the individual institutions. In the instance where some institutions may be governed by their own boards, then they would be in a compact between the OEIB and their own boards.

MOTION: DIRECTOR MULVIHILL MOTIONS TO APPROVE THE CONCEPT; DIRECTOR YVONNE CURTIS SECONDS THE MOTION.

Discussion:

- *Critical Placeholder* for discussion regarding the out of school youth. Who signs the compact on their behalf? Who is responsible for them? Most districts don't have a retrieval program because they don't have anything to offer those young people.
- Language may be needed to insure that they get funded adequately.
- *Placeholder*: What is the role of social services, and are we going to think outside the box to encourage the other state wide entities that should play a role in this?
- Funding is a legislative role.
- Explanation of "a waiver of Division 22 reporting requirements" needed.

VOTE: THE MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY

Outreach and Communication:

Todd Jones, Policy Advisor, OEIB Staff

- Promising Practices and Opportunities to be Addressed

Sarah Ames, Communications, OEIB Staff

- Online survey update: 5000 participants, 700 pages of comments
- Outreach:
  - Regional meetings. Important to have conversations from practitioners from all over and all levels.
  - Regional meetings being married with scheduled meetings. Not an add-on.
  - Bring in a broader range of people. Families.

FUTURE MEETINGS:

Tentatively set for Dec. 7th. Still waiting for January dates.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Mary Daly-Piehl, parent and coalition member
- Jennifer Schuberth, Assistant professor, PSU, Founding member of CORE (Calling Oregon to Reinvest in Education)
- Steve Buel, taxpaying citizen, 43 year school teacher
- Mary Lou Hennrich, Health Kids Learn Better

Chair Golden adjourned the meeting at 5:02.